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Any agenda-related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the Planning Commission after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed, typically they are distributed on the Thursday or Friday preceding the Planning Commission meeting and/or on Monday before the meeting. Supplemental Packets on Thursday or Friday are available for public inspection in the Community Development Department, 2100 East Thousand Oaks Boulevard, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2). All Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the Planning Commission on the City’s website www.toaks.org.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): In compliance with the ADA, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting or other services in conjunction with this meeting, please contact the Planning Division, (805) 449-2500. Upon request, the agenda and documents in this agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. Notification at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or time when services are needed will assist the City in ensuring that reasonable arrangements can be made to provide accessibility to the meeting or service.
To: Planning Commission

From: Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director

Date: July 10, 2023

Subject: Regarding Item 7A - Proposed 30-Unit Apartment Complex - Residential Planned Development 2021-70328-RPD and Parcel Merger (PM) 2023-70002, located at 170 Erbes Road, Assessor's Parcel No. (APN) 670-0-250-230, Allied Management Group

The attachment contains public correspondence that arrived after the printing of the Agenda Packet.
New User Fees go into effect July 1, 2023. Applications submitted with minimum application requirements by June 30, 2023, will be subject to current fees. Applications invoiced on or after July 1, 2023, will be subject to new fees. Click HERE to view.
F: 818.879.1539
E: Patrick.Naylon@NaylonAssociates.com
PATRICK R. NAYLON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
3835 EAST THOUSAND OAKS BLVD. SUITE 277  
WESTLAKE VILLAGE, CALIFORNIA 91362  
TEL:  (818) 879-1533  
(818) 355-4176

July 10, 2023

City of Thousand Oaks  
Planning Commission  
Community Development Department  
2100 Thousand Oaks Blvd.  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

RE: 170 Erbes Road  
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362  
(herein “the Erbes Project”)

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am the owner of the apartment building located at 1800 Foursite Lane, Thousand Oaks, CA 91362. (herein “Foursite Lane”) I am an attorney and real estate broker licensed in the State of California since 1972. I have practiced in the field of real estate transactions, litigation and construction. I have built many luxury homes, apartment buildings, shopping centers, gas stations and single tenant structures since 1972. I am well-versed in all areas of construction from planning to leasing or sale.

I am submitting this communication to the City as my opposition to the Erbes Project. Generally speaking the Erbes Project is grossly overbuilt, violates the intent of the Thousand Oaks General Plan and is an abuse of the so-called “density bonus laws” enacted by the State of California in 1979.

I emphasize that this is not a normal case of 2 property owners differing over the use of each other’s property. Foursite Lane is 15 to 20 feet below the grade line of the Erbes Project and this must be taken into account when examining the
issues. If the 2 properties were on a level playing field there would be no justifiable argument against the Erbes Project in light of current law.

I base my argument that the Erbes Project is illegal on the following grounds:

1) Description of Foursite Lane

Foursite Lane is a 20 unit apartment complex that contains about 18,000 square feet of living space and has 43 parking on about 1 acre of land. It was built in 1984 and I have owned it since 1999. It is contiguous to the Erbes Project on its north side separated by an approximately 15 foot to 20 foot high retaining wall which currently supports the dirt upon which the Erbes Project will be built. 13 of the Foursite Lane apartments have patios which face the retaining wall. Therefore, the living space of these 13 apartments is about 15 to 20 feet below the Erbes Project grade. The retaining wall runs the length of Foursite Lane from Erbes Road up to about 200 feet on the property line between the two (2) properties. 13 of the 20 units face the retaining wall. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a photograph of part of the retaining wall on the Foursite Lane Property.

2) Description of the Erbes Project

The Erbes Project is located on 3/4 of an acre. There is a proposed 30 unit apartment complex containing approximately 50,000 square feet of living space with 42 parking and a height of 42 feet with set backs ranging from 5 feet to 15 feet from the Foursite Lane retaining wall or boundary line. The original zoning was RPD-20 which allowed 20 units per acre or, in that case, 15 units maximum. The General Plan designates the property as “high density” which allows 30 unit per acre or, in that case, 22 units. The original limitations for the site are a maximum height of 35 feet and setbacks of 15 feet. The City has applied the density bonus laws which would allow the construction height to be raised to 42 feet and to allow a reduction in setbacks to 5 feet from 15 feet. All of these exceptions affect the north side of the Erbes Project which is where the Foursite Lane retaining wall and apartments are located. These exceptions and variances to the zoning constitute an illegal and unjustified application of the density bonus laws because they create a threat to the environment and the public safety and health of the tenants of Foursite Lane.
3) Application of the density bonus laws

The density bonus laws are in effect to give incentives to developers to provide more housing for the State of California. If a developer wants to make use of the laws some of the proposed apartment units must be rented to low-income tenants and the local city zoning laws are superceded by the state laws. For each low income tenant a waiver or an exception is given to the developer and in this case the City has given a variety of incentives and exceptions which strip away normal limitations. This is unfair and unreasonable as they relate to Foursite Lane. The City has the right to refuse the application of the density bonus laws in whole or in part if it finds that there is “an unmitigable impact on public health or safety.” The following list of problems which will occur if this project is approved will create environmental, health and public safety issues for the tenants of Foursite Lane and the general public:

a) The Erbes Project will interfere with the solar panels in the patios of the Foursite Lane tenants. The State of California passed a law codified in Section 714 and 714.1 called the Solar Rights Act which gives all homeowners the right to “sunlight” between adjacent property owners by easement. This easement can be implied or in writing. The law requires that cities in the State of California do not allow or permit construction which will interfere with the easement. If the height of the Erbes Project is 42 feet and the depth of the ground floor of the Foursite Lane tenants is 10 to 15 feet below the existing grade then the height of the new construction may reach 57 feet which will inalterably block sunlight to the patios and the units including the solar units of the Foursite Lane tenants. The Erbes Project architect tried to deal with this problem by submitting a “Sun” study but the results are factitious when looking at the aforesaid disparity in heights. The truth is that the sun will be blocked completely and cast only shadows to the units and patios from approximately 11:00 AM in the day in the winter months and from approximately 1:00 PM in the day in the summer months. At a minimum further studies by the City should be done on this issue.

b) The Erbes Project will cause a diminution in sunlight to the patios of the tenants of the Foursite Lane property which will interfere with the circadian rhythms and psychological well-being of both adults and children. There is no dispute that the Erbes project will cast a shadow on the Foursite Lane property and, more particularly, on the patios of those units facing the retaining wall. There is a plethora of scientific evidence found by neurologists and mental health experts that darkness breeds migraines, fatigue, sleeplessness, insomnia, depression and
other symptoms. Light, especially natural sunlight, influences alertness and cognition. Approving this project will create a deleterious affect on the tenants and their children which is all in a cause to create few more affordable apartments and to service the interests of a developer. This is not a judicious outcome.

c) The Erbes Project will cause a diminution in sunlight to the patios of the tenants of the Foursite Lane property which will constitute a “nuisance” in violation of California law. Nuisance law balances the right of landowners to use land as they see fit against the duty to not use their land to injure a neighbor. In this case, the nuisance is substantial and intentional and therefore strict liability will apply. Light and air have long been recognized to be of esthetic and health value in architecture and construction. Light and air aid in the control of temperature and other sources of energy such as solar. If buildings are adequately spaced there should be no cause for concern. In this case reducing the setbacks is radically injurious to Foursite Lane. Included in this nuisance concept is the fact that the Erbes Project will create a noise nuisance, block cell phone coverage and invade privacy rights since the tenants at the Erbes Project will have a direct view of the patios and interiors of the Foursight Lane tenants. This will be exacerbated by the lack of foliage blocking an intrusion which is another incentive given to the Erbes Project.

d) The Erbes Project will cause a violation of the planning guidelines because the differential in height from the first floor of the Foursite Lane apartment units and patios to the new construction will exceed more than 1 story and, accordingly, the setbacks to 5 feet is improper.

e) The Erbes Project calls for a dumpster to be placed within 5 feet of the boundary line at the highest point of the construction and adjacent to the Foursite Lane living spaces. Obviously, this will cause noxious fumes to penetrate the Foursite Lane tenants' spaces who will have living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms so close to a trash bin. There will be little or no ventilation which will exacerbate the noxious fumes. This will also constitute a fire hazard since the phrase “dumpster fire” is an illusion to the number of accidental fires emanating from trash bins. Further, radical departure from norms had to be given by the fire department which jeopardizes Foursite Lane because if its close proximity to the building itself.

f) The Erbes Project has not submitted any data to show that it is economically feasible to the City to reduce the rents in an attempt to satisfy the obligations
required by the density bonus laws.

g) The Erbes Project calls for a reduction in landscaping which will cause a risk of flooding due to lack of drainage.

h) The Erbes Project is not consistent nor compatible with the applicable policies expressed in the City’s General Plan. In fact, it is a flagrant abuse of the concept that the general plan be sensitive to highlighting and complimenting the natural environment and natural features.

i) The intent of the density bonus law is to increase affordable housing. The City of Thousand Oaks has the right to deny the request for application of the density bonus laws by this applicant because the statute allows cities to manage their own affairs under the doctrine of “home rule” and where it has met its statewide obligations to provide affordable housing. There are over 1,000 units in the plan stages. All of those projects are not intrusive to the neighborhood such as the Erbes Project is to Foursite Lane. In fact, it would be fair to say that the described construction is a punitive application of the density bonus laws because of its unfair and unjustified application of the waivers and exceptions.

j) The approval by the City of the Erbes Project is a violation of my federal and state constitutional rights in that it constitutes a “taking” of my property without compensation or excuse and the City should be enjoined from such action.

4) The Erbes Project is inherently unsafe from a structural analysis.

The structural plans have not been submitted as of this date but the proximity of the setbacks to the existing retaining wall militate against approving construction because there is no engineering calculation that will safeguard the integrity of the retaining wall. Even applying generally acceptable structural guidelines such as a 45 degree angle from competing footings is insufficient to ensure that substantial damage will not occur during construction or in later years after inevitable settling of the earth. In fact, the approval of the ingress and egress is a sample of this illogic. The egress from the garage is 5 feet from Foursite Lane above grade. That can be interpreted to mean that 10,000 to 15,000 pound cars will transfer a load to the retaining walls in perpetuity. To prevent that from occurring is why we have setbacks and there is no engineer that will guaranty that his formula will be inherently foolproof. In essence it is guesswork and the only real way to obviate this problem is to adhere to safe setbacks. The threat that there be a “zero load” on
Foursite Lane was of such paramount importance that the YOLO project installed a 20 foot retaining wall over piles circumscribing the majority of their property. That is impossible with this construction.

5) The Erbes Project will create a traffic nightmare on Erbes Road.

The construction calls for 42 parking in the Erbes Project. There is no street parking available on Erbes Road. The correct ratio of parking to the number of units and the unit size and square footage has been completely rejected in this case. The need for overflow parking will create a neighborhood problem as these excess vehicles seek to find other properties where they can illegally park.

6) 150 Erbes Road

The single family home located at the souther boundary line will be adjacent to the ingress to the parking garage of the Erbes Project. This will inherently create a dangerous condition to that house and there is no way to mitigate that problem except to deny the application to revise the setbacks. This will effectively scuttle the project. A photo of that house is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

7) Foursite Lane tenants

I am submitting as Exhibit C the written petition of my affected tenants to rescind any approval or any recommendation for approval of this construction because it is an affront to their physical, mental and emotional well-being as well as their children.

8) Conclusion

I have been a resident of this area since 1980. If the City of Thousand Oaks moves forward on this project it is in violation of everything all residents hold important which is a safe, healthy and attractive city. I intend to fully protect my rights as a citizen of this city and state and do whatever is necessary under the law to protect my tenants and my family including requesting a court issue an injunction. An objective application of the city and state laws must take notice that when I purchased Foursite lane in 1999 I assumed that only 15 units would be built on the adjoining property. That assumption should have some weight in determining on how the current guidelines should be applied in fairness to all involved. That includes the State, the City, the developer and me.
I hope the planning commission agrees and scales back this project to a reasonable size and scope.

Sincerely,

Patrick Naylon
PRN:al
cc: attachments
Tenants
1800 Foursite Lane
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Re: 170 Erbes Road
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362 (New Project)

Dear Tenant:

The undersigned is the owner of 1800 Foursite Lane, Thousand Oaks, CA 91362 (herein “Foursite Lane”) which is the 20 unit apartment building in which you live. The adjacent property to the south of Foursite is a vacant parcel of land on which the City of Thousand Oaks intends to approve the construction of the New Project which is a 30 unit apartment complex which will have a set-back from Foursite of 5 feet to 15 feet from the property line and will be approximately 40 feet high. This is far in excess of the normal and standard setback and height requirements for the City of Thousand Oaks. Your apartment and your patio faces the retaining wall on the property line between Foursite and the New Project. This New Project will adversely affect Foursite and your apartment by blocking sunlight which is necessary for your solar panels which you now have or may want to install in the future; creating interference with cell phone coverage; creating dangerous traffic conditions and traffic flow on Erbes Road; creating undue noise, creating a fire hazard, creating inadequate and improper ventilation, creating a high load and extreme pressure on the retaining wall and generally will be an eye-sore and in particular is an overbuilt and too dense of a project to approve.

Your signature which is attached to this letter will be submitted to the Planning Commission and will register with them a notice that you have reviewed the site plan and elevations and adamantly and strenuously object to the New Project.

Also, your signature will advise the Planning Commission that you work either full
or part time at your apartment, have children who reside with you and use the patio as a necessary part of your living quarters. Allowing this project to go to completion as designed will adversely affect your health and well being.

Sincerely,

Patrick R. Naylon
PRN:al
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 170 ERBES ROAD, THOUSAND OAKS, CA. (NEW PROJECT)

1) THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDES AT 1800 FOURSITE LANE APARTMENT #7 THOUSAND OAKS, CA. MY APARTMENT BACKS UP TO A RETAINING WALL ON THE PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN FOURSITE AND THE NEW PROJECT.

2) I HAVE REVIEWED THE SITE PLAN OF THE NEW PROJECT AND I DO NOT APPROVE IT BASED ON THOSE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE LETTER OF PATRICK NAYLON DATED JULY 9, 2023.

3) I HAVE CHILDREN LIVING WITH ME AND THIS MAY AFFECT SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELL BEING. FOR THOSE WHO LIVE IN THE COMPLEX THIS SIDE OF ERBES HAS NO PARKING, BUSY STREET, CONNECTING TO WESTBOUND 101.

4) I HAVE OR INTEND TO HAVE SOLAR PANELS INSTALLED TO REDUCE THE COST OF ELECTRICITY TO MY UNIT INCLUDING THE 40 GALLON HOT WATER HEATER.

APARTMENT NUMBER: #7

BY

PRINT NAME:
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 170 ERBES ROAD, THOUSAND OAKS, CA. (NEW PROJECT)

1) THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDES AT 1800 FOURSITE LANE APARTMENT 10 THOUSAND OAKS, CA. MY APARTMENT BACKS UP TO A RETAINING WALL ON THE PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN FOURSITE AND THE NEW PROJECT.

2) I HAVE REVIEWED THE SITE PLAN OF THE NEW PROJECT AND I DO NOT APPROVE IT BASED ON THOSE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE LETTER OF PATRICK NAYLON DATED JULY 9, 2023.

3) I HAVE [ ] CHILDREN LIVING WITH ME AND THIS MAY AFFECT THEIR SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELL BEING.

4) I HAVE OR INTEND TO HAVE SOLAR PANELS INSTALLED TO REDUCE THE COST OF ELECTRICITY TO MY UNIT INCLUDING THE 40 GALLON HOT WATER HEATER.

APARTMENT NUMBER: 10

BY: _____________________________

PRINT NAME:
Neftali Perez
Briana Perez
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 170 ERBES ROAD, THOUSAND OAKS, CA. (NEW PROJECT)

1) THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDES AT 1800 FOURSITE LANE APARTMENT #5 THOUSAND OAKS, CA. MY APARTMENT BACKS UP TO A RETAINING WALL ON THE PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN FOURSITE AND THE NEW PROJECT.

2) I HAVE REVIEWED THE SITE PLAN OF THE NEW PROJECT AND I DO NOT APPROVE IT BASED ON THOSE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE LETTER OF PATRICK NAYLON DATED JULY 9, 2023.

3) I HAVE 1 CHILDREN LIVING WITH ME AND THIS MAY AFFECT THEIR SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELL BEING.

4) I HAVE OR INTEND TO HAVE SOLAR PANELS INSTALLED TO REDUCE THE COST OF ELECTRICITY TO MY UNIT INCLUDING THE 40 GALLON HOT WATER HEATER.

APARTMENT NUMBER: #5

BY: MARIE DAYAL

PRINT NAME: [Signature]
OBSESSION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 170 ERBES ROAD, THOUSAND OAKS, CA. (NEW PROJECT)

1) THE UNDERSIGNED RESIDES AT 1800 FOURSITE LANE APARTMENT THOUSAND OAKS, CA. MY APARTMENT BACKS UP TO A RETAINING WALL ON THE PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN FOURSITE AND THE NEW PROJECT.

2) I HAVE REVIEWED THE SITE PLAN OF THE NEW PROJECT AND I DO NOT APPROVE IT BASED ON THOSE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE LETTER OF PATRICK NAYLON DATED JULY 9, 2023.

3) I HAVE 2 CHILDREN LIVING WITH ME AND THIS MAY AFFECT THEIR SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELL BEING.

4) I HAVE OR INTEND TO HAVE SOLAR PANELS INSTALLED TO REDUCE THE COST OF ELECTRICITY TO MY UNIT INCLUDING THE 40 GALLON HOT WATER HEATER.

APARTMENT NUMBER: 4

BY: [Signature]

PRINT NAME: Rachel Asvanonda

[Signature]

Jordan Anderson
OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 170 ERBES ROAD, THOUSAND OAKS, CA. (NEW PROJECT)

1) THE UNDERSigned RESIDES AT 1800 FOURSITE LANE APARTMENT 3 THOUSAND OAKS, CA. MY APARTMENT BACKS UP TO A RETAINING WALL ON THE PROPERTY LINE BETWEEN FOURSITE AND THE NEW PROJECT.

2) I HAVE REVIEWED THE SITE PLAN OF THE NEW PROJECT AND I DO NOT APPROVE IT BASED ON THOSE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE LETTER OF PATRICK NAYLON DATED JULY 9, 2023.

3) I HAVE 2 CHILDREN LIVING WITH ME AND THIS MAY AFFECT THEIR SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELL BEING.

4) I HAVE OR INTEND TO HAVE SOLAR PANELS INSTALLED TO REDUCE THE COST OF ELECTRICITY TO MY UNIT INCLUDING THE 40 GALLON HOT WATER HEATER.

APARTMENT NUMBER: 3

BY: Julio Orellana Olivia O'Gorman

PRINT NAME:
Julio Orellana Olivia O'Gorman
To: Planning Commission

From: Kelvin Parker, Community Development Director

Date: July 10, 2023


The attachment contains public correspondence that arrived after the printing of the Agenda Packet.

Dear GP team, Planning Dept, Planning Commission & Honorable Councilmembers,

I apologize in advance for this lengthy email. However this is a complex subject that can’t be addressed in a 3 minute speech or brief email. First this has nothing to do with the Wetlands issue. Please do not let the recent Fish & Wildlife determination cloud the issues. CVASP and Newbury Park is against this change for so many reasons which have been stated time and again. We believe it is premature to make such a drastic land use change without knowing what the ultimate project will look like, as well as the impact it will have on the surrounding neighborhood. Each step closer to this change transfers power to the property owner, while reducing the city’s control. At the May 23rd council meeting a speaker said something to the effect that “we know the original EIR for Fox Meadows always provided for this parcel to be developed and that the parcel has the same conditions of Fox Meadows and was able to be developed”. I was curious about this statement so I obtained the 1977 EIR & additional documents. It was very enlightening and is a document which everyone involved in
this decision should be made aware of. It covers many areas of interest (such as the suggestion that the cut area should have been planted with vegetation to heal the scar, which is exactly opposite of what’s been occurring the past several years, as well as the flood control issues), but I’m going to focus on traffic.

While this EIR and traffic study was for the Fox Meadows development it also looked forward to the additional traffic impact should the Borchard parcel be developed. Page 51 of the EIR discusses the traffic impact for the 147 Fox Meadows units. It concluded that collector streets Alice & Shirley could handle the flow and be within the County Volumes of 300 vehicles per hour & City standards of a collector street serving no more than 250 homes.

Page 57 however points out concern regarding development of the 30 acres to the east (Borchard Parcel).

Page 68 begins the discussion of the impact of development of the Borchard parcel. It reads “in conclusion, the maximum number of dwellings units which can be constructed in this area is 113 if County policies are respected”

Page 3 of the Staff Report document also referenced the future traffic problems when/if the Borchard site was developed. It concluded a bridge would need to be built on the Michael side.

I realize the traffic study conclusions were based on conditions and standards in place in 1977 and in all likelihood, current standards would allow for higher traffic flows. However I ask you to consider, in 1977 what were the average number of vehicles per household? How many households had more than one family member working outside the home? Today most households have two or more working members. Most teenagers didn’t have cars then. A majority do today. In 1977 most young adults left home after high school or college. Today many live with their parents much longer. All of these
factors generate more cars and more car trips than were anticipated in the 1977 study, and even then, that study didn’t feel more than 115 homes could be added based on the current street configuration.

So this is why I am proposing that some type of traffic study be conducted prior to making this change. Ignoring the flood issues, the city needs to determine how many homes and businesses could reasonably be constructed on this parcel even with a bridge access on the Michael side. Then the land use should be crafted according to this. Some may say that a study can’t be conducted without a project plan. I disagree. Current traffic volumes can be determined. After that various scenarios can be input based on different housing limits. It won’t be perfect but it will give some guidance. The City Council can’t make this major decision and kick this can down the road expecting others (traffic division, fire/police depts, flood control district) to stop the project if it won’t work. We all know this land owner and once the change is made he is going to push for approval of a project even if the traffic studies don’t support it. He’s going to ask for waivers and variances. We all know this. Or he’s going to sell the property to a big developer with lots of lawyers and deep pockets.

Another issue is the collector streets on the Wendy side are County streets. How will this impact the County and will the County also have a right to be involved in final approval? I have asked this question of several Council members, and some city staff and none could provide an answer. Isn’t this something that should be investigated?

In 2000 City Council Members Gillett, Markey, and Fox voted to approve the lease to Caruso. Member Del Campo was absent but voiced his support. I am not trying to blemish their reputations, but twenty years later it seems most agree this was a bad deal for the city. We received no rental income and were forced to sell the
property at less than the city paid for it due to the terms of the lease. However this is part of the legacy of these four councilmembers. Please don’t let developers, the Chamber of Commerce and other special interests pressure you into making a similar decision that may affect your legacy of service to the city. All we’re asking is to put on the brakes. Listen to the citizens of Newbury Park and obtain scientific input from experts.

PS- I have bookmarked comments throughout both of these documents.

Respectfully,

Karen Wilburn
213-216-1937
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Department
REPORT: Tract 2790
APPLICANT: Griffin Development Company
FILED: November 16, 1977

REQUEST
A tentative tract map has been submitted to allow the subdivision of 40 acres into 145 lots for single family detached residences on property located south of the Ventura Freeway at the easterly terminus of Alice Drive and Shirley Drive within the Newbury Park area of the City of Thousand Oaks.

ZONING
The site is currently zoned, R-1-8 (single family residences 8,000 square foot minimum lot size) as shown on Zoning Map Section D-7 and D-8.

USE
The subject property is currently vacant and unimproved. Some disposal of dirt and other refuse has been placed on the property.

PARCEL SPECIFICATIONS
The subject property consists of 40 acres situated on relatively level terrain and is irregular in shape.

STREET SPECIFICATIONS
The tentative tract map area will be served by the extension of Shirley and Alice Drives which stub out on the westerly property line. Alice Drive is proposed to be extended as a 50' wide right-of-way and ultimately connects with Wendy Drive to the west. Alice Drive will be extended as a 46' right-of-way and connects with Debby Street which ultimately intersects Wendy Drive to the west. The only other source of access to the property would require construction of a bridge over the south branch of the Arroyo Conejo.

ADJACENT ZONING
The surrounding zoning is C-2 and M-1 across the Ventura Freeway to the north; R-E-1AC, RPD-SFD-4.5U and R-1-8 across the Arroyo Conejo to the south; R-1-8 to the west and east.

ADJACENT LAND USES
Adjacent land uses consist of the Ventura Freeway and scattered commercial and industrial uses to the north; vacant property and the south branch of the Arroyo Conejo and single family detached residences to the south; vacant property to the east and single family detached residences to the west.
PREVIOUS PERTINENT CASES
There are no previous pertinent cases on the subject property.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION
The Land Use Element of the General Plan designates the subject property for low density residential (2 to 4.5 units per net acre).

E.I.R. DETERMINATION
Environmental Impact Report Number 135 must be certified prior to acting on the subject application. Findings regarding the implementation of mitigation measures, as required by the California Resources Code, are as follows:

1. Changes or alterations have been required which mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects, as identified in the final E.I.R.

2. Specific economic considerations make infeasible the implementation of mitigation measures or project alternatives, particularly in respect to the construction of a secondary vehicular access via a bridge over-crossing connecting with Michael Drive to the south.

EVALUATION
This tentative tract map has been submitted to sub-divide 40 acres of land into 145 single family detached lots. The property has been zoned for a considerable number of years to allow for this type of development and was initially planned to be an extension of the adjacent Casa Conejo tract to the west. Prior to the City considering developing on any portion of the property, the Planning Department directed the applicant to submit an overall concept for the entire vacant acreage south of the Ventura Freeway up to the Borchard Road overpass and this has been shown on the tentative map exhibit. It is planned by the applicant to file a second tentative tract map on the residual acreage in the future, however, one of the main reasons this land cannot be sub-divided at the present time is due to Flood Control problems caused by a sub-standard channel size going under the Ventura Freeway and along a portion of the north side of the freeway. During heavy runoff conditions upstream, the water backs up on to this area as well as other properties, causing a flood hazard. The Environmental Impact Report, as well as information submitted by the Ventura County Flood Control District further explains this matter.

The subject property is also unique due to the fact that it is zoned with the original Ventura County classification of R-1-8, thus eliminating the need for a residential planned development permit and is one of the last remaining large parcels in this zone.

The principal review items which should be considered by the Planning Commission are as follows:

1. Zoning Compliance
   The minimum lot size of 8,000 square feet and lot width of 75 feet has been met throughout the tentative tract map. This zoning has been in effect for approximately 15 years and complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan in terms of net density.
2. Park Dedication Requirements

Based on preliminary Staff calculations approximately 2 acres of land should be set aside to meet, in part, public recreational requirements for this development. The applicant has indicated his desire to provide a fee based on the fair market value of the land plus the proportional cost for street improvements which will be donated to the park district for development of park facilities within the service radius of the tract. A recent indication from the Park District's staff, however, is that there currently is a deficiency of park lands in this general area and some negotiations may be initiated to have a portion of this tract or adjacent property dedicated for a neighborhood park. The Planning Department expects to receive a letter from the District Staff explaining their position for the review of the Planning Commission. A public concern raised by the District that is shared by the Planning and Engineering Department is the circuitous route that must be taken by pedestrians, particularly school children in reaching the nearby school sites on the south side of the channel, as well as the possibility of a park site within the subject tract or on adjacent property. A consideration that should be thoroughly analyzed is the prospect to construct a pedestrian bridge over the south branch of the Arroyo Conejo near Alice Drive. As can be determined by reviewing the site, pedestrians go through this area at the present time creating a vandalism problem (fence damage) as well as a hazard within the channel particularly during the rainy season. The applicant should be prepared to further address this issue.

3. Street Circulation Pattern

The Environmental Impact Report thoroughly addresses this aspect of the proposal in that this was considered to be one of the major impacts caused by this project that would substantially affect the adjacent sub-division to the west.

Due to the existence of two stub streets along the west boundary, it must be concluded that their extension was always planned to occur on to the subject property. The only other consideration for access would be via a bridge overcrossing which may be provided near the extreme east end of the larger parent parcel close to the Borchard Road overpass. A 60' wide easement exists in that area adjacent to the recently completed shopping center on the north-west corner of Borchard Road and Michael Drive. However, no easement exists over the channel at the present time. Access is a severe development constraint on the subject property due to the existence of the Ventura Freeway to the north and the south branch of the Arroyo Conejo to the south. In considering the access limitations, the tract must be designed to connect with the existing stub streets along the west boundary. A number of revisions to the street pattern were undertaken by the applicant as directed by the Engineering Department to funnel the majority of traffic on to Alice Drive, a collector street, rather than to Shirley Drive, a local street. Furthermore, Alice Drive is a direct route to Wendy Drive, a secondary highway with an on and off ramp system at the Ventura Freeway. The Shirley Drive access requires the use of two other local residential streets before reaching Wendy Drive. The handling capacities of these two existing streets will not be exceeded by volumes generated from this development, thus the Staff is recommending approval of this circulation system. The City must anticipate a future problem, however, when the adjacent subdivision on the residual property is filed. In all likelihood, if economically feasible, a bridge overcrossing will have to be constructed to connect with Michael Drive unless a waiver of city street standards is granted.
4. **Overhead Utility Lines**

A substantial system of overhead utility lines currently exists along the north, west and south perimeters of the subject property. The most significant section of these lines follows along the Ventura Freeway which is classified as a scenic freeway and the City is requiring that these lines should be relocated and under-grounded. The Staff has been informed that the current cable system for the Pacific Telephone along the southerly boundary will be removed and discontinued in approximately two years. In any event, the applicant has filed an underground utility waiver to defer the undergrounding of these lines which will be before the Planning Commission in the near future. A standard condition requiring complete undergrounding of adjacent utilities is being suggested as required by the Municipal Code.

5. **Grading**

Very limited grading is required due to the flat topography on the subject property. Primarily, however, the grades of all the proposed pads must be elevated in order to fall outside the one hundred year flood plain area, as shown within the Environmental Impact Report. The material to elevate the pad is generated within the adjacent property labeled for a future subdivision. The excavation of earth materials in this location will result in a flood basin area which will hold water primarily during rainfall conditions. However, that water should either run off to the existing channel or percolate within a rapid period of time. **The grading in this area will require the applicant to install some native landscaping materials to heal over the scar caused by excavation of this material.** Correspondence within the E.I.R. indicates that the current property owner may farm this area. The standard requirements regarding installation of an irrigation system and landscaping on all graded slopes over 3 feet is a condition.

6. **Noise Controls**

Due to the close proximity of this subdivision to the Ventura Freeway, the applicant is establishing noise buffers to reduce the ambient level of sound emanating from the freeway traffic on to the subject property. This is occurring through the installation of a combination berm and wall. The berm may be as high as 6 feet with a five foot wall on top and the outside portion of this barrier will be landscaped and irrigated and placed within a Maintenance District.

Access to this Maintenance District must be provided either from Wendy Drive on ramp or from the subject property as an easement through a lot area on Shirley Drive. The installation of this noise buffer will protect future inhabitants within this tract however, the offsetting disadvantage is the fact that this barrier will effectively block the scenic vistas, particularly as viewed by east-bound motorists looking in a southerly direction.

7. **School Conditions**

The standard school requirement is being suggested stipulating that the agreement to assist the school district must be consummated before the filing of the final tract map.
8. Other Considerations

Other considerations regarding the subdivision are as follows:

A. A condition is being suggested regarding the control of fence or block wall construction on all lots to maintain a consistency in appearance and design.

B. The Planning Department will review as part of the Precise Plan of Design process, the yard setbacks and architectural style at the time the building permits are requested for construction of the residences.

C. Barriers should be installed at the end of A Street and Alice Drive in an attempt to prevent vehicles, particularly motorcycles from entering the vacant land area and creating a nuisance for existing and future residences of this area.

9. Subdivision Map Act Findings

In reviewing these findings as stipulated within the Subdivision Map Act, it is found that the project generally meets these provisions, particularly as it relates to density being consistent with the General Plan and the site's physical suitability to accommodate the proposed project due to the relatively level topographic conditions. One of the more unique parts of the findings relates to causes of serious public health problems due to size of the tract or the type of improvement.

In this particular case, the noise emanating from the freeway could be considered such a problem, however, it is being mitigated through the installation of the berm and wall, reducing noise levels to appropriate City standards suggested within the Noise Element of the General Plan.

CONCLUSION

Due to the conventional R-1-8 zoning on the subject property and the existing street circulation pattern on adjacent properties, the Staff is recommending approval of the tentative tract map. Proximity to the Ventura Freeway and the Flood Control considerations, as well as the circulation pattern have been thoroughly reviewed by respective staffs and it is found that the design of the tract in conjunction with the suggested conditions should serve to resolve these matters to protect the health, safety and welfare of future inhabitants within the subdivision as well as within the adjacent existing tracts.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of the Planning Department that based on the studies, reports and other documents submitted to and considered by the Planning Commission in that matter, and the testimony and other evidence presented at this public hearing, the Planning Commission finds that Tentative Tract Map No. 2790, together with its design and plan for improvement, is consistent with the Thousand Oaks General Plan in that the proposed subdivision and its land use are compatible with the objectives, policies, land uses and programs stated in the Plan and that this Tract be approved subject to the attached suggested conditions.

Prepared by:

Michael J. Sangster
Deputy Director of Planning

Submitted by:

Phil E. Gatch
Planning Director
MEMO

TO: City Council
FROM: Planning Department
SUBJECT: POSSIBLE APPEAL OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S DECISION ON UUW 283 -- (TRACT 2790 - GRIFFIN DEVELOPMENT COMPANY)
DATE: September 19, 1978

Pursuant to the direction of the City Council at its meeting of September 12, 1978, attached is a copy of the Staff Report relative to this appeal and a letter from Mr. Charles W. Cohen, which was given to the Planning Commission just prior to the hearing.

After careful evaluation of this appeal, the Planning Commission (by a 3 to 2 -- Blum/Davis vote) approved the appeal allowing the utility poles adjacent to the freeway to be retained and not requiring any remuneration from the developer for their eventual removal.

If the Council wishes to appeal this matter, they must do so tonight in order to comply with the 20-day time limit.

Philip E. Gatch
Planning Director
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Presented 9-19-78
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cc Dpy 9/15/78
Honorable Richard I. McCann, Chairman
Planning Commission
City of Thousand Oaks
P.O. Box 1496
Thousand Oaks, California 91360

Re: UUW 282, Tract 2790

Dear Chairman McCann:

Despite our failure to preserve the action of the Planning Commission regarding the famous "bridge to Ralph's Market", with well licked wounds Griffin Development Company intrepidly requests that equity be done in granting relief under Thousand Oaks Municipal Code § 7-5.203(e).

Griffin asks that a waiver be granted for undergrounding overhead utilities along the northerly (US 101) boundary of Tract 2790. These lines are close to the State right-of-way and do not orient visually to the homes.

July, 1978 cost estimates for removal, relocation and undergrounding of said line are:

- Edison conversation  $86,664.00
- General Telephone conversion  85,021.00
- Total Estimated cost  $173,685.00

Tract 2790 was approved for 145 single family detached homes. That amounts to slightly less than $1,200.00 per home. Interest and financing charges over the life of the loan would bring the cost per home to more than $3,600.00.

This tract is already conditioned to pay approximately $165,000.00 of the costs of said bridge.

Because of the enormous cost, said lines should be left in place. There is a State interest here analogous to freeway landscaping. The removal of these lines is a general public matter, transcending tract, City and County.
In these post Proposition 13 times, one must rethink priorities. Would the general public vote a $173,000.00 tax upon itself for the cost of this presumed aesthetic benefit?

Certainly fairness dictates against a facile shifting of a burden of this magnitude to a single tract of 145 homes.

As you know, the ordinance provides for relief in cases of extraordinary cost.

This extraordinary cost relates to the Utilities and their peculiar and expensive conversion formula for almost one-half mile, 2,500 lineal feet, of line, plus subtraversing the freeway.

The Utilities find that the present system is functional, that relocation and undergrounding is an unnecessary pain, and therefore they layoff onto others the costs of conversion less salvage value.

Should the City mandate undergrounding, Griffin will agree to pay the cost of removal only of poles and lines, but urges that conversion costs be borne by the Utilities (8209 Fund) and/or the general fund.

The waiver has been administratively approved in part. We trust that the Planning Commission will apply existing policy in confirming the waivers on the westerly and southerly boundaries.

Undergrounding has been historically waived where existing homes (e.g. Casa Conejo Tract) would face substantial expense to convert overhead services. Fortunately, mature landscaping growth on the west screens and obscures said poles and lines.

In view of the confirmation from Pacific Telephone Company of its plan to remove main cable lines southerly of the tract within twentyfour (24) months (from January, 1978), we trust that you will concur with the Planning Director's recommended waiver and conditions for that part of the system.

We are seeking your approval of UUW 283, as follows:

1. Reaffirm the Administrative Approval in part of UUW 283.

2. Grant the waiver as to the northerly lines because of enormous cost per home and general public interest as contrasted with nominal benefit to Griffin home buyers.
We will appear at the public hearing to provide oral evidence in support of the Griffin application.

Thank you for your consideration and courtesy.

Very truly yours,

COHEN, ALEXANDER & CLAYTON
A Professional Corporation

Charles W. Cohen

CWC:p
MEMO

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Planning Department
SUBJECT: Appeal of the Planning Director's Decision for UUW-283 - Griffin Development
DATE: September 11, 1978

This appeal of the Planning Director's decision has been filed to allow the retention of the existing overhead system adjacent to the Ventura Freeway and along the north property line of this proposed development, Tract 2790. The Planning Director approved the waiver in part, allowing the maintenance of overhead utility systems along the west and south perimeters of the tract. This decision was based on the fact that the west utility line currently serves existing residences and the southerly Pacific Telephone cable system will be undergrounded in accordance with an attached letter in 1980.

As the Commission can determine, the subject property is currently being graded in preparation for the construction of 145 single family detached residences. The approval of this subdivision included the imposition of a condition requiring the undergrounding of the overhead systems unless a waiver was granted by the City. The basis for the applicant's appeal to retain the system next to the Freeway is as follows.

1. The proximity of this overhead system next to the Ventura Freeway and the orientation of the Tract away from this scenic route should result in the establishment of an 8209 fund application for the undergrounding of this system, since the general public will benefit from this conversion.

2. Insignificant benefit would result to future homeowners in Tract 2790.

3. Extreme economic burden amounting to approximately $1,200 per lot that is placed on Tract 2790, in addition to the previous extraordinary fees and assessments placed on this property.

The Staff, in considering the appeal, should indicate that the possible grounds to justify a waiver should be based on the following provisions as stipulated within the Ordinance: Section 7-4.203(c) which deals with the existence of overhead lines on the adjacent property, particularly to the east or subsection (e), the cost of underground lines compared with the cost of development. The appellant is primarily basing his position upon the cost benefit considerations if these overhead utility lines are converted to an underground system. In the appellant's opinion, the general public will benefit more from this conversion rather than just the residents within this subdivision since the system is exposed to the Ventura Freeway which is designated as a Scenic Highway. Apparently, the applicant is willing to provide these funds based upon an equitable share of the costs which is undetermined at the present time and may be difficult to establish at some future date. The applicant further states that the use of 8209 funds should be applied to this case, due to the general public benefit received as a result of this undergrounding. These funds are collected by the utility companies from the customers being served and may be applied, at the discretion of the City Council, for the undergrounding of lines within the community. As the Commission may be aware, these funds have been used on Thousand Oaks Boulevard and are earmarked for further undergrounding along this major artery based upon a priority program adopted by the City Council. Since a substantial amount of overhead lines still remains on Thousand Oaks Boulevard, it is estimated by the Staff that it will take several years before any other monies are available for other parts of the community.

In the opinion of the Planning Department, the information provided by the applicant seems to present insufficient support to justify entirely waiving the responsibility for the undergrounding of these existing lines.
The City historically has been very consistent by imposing on all development proposals, a requirement to underground existing lines located on-site or adjacent to the subject property. The Planning Department cannot recommend approval of the waiver for the following reasons:

1. The extent of this system, consisting of an 1800 foot length next to the Freeway as well as the exposed location along this Scenic Highway should require the removal and undergrounding of these lines.

2. The City has been generally consistent by imposing this requirement on all development in order to implement the City's policies for complete undergrounding of all overhead lines throughout the community. The developer is going to provide underground service within the subdivision and the applicant has been relieved of the undergrounding requirement along the west and south perimeter.

It should be indicated that the future expansion of the Ventura Freeway to six lanes will require the relocation of these lines and poles, particularly since some of these poles are located within the freeway right-of-way. The State has also indicated through its local representative that the relocation of these lines and conversion to an underground system, will eliminate a current hazard for motorists along this right-of-way, as well as improve the scenic qualities along this route.

The Staff would prefer to see a cost sharing program established that would include the California Department of Transportation since some benefit would be derived to the State if this system is removed and undergrounded. However, Cal-Trans representatives cannot commit any funding for this project.

The Commission will find attached the estimated cost of undergrounding as well as an explanation which is provided by the appellant regarding their position on this case. It is the Planning Departments finding however, that the visual marring effect of this system along this Scenic Freeway, in conjunction with the City's consistent position to underground existing lines where technically feasible should result in the denial of this appeal and the upholding of the Planning Director's decision.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the recommendation of the Planning Department that the appeal of UWW 283 be denied and the Planning Director's decision upheld requiring the undergrounding of this system next to the Ventura Freeway.

Prepared by:

Michael J. Sangster
Deputy Director of Planning

Submitted by:

Philip E. Batch
Planning Director
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ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
TRACT 2790
E.I.R. #135

Applicant:
Griffin Development Co.
9436 Ventura Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90025
(213) 478-3081

Prepared by:
John C. Prescott
Thousand Oaks Planning Dept.
Review Period:
October 17, 1977, to
November 16, 1977
COMMENTS RECEIVED

During the review period, comments were received from the Ventura County Flood Control District, the Conejo Valley Unified School District, and the applicant, Griffin Development Company. The full text of these comments is included within Appendix E.

Ventura County Flood Control District

Comment

The District noted the absence of Figure 3-7 (100-year flood plain) from the Draft EIR.

Response

This figure is included in Section III G of the Final EIR. It is also identical to Plate II in Appendix D.

Comment

The third paragraph of Section III G (Hydrology) should be reworded to state that storage volumes for flood waters will not be decreased (rather than increased, as in Draft EIR).

Response

The Final EIR reflects this comment.

Conejo Valley Unified School District

Comment

The School District commented that the walking distance standards contained in the Traffic Study (Appendix B) were out of date and should be revised.

Response

The comments of the District, including the revised walking distance standards are hereby incorporated into the EIR.

Griffin Development Co.

Comment

The applicant commented that:

(1) If they develop the property to the east of Tract 2790, they would intend to conform to the County's Access Policy.

(2) It is their understanding 115 lots could be developed on the 30 acres to the east of Tract 2790.
Response

The development of the 30 acres to the east should at least meet the City's access policy, which is less than the County's (250 homes - about 245 vph - compared to 300 vph). This would correlate to about 65 homes on the 30 acres, not 115.

Present zoning on the 30 acres could allow up to 130 homes, as indicated in the Draft EIR, not 115.

Additional Information

During the review period for the Draft EIR on Tract 2790, it was discovered that a second access to the area of Tract 2790 could be achieved.

There exists a 60-foot wide access easement, benefitting the subject property of Tract 2790 and the 30 acres to the east, which is a part of the same parcel of record. This easement extends north from Michael Drive on the westerly portion of the property located at the northwest corner of Borchard and Michael (site of new shopping center), as depicted on Figure 1 (next page). This easement does not extend across the flood control channel, according to the Flood Control District. However, Mr. Bill Frank, of the District, indicated they would be willing to consider granting an easement for a bridge across the channel to provide a road from Michael Drive to the subject property.

This concept was reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer, who endorsed it (see Appendix F, for the text of his response). In addition to the benefits he outlined, this bridge could substantially improve access of emergency vehicles to the area.

As an additional note to Mr. Clement's calculations of Bridge Policy obligations, the 30-acre parcel east of Tract 2790 would have an obligation of $10,560 ($30 acres @ $352/acre). Thus, the difference between the estimated cost of the bridge ($150,000) and the sum of monies paid into the Bridge Policy fund ($18,408) plus the normal obligations of development of the total 70 acres ($24,640) is $106,952.
I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

A tentative tract map and RPD permit application have been submitted to allow the construction of 145 single-family detached homes on 40 acres. The project site is located south and adjacent to the Ventura Freeway (Route 147) and approximately 1000 feet east of Wendy Drive. See figure 1.1 for project location.

Access to the property is proposed from the west via Alice Street and Shirley Drive. Both of these streets connect to Wendy Drive, further to the west. The minimum lot size within proposed Tract 2790 is 8,000 square feet, in conformance with the underlying R-1-8 zoning.

A copy of the proposed subdivision is shown in Figure 1.2. This map also shows the vacant land immediately east of Tract 2790, labelled "future subdivision."

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A. Site Description

1. Land Forms

The property is generally flat. The site terrain varies from 641 feet above sea level to 645 feet above sea level except for two small isolated areas where the site terrain rises above the flat areas. These areas have been created through previous grading operations for the Wendy Drive access onto the Ventura Freeway (Route 101) and for agricultural purposes. The highest point on the property is 670 feet above sea level in the northwestern section of the property, adjacent to the Wendy Drive interchange.

2. Vegetation

The property has previously been used for agricultural purposes, such as row crops and hay. However, the site is currently fallow. The dominant vegetation on the site consists of several clusters of trees, including several varieties of Eucalyptus, American Elm (Ulmus americana), California Pepper (Schinus molle), and California Walnut (Juglans californica).
3. Wildlife

Due to the surrounding area land utilization and the previous agricultural uses of the property, the wildlife types using the property is limited, although field observations revealed a heavy concentration of ground squirrels. Other wildlife that may be found on this property include reptiles (lizards and snakes), assorted birds (jays, hawks, vultures), and mammals (rabbits, the Southern Pocket Gopher, and the California Pocket Mouse).

B. Air Quality

The City of Thousand Oaks and Ventura County are located in the South Central Coast Air Basin and have been designated by The State Air Resources Board as an area of "Critical Concern" with respect to deteriorating air quality.

The principal air pollution problems in Thousand Oaks are particulate and photochemical oxidant emissions. Sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide, common to some areas, are not a problem in either Thousand Oaks or Ventura County.*

Primary sources of particulate emissions in the Thousand Oaks area are natural (wind, dust, salt), as well as man-made (residential and commercial heating, agricultural operations, construction and related activities, automobiles and off-road vehicles). The federal standard for particulate emissions was exceeded in Thousand Oaks an average of 28% of the measured days in 1974, 37% of the days measured in 1975, and 24% of the measured days in 1976.

Oxidants are formed by photochemical reactions between reactive hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides in the presence of sunlight. The principal source of photochemical oxidant pollution in the South Central Coast Air Basin, including Thousand Oaks, is the automobile. (See figure 2.2 for the percentage of days the federal oxidant standard of .08 parts per million was exceeded in Thousand Oaks).

C. Archaeology

Maps on file with the Planning Department showing the general location of significant archaeological resources in the Conejo Valley reveal no sites on or adjacent to the subject property. This was confirmed in a field reconnaissance by Archaeologist Clay Singer in July, 1977. A copy of this survey is on file with the City Planning Department.

*Ventura County Air Pollution Control District
PERCENTAGE OF DAYS
FEDERAL OXIDANT STANDARD (.08 ppm)
EXCEEDED IN THOUSAND OAKS
1973-77

FIGURE 2.2
D. **Land Use and Zoning**

The site is zoned R-1-8 (Single Family Residential - 8,000 square foot minimum lot size). According to the Land Use Element of the General Plan, the site is designated for "Low Density Residential" uses, with a net density between 2 and 4.5 units per acre.

Zoning on the property surrounding the project site is as follows:

- **North:** Ventura Freeway
- **South:** Flood control channel and undeveloped land zoned RPD-SFD-4.5U
- **East:** Undeveloped land zoned R-1-8
- **West:** Developed single-family residential

Figure 2.3 depicts the surrounding area land use and zoning.
III. SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

A. Noise

Impact:

A noise study (Appendix A) on the effects of Ventura Freeway traffic noise on this project has been prepared by ENVICOM Corporation. Guidelines set out by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development were used for the assessment of noise impacts. Using traffic data from the California Department of Transportation, the investigation calculated the current noise level and future noise level (5 years hence) at two locations on the property; lot 97 and lot 73. These lots are representative of the approximately twenty lots that will be located adjacent to the freeway right-of-way.

The applicant is proposing a 12-foot high barrier (6-foot wall on top of a 6-foot high berm) adjacent to the freeway to screen noise from the homes in the proposed tract. The ENVICOM noise study also evaluated the effectiveness of this barrier.

The results of this study are summarized below and also illustrated in figure 3.1 (Impact of Automobile Noise), 3.2 (Impact of Truck Noise) and 3.3 (HUD Acceptability Criteria).

1. The proposed 12-foot high barrier is high enough to mitigate current noise levels from the Ventura Freeway. As can be seen in Figures 3.1 and 3.2, the noise levels are in the "normally acceptable" range for both automobile and truck noise (based on HUD Guidelines).

2. Future noise levels, especially truck noise, will exceed "normally acceptable" limits and will be "normally unacceptable."

Temporary noise impacts will also occur during the construction of Tract 2790 from earth-moving and construction vehicles. This impact will occur not only on the site itself but on access roads to the site, particularly Alice Drive, which is the most direct route to Wendy Drive. Other local streets affected will probably include Bella Drive, Shirley Drive, and the stretch of Debbie Street between Bella Drive and Shirley Drive.
Impact from automobile noise.

FIGURE 3.1
Impact from truck noise.

FIGURE 3.2
H.U.D. ACCEPTABILITY CATEGORIES

DEFINITIONS

Clearly Acceptable: The noise exposure is such that both the indoor and outdoor environments are pleasant.

Normally Acceptable: The noise exposure is great enough to be of some concern but common building constructions will make the indoor environment acceptable, even for sleeping quarters, and the outdoor environment will be reasonably pleasant for recreation and play.

Normally Unacceptable: The noise exposure is significantly more severe so that unusual and costly building constructions are necessary to ensure some tranquility indoors, and barriers must be erected between the site and prominent noise sources to make the outdoor environment tolerable.

Clearly Unacceptable: The noise exposure at the site is so severe that the construction costs to make the indoor environment acceptable would be prohibitive and the outdoor environment would still be intolerable.
Mitigation:

1. According to the noise study, reducing the noise level to the "normally acceptable" range for the future (5 years hence) traffic flow on the freeway would require increasing the barrier height by one foot to 13 feet, adjacent to lots 72-80 and 93-99.

Barriers provide noise level reduction to an area located within the "shadow zone" provided by the barrier. To increase the "shadow zone," the barrier must be increased in height.

**FIGURE 3.4**

Noise follows a direct path to receivers who can see a sound source over the top of a barrier. If the barrier does not block the line-of-sight, it provides no abatement. The proximity of the wall to the source of the sound is important in reducing noise levels. This is depicted in the illustration below. As can be seen, the closer the ground barrier is to the sound source, and also the higher the barrier, the more the sound waves will be reflected by the barrier.
2. Increasing the distance between the homes and the freeway would also reduce the noise impacts. Every doubling of the distance from the source results in a 6 decibel reduction in sound pressure. When a 10 decibel decrease in an existing sound level occurs, the apparent loudness is decreased by half.

According to a report to the Assembly Committee on Transportation an intervening 6-foot berm and 5-foot wall will reduce noise at a point 60 feet from the road to the same level as a point 240 feet from the road if the berm and wall were not there. This is illustrated below.

![Diagram showing noise reduction with and without barriers]

FIGURE 3.5

The noise barrier creates a 12dBA advantage at any given distance. The noise levels above represent a single diesel truck passing.

3. The results from investigations conducted so far indicate that trees do reduce sound levels, but not enough to justify a large expenditure for this purpose alone. Research has shown that decorative plantings, while they do not significantly reduce the sound level, have reduced the incidence of complaints about noise by performing a psychological shielding function.
4. To mitigate the short term noise impacts, the City exercises control over construction activities and accompanying noise by permitting such activities to occur only between 7 A.M. and 7 P.M. Monday through Saturday (per Section 8-11.01 of the Municipal Code). Permission to work at different hours or on Sunday is granted only in emergencies and requires a special permit from the Director of Public Works.

5. Individual vehicular noise is expected to decrease 3 decibels in the future because of legal constraints imposed by the California Vehicle Code, Section 27160, "Motor Vehicle Noise Standards." If the general noise reduction is taken into account, the future noise levels at the site would meet "normally acceptable" criteria established by HUD with the proposed 12-foot high barrier.

B. Traffic and Circulation

Impact:

A traffic study for Tract 2790 was prepared by Weber and Associates, and reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer. This report is attached as Appendix B.

As noted in the study, the only access to Tract 2790 is via Alice Drive and Shirley Drive, two residential streets connecting ultimately to Wendy Drive, a free access secondary road about 1/4 mile west of Tract 2790.

Peak hour volume increases on these streets attributable directly to Tract 2790 would be 117 trips on Alice Drive and 33 trips on Shirley Drive. These volumes are depicted in Figure 5 of the traffic study. Figure 6 of the study shows the cumulative volumes (including existing development) at the two outlets to Wendy Drive - Alice Street and Bella Drive.

On Page 6 of the traffic study, it is noted that the resultant peak hour volumes of 185 vehicles/hour on Alice Street and 170 vehicles/hour on Bella Drive are well below the County's Access Policy. These volumes would also be less than the City's Access Policy, which is that such roads should not serve more than 250 homes (equivalent to 255 peak hour trips).
An important additional consideration with respect to Tract 2790's traffic impact relates to the vacant property to the east (labelled "future subdivision" in figure 1.2). The construction of Tract 2790 would provide the only access to this 30-acre area, and once that area was developed, its traffic impact would also affect Alice Drive, east of Wendy Drive.

The traffic study includes, as Appendix D thereto, an analysis of the additional impact which could be anticipated when that 30-acre area is developed.

The 30-acre area could yield approximately 130 homes, based on the existing zoning. Because of the property's configuration, and the proposed street plan for Tract 2790, all of the property would be served by Alice Drive. Thus, if the property to the east were fully developed to 130 homes (equivalent to 133 peak hour trips), peak hour traffic volume on Alice Drive, at its intersection with Wendy Drive, could rise to 318, compared to a present peak hour volume of 68 and a peak hour volume of 185 with Tract 2790 alone.

The 318 vehicle per hour volume would exceed both the County's Access Policy of 300 vehicles per hour and the City's Access Policy of 250 homes (roughly 245 vehicles per hour).

The traffic study (Appendix B) concludes that up to 113 homes could be constructed in the area east of Tract 2790 without exceeding the City or County access policy with respect to Alice Drive.

The additional traffic volumes which would be imposed on Alice Drive by Tract 2790 alone, and particularly with the ultimate development of the 30-acre area to the east, would constitute a significant adverse environmental effect for residents of the existing homes fronting on Alice Street, between Tract 2790 and Wendy Drive.

The impact on Shirley Drive, Debbie Drive and Bella Street would be much less, since only about 32 additional homes within Tract 2790 would be served by that access route to Wendy Drive.

**Mitigation:**

1. The future installation of a traffic signal at the Wendy Drive-Alice Street intersection will mitigate future impacts at the intersection. This signal will be needed when additional development takes place to the east of the subject property which would utilize Alice Street as an access. Tract 2790 will create a portion of the need for this signal.
2. The only mitigation measure which could reduce the projected traffic flow from Tract 2790 and the area to the east upon Alice Drive would be an additional access route out to Michael Drive. Such a connection would have to cross the flood control channel and private property between the channel and Michael Drive. Depending upon the location of such a connection, if it were even feasible, the traffic flow could adversely affect Michael Drive.

C. Visual

Impact:

The visual character of this area will be impacted by the construction of homes and a 12-foot high barrier that is proposed by the applicant to reduce the noise impacts from the Ventura Freeway. A perspective view of the visual impact of the barrier is shown in figure 3.6.

The Ventura Freeway is an adopted City and County Scenic Highway and particular attention must be given to the visual display that this (or any other) proposed development will create. The straight, line effect of the homes and height of the barrier will impact short-range views of the property and the long-range views of the Newbury Park area and the Santa Monica Mountains.

Mitigation:

1. Single-story construction for units adjacent to the Ventura Freeway.

2. Creation of a more interesting visual corridor adjacent to the Ventura Freeway than that proposed. This could be partially accomplished by eliminating the straight, line effect of the barrier adjacent to the freeway, and creating a curved, or segmented barrier along this boundary of the project.

3. Landscaping treatment (trees and shrubs) adjacent to the barrier along the freeway should be required to further soften the impact of the barrier.
D. Schools

Impact:

Appendix C consists of information submitted by the Conejo Valley Unified School District relating to the adequacy of schools to serve Tract 2876. As it indicates, elementary and intermediate pupils cannot be accommodated at their normal school of attendance if already approved tracts within their attendance area develop out. High school pupils can be accommodated with the opening of Westlake High School next school year.

Mitigation:

The response from the Board of Education recommends imposition of a condition on the tract to require the developer to enter into a binding agreement with the District to mitigate adverse impact. The City is now imposing a condition on all residential projects to require the developer to make arrangements for providing adequate school facilities for children expected to be generated by the tract.

E. Energy Consumption

Impact:

Energy will be consumed both during and after the construction phase of the project. This will increase energy demands on off-site power generating facilities and will result in increased petroleum consumption due to increased vehicular traffic to and from the site. Energy consumed on the site will be from the use of natural gas and electricity to heat, cool, light and maintain the individual homes.

Mitigation:

1. Encourage pedestrian and bicycle traffic by providing bicycle lanes and pedestrian access to adjacent park site.

2. Design and orientation of the structures with respect to sun movement.

During the summer the heaviest sun radiation loads will be on the roof and the east and west exposures of the homes. The sun bakes the east and west walls longer and with greater intensity than the south wall, which intercepts solar rays at a less direct angle. Southern exposures permit more significant heat gains during winter months.
because the sun is lower on the horizon. Whereas openings (such as doors and windows) in the east and west walls are subject to direct radiation year round. Thus, buildings are generally best so that major openings are oriented toward the north and south, with reduced east/west exposure.

3. Where ideal orientation of the structure is not feasible, the use of overhangs, movable external shading on windows (to deflect sunlight or allow it to enter), and heat reflective glass, particularly on east and west exposures, can moderate seasonal increases in temperature.

4. Use of appropriate and well-placed landscaping to moderate temperature. For example, deciduous trees located on the south and west provide shade during the summer yet allow light and heat to enter during the winter months.

5. Use of fluorescent lighting rather than less efficient types of lighting.

6. Installation of attic fans or other ventilation devices for use during summer.

7. Two-zone heating system to promote separate heating of living areas compared to sleeping areas.

8. Insulation from heat loss or gain in walls, ceilings, floors, windows and hot water lines.

9. Use of solar energy for water and space heating.

F. Air Quality

1. Short Term Impact

Preparing the site for construction will produce two temporary air pollutant emissions - exhaust from construction equipment and dust generated as a result of soil movement.

2. Long Term Impact

The long term air quality impact of this project must be viewed in light of its effect upon air quality in Thousand Oaks and the larger South Central Coast Air Basin. Thousand Oaks already suffers from high photochemical oxidant pollution concentrations during parts of the year. Natural gas emissions from this development will be minimal. The largest single contributor to the oxidant air pollution problem is the motor vehicle. Any development which generates increased
vehicular traffic within Thousand Oaks increases the number of air pollution sources in the area.

As yet, no reliable model has been developed which can accurately predict the change in air quality as a result of an increase in oxidant-forming auto emissions. The difficulty of assessment is compounded by the very mobility of automobiles and the effect that varying topographical and meteorological conditions have upon the emitted pollutants themselves. These variables, coupled with the delayed reaction time of photochemical oxidants once they are emitted (2-4 hours), make it difficult to evaluate the impact of a given project upon local and regional air quality. It can be concluded that the project will cause a marginal deterioration in air quality as a result of the increased auto emissions associated with the project. The quantification of this "marginal change," however, can only be evaluated when a reliable model is developed which can accurately relate auto emissions under varying meteorological and geographical conditions to predictable changes in local and regional air quality.

The location of the project, particularly the northerly units in close proximity to the freeway, will expose those units to increasing levels of freeway-associated emissions, particularly carbon monoxide (CO). At the present time CO is not a problem, especially with prevailing westerly winds. However, future increases in traffic on the Ventura Freeway may have a significant effect. As an example, the current traffic flow is 54,000 vehicles per day (between Rancho Conejo Boulevard and Wendy Drive) and in five years the traffic flow is expected to be 64,135 vehicles per day.

Mitigation:

1. While several oxidant air pollution models are under review by the Environmental Protection Agency, none is being promoted by the agency as entirely reliable with regard to forecasting photochemical oxidant pollution. Mitigation measures must be oriented toward the automobile, which is the major source of local air pollution emissions. A reduction in vehicular emissions, however, is beyond the scope of any practical project-oriented modification. Future reductions in auto-related pollution will ultimately hinge upon an effective automobile emission control program, and an expanded multi-mode transportation system. This would reduce the dependence upon the automobile as the sole means of travel.
2. One aspect of air pollution control in which the City can exert some positive effort is in the area of land use planning itself. In this regard, Thousand Oaks is working closely with Ventura County and the County APCD during 1977 in County-wide land use and growth planning, which will ultimately be the backbone of a County Air Quality Maintenance Plan.

G. Hydrology

Impact:

A portion of the site of Tract 2790 is within the 100-year flood plain of the South Branch of the Arroyo Conejo, which borders the subject property on the south. Figure 3.7 depicts the present location of the 100-year flood hazard area.

The applicant is proposing to fill the lower portions of the subject property (up to 3 feet) in order to raise its elevation above the 100-year flood hazard level. Flooding of homes within Tract 2790 would therefore be avoided.

The applicant proposes to obtain the earth for this fill operation from the vacant land to the east, which is also within the 100-year flood hazard area. If this is done, total storage volumes for flood waters in this area will not be decreased, and flood hazard to existing residential areas will not be increased.

However, any future development of the area east of Tract 2790 (the "cut" area) would have to be conditioned to control a 100-year flood in the South Branch of the Arroyo Conejo. Most likely this would depend upon the completion of a major flood control project to reduce flood hazard throughout the 100-year flood plain of the South Branch. The Flood Control District has provided input and recommendations regarding Tract 2790, as well as the total flood control situation relating to the South Branch. This information is contained in Appendix D.

Mitigation:

The applicant's plans will avoid increased flood hazard to existing residences as well as homes in proposed Tract 2790. Development of the area easterly of Tract 2790 could not take place until and unless a flood control project is completed for the South Branch of the Arroyo Conejo, per the Flood Control District's letter.
FIGURE 3.7
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PLATE II
Approval of Tract 2790 should be conditioned to provide the flowage easement requested by the Flood Control District in Mr. Frank's letter of July 8, 1977, (Appendix D).

The applicant has indicated that the "cut" area will be farmed by the property owner (Seventh Day Adventist Church) or their agent.
IV. **SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSAL IS IMPLEMENTED**

A. **Visual**

Homes and the barrier proposed along the Ventura Freeway will impact the views from the freeway. The Ventura Freeway is an adopted City and County Scenic Highway.

B. **Schools**

The project will add 88 elementary, 29 intermediate, and 44 high school pupils to an already overburdened school system.

C. **Air Quality**

A short-term impact of dust generated by construction activities will occur. The increased vehicular traffic associated with this project will add to the deterioration in air quality in the Conejo Valley.

D. **Traffic**

Traffic impact as discussed above is an unavoidable impact. Even if an additional access route to Michael Drive from Tract 2790 could be provided, it would only partially mitigate increased traffic flows on residential streets west of Tract 2790.
V. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

A. No Project

The alternative of no project would eliminate all the significant environmental impacts noted in Sections III and IV above. The land would be retained for future land use options and proposals.

B. Modified Tentative Tract

Another alternative would be a modified tract map which showed a lesser number of lots and/or an additional access route to the tract. Such an alternative would mitigate traffic impact to a greater degree than the project proposal.
VI. GROWTH INDUCING IMPACT

An estimated 535 people will live in the 147 housing units. The cumulative growth inducing effects of this project and other projects will require the creation of new jobs to provide the residents with the services they need. The induced jobs will include teachers, mechanics, bank clerks, store clerks, etc. People will move to the Conejo Valley to fill these jobs.

The cumulative effects of the development of this parcel and the additional 30-acre undeveloped parcel to the east will have a significant impact on traffic and flood control.
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I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This report is an evaluation of the impact of present and future highway noise from the Ventura Freeway (Route 101) on Tentative Tract 2790 in Newbury Park (Figure 1). Of particular interest is the ability of a 12-foot acoustic barrier between the freeway and the property to mitigate the excessive noise emitted by vehicular traffic.

B. TOPOGRAPHY OF SITE

The project site (see Tract Map) is essentially level along the north property line where it adjoins the freeway right-of-way. There is a slight increase in elevation in the northwestern corner of the property where the northern boundary adjoins the Wendy Dr. eastbound on-ramp for the freeway. The on-ramp already serves as a partial barrier to noise emitted by the freeway for the eight lots (100-108) in the northwest corner.

C. METHODOLOGY

Guidelines set out by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (1) were used for the assessment of noise impact at this site because this procedure is the only one used by the City of Thousand Oaks (2), which has jurisdiction over this property. Peak hour traffic data was used or estimated at 10% of ADT (Average Daily Traffic Volume) so that a worse case condition would be evaluated.
Figure 1. Project site location map.
II. RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

Traffic data (Table 1) used in calculating noise impact at the project site were received from Caltrans and was estimated to increase 5.5% per year. This data was used to complete the worksheet (Figure 2) for two lots adjacent to the freeway, Lots #73 and #96. The effect of a proposed twelve foot barrier was derived from the barrier nomograph used by HUD (Figure 3) and included in the calculations. The following assumptions were used for the calculations:

1. The houses are located at 20 feet from the back (north) property line.
2. The effective height of the noise source is five feet above the pavement.
3. The effective height of the receiver for a one-story house is five feet above the pad elevation.
4. The vehicles travel at 55 mph.
5. The proposed barrier is 12 feet above the pad elevations along the north property boundary line.

The impact of Ventura Freeway automobile noise on the project site is illustrated in Figure 4 with truck noise illustrated in Figure 5. As seen in these figures, present noise emissions from the freeway will be adequately mitigated by the 12-foot barrier. However, future truck noise at both lots and automobile noise at Lot #96 would be normally unacceptable according to HUD guidelines.
Table 1
Traffic Flows in the Site Vicinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Route</th>
<th>Present Data</th>
<th>Future Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Freeway, between Rancho Conejo Blvd. and Wendy Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,135&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Daily Traffic Flow</strong></td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>64,135&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Hourly Flow</strong></td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Wendy Drive - Onramp Eastbound         |              | 8,810<sup>1</sup> |
| **Average Daily Traffic Flow**         | 7,420        | 8,810<sup>1</sup> |
| **Peak Hourly Flow**                   |              |               |
| AM                                     | 440          | 880           |
| PM                                     | 240          | --            |

<sup>1</sup>Based on an annual growth rate of 3½%

1. The distance in feet from the site to the centerline of
   a. nearest lane:
      - Current Case: 120'
      - Future Case (5 yrs.): 120'
   b. farthest lane:
      - Current Case: 185'
      - Future Case (5 yrs.): 185'

2. The total number of automobiles per hour in both directions:
   - Current Case: 4512
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): 6016

3. The number of trucks per hour
   a. uphill direction:
      - Current Case: n/a
      - Future Case (5 yrs.): n/a
   b. downhill direction:
      - Current Case: 288
      - Future Case (5 yrs.): 384
   c. both directions:
      - Current Case: 149
      - Future Case (5 yrs.): 149

4. Effective distance from site to road:
   - Current Case: 4512
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): 6016

Adjustments for Automobile Traffic

5. Stop-and-go:
   - Current Case: None
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): None

6. Mean speed:
   - Current Case: 3835
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): 5114

Adjustments for Truck Traffic

7. Road gradient:
   - Current Case: None
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): None

8. Stop-and-go:
   - Current Case: None
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): None

9. Mean speed:
   - Current Case: 164
   - Future Case (5 yrs.): 219

Barrier Adjustment

10. Distance from site to barrier:
    - Current Case: 20'
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 20'

11. Distance from center of road to barrier:
    - Current Case: 130'
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 130'

12. Effective elevation of road:
    - Current Case: 649.5
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 649.5

13. Effective elevation of site: one-story
    - Current Case: 653.2
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 653.2

14. Effective elevation of barrier:
    - Current Case: 660.2
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 660.2

15. Difference in elevation between site and road:
    - Current Case: 3.7
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 3.7

16. Difference in elevation between barrier and road:
    - Current Case: 10.7
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 10.7

17. Adjusted distance:
    - Current Case: 641
    - Future Case (5 yrs.): 641

Figure 2. Roadway Noise Worksheet.
Figure 3. Barrier Monograph
Figure 4. Impact from automobile noise.
Figure 5. Impact from truck noise.
III. DISCUSSION

The proposed 12-foot barrier is high enough to mitigate current noise arising from the Ventura Freeway, but the projected noise, especially truck noise, would still exceed normally acceptable limits, according to HUD guidelines. However, the guidelines do not take into effect recent legislation to reduce noise emissions from vehicles, especially heavy trucks. This legislation is already causing reductions in noise levels along freeways and these levels will continue to decrease as new, quieter vehicles replace old ones. If this general noise reduction is taken into account, the future noise levels at the site would meet normally acceptable criteria.

If, however, the analysis must follow all aspects of the HUD guidelines, it will be necessary to increase the wall height one foot from Lots 72 to 80 and 93-99. This would provide normally acceptable levels for the project site according to HUD guidelines and criteria. A slightly greater height increase, 1.5 feet, would be necessary if the back yards are increased from 20 feet to 40 feet.

Because the freeway curves away from the property in the northwest corner, the barrier wall needed to provide acceptable noise levels on the project site can gradually decrease in height from 13 feet at Lot 99 to 6 feet in the northwest corner of Lot 103. A six foot wall at the north property line of Lot 103 will reduce noise to acceptable levels from both the freeway and the Wendy Dr. on-ramp, but aesthetic impacts may be increased by a decreasing wall height.

To adequately protect Lot 72 from high noise levels, it will be necessary to extend the barrier wall approximately 50 feet south along the east boundary line, or continue it approximately 150 feet along the freeway right-of-way. It is assumed the latter option would be by some arrangement with the developer of the adjacent "future subdivision."

The construction of two-story homes was not considered in the analysis as it would be economically unfeasible to construct a
barrier high enough to attenuate freeway noise at the second story level. The barrier wall needed for attenuation at this level would need to be at least 20 feet high. However, two-story construction might be allowed if there are either no windows for the second story facing the freeway, or such windows as face the freeway would be double-glazed and sealed.
IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. A 12 foot high barrier along the north property line with a 50 foot southerly extension from the northeast corner will provide normally acceptable (HUD) noise levels for the project site for present traffic conditions.

2. Increased future traffic will result in a corresponding increase in noise levels. However, individual vehicular noise is expected to decrease 3dB in the future because of legal constraints imposed by the California Vehicle Code, Section 27160, "Motor Vehicle Noise Standards" (3). This will mitigate the expected increase in noise from increased traffic. As present, the HUD Guidelines (under revision) do not take this into account. This results in calculations which correspond to an increase in barrier height of some 1 - 1.5 feet to attenuate future noise levels. As stated earlier, such an increase in height, however, is not considered necessary.
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INTRODUCTION

The Griffin Development Company is proposing to construct 147 single family dwelling units, Tract 2790, on 31 acres located immediately south of the Ventura Freeway and approximately one-half mile east of Wendy Drive (see Figure 1).

This is a study to determine the traffic volumes which will be generated by this tract and what impact such traffic will have on the surrounding street system.

ENVIRONMENT

The access to Tract 2790 will be via Alice Street, a collector street, and Shirley Drive, a local street. Both of these streets provide a route to Wendy Drive, a free access secondary highway interchanging with the Ventura Freeway.

No access is available to the north because of the Ventura Freeway. No access is available to the east or south because of the Arroyo Conejo, a storm drain channel approximately 60 feet wide.

Alice Street and Shirley Drive are streets in an existing 182 unit subdivision. This existing subdivision has not been incorporated into the City of Thousand Oaks. The proposed Tract 2790 is located in the City of Thousand Oaks.
The existing traffic volume on Wendy Drive is 6850 for 24 hours with a p.m. peak hour of 645.

Traffic counts taken on Alice Street and Bella Street entering Wendy Drive disclosed traffic volumes during the p.m. peak hour as indicated in Figures 2 and 3. The existing traffic is oriented 57% toward the Ventura Freeway.

The Walnut Elementary School located on Dena Drive and the Sequoia Intermediate School located south of the Conejo Arroyo will serve Tract 2790.

IMPACT

Tract 2790 with 147 units will generate approximately 150 trips* during the peak p.m. hour. These trips were distributed to Alice Street and Shirley Drive depending upon the number of units served by each street. The number of units which will be served by each street was determined by selecting the mid point of "B" Street (see Figure 4) and assigning the traffic from all units north of this point to Shirley Drive and all units to the south to Alice Street.

This method indicates that Shirley Drive will serve 32 units and Alice Street 115 units.

* See Appendix A.
FIGURE 2

FIGURE 3

P.M. PEAK HOUR TRAFFIC VOLUMES
FIGURE 4

TRACT 2790

FIGURE 4
The traffic generated by Tract 2790 based upon this distribution is indicated in Figure 5.

Fifty-seven percent of the newly generated traffic was assigned toward the Ventura Freeway.

By adding these volumes to the existing volumes on Alice Street and Bella Drive, the traffic volumes which will exist on these two streets after construction of Tract 2790 can be determined. These traffic volumes are indicated in Figure 6.

Traffic volumes of 185 on Alice Street and 170 on Bella Drive are considerably below the Residential Access Policy for the County of Ventura* which allows a maximum of 300 vehicles per hour on a collector street with fronting lots.

Tract 2790 is also in conformance with the access policy of the City of Thousand Oaks. This policy** allows a collector street such as Alice Street to serve 250 dwelling units and a local street such as Shirley Drive to serve 39 units. Within Tract 2790, these two streets will serve 115 and 32 dwelling units respectively.

Tract 2790 will generate approximately 88 elementary school children who will use the Walnut Elementary School located west of Wendy Drive on Dena Drive. This school is approximately 0.91 miles from the most easterly point of Tract 2790. This distance exceeds

---

* See Appendix B.
** See Appendix C.
the 0.75 miles maximum walking distance for elementary school children as set forth by the Conejo Unified School District* by approximately 800 feet.

Tract 2790 will also generate approximately 20 school children in the intermediate grades. They would attend the Sequoia Intermediate School located south of the Arroyo Conejo.

The maximum walking distance for intermediate school children as set forth by the Conejo Unified School District is 2.0 miles. All portions of Tract 2790 are within this distance of the Sequoia Intermediate School. The maximum walking distance would be approximately 1.2 miles.

Inspector Cronk of the City of Thousand Oaks Fire Department was contacted with respect to emergency access requirements concerning Tract 2790. The two points of access, Alice Street and Shirley Drive meet the Department's minimum requirements.

CONCLUSION

The traffic volumes generated by Tract 2790 are quite light. No operational or safety problems will be created by the proposed development.

Traffic volumes will increase on Alice Street and Shirley Street however, the increase anticipated will be well within the limits set forth by policies of the County of Ventura and the City of Thousand Oaks.

* There is an existing school crossing guard to assist elementary school children across Wendy Drive.
Traffic signals will not be warranted at the intersection of Wendy Drive and Bella Drive nor does it appear that they will be warranted in the foreseeable future.

Traffic signals are not warranted at the intersection of Wendy Drive and Alice Street nor will they be warranted after the construction of Tract 2790. It is apparent, however, that if additional development takes place that would utilize Alice Street as an access*, traffic signals would, in all probability, be required. If such is the case, a portion of the cost of installing traffic signals at this intersection would be attributable to Tract 2790**.

As for the elementary school children, approximately 36 will live beyond the maximum 3/4 mile walking distance. All of the intermediate school children will live within the maximum walking distances as set forth by policy of the Conejo Unified School District.

In addition, none of these school children will be exposed to any unsafe street crossing. The elementary school children must cross Wendy Drive, however, this is the present pattern and they are adequately protected by a crossing guard. The intermediate school children will not be required to cross any arterial highway.

To conclude, no adverse impact will be created with respect to vehicular traffic or school child pedestrians.

The only note of caution with respect to Tract 2790 would concern the development of 30 acres immediately to the east. This has been covered in Appendix D.

* See Appendix D
** See Appendix E
APPENDIX A

The traffic generation factors used in this study were obtained from J. Clement, Traffic Engineer for the City of Thousand Oaks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING TYPE</th>
<th>FACILITIES STUDIED</th>
<th>TRIP UNITS</th>
<th>TRIP UNIT A.D.T.</th>
<th>RANGE OF A.D.T.'S</th>
<th>R.M. PEAK IN %</th>
<th>R.M. PEAK OUT %</th>
<th>R.M. PEAK IN %</th>
<th>R.M. PEAK OUT %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>D.U.</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>6.81-12.2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENCES</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>D.U.</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>3.0-8.88</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE HOME PARKS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D.U.</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>3.8-10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTELS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>D.U.</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>4.7-13.4</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANTS - DRIVE IN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>2210</td>
<td>1160-3260</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANTS - SIT DOWN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE STATIONS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR WASH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOK STORES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>31.6-107.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>28.7-75.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>61.45</td>
<td>5.8-188.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK DRIVE IN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>EACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL OFFICES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>DOCTOR</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>31-128.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITALS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BED</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>3-17</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL OFFICES</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>4.6-13.6</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROCERY STORES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>17.6-35.4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUG STORES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>19.0-97.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING STORES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>10.4-55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARDWARE STORES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>21.6-37.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT STORES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>6.2-56.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIETY STORES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.8-10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNITURE STORES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.6-13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD SHOP CTRS.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>84.9-216</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SHOP CTRS.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>64.78</td>
<td>40-93.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL SHOP CTRS.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>40.88</td>
<td>17.23-71.32</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL PARKS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1000 a'</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>3.7-25.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOLS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>11-2.1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.9-3.9</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources for Trip Generation Factors

A1  Websterite, June-July, 1969
A2  Trip Generation, ITE Western Section, Jan., 1967
B   Traffic Study for Westlake Tower, A. Weber, 1975
C   Woodlake Townhouse Arts, A. Weber, Oct., 1969
E   Towns House Develop, Unit 3, Westlake, A. Weber, July, 1969
F   7th Progress Report, Trip Ends Gen. Research Counts,
    Cal. Trans., San Francisco, Dec., 1971
G   Traffic Generators, San Diego, Dec., 1972
H   Traffic Generators, San Diego, Dec., 1971
J   Traffic Quarterly, ENO, April, 1963
K   Traffic Engineering, Jan., 1973
APPENDIX B

Ventura County Access Policy
RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A RESIDENTIAL ACCESS POLICY FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

It is the desire of the Board to establish a policy to provide reasonable access into and out of residential types of development; and

It is desirable to encourage the design of a logical street system so that local streets flow into collector streets, with collector streets combining to join the major highway network; and

It is not the intent of this policy to require excessive road development; and

It is recognized that certain off-site development may be required in order to provide adequate access to a proposed development; and

Required road sections should be established by examining peak hour loadings, as determined by traffic engineering; and

Numerous studies have indicated that roadway design should consider an average of 1.45 trips generated during the design hour for each dwelling unit served, with 67 percent of the trips traveling in one direction; and

It is desired to correlate the width of access roadways with the volume of traffic to be carried on the roadway, and to recognize that no policy statement can substitute for an engineering analysis of traffic flow:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the roadway sections to be used within or leading to any residential development within the unincorporated areas of Ventura County will be determined by assuming the number of trips generated by each dwelling unit to be 1.45 trips during the design hour, with 67 percent of the generated trips flowing in one direction; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that roads leading from the development shall be constructed or widened to carry the traffic from that development in addition to any existing traffic on those roads; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such roads leading from a particular development must connect with a public road adequate to carry the total anticipated traffic upon completion of the development; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director of Public Works may, on the basis of an engineering report, permit deviations from the trip generation and road capacity figures established in this policy and may additionally recommend to the Planning Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors certain other deviations from this policy; however, approval of said deviations other than trip generation and road capacity figures may be granted only by the Board of Supervisors; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a traffic engineering report is recommended for all developments and may be required by the Director of Public Works in developments of sufficient size to warrant such a report; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the total anticipated volume of traffic upon any roadway shall not exceed the capacity of that roadway, and that the total volume of traffic upon any road in a residential area shall not exceed the following capacities hereby assigned to each of the Ventura County Roadway Sections:

ROAD CAPACITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Peak Hour Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3000 VPH* one direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Secondary (Cont. Access)</td>
<td>2000 VPH* one direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Secondary (Free Access)</td>
<td>1300 VPH* one direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Standard Collector (Side Lots)</td>
<td>800 VPH* two directions 550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Standard Collector (Front Lots)</td>
<td>300 VPH* two directions 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6 &amp; B-7</td>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td>200 VPH* two directions 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>Hillside Collector</td>
<td>250 VPH* two directions 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9 &amp; B-10</td>
<td>Hillside Local Roads</td>
<td>150 VPH* two directions 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-11 &amp; B-12</td>
<td>Rural Roads</td>
<td>850 VPH* two directions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. Avg. Dwelling Units**

Rev. 3/11/69
Vpm = Vehicles Per Hour

The number of average dwelling units shown is to be used as a guide only. All determinations of roadway adequacy must be based upon the generation factors and the indicated roadway capacities.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 11th day of March, 1969.
APPENDIX C

City of Thousand Oaks
Access Requirements
DESIGN CRITERIA:

- DESIGN SPEED: 30 M.P.H.
- CURVE RADIUS: 380' MIN.
- GRADIENT: 0.4% MIN - 12% MAX OR AS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
- STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE: 200' MIN.
- SUPERELEVATION: NONE
- CURB RETURN RADIUS: 25' MIN, 35' AT INT. W/ PRI. & SEC. ROADS
- TRAFFIC INDEX: 6 OR AS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
- DRAINAGE: SEE "A" SERIES PLATE

NOTES:
1. Pavement width measured from top inside face of opposing curbs.
2. Street trees shall be required.
3. Collector road providing access to 250 dwelling units or less.
4. Length of vertical curve: See Plates D-2, D-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBR</th>
<th>ELASTICITY %</th>
<th>EXPANSION</th>
<th>A.B</th>
<th>ALTERNATE SECTION</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 4&quot;</td>
<td>SEE PLATE E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-29</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;=2.5</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>1.8-2.5</td>
<td>&gt;=30</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&lt;=1.8</td>
<td>&gt;=30</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td>&gt;2.5</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

STANDARD
COLLECTOR ROAD

SUBMITTED

APPROVED
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL 12-21-76
BY RESOLUTION NO. 76-391
DESIGN CRITERIA:

DESIGN SPEED 25 M.R.H.
CURVE RADIUS 300' MIN.
GRADIENT 0.4% MIN.-12% MAX. OR AS DETERMINED BY
THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
STOPPING SIGHT DISTANCE 165' MIN.
SUPERELEVATION NONE
CURB RETURN RADIUS 25' MIN.
TRAFFIC INDEX 5 OR AS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
DRAINAGE SEE "A" SERIES PLATES

NOTES:
1 Pavement width measured from top inside face of opposing curbs.
2 Street trees shall be required.
3 Local purpose road providing access to 39 dwelling units or less.
4 Length of vertical curve: See Plates D-2, D-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.B.R</th>
<th>ELASTICITY %</th>
<th>EXPANSION</th>
<th>A.B.</th>
<th>ALTERNATE SECTION A.R. T A.S.B. R:40</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 4&quot;</td>
<td>SEE PLATE E-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-29</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 12</td>
<td>&lt; 2.5</td>
<td>&lt; 30</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 12</td>
<td>1.8-2.5</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 12</td>
<td>&lt; 1.8</td>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 12</td>
<td>&gt; 2.5</td>
<td>NOT REQ.</td>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>4&quot; + 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBMITTED 12-20-76
APPROVED 2-1-76
ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL 12-21-76

CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
STANDARD
RESIDENTIAL MINOR ROAD

BY RESOLUTION NO. 76-391
APPENDIX D

Traffic Analysis of the Additional 30 Acres East of Tract 2790
There are approximately 30 acres of undeveloped land lying to the south and east of Tract 2790 which may be required to utilize the same access points as Tract 2790 (see Figure D-1). If it is assumed that such is the case, the number of dwelling units which can be constructed in this area will be restricted to the number of units which will not result in exceeding the limits as set forth by the policies of the Ventura County and the City of Thousand Oaks.

If it is assumed that Tract 2790 is constructed, the traffic volumes on Alice Street and on Bella Drive will be as shown in Figure 5. Alice Street will carry a volume of 185 during the peak hour. The County's Access Policy allows a peak hour volume of 300 vehicles per hour. Thus, an additional 115 vehicles could utilize this street during the peak period. The number of dwelling units which would generate 115 trips is 113. Because of the alignment of the internal street system in this area, no additional traffic would be placed on Bella Drive.

The number of units served by the portion of Alice Street in the City of Thousand Oaks would be 228. The policy of the City of Thousand Oaks allows a collector street such as Alice Street to serve 250 dwelling units.

The 113 additional dwelling units would generate 68 elementary school children and 23 intermediate school children. Of the 68 elementary school children, 56 would live beyond the 3/4 mile maximum walking distance limit and thus require bussing.
With respect to the intermediate school children, the maximum distance they would have to walk is 1.76 miles. This is within the 2.0 mile maximum walking distance range established by the Conejo Unified School District, thus none of the children would have to be bussed.

Two points of access will be available to this area, thus the minimum requirement of the Fire Department will have been met.

In conclusion, the maximum number of dwelling units which can be constructed in this area is 113 if County policies are respected. Units in excess of 113 will result in exceeding County policies and as a result, require an additional access point.
APPENDIX E

Traffic Signal Cost
If traffic signals are installed at the intersection of Wendy Drive and Alice Street, the governing traffic signal warrant would be the Interruption of Continuous Traffic Warrant. In other words, the reason for installing the traffic signals is to interrupt the main street through traffic to allow the side street traffic to enter or cross the main street. The burden of the signal cost should therefore be borne by the development which generates the traffic requiring the interruption.

The existing P.M. peak hour traffic volume on Alice Street entering Wendy Drive is 26. Tract 2790 will generate approximately 47 vehicles during the P.M. peak hour which will enter Wendy Drive from Alice Street. The full development of the 30 acres east of Tract 2790 will generate approximately 45 P.M. peak trips which will use Alice Street to enter Wendy Drive.

Based upon these volumes and an anticipated signal cost of $50,000, 40% or $20,000 of the signal cost would be attributed to Tract 2790. Thirty-eight percent or $19,000 would be attributable to the area east of Tract 2790 upon its development.

* See Appendix D
APPENDIX C
Dear Board:

The Thousand Oaks Planning Department has received an application to allow construction of 147 single family homes located at the intersection of Olive Drive and Ventura Drive in your study area.

The Thousand Oaks Planning Commission is requesting information regarding the impact of this development on the schools of the District at each school level, taking into account other developments approved by the City within the District, as well as existing housing.

It is requested that the impact summary include:

**Impact Data:**

1) Projected number of pupils at each level from the subject proposed development.

2) Current enrollment and capacities at each affected school.

3) A tabulation of already approved projects which would be tributary to these schools, their projected pupil populations, and anticipated phasing of pupils into the school system.

4) A statement whether the projected impact can or cannot be accommodated at the normal schools of attendance, without additional mitigation measures.
If the students which would be generated by this development cannot be accommodated at the normal schools of attendance, please advise at what school, if any, they can be accommodated, and what measures, if any, will have to be undertaken to permit their accommodation at the schools named.

Based on the above information, the Conejo Valley Unified School District informs the Planning Commission that it:

☐ can ☐ cannot accommodate elementary level pupils from the proposed development.

☐ can ☐ cannot accommodate intermediate level pupils from the proposed development.

☒ can ☐ cannot accommodate high school level pupils from the proposed development.

Please return this completed form, with attachments, to the Thousand Oaks Planning Department by __________.

Submitted by: Conejo Valley Unified School District

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Philip E. Gatch, Planning Director for the Thousand Oaks Planning Commission
7 October 1977

Philip E. Catch, Planning Director
City of Thousand Oaks Planning Department
401 West Hillcrest Drive
Thousand Oaks, California 91360

Dear Mr. Catch:

The following information is offered in response to a request for impact data on the schools of the District relative to the proposed subdivisions indicated.

Tract 2790

These homes are located in the vicinity of Walnut Elementary School and Sequoia Intermediate School and these are the probable schools of attendance for these tracts. Assuming that the proposed high school attendance boundaries will be adopted, the high school pupils will attend Newbury Park High School. The following is a summary of projected pupil population data for Walnut Elementary School and Sequoia Intermediate School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1977 Pupils</th>
<th>Addn'1 Pupils from apvd.Tr.</th>
<th>Tot. Existing &amp; Addn'1 Trs.</th>
<th>Addn'1 Pupils Subject Tract</th>
<th>Perm. Plant Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Net Capacity 77/78 based on program utilization: Walnut 461, Sequoia 993
PUPILS PROJECTED TO BE GENERATED BY THESE ADDITIONAL DWELLING UNITS CANNOT BE ACCOMMODATED AT THEIR NORMAL SCHOOLS OF ATTENDANCE INDICATED ABOVE WITHOUT SOME IMPACT MITIGATING MEASURES AND THE BOARD OF EDUCATION HAS FOUND THAT THE ONLY SATISFACTORY MITIGATING MEASURES PRESENTLY AVAILABLE IS IN THE FORM OF ADDITIONAL CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION SATISFACTORY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The projected added enrollment shown above from previously approved projects assumes that 100% of these approved projects will be developed, sold and occupied. Additional pupils to be generated by the tract under consideration in this report would have a further adverse affect on the District's ability to house its K-8 pupils.

It is requested that, if this tract is to be approved, a condition be imposed requiring the Developer to arrange a binding Agreement to assist on a prorata basis in the funding to provide additions at schools which will be impacted by the growth projected to be generated from this development and, further, that this Agreement be acceptable to the Board of Education on or before filing and recording the final tract map.

Information contained herein was reviewed and acted upon by the Board of Education at its meeting on October 12, 1977.

Yours truly,

A.H. Fuller
Director of Planning

A.H. Fuller
Director of Planning

PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>K-6</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>YEAR PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2767</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2682</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2491</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2549</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2549</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2751</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2549</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2503</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2673</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2488</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2488</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2799</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2645</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2480</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2612</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2174-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2177-78-79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2498</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2498</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2438</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77/78 (2nd ½)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 8, 1977

Mr. Jeffery C. Baird, Assistant Planner
City of Thousand Oaks, Planning Department
401 West Hillcrest Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Subject: Tentative Map Tract 2790, South Branch Arroyo Conejo, Thousand Oaks, Flood Zone III

Dear Mr. Baird:

On June 28, 1977, this office received your letter requesting assistance in determining the flood hazard to the subject tract as shown on the tentative map for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

The Flood Control District furnished your office copies of a "Status Report, Flood Control Planning for South Branch Arroyo Conejo in the Vicinity of Newbury Park, October 1976". Enclosed for your information is a copy of this report which has been marked up to emphasize portions which speak to the subject proposed development.

The engineers for the developer have contacted Flood Control staff engineers for advice in solving flood hazard problems associated with developing the subject property.

The proposed grading as shown on the subject tentative map indicates that the initial unit of the development will be filled to raise the first floor of residential structures above the 100-year flood elevation. The fill material is to be generated by cutting from adjacent land such that storage for potential flood water remains unchanged by the development. Development of the subject tract in the manner proposed would satisfy the basic intent of the National Flood Insurance Program; however, any future development in the "cut" area must be conditioned to controlling the 100-year flood in South Branch Arroyo Conejo. The Flood Control District is actively pursuing a flood control project, but exact scheduling of project completion cannot be assured at this time.
Mr. Jeffery C. Baird  
City of Thousand Oaks  

July 8, 1977  

Page 2

Subject: Tentative Map Tract 2790, South Branch Arroyo  
Conejo, Thousand Oaks, Flood Zone III

The Flood Control District would request that the "cut" area be encumbered by a flowage easement until such time as the flood control project is completed.

A watercourse permit would be required for constructing the pipe under the dike which would drain the "cut" area into the channel of South Branch Arroyo Conejo.

The "cut" area may present problems in the immediate area due to poor drainage. Stagnant pools may form which could create mosquito problems. A question arises regarding land-use in the interim before future development occurs and also with respect to the future grading for development of the "hole" after it is created. Who will maintain the area?

Please feel free to call if you need any additional information.

Very truly yours,

G. J. Nowak, Deputy Director  
Flood Control and Drainage Department

By W. G. Frank  
Division Engineer

JGW:cv
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PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to identify the flood problem and solutions proposed for further study so that the City of Thousand Oaks, other agencies, and private interests are aware of the District's concerns, interests, and plans and can take appropriate action to insure that the information is reflected in their planning activities relative to the South Branch Arroyo Conejo watershed.

BACKGROUND

The South Branch Arroyo Conejo drains 8,614 acres of watershed into Arroyo Conejo. (See Plate I, Drainage Area Map.) The flatter valley areas of the watershed known as Newbury Park have been subjected to rapid urbanization within the last 20 years. Historical evidence of major flooding from this stream is not available, largely because prior to development, the watershed was mostly native vegetation with some agricultural use in the valleys and there was little to be seriously damaged by floodwaters. Farmers and ranchers often considered flooding of their fields to be a benefit.

The Ventura County Flood Control District bond program approved in 1967 included a channel improvement project for the South Branch Arroyo Conejo. In October 1975, the staff began a detailed engineering analysis of the flood control problems of the South Branch Arroyo Conejo; since that time the District has performed comprehensive studies of the hydrology and hydraulics. The Federal Insurance Administration (FIA), under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Ventura County Flood Control District recognize the South Branch Arroyo Conejo to be one of the major flood hazard areas in Ventura County with respect to potential for urban property damage.
In 1968, the Federal Government enacted laws providing subsidized flood insurance and requiring special precautions in the use of land areas subject to flooding up to the level of the 100-year flood. In 1973, the law was modified to make the land-use restrictions mandatory as a condition for obtaining any Federally subsidized funds.

THE FLOOD HAZARD

The District's flood plain maps and the FIA Flood Hazard Boundary Maps indicate an estimated 650 residences are within the 100-year flood plain between U. S. Highway 101 and Reino Road, and an estimated 200 residences are within the 100-year flood plain between Reino Road and Kimber Drive. (See Plate II, Flood Plain Map.) The 100-year flood plain of South Branch Arroyo Conejo covers approximately 550 acres, 70 percent of which is single family residential development, condominiums, shopping centers, schools and parks. Residents in the flood plain risk hazards to life and health as well as the risk of serious property loss. In the near future the Federal Insurance Administration will sponsor a new flood insurance study for the City of Thousand Oaks that will more accurately define overflow limits and elevations of floods.

Federal flood insurance is now required to obtain any Federally assisted financing in the 100-year flood hazard areas. When existing property in the flood plain is sold, the buyer will be required to purchase flood insurance covering full value of the structure that is financed. Presently, under Federally subsidized rates, a home financed for $35,000 may require $100 per year in flood insurance premiums. In the near future, when more detailed engineering studies specifically define the risk, rates* could increase tremendously as premiums would be based on the actuarial rates without Federal subsidy. The total money paid out by homeowners for flood insurance premiums could add up to tremendous sums in a few years without doing anything to reduce the potential for flood damages.

*(Actuarial rates will apply to new construction.)
FLOOD PLAIN MAP

LEGEND

100-YEAR FLOOD PLAIN

BASE MAP IS AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH DATED JULY 1973, 1 INCH = 1000 FEET

PLATE II
Like many other communities throughout the nation, the City of Thousand Oaks had, until recently, followed the policy of permitting urban development of land using drainage facilities with maximum hydraulic efficiency. In other words, facilities were designed to "drain the runoff away from the development as quickly as possible". The problems with this policy are numerous:

1. Downstream lands are subject to increased flood hazard from increased amounts of runoff for any given amount of rainfall.
2. Previously constructed channels often prove to be inadequate because previous projections of future watershed development were underestimated, and new technology may be developed and more conservative design standards may be adopted.
3. Concrete-lined improved channels may be undesirable from the standpoint of aesthetics and preservation of a natural stream environment.

Within the past year, at the request of the Flood Control District, the City now requires developers to provide storm water detention where possible, to prevent new development in the watershed of South Branch Arroyo Conejo from causing increased runoff.

Another problem caused by development in the flood plain is the reduction of flood plain storage. Between Wendy Drive and Highway 101 at Borchard Road, the occurrence of the 100-year flood would, in effect, create a pond approximately 4000 feet long by 3000 feet wide as shown on Plate II. Without an adequate flood control project, continued encroachment of imported land fill in this ponding area would cause increased depths of water on existing property. (A simple analogy would be to consider the ponding area equivalent to a tub and the encroaching land fill equivalent to bricks; say a given quantity of water will have a depth of 10 inches in the tub which contains no bricks. Placing a single brick in the tub causes the depth of water to increase by such a small amount, we cannot measure it; however, placing 50 bricks into the tub causes the depth of water to rise to 15 inches.)
The Rules and Regulations for the National Flood Insurance Program which have been published in the Federal Register elaborate the specific details relative to development within special flood hazard areas (100-year flood plain). Basically, the law requires that all new construction must be adequately protected from the 100-year flood and that the new construction (when taken together with all similar construction in the immediate area) will not cause a significant increase in the flood hazard to existing development.

The City of Thousand Oaks is required to regulate new construction in accordance with the intent of the National Flood Insurance Program. Due to the complexities of the hydrology and hydraulics of major flooding on South Branch Arroyo Conejo, the full extent of the problem was not previously understood. Evaluation of flood hazards on a tract by tract basis has been like looking at the individual pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. Recent studies by the Soil Conservation Service, 1972; Kobig and Kobig, 1974; and Ventura County Flood Control District, 1976; have been an attempt at better understanding the potential flood hazard from the perspective of the total watershed.

The District, in an advisory capacity to the City, has been furnishing technical information relative to development in areas which have any impact on flood hazard from South Branch Arroyo Conejo. **Every effort should be made to minimize the adverse impact of new development until the District's bond project is constructed.**

"STATUS QUO" - IMPROVED CONCRETE CHANNELS

Presently, the improved channels of South Branch Arroyo Conejo do not have the capacity to convey the runoff from a 50-year frequency storm, and projected urban development in the 1990 Open Space Plan as shown in Plate III will cause the flood hazard to increase. All 23,760 feet of flood control channel would need to be enlarged to provide adequate flow capacity according to present District design criteria. (See Plate IV.) In most locations, total reconstruction would be required. The cost of rebuilding all inadequate channels
in the near future would probably be prohibitive; however, preliminary cost estimates will be made for purposes of economic comparison with other alternative solutions to the problem. Many alternatives were considered; only the two apparently most feasible alternatives to the concrete channel are presented as follows:

**ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION - PLAN "A"**

In order to eliminate the major flood hazard to existing property along the South Branch Arroyo Conejo, and avoid the expense of constructing new channels and reconstructing existing flood control channels, a retention dam located below the confluence of Conejo Mountain Creek and South Branch Arroyo Conejo would appear to be the most effective alternative. (See Plate V.) A dam at this location could temporarily store the runoff from 4,208 acres, thereby greatly reducing the rate of outflow to be safely within the capacity of existing channels located downstream of the dam. A dam at this location would require relocating about 3,600 feet of Reino Road. Replacement of 2,700 feet of inadequate existing improved channel upstream of the dam may still be needed to provide protection within the study area. The size of the dam required to provide needed flood control benefits would necessitate meeting State Division of Dam Safety requirements. Much of the 46 acre area required for temporary ponding of floodwaters could be left in its natural state thereby preserving a significant area of valuable wildlife habitat. The City of Thousand Oaks should take appropriate planning actions to preclude development of the area which may be required as right-of-way for this alternative. It is understood that this area is zoned for future urban development.

**ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION - PLAN "B"**

Preliminary planning studies indicate that another alternative incorporating retention of floodwaters may be feasible. This alternative involves 3 dams located further upstream than the dam in Alternative "A" and would store runoff from 3,066 acres of watershed.
Downstream of the dams, the reduced peak flows at some locations would still exceed existing channel capacity requiring construction of 2,260 feet of channel, and enlarging the floodway beneath 4 bridges. About 80 acres of area behind the 3 dams would be available for open space wildlife habitat or environmentally popular land use. The dams of Alternative "B" are presently outside the corporate limits of the City of Thousand Oaks. (See Plate VI.)

The above mentioned solutions to flood control problems are presently being evaluated by the Ventura County Flood Control District staff. A preliminary design report to evaluate the engineering and economic factors is in progress and scheduled for completion by about January 1977. (See Table I, Basic Data Comparison.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No Retention</th>
<th>Alternative &quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>Alternative &quot;B&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Channel which needs Major Improvement: (Feet)</td>
<td>23,760</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges which need to be replaced to provide floodway (Number)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary Drainage Area upstream of proposed dams (Acres)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>3,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Relocation Required (Feet)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Area in Flood Plain (Acres)</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Area in Flood Plain (Acres)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

TEXT OF COMMENTS RECEIVED
November 14, 1977

Mr. John C. Prescott, Senior Planner
City of Thousand Oaks
401 West Hillcrest Drive
Thousand Oaks, California 91360

Subject: DRAFT EIR - TRACT 2790, THOUSAND OAKS, SOUTH BRANCH ARROYO CONEJO, FLOOD ZONE III

Dear Mr. Prescott:

The subject draft EIR has been reviewed by Flood Control staff engineers and the following comments are offered:

1. In the first paragraph of Section G, Hydrology, reference is made to "Figure 3.7 .... 100-year flood hazard area." Figure 3.7 was missing from our copy of the report.

2. It is suggested that Section G, Hydrology, third paragraph, second sentence, be reworded: "If this is done, total storage volumes available for flood waters in this area will not be decreased, and flood hazard to existing residential areas will not be increased.

Please feel free to call if you need any additional information.

Very truly yours,

G. J. Nowak, Deputy Director
Flood Control & Drainage Department

By [Signature]

W. G. Frank
Division Engineer

JGW/tb
27 October 1977

City of Thousand Oaks Planning Department
401 West Hillcrest Drive
Thousand Oaks, California 91360

ATTENTION:  Mr. John Prescott, Senior Planner

RE: Draft Environmental Impact Report - Tract 2790
Griffin Development Company

Dear John:

Subject Environmental Impact Report has been reviewed by this office and it is noted that Appendix "C" contains appropriate correspondence and response relative to the impact on the schools for this development.

Your attention is drawn particularly to the request that, if this tract is approved, a condition be imposed requiring the Developer to arrange a binding agreement to assist in the funding to provide additions at schools which will be impacted, etc. Your attention is further directed to Appendix "D", page 1, last paragraph and page 3, first paragraph dealing with the pupils who would be walking to school or require transportation. The information contained in these paragraphs should be updated to reflect the walking distances established by the Board of Education in June 1977 which are as follows: Kindergarten, 1½ miles; grades 1-3, 1½ miles; grades 4-6, 2½ miles; grades 7-8, 2½ miles; and grades 9-12, 2 3/4 miles.

Yours truly,

A.H. Fuller
Director of Planning

AMF: dkz
December 2, 1977

City of Thousand Oaks
401 West Hillcrest Drive
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Attention: John Prescott

Reference: Tract 2790 EIR

Dear Mr. Prescott:

This letter is written to inform you that should Griffin Development Company develop the property directly east and south of the above tentative tract, we would propose to develop only the number of lots that could be accommodated on Alice Street per the County of Ventura Access Policy.

My understanding is that 115 lots could be developed on the approximate 30 acres assuming that Tract 2790 developed with the 145 proposed lots.

Very truly yours,

GRiffin DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

[Signature]

Gilbert O. Nielsen
Vice President

GON: sml

cc: Joel Silverman
Al Webber
APPENDIX F

TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S MEMO
MEMORANDUM

TO: MR. JOHN PRESCOTT, SENIOR PLANNER

FROM: MR. JOHN P. CLEMENT, SENIOR TRAFFIC ENGINEER

DATE: DECEMBER 1, 1977

SUBJECT: TRACT NO. 2790 (Reference your Memo of November 23rd attached)

The vehicular bridge across the flood control channel connecting Tract 2790 to Michael Drive should be constructed at some time due to the desirable benefits derived from same.

Elementary school children in Tract 2790 will attend Walnut School which is west of Wendy. If a bridge were constructed these children could attend Manzanita School south of Michael. This would reduce walking distances and the hazards associated with crossing Wendy Drive.

Traffic would gain access to Michael Drive providing in essence a new front door to the tract where most of the traffic would be oriented. This would significantly reduce the traffic and impact on the existing westerly tract. There would be no impact to any residences on Michael Drive.

This possible bridge is in Bridge Policy Area 21 for which 5 previous developments have contributed $18,408.24 (see attachment). Tract 2790 would normally contribute approximately $14,080 to this Bridge Policy Area (40 acres @ $352/acre). It is estimated that the actual bridge may cost about $150,000.

If the bridge can be built, it is very desirable to construct it.

John P. Clement
Senior Traffic Engineer

JPC/kjk
Attachments
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

Date: November 22, 1977

To: John Clement, Traffic Engineer
From: John C. Prescott, Senior Planner

Subject: Tract 2790 (Griffin Development)

I am preparing the Final EIR for Tract 2790 and would like to add some information regarding circulation. You have a copy of the Draft EIR and, as you may recall, access is a problem with the subject property. (See attached map for location.)

I have discovered that there is a 60-foot wide access easement (benefiting the subject property of T-2790) in the westerly portion of the shopping center under construction at the northwest corner of Borchard and Michael, extending the depth of that property, from Michael Drive to the Flood Control Channel. According to the Flood Control District, this easement does not cross their right-of-way, but one could be obtained from the District to provide a bridge crossing.

From your standpoint, would the connection to Michael Drive, as shown on the attached map, be desirable if it could be achieved?

JCP: jm

Copies: Bill Frank, Flood Control Dist.

Signed: John C. Prescott
Title: Senior Planner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>BRIDGE</th>
<th>DEVELOPER</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/16/68</td>
<td>LD 45 &amp; 62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potrero Homes</td>
<td>1,995.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9/71</td>
<td>SUP 70-112</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Julie Billiart</td>
<td>1,910.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/30/77</td>
<td>DP 76-318</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rinker Company</td>
<td>1,232.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/77</td>
<td>Tr. 2503</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warmington Development, Inc.</td>
<td>7,990.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/77</td>
<td>Tr. 2517</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. B. Homes, Inc.</td>
<td>5,280.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW DOCUMENT

I. INITIAL STUDY

A. Project Description

1. Project Number (s) TRACT 2790 / RPD 77-

2. Project Description CONSTRUCTION OF 147 S.F.D. HOMES ON 40 ac

3. Project Location S. OF VENTURA Fwy (101) - 1000 FT. W. OF WENDY DR.

4. Project Applicant GRIFFIN DEVELOPMENT CO.

5. Date Filed APRIL 5, 1977

B. Environmental Setting

The environmental setting of the project is as follows (Check applicable boxes):

1. Topography: [X] Level [ ] Gently rolling [ ] Moderate slopes
   [ ] Steep slopes [ ] Other __________________________

2. Vegetation: [X] Grasses [ ] Brushland [ ] Oak Trees
   [ ] Other significant trees [ ] Other ____________________


4. Water: [ ] Sheet drainage or minor ditch only [ ] Small barranca
   [ ] Large barranca [X] Running Stream [ ] Other ____________
   FLOOD CONTROL CHANNEL

5. Utilities: [X] At site or can be extended a short distance
   [ ] Require major extension [ ] Other ______________________

6. Wildlife: [ ] Significant wildlife habitat [X] Not significant habitat [ ] Unknown

7. Archaeological/Historical Resources: [ ] No known or probable sources at site [ ] Possible or known resources [X] Unknown
C. Environmental Impacts

Potential significant environmental effects of the project are as follows (Check applicable boxes):

☐ Topographic impact
☐ Vegetation removal or damage
☐ Air quality degradation
☐ Water quality degradation
☐ Wildlife habitat reduction
☒ Increased noise level - FROM VENTURA FWY.
☐ Increased light glare
☒ School impact
☒ Traffic impact
☐ Utilities - sewerage system
☐ Utilities - water system
☒ Historic or archaeological resources
☒ Geologic hazards
☒ Hydrology/flood control
☒ Other: VISUAL IMPACT
☐ Other: __________________________________________
☐ Other: __________________________________________

D. Project Compatibility with General Plan, Zoning

The project may not comply with (Check if applicable):

☐ Land Use Element of the General Plan
☐ Conservation Element of the General Plan
☐ Zoning
E. Recommended Mitigation Measures: SEE E.I.R.


F. Mandatory Findings of Significance (Check if applicable):

☐ The project has the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

☐ The project has the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

☐ The project has possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable, as defined by the State Guidelines.

☐ The environmental effects of a project will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

G. Prepared by:

Jeffrey C. Baird

(Signature)

Assistant Planner

April 13, 1977

(Date)
II. DETERMINATION

1. ☑ EIR Required. On the basis of the Initial Study, it has been found that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment. An EIR will be prepared by the Thousand Oaks Planning Department.

   [Signature]
   April 13, 1977
   (Date)

2. a. ☑ Draft Negative Declaration. On the basis of the Initial Study, the Planning Department hereby issues a Draft Negative Declaration on the proposed project. Mitigation measures, if any, which have been incorporated in the project to avoid potentially significant effects are as follows:


Draft ND prepared: __________________________ By: __________________________
(Date) (Signature)

b. ☑ Final Negative Declaration. Comments on the Draft Negative Declaration, if any, and responses thereto are attached.

Final ND prepared: __________________________ By: __________________________
(Date) (Signature)
III. NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

A. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION  Tract 2790

B. This project has been approved by the City of Thousand Oaks.

C. This project, in its approved form, □ will ☒ will not have a significant
effect on the environment.

D. ☒ An EIR was prepared and certified for this project and mitigation measures
required by the City are contained in the Planning Commission and/or
City Council resolution of approval.

□ An EIR was not prepared for this project.

[Signature]  [Date]

John C. Leventhal  April 1, 1978
This invoice is for costs incurred in preparing the EIR for the above referenced project. The total amount due must be paid within 15 days, or prior to the Planning Commission hearing date, whichever occurs first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Time Involved</th>
<th>Amount per Hour</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff fee</td>
<td>3½ hours</td>
<td>30 00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman &amp; paraprofessional fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist fee</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>9 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. fee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AMOUNT DUE** $114.00

Philip E. Gatch
Planning Director

PEG:mf
NAME
Griffin Development Company
ADDRESS
Tarzana, CA
91336
PAYMENT FOR
EIR No. 135--Tract 2790
THOUSAND OF HILLCREST DRIVE
6041 CALIFORNIA
8136

CASH

FUNO NO.

DEPT. NO.

ACC. NO.

AMOUNT

$ 1777.86

CHECK NO.

10731

RECEIVED BY

Marita Faust

THIS RECEIPT VOID UNLESS MACHINE VENEERED WITH DATE AND AMOUNT.
November 8, 1977

Griffin Development Company
19436 Ventura Boulevard
Tarzana, CA 91356

RE: EIR #135--Tract 2790

The following invoice is for costs incurred in preparing the EIR for the above referenced project. The total amount due must be paid within 15 days, or prior to the Planning Commission hearing date, whichever occurs first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Time Involved</th>
<th>Amount per Hour</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff fee</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30 00</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman &amp; paraprofessional fee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18 00</td>
<td>126.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist fee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. fee: Mileage and Photos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT DUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1737.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philip E. Gatch
Planning Director
PLEASE NOTE: This invoice is due in full prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CITY OF THOUSAND OAKS
401 W. Hillcrest Dr.
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

D: Griffin Development Company
19436 Ventura Blvd.
Tarzana, CA 91356

DATE: September 20, 1977
CASE FILE #: EIR #135, Tr. 2790

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invoice Period From To</th>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Time Involved</th>
<th>Amount per Hour</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional staff fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draftsman &amp; paraprofessional fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stenographer or typist fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant fee (Archaeologist - Cultural)</td>
<td></td>
<td>250 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duplication fee (Prints and rendering)</td>
<td></td>
<td>200 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc. fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LESS MINIMUM FEE OF $100------------------------ 100 00

TOTAL AMOUNT DUE IMMEDIATELY

350 00
Check No. 0777

Amount $100.00

Fund No. 94.6

Revenue Account No. 146

Payment for Minimum Fee for EIR #135 (Tract 2790)

Address

19436 Ventura Boulevard

Griffin Development Co.

City of Thousand Oaks - Finance Dept. Receipt

No. 95516
AGREEMENT FOR PAYMENT
OF COSTS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE
PREPARATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT

Griffin Development Co., who has been advised by the
(Name of Applicant)
City of Thousand Oaks Planning Department that an Environmental Impact
Report will be required for Tract 2790-EIR #135, hereby pays a deposit
(Project) of $100.00 as a minimum fee and agrees to pay such additional sums as may
be billed by the City for its preparation of the EIR, including fees of
consultants hired by the City, if any. Said payment shall be made prior to
consideration of the project by the Planning Commission or City Council, or
within 15 days from the date of invoice, whichever first occurs.

Dated 4/12/77
Signed Craig Dickson