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Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. Project Title: Cedarvalley Senior Residential Care Overlay and Senior Housing Project

2. Lead Agency: City of Westlake Village Planning Department
31200 Oak Crest Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91361

3. Contact Person: Philippe Eskandar, Deputy City Manager & Acting Planning Director
Phone: (818) 706-1613
Email: Philippe@wlv.org

4. Project Location: 31200 Cedarvalley Drive, Westlake Village, CA
AIN: 2054-031-030

5. Project Sponsor: Alliance Residential Company
5959 Topanga Canyon Boulevard, Suite 125
Woodland Hills, 91367

6. Existing General Plan Designation: Business Park (BP)/Specific Plan

7. Existing Zoning: Business Park (BP)/Specific Plan

8. Project Setting and Overview:
The major components of the proposed project include: 1) amendment of the Westlake Village General Plan and North Business Park Specific Plan to create a Senior Residential Care Overlay within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District; 2) application of the Overlay to a 1.3-acre project site located at 31200 Cedarvalley Drive; 3) demolition of an existing office/industrial building on the project site; and 4) development of a 3-story senior assisted living project (Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project). Details of the project are outlined below.

a. Environmental Setting
The project area under consideration by this report includes the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District of the North Business Park Specific Plan immediately south of Via Colinas and west of Via Rocos (Figures 1, 2 and 3). The district includes developed property along the Cedarvalley Drive cul-de-sac. Buildings range from two to three stories in height and include office and industrial buildings and the Oaks Christian School Learning Center and student housing. Areas immediately adjacent to the Cedarvalley Zoning District are developed with office, industrial, religious, and educational uses. Notable uses in the area include the Hilton Foundation Headquarters (formerly Dole Headquarters) east of the site across Via Rocos, and the Four Seasons Hotel farther to the southeast.
Figure 1. Regional Project Location

Source: Bing Maps, 2020

Figure 2. North Business Park Specific Plan

Source: City of Westlake Village, 2020
The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is located at 31200 Cedarvalley Drive within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District of the North Business Park Specific Plan. The 1.3-acre (57,063-square-foot) site comprises a square-shaped parcel immediately southwest of the intersection of Via Rocas and Cedarvalley Drive. The site currently contains a two-story concrete tilt-up building that houses MWS Wire Industries, a specialty wire company. The 31,173-square-foot building was constructed 1981 and includes a 21,000-square-foot surface parking lot with 62 parking spaces. Ornamental shrubs, trees, turf, and groundcover surround the perimeter of the building. Vehicular access to the site is from driveways off Via Rocas and Cedarvalley Drive. Public sidewalks do not exist along the fronting roadways except for a pedestrian ramp at the intersection.

The Westlake Village General Plan Land Use Plan and Zoning Map designate the project site as “North Business Park Specific Plan.” The North Business Park Specific Plan identifies the Cedarvalley Zoning District as a “Mixed Use” area, which allows office and business park activities, ministry and educational support uses, and educational uses including student housing. Residential uses (other than student housing) are currently not permitted in the District. However, the Specific Plan includes language stating that, near the conclusion of the Specific Plan preparation process, there were preliminary discussions about the potential for senior housing in the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. Further, the Specific Plan acknowledges it may be appropriate to consider senior housing in the District through future General Plan and Specific Plan amendments.

b. Proposed Project

Senior Residential Care Overlay

To allow senior residential uses within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, and accommodate the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project (described further below), amendments to the General Plan and the North Business Park Specific Plan are proposed to add a “Senior Residential Care Overlay.” The
proposed General Plan Amendment would modify the Land Use Element to include a goal related to the establishment of a Senior Residential Care Overlay for housing for persons 60 years of age and over where 24-hour non-medical care and supervision are provided. Policy language would also be added stating that development in the overlay should be high quality and complementary with the neighborhood, should incorporate adequate open space, and should allow for walkability.

The proposed amendment to the North Business Park Specific Plan would establish the Senior Residential Care Overlay and define policies and regulations regarding the Senior Residential Care Overlay. The Specific Plan would indicate that the overlay could be proposed on sites within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District but would only “apply” it to the proposed senior residential site at 31200 Cedarvalley Drive on the Specific Plan Zoning Map (Figure 4). If the overlay is proposed on additional sites in the future, subsequent Specific Plan amendments and environmental review would be required, although General Plan amendments would not.

Figure 4. North Business Park Specific Plan Amendment Proposed Zoning Map

![North Business Park Specific Plan Amendment Proposed Zoning Map](source)

The proposed Specific Plan Amendment includes language addressing the purpose of the Senior Residential Care Overlay, qualifications for eligibility, permit requirements, and development standards and requirements. The intent of the overlay is to encourage compatible senior residential care housing, ensure that it includes an affordable housing component and functional design, and meets the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). In addition, the Specific Plan Amendment requires that a minimum of 15% of the senior housing be reserved for very low, low, or moderate income residents subject to a recorded covenant or other mechanism to ensure long-term availability.

Regarding development standards and requirements, the proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would allow for design incentives or exceptions from the Specific Plan development regulations to be approved for qualifying senior housing projects. These include: 1) a reduction in required parking with a parking demand study; 2) a density bonus from 0.5 to 1.75 Floor Area Ratio (FAR), 3) a height bonus from up to 2 stories and 35 feet to 3 stories and 55 feet, and 4) a lot coverage increase from 40% to 65%.
Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project

The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project involves demolition of the existing building at 31200 Cedarvalley Drive and construction of a 128-unit luxury residential care facility for the elderly. The building would include 92,500 square feet (above grade) with 128 total units comprised of 102 assisted living units and 26 memory care units. The facility would provide living and supportive care services to residents, including personal assistance, on-call health and emergency care, dining, housekeeping, recreation, and entertainment. In addition, 16 of the assisted living units would be reserved for moderate income occupants.

The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would include a box-shaped “courtyard” building with three stories and an underground garage built around an internal patio/courtyard (Figure 5). The garage would include parking (addressed below), mechanical and electrical rooms, a maintenance shop, a trash room, laundry facilities, a storage room, and a 700-square-foot theater.

The first floor of the building would include the lobby area, two dining rooms, two living/activity rooms, a staff lounge, offices, a beauty salon, and housing units around a central landscaped courtyard (Figure 5). Housing at this level would include 11 assisted living units and 26 memory care units with a total of 42 beds (some rooms would be shared). The second floor would include a dining room, an activity room, and 39 assisted living units with 40 beds. The third floor would include 52 assisted living units with 53 beds.
The roof would include a series of flat areas around the open courtyard areas with scattered hipped roof tower elements. The roof would include a 2,000-square-foot landscaped roof deck with seating, landscaping, and a trellis (Figure 6). Other uses at this level would include three photovoltaic panel arrays and mechanical equipment such as heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment. All equipment would be clustered and screened by trellises to shield views from surrounding areas.
Employees

The Cedarvalley Project would have a total of 52 employees including management, administration, caregiving, dietary, activities, and housekeeping staff. The majority of staff would be on-site during the daytime hours (i.e., 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.) with other staff on-site throughout the day and night to provide continuous care and support. The maximum number of employees on-site at any time would be 35, which would occur around 2:00 p.m. during the staff shift change when morning and afternoon shifts are switching.

Architecture and Landscaping

As shown on Figure 7 and Figure 8, the building would feature a variety of architectural materials and finishes in cream, gray, black, blue, and brown colors. Materials would include cement plaster, cementitious board lap siding, wood trellises, metal railings, and concrete slate tile roof. Stone would be added to the base of the building and would extend up on four sides of the building. The building would feature a variety of building and roof planes to break up the building and add interest. The building would be set back 15 feet from the property line on Cedarvalley Drive and 12 feet from the property line on Via Rocas.

The project would be 3 stories tall, and a majority of the roof would be 40 feet high with appurtenances including hipped roof tower elements rising up to 52 feet, which complies with the proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay limit of 3 stories and 55 feet for senior care facilities. In addition, the project would have an FAR of 1.63 and lot coverage of 52% which also meet the development regulations of the proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay.
Landscaping would be planted in the courtyard, on the roof deck, and around the building exterior, including variety of drought-resistant trees, shrubs, and groundcovers. Chinese Flame Trees would add interest and color to the landscape palette.

**Figure 7. North Elevation (View from Cedarvalley Drive)**

**Figure 8. East Elevation (View from Via Rocas)**

**Circulation and Parking**

The project would have a surface level “drop-off” area at the front entry of the project on Cedarvalley Drive where residents could be picked up and dropped off, but no parking would be provided in this area. The project would close an existing driveway off Via Rocas and provide two driveways off Cedarvalley Drive to access the drop-off area and underground parking garage and a loading/unloading area on the west side of the project. Sidewalks would be constructed along Via Rocas and Cedarvalley Drive where none are currently available.

The underground parking garage would include 65 parking spaces including two spaces accessible per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The applicant has prepared a parking demand study demonstrating the adequacy of the proposed parking (Appendix F). Residents of the project would not be permitted to have personal vehicles on the site, except for the residents of two proposed two-bedroom units, which could amount to up to two residential vehicles for the entire project. The project would have up to a maximum of 35 staff on-site during the peak afternoon shift change and up to twenty visitors at any time, which could result in a peak demand of 57 parking spaces which is fewer than the 65 spaces proposed.
Construction Schedule and Grading

Demolition and construction of the project is expected to take approximately 18 months. Following demolition of the existing building, excavation of the parking garage would occur over a 2-month period and require approximately 15,000 cubic yards of cut to a depth of 12 feet. Excavators and rubber tire bulldozers are expected to be used, but no blasting is anticipated. Following excavation, limited shoring will be installed around the perimeter of the cut area and footings installed, followed by the installation of concrete and construction of the building.

Drainage and Stormwater

The site currently drains via surface flow into existing gutters and inlets. Drainage along the western edge of the property is collected in an on-site 18-inch storm drain that drains to a City-owned catch basin to the south. Surface flows from the site flow southerly along Via Rocas and are intercepted by a catch basin owned and maintained by the City. Drainage from the site ultimately flows southerly through a network of pipes before flowing into a Caltrans-owned pipe under Highway 101 and discharging into Russell Channel and Westlake Lake.

Other Approvals and Actions

In addition to the General Plan Amendment and Specific Plan Amendment, the project will require a Planned Development Permit, and the City and the applicant intend to enter into a Development Agreement for the project. In addition, the applicant is pursuing an amendment to Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) in effect on the property under a separate process. Adopted in 1968, the CC&Rs prohibit residential development within a 250-acre area including the project site. The CC&R amendment is a private process among property owners that does not require action by the City.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required

None.

11. Consultation with California Native American Tribes

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, on April 30, 2020, the City sent project notification letters to all Native American Tribes contained on a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission. The City received one request for consultation from Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and consultation began with a video meeting on July 16, 2020. The Tribe requested the incorporation of mitigation measures for the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project, including monitoring of excavation by a Native American, that have been incorporated in this document (Sections VI and XIX). Consultation remains open as of the date of this report pending the Tribe’s review of the environmental documentation for the project.
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Biological Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Geology and Soils ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Energy
☒ Hydrology and Water Quality ☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Noise ☐ Land Use and Planning ☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Recreation ☐ Population and Housing ☐ Public Services
☒ Utilities and Services Systems ☐ Transportation ☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Wildfire ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Preparation:

This Initial Study for the Cedarvalley Senior Residential Care Overlay and Senior Housing Project was prepared by:

Mary P. Wright, Planning Consultant
Determination: (to be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the project could have a significant effect on the environment there would not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Megan Sinkula, Associate Planner
December 16, 2020
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an EIR is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used: Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed: Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures: For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from the checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.
II. Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less than significant impact. The Westlake Village General Plan Natural Resources Element includes goals, objectives, and policies related to scenic resources. The plan identifies several important scenic resources in the City, including ridgelines in the northeast and southwest limits of the City, Westlake Lake, Westlake Golf Course, and the Las Virgenes Reservoir. The General Plan identifies that Ventura Freeway provides significant views of the City, particularly of the Santa Monica Mountains, Westlake Golf Course, and well-designed business park development. The plan also identifies that tree-lined parkways and landscaped medians of the City’s major arterials are a visual resource of the City that should be preserved and maintained. In addition, the North Business Park Specific Plan identifies scenic vistas extending south from a ridgeline off Via Colinas to the project area.

The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not create development that could potentially affect visual resources. The Overlay would be applied to the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site to accommodate the proposed project. As shown on Figure 7 and Figure 8, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would be three stories tall with a variety of materials, colors, and offsetting planes and rooflines used to create interest. The main roofline of the building would be 40 feet in height with architectural elements including hipped roof tower features and roof trellises extending up to 52 feet. Other buildings with three or more stories in the Cedarvalley area include the Oaks Christian School student housing building, the Hilton Foundation building, and the Four Seasons Hotel. Figure 9 illustrates a visual perspective of the project area, including the proposed project, from Westlake Village Community Park to the north. As shown on Figure 9, due to the presence of taller structures in the vicinity, the gently sloping nature of the topography, extensive landscaping, and backdrop of the Santa Monica Mountains, the project would only be minimally visible from vantage points such as Westlake Village Community Park. In addition, the project would not block any scenic vistas, such as those of the Santa Monica Mountains. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on scenic vistas.
b) **Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**No impact.** The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) manages the State Scenic Highway Program and designates scenic highways as either “Officially Listed” or “Eligible.” There are no designated scenic highways within the City of Westlake Village. In addition, there are no significant trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Because there are no scenic highways or other resources in the area, the project would not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, and no impact would result.

c) **In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points).** **If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

**Less than significant impact.** The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District and the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site are located in an urbanized area and are developed with a variety of commercial, industrial, and other land uses. As outlined above, the project would not affect public views, such as those available from Westlake Village Community Park. In addition, The North Business Park Specific Plan includes development regulations that help to regulate the bulk and scale of new development and protect scenic quality. The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would provide for exceptions from the development regulations of the North Business Park Specific Plan to be made for senior residential care projects within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. The exceptions are intended to incentivize senior care projects and reflect the unique nature and needs of these facilities. Exceptions include deviations from the floor area ratio, height, and lot coverage.
requirements of the Specific Plan, which are the primary zoning regulations governing the size, bulk, and mass of new development.

Floor area ratio (FAR) measures the square footage of a building relative to the size of the site. The existing North Business Park Specific Plan has a maximum floor area ratio of 0.5. The proposed amendment would increase the FAR for qualifying senior residential care projects to 1.75. With 92,500 square feet of above-ground floor space, and a site size of 57,063 square feet, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would have an FAR of 1.62, which would meet this exception. In addition, the North Business Park Specific Plan currently has a height limit of 2 stories and 35 feet for the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, and the proposed amendment would allow a height limit of 3 stories and 55 feet for qualifying development. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would be three stories tall with a maximum height of 52 feet and would meet this exception. Finally, the Specific Plan’s lot coverage limitation (measurement of the building footprint compared to the size of the project site) of 40% is proposed to be changed to 65%, which would accommodate the project’s 52% lot coverage. Thus, the project would meet the development regulations of the North Business Park Specific Plan as they are proposed to be amended.

The additional FAR, height, and lot coverage provided by the Specific Plan Amendment and proposed by the project applicant would result in a bigger and taller building than would be allowed under current regulations. However, as outlined previously, due to the presence of taller structures in the area, the gently sloping nature of the topography, extensive landscaping, and backdrop of the Santa Monica Mountains, the project would not adversely affect visual quality. Furthermore, the project would have a high quality of design and would utilize a variety of roof lines, wall planes, offsets, and materials, which would enhance the scenic quality of the area and create visual interest. As such, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, and a less than significant impact would result.

d) **Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

*Less than significant impact.* The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not create development that could potentially introduce a new source of light and glare. However, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would introduce a new development to the project site with new and different light sources. Exterior lighting would be low level and shielded to direct light downward within the project site. In addition, all lighting would conform with the City’s lighting standards and regulations and would not adversely affect views in the area.

Regarding glare, the project would utilize non-reflective materials and would not generate a substantial amount of glare. A minimal amount of glare could result from sunlight reflecting off automobile windshields traveling to and from the site. However, all parking would be located underground, and parked cars would not create a substantial source of glare. Thus, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant.
III. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?**

**No impact.** According to the Westlake Village General Plan, portions of the City and the surrounding area were historically used for dry farming, grazing, and limited orchard and crop production. However, these activities have not occurred in the City for several years and “parcels suitable for farming based on soil capability are scattered and small in size” (Westlake Village General Plan, Chapter III, Natural Resources). It is not known whether the project site was historically used for farming or related activities; however, the existing office/industrial building has been present on-site for almost 40 years. In addition, according to the State of California Department of Conservation 2014 Map of Important Farmland, the project site is located within an area designated “Urban and Built-Up Land” and is not considered Prime, Unique, or Important Farmland. Thus, the project would not convert important farmland to nonagricultural use, and no impact would result.

b) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No impact.** The project site is currently zoned BP – Business Park and is not zoned for agricultural use. In addition, the project site is not under a Williamson Act contract that provides financial incentives to maintain property in agricultural use. Thus, the project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would result.
c) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

*No impact.* The project site is not zoned or designated forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526). In addition, the project site is not designated or zoned for forestry or timberland resources. Thus, no impact would result.

d) **Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

*No impact.* The project site does not contain forest land, nor would it convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would result.

e) **Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

*No impact.* The project site does not contain agricultural or forest lands, nor would it involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of agricultural or forest land to other uses. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land, and no impact would result.
IV. Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

*Less than significant impact.* The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) monitors air quality in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which includes all or portions of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties. SCAQMD monitors air quality based on federal and state standards that have been promulgated for carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O$_3$), sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), particulate matter (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$), and lead (Pb). The Basin is currently designated as a federal nonattainment area for ozone and PM$_{2.5}$, and is a state nonattainment area for ozone, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ (Appendix A).

SCAQMD developed the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) to identify emission-reduction measures to bring the Basin into attainment with federal and state air quality standards. The AQMP includes Localized Significance Threshold (LST) guidelines for construction and operation of a proposed project to assist in analyzing the environmental effects of new development. The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development and would have no effect on air quality. However, as outlined in an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Analyses prepared for the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project (Appendix A), the project was evaluated for conformance with SCAQMD LST thresholds. Emissions were calculated for regional and localized peak daily construction emissions and regional and localized peak daily operational emissions. Based on this analysis, the project would not exceed any of the SCAQMD thresholds of significance for federal or state air pollutants. Thus, the project would not obstruct implementation of the South Coast AQMP, and a less than significant air quality impact would result.

b) **Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?**

*Less than significant impact.* Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor but collectively significant projects, which “when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines § 15355). As outlined above, the South Coast Air Basin is in federal nonattainment for ozone and PM$_{2.5}$, and state nonattainment for ozone, PM$_{10}$, and PM$_{2.5}$. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would be considered cumulatively significant if its impacts exceed SCAQMD project-specific significance thresholds. As discussed under threshold (a), construction and operation of the project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for regional...
emissions or localized impacts of criteria pollutants. Therefore, the project’s contribution would not be considered cumulatively considerable under SCAQMD’s policy and impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

*Less than significant impact.* Sensitive receptors include residences, schools, hospitals, and similar uses that are particularly sensitive to adverse air quality. The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not create development that could expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. The closest sensitive receptor to the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site would be the Oaks Christian School, which operates dormitories and family units at the northwest limit of the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. During construction, the project would generate less than 1 pound per day of diesel particulate matter, which would not exceed SCAQMD’s LSTs for PM$_{10}$ or PM$_{2.5}$. Likewise, operation of the project would consist primarily of residential activities, would not involve heavy industrial processes typically associated with generation of toxic air contaminants, and would not exceed SCAQMD’s significance thresholds for PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. Thus, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and a less than significant impact would result.

e) **Would the project result in emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?**

*Less than significant impact.* The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in emissions adversely affecting a substantial amount of people. During construction, heavy equipment such as bulldozers and backhoes would be utilized on the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site, which could be a source of objectionable odors due to diesel exhaust. However, construction activities would be temporary, and heavy equipment would be utilized sporadically, primarily during the early phases of construction. No sources of objectionable odors would result from long-term operation of the project, and a less than significant impact would result.
V. Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

*Less than significant impact.* The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District is an urbanized area that is developed with commercial, industrial, and student housing buildings, public streets, infrastructure, and ornamental landscaping. Adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay would not directly result in construction, modification, addition, or placement of any building or structure in the Zoning District. In addition, the Final Program EIR prepared for the North Business Park Specific Plan did not identify any special status plant or wildlife species within the planning area. However, the EIR identified that trees, shrubs and other plants in the area could provide nesting habitat for birds and are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and/or the California Fish and Game Code. Site-specific environmental review would be required for any future senior housing proposals in the area.

The 1.3-acre Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is developed with an office/industrial building surrounded by non-native ornamental landscaping including trees, shrubs, and groundcovers. As outlined above, there are no threatened, endangered, or special status plan or wildlife species known to exist in the area. However, a potential exists for ornamental trees, shrubs, or other plants on the site to provide nesting habitat for native bird species that are protected by the MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code. Prior to any ground disturbance, the City’s regulatory requirements...
will require a determination by a qualified biologist regarding whether any native bird species are nesting on-site during the breeding season (typically March 1 through August 15). If active native nests are identified, a buffer may need to be established as determined by the biologist and/or applicable regulatory agencies to limit construction activities until the breeding season has ended. Because the project would be required to comply with these regulatory requirements, impacts to special status species would be less than significant.

b) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**No impact.** The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District and the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site do not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. Thus, implementation of the project would not adversely affect any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural biological community, and no impact would occur.

c) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**No impact.** There are no federally protected wetlands within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District or on the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site. Therefore, project implementation would have no impact on protected wetland areas.

d) **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**Less than significant impact.** The project area is urbanized and developed and not conducive to wildlife movement. In addition, the area does not contain any native plant or animal species and does not connect any native habitat areas. Implementation of the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project will require conformance with the MBTA to protect any birds nesting on the property. With the incorporation of this standard requirement, the project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and a less than significant impact would occur.

e) **Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**No impact.** The North Business Park Specific Plan calls for the use of California native or adapted plants and a sustainable plant palette. In addition, Chapter 9.16 of the Westlake Village Municipal Code requires water-efficient landscaping. The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would not result in any new development other than the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project. The project includes a landscape and irrigation plan that utilizes non-invasive, low water use plants in compliance with regulatory requirements.

Chapter 9.21 of the Westlake Village Municipal Code contains the City’s Oak Tree and Heritage Tree Preservation Standards. The standards prohibit the damage or removal of oak trees above a certain size as well as certain heritage trees that have been so designated by the City for having aesthetic, ecological, or historical significance. The site currently contains a variety of ornamental trees, shrubs, and groundcovers including eucalyptus and fern pine trees, which are ornamental and non-native.
There are no oak or heritage trees present on-site. As such, the project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources or tree preservation, and no impact would occur.

f) **Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

*No impact.* There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) in effect in the City of Westlake Village. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with any HCP or NCCP, and no impact would occur.
VI. Cultural Resources

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?**

**No impact.** The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, like much of the North Business Park Specific Plan, contains mixed commercial, industrial, religious, and related development constructed within the last 50 years. There are no historic structures present in the zoning district. The existing commercial/industrial building at 31200 Cedarvalley Drive on the site of the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project was constructed in 1981 and is likewise not historic. Because there are no historic resources present in the area, the project would not cause a substantial change to a historical resource, and no impact would result.

b) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?**

**Less than significant with mitigation.** A Sacred Lands File Search was conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in conjunction with the consideration of the North Business Park Specific Plan and did not identify the presence of Native American cultural resources within the Specific Planning area, including the project site. In addition, an archaeological/historic records search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) for the area. Although several prehistoric sites are located within a 1-mile radius of the Specific Plan boundaries, none were located within the Specific Planning area, the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, or the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site. Nonetheless, the regional area is known to have been actively used in the past by Native American tribes.

A site-specific cultural resources site reconnaissance survey was not conducted in advance of construction of the office/industrial building at 31200 Cedarvalley Drive in the early 1980s, and it is not known whether any archaeological resources were disturbed by development of the site. Based on a Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project (Appendix B), the project site is underlain by artificial fill materials at a varied depth of 0 to 7.5 feet. Due to their disturbed nature, fill materials are unlikely to contain significant cultural resources. However, the site is also underlain by undisturbed alluvial materials varying in depth from 6.5 to 12 feet, and Topanga siltstone and sandstone generally at a depth of 5.0 feet and over. These formations have the potential to contain previously unidentified archaeological resources.

The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would include excavation to a depth of 12 feet for the underground parking garage. As such, the grading is anticipated to impact previously undisturbed
soil that may contain cultural resources. Thus, grading activities could adversely affect archaeological resources, and monitoring will be required. In accordance with Assembly Bill (AB 52) and Senate Bill (SB 18), the City conducted tribal consultation with the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians (FTBMI) as described in Section XIX, Tribal Cultural Resources. FBTMI has agreed to the following mitigation measures for the protection of cultural resources. With the incorporation of CULT-1, CULT-2 and CULT-3, potential impacts to cultural resources would be mitigated to below significance.

Mitigation Measure

CULT-1 The project applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor from the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians or consulting Tribe under AB 52 to observe all grading operations up to 5 feet below the surface of native soil, unless there is evidence to suggest cultural resources extend below the specified depth.
- Part-time or spot check monitoring shall be conducted in areas with fill or sediments that are highly disturbed. Full time monitoring shall be conducted when ground-disturbance occurs within native (non-fill) levels.
- If cultural resources are encountered, the Native American monitor will have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within 60 feet of discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time.

CULT-2 The Lead Agency and/or the applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and consulting Tribes on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during project grading.

CULT-3 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County coroner shall be contacted. If the human remains are determined to be Native American in origin by the County coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the Lead Agency, the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, and consulting Tribes.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Less than significant with mitigation. See above. The adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay within the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District would not result in construction or development, except as related to the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project. Although unlikely, there is a potential for human remains to be uncovered during grading of the underground parking garage. The incorporation of CULT-3 will ensure that any human remains are appropriately handled. With the incorporation of CULT-3, impacts to human remains would be less than significant.
VII. Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

**Less than significant impact.** Adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay would not directly result in construction, modification, addition, or placement of any building or structure in the zoning district. As such, the overlay would not increase the consumption of energy resources, and no impact would result.

The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would consume energy during construction and long-term operation. During construction, the project is anticipated to consume 5,250 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity per month of construction or approximately 105,000 kWh for the anticipated 20-month construction period (Alliance Residential, 2020). In addition, most of the construction vehicles and equipment would utilize fossil fuel (i.e., gasoline, diesel fuel, and motor oil) although the amount of fossil fuel consumption is uncertain. However, construction would be short-term and temporary, and energy consumption is anticipated to be comparable to construction of other similarly sized senior housing projects in Southern California. In addition, the project is not anticipated to include any unique features or construction techniques that would generate high energy demand. The project would conform with all state and local requirements regarding construction-related energy use, including anti-idling regulations.

During operation, the project would utilize energy in the form of electricity and natural gas, as well as fuel used for vehicular travel to and from the project site. The project is estimated to need 350,000 kWh annually, 55% of which would be covered by a roof-installed photovoltaic system. In addition, the project is anticipated to use 12,000 therms of natural gas for water heating and commercial cooking. The project would conform with all applicable standards for building energy efficiency and would not generate a need for excess energy resources. In addition, trip generation associated with the project would be less than the existing use, as outlined in Section XVIII, Transportation, which in turn would result in lower fuel consumption from the project site.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

**Less than significant impact.** In 2003, the State’s three major energy policy agencies (the California Public Utilities Commission, the California Energy Commission, and the California Power Authority) joined forces to create the State’s first Energy Action Plan (EAP). The Plan, which was updated in 2005 and 2008 as EAPII, outlines a strategy to meet California’s future energy needs in part by reducing reliance on non-renewable sources of energy. In addition, in 2007 the California Energy Commission
and the Air Resources Board adopted the State Alternative Fuels Plan, which outlines the steps California must take to increase reliance on alternative non-petroleum fuels.

The Westlake Village General Plan and the North Business Specific Plan also include goals and objectives related to energy efficiency. The Natural Resources Element of the General Plan calls for conservation and innovative planning as well as the incorporation of green technologies into new development. The North Business Specific Plan calls for the use of energy efficient building orientation, and the use of photovoltaic systems and energy efficient equipment to reduce reliance on traditional energy sources.

As previously addressed, the Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not affect energy consumption. Construction and operation of the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation any of the energy plans outlined above. The project would not require a large amount of energy and would incorporate a rooftop photovoltaic system that would reduce operational electricity consumption by 55%. In addition, the project would comply with all applicable energy standards and regulations and would have a less than significant impact related to energy.
VIII. Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

This analysis contained in this section is based on a Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the project site by Geocon West in 2019 (Appendix B) and by a paleontologic literature search conducted by the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County in 2013 (Appendix C).

a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known fault?

Less than significant impact. The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, including the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site, is not located within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zone, and no active or potentially active faults are known to exist on-site. The closest known faults to the project site are Malibu Coast Fault located 7.9 miles to the south; the Simi Fault located 8.2 miles to the north; the Oak Ridge Fault located 15.8 miles to the north; the San Cayetano Fault located 18.1 miles to the north-northwest; and the Santa Monica Fault located 18.5 miles to the east-southeast. The San Andreas Fault, the state’s largest active fault, is located approximately 41 miles northeast of the site. Because the site is not located on or near a known fault line, it is unlikely to cause fault rupture and a less than significant impact would result.
ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

_**Less than significant impact.**_ The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could cause or be impacted by seismic shaking. Although the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is not located on or near a known earthquake fault, Southern California is an active seismic region, and moderate to strong ground shaking occurs periodically in the region. The project site will likely experience future ground shaking from earthquake events; however, this potential is not unique to the site, and the project will be conditioned to incorporate standard construction techniques to stabilize the proposed structure and reduce the effect of seismic shaking. As such, the exposure of people to strong seismic ground shaking will be minimized, and impacts would be less than significant.

iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

_**Less than significant impact.**_ Seismic-related liquefaction is a type of ground failure that occurs when saturated and loose sandy soils lose cohesion during seismic events. The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District including the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is located in a seismically active area and will likely be subject to seismic shaking in the future. According to the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the project, the potential for liquefaction is low. This is due to an analysis of the soils conditions, water table level, and potential seismic movement at the project site. In addition, the area is not located in an area identified as having a potential for liquefaction on the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Thousand Oaks Quadrangle. Thus, a less than significant impact would result.

iv) **Landslides?**

_**No impact.**_ The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could cause or be impacted by landslides. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is relatively level, ranging in elevation from approximately 982 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) at the southeast corner of the site to 990 feet AMSL at the northwest corner of the site. The site is not identified as an area having the potential for seismic slope instability by the City of Westlake Village, the County of Los Angeles, or the State of California. In addition, there are no known landslides on or near the site. Thus, the potential for landslides on the project site is considered low, and no impact would result.

b) **Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

_**No impact.**_ The Senior Residential Care Overlay would not result in development and would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site has been graded and developed in the past and contains approximately 7.5 feet of fill material and no native topsoil. Fill materials consist of clay with some silt and fine to medium sand. Construction of the project will require grading to a depth of 12 feet for the underground parking garage, which will remove the fill material and excavate into alluvium and bedrock. All areas of the site will be developed, paved, or landscaped, and construction will utilize standard construction techniques that will stabilize the soils. In addition, the relatively flat nature of the site and the implementation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) will further reduce the potential for soil erosion. No impact would result.
c) **Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**No impact.** The Mixed Use Cedarvalley District and the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site are not located in an unstable geologic unit, and, as outlined above, would not create the potential for landslide, spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. No impact would result.

d) **Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**

**Less than significant.** The Senior Residential Care Overlay would not result in development and would not be affected by expansive soil. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is relatively level and includes fill material including clay with silt and sand. Grading for the underground parking garage would remove fill material as well as native alluvium and sandstones and siltstones. The project would follow the recommendations of the consulting geologist, and a less than significant impact would result.

e) **Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

**No impact.** The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District and the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site are served by a municipal wastewater system. Development in the area and on the project site would connect to the municipal wastewater system and would not include septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems. Thus, no impact would result.

f) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less than significant with mitigation.** The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could impact paleontological resources. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is underlain by artificial fill, Holocene age alluvial deposits, and sandstones and siltstones associated with the Topanga Formation (Appendix B). Development of the proposed project would include excavation to a depth of 12 feet, which could expose each of these layers. Artificial fill materials have a very low potential to yield paleontological resources because they have lost their geological context and have been disturbed by earth working activities. In addition, according to a paleontological records search conducted in the project area (Appendix C), no fossil remains have been discovered on or near the project site. However, vertebrate fossils have been found in alluvial deposits and the Topanga Formation outside the project area, and grading of the project site may uncover fossil remains.

To ensure that paleontological resources are not impacted by grading associated with the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 will be required involving monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during grading as outlined below. With the incorporation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

**GEO-1** Prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to monitor excavations that extend into sensitive rock formations (alluvial deposits and Topanga Formation rocks). The schedule and extent of monitoring activities
shall be established by the supervising paleontologist in coordination with the contractor and the City at a pre-grade meeting. It shall be the responsibility of the supervising paleontologist to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City, the appropriate level of monitoring necessary based on the on-site soils and final grading plans, when available.

All paleontological work to assess and/or recover a potential resource at the project site shall be conducted under the direction of the qualified paleontologist. If a fossil discovery occurs during grading operations when a paleontological monitor is not present, grading shall be diverted around the area until the monitor can survey the area. Any fossils recovered during site development, along with their contextual stratigraphic data, shall be donated to the City of Westlake Village or, at the discretion of the City, to the County of Los Angeles or other appropriate institution with an educational and research interest in the materials. The paleontologist shall prepare a report of the results of any findings as part of a testing/mitigation plan following accepted professional practice.
IX. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

*Less than significant impact.* Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are naturally present in the atmosphere and are released by natural sources or formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. In addition, human activities over the past 200 years have caused greatly increased quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere, which in turn increases the natural greenhouse effect and are thought to cause global warming. Human-induced GHGs include the following:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂)
- Methane (CH₄)
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O)
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- Sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆)

The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could generate greenhouse gas emissions. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2016.3.2, was used to quantify emissions from anticipated construction and operational activities associated with the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project (Appendix A). GHG emissions associated with the project would occur from direct sources such as construction equipment, the use of mobile vehicles by employees and visitors (most residents would not be allowed to have vehicles), and area sources such as consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape equipment. GHG emissions would also occur from indirect sources, such as the use of electricity, water conveyance, wastewater treatment, and waste disposal. Based on an analysis of construction and operational GHG emissions using CalEEMod, emissions would be below the SCAQMD threshold, and a less than significant impact would result.

b) **Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

*Less than significant impact.* In 2006, California adopted AB 32, which required the state to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. In 2016, California adopted SB 32, which required the state to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. AB 32 and SB 32 codified State targets and directed State regulatory agencies to develop rules and regulations to meet the targets; AB 32 and SB 32 do not stipulate project-specific requirements. Specific requirements are codified in rules and regulations developed by regulatory agencies such as CARB and SCAQMD, and local City ordinances.
The AB 32 2008 Scoping Plan outlined the State’s strategy to achieve the 2020 GHG emissions reduction target via a set of recommended measures. The implementation of these measures relies on actions on the part of state agencies and local governments, not individual projects. Actions include, but are not limited to, development and implementation of rules, market projects, zero-emission projects, renewable fuel standards, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), vehicle efficiency measures, energy efficiency projects, green building strategies, market-based mechanisms, incentive measures, as well as land use planning and permitting.

In 2014, CARB adopted an update to the 2008 Scoping Plan that built upon the initial Scoping Plan, with new strategies to achieve the 2020 AB32 State target. In 2017, CARB adopted a second update to the 2008 Scoping Plan. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update highlights the State’s progress toward meeting the 2020 GHG emission reduction goal, identifies funding opportunities to reduce GHG emissions through state planning and low carbon investments, identifies climate change priorities for 5 years, and sets the groundwork to reach long-term goals. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update also includes specific recommended actions for lead agencies and identifies possible regulatory actions for vehicles and fuels.

The 2008 Scoping Plan, 2014 Scoping Plan Update, and 2017 Scoping Plan Update envision that reductions in GHG emissions will come from virtually all sectors of the economy and be accomplished from a combination of policies, planning, direct regulations, market approaches, incentives, and voluntary efforts. These efforts also target GHG emission reductions from cars and trucks, electricity production, and fuels; implementation relies on actions on part of state agencies and local governments, not individual projects.

The Senior Residential Care Overlay would not result in development that could conflict with the Scoping Plan. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would comply with existing regulations applicable to project activities, and would, by law, comply with future regulatory requirements applicable to project activities. No elements of the project would conflict with the Scoping Plan or Plan Updates. The project would therefore not preclude the State’s implementation of AB 32 or SB 32.

The project would include design features to reduce energy and water consumption, per California’s Title 24 Part 6, Building Energy Efficiency Standards and Part 11, Green Building Code Standards. The Building Energy Efficiency Standards for new residential and commercial buildings seek to ensure that building construction, system design, and installation achieve energy efficiency. The Green Building Code Standards were developed in response to AB 32 and establish mandatory green building construction standards. The project would comply with Title 24 Parts 6 and 11, pursuant to the City’s Municipal Code and as part of the conditions set forth in the building permit. In addition, the project would incorporate rooftop photovoltaic panels, which would reduce on-site operational electricity use by 55% and have a corresponding reduction in GHGs. Thus, impacts related to conformance with greenhouse gas plans, policies, and regulations would be less than significant.
X. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

**Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?**

*Less than significant impact.* The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could create a hazard to the public through the transport of hazardous materials. The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project involves the demolition of an existing office/industrial building and construction of a 128-unit senior housing project. Materials generated by demolition of the existing building would be appropriately handled, and any hazardous materials would be disposed in accordance with applicable laws. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would involve minimal use of hazardous materials during construction and operation. During construction, petroleum-based hydrocarbons would be used to power and maintain heavy equipment. In addition, construction materials would include paints, adhesives, solvents, and other substances that are considered hazardous if used or stored improperly. However, these are standard risks associated with all construction sites and are not considered unique to the project. Construction contractors would be required to adhere to all local, state, and federal requirements regarding the use of hazardous materials, and a less than significant impact would result.

During long-term operation of the project, routine maintenance activities would include the use of cleansers, solvents, pesticides, fertilizers, paint, and other materials. In addition, oxygen and medicines would be used on-site for treatment purposes. All substances would be used in accordance with applicable requirements and would not pose a significant hazard to the public or environment. Thus, a less than significant impact would result.
b) **Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

*Less than significant impact.* As outlined above, demolition of the existing building and construction and operation of the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project could involve the use of hazardous materials, which would be handled in compliance accordance with all applicable rules and requirements. The transportation, use, and disposal of these materials would adhere to state and local standards and regulations for handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous substances. Compliance with applicable regulations will minimize potential health risks associated with their use or the accidental release of such substances. Accordingly, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. A less than significant impact would occur.

c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

*Less than significant impact.* There are no existing or proposed public schools located within a quarter mile of the project site. However, the site is located just under one-quarter mile northeast of Oaks Christian School, a private school serving grades 5-12 located at 31749 La Tienda. However, other than the use of small amounts of substances such as solvents and pesticides, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, and a less than significant impact would result to existing or proposed schools.

d) **Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

*Less than significant.* The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Envirofacts Database was consulted to determine if any uses in the area are authorized to utilize hazardous substances. Similar to several other industrial and manufacturing facilities in the area, the existing wire manufacturer on the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is listed on the USEPA’s Envirofacts Database as a facility that is permitted to utilize a variety of hazardous substances in the manufacturing process. In addition, a commercial printing operation and an auto body shop were previously located northwest of the project site that utilized solvents, inks, and petroleum hydrocarbons and are also on the Envirofacts Database. However, none of these facilities are included on the Cortese Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, which is compiled pursuant to § 65962.5 of the California Government Code. Thus, the project would not be located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to the Government Code and would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site in August 2019 to determine whether any hazardous substances from the wire manufacturing operation or adjacent uses have contaminated soil on the project site (Appendix D). The report summarized the results of six soil vapor probes that were installed on-site by Optimal Technologies in 2018 to determine if past and present industrial use of the site has resulted in soil contamination. Three probes were installed beneath the building in the vicinity of the chemical mixing room, and three probes were installed to the northeast and northwest of the building in the asphalt parking lot. All of the probes contained either undetectable or very low levels of hazardous soil vapor, which were well below acceptable screening levels for commercial and residential uses.
Thus, the report concluded that the project site does not contain substances that would represent a health hazard, and a less than significant impact would result.

e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

*No impact.* The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, including the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site, is located approximately 15 miles east of the City of Camarillo Airport, the closest public or private airport to the site. The area is not located within the Camarillo Airport Land Use Plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) **Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

*No impact.* The City of Westlake Village is part of the Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP). The HMP identifies earthquake, wildfire, windstorm, landslide, flood, and terrorism threats to the City and identifies goals and strategies to protect life, property, and the environment. All participating cities are committed to work cooperatively to implement the projects and strategies in the HMP and assist one another during emergency events. Implementation of the Senior Residential Care Overlay would not directly result in development and would not impair the City’s emergency response plan.

The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would not impair an emergency response plan or evacuation plan. According to the City’s Disaster Route Map, emergency evacuation routes in the vicinity of the project site include Lindero Canyon Road and U.S. 101. The project would not alter the existing or planned roadway network in the area, and no impacts to emergency access would occur. In addition, the project is projected to generate slightly less traffic than the existing use, and thus project-related traffic would not cause traffic congestion in the area that could potentially impede emergency access. Construction of the project may temporarily block traffic and access in the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, these occurrences would be infrequent, and would not affect emergency evacuation of the City. Thus, a less than significant impact would result.

g) **Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?**

*Less than significant impact.* The City of Westlake Village has been subject to wildland fires in the past, most recently during the Woolsey Fire of 2018. In addition, much of the City is within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), as identified by CAL FIRE. However, the project area is urbanized and not located in the VHFHSZ; the closest VHFHSZ boundary to the project site is located 1,500 feet to the north, directly across Thousand Oaks Boulevard. The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would replace an existing office/industrial building with a senior housing complex that would be built in accordance with all applicable building and fire code requirements and would not increase the likelihood of wildland fire in the area. Thus, although the City remains subject to wildland fires, the project would not directly or indirectly subject people or structures to wildland fires, and a less than significant impact would result.
XI. Hydrology and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Less than significant impact. The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could potentially impact water quality. As previously identified, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site currently contains a two-story office/industrial building. According to a Hydrology Report prepared for the project by Fuscoe Engineering in 2020 (Appendix E), existing site stormwater runoff currently flows northwest and southwest to two grated catch basins and an 18-inch reinforced concrete pipe that lies under the southwesterly property line. From there runoff is conveyed to Via Rocos where it flows into a 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe and flows to the southwest, eventually draining into the Russell Channel near the 101 Freeway.

The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project is projected to generate slightly less stormwater than the existing use and would utilize the catch basins and the concrete pipe currently in place. In addition, the project will be conditioned to comply with the City’s Low Impact Design (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual (“LID Manual”) to ensure that water quality standards are met. To meet LID requirements, the project will need to treat a minimum of 3,540 cubic feet of stormwater through infiltration, reuse, or other measures. The project will be required to prepare a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to outline specifically how the project will incorporate BMPs and meet LID requirements. Incorporation of BMP measures will ensure the project would not violate any water quality standards, and a less than significant impact would result.
b) **Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?**

*No impact.* The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not create development that could potentially affect groundwater supplies. In addition, no groundwater was encountered in several borings conducted in 2019 by Geocon West for the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site to a depth of 30½ feet below the existing ground level. In addition, due to the shallow depth of bedrock and the depth of the proposed construction, the groundwater table is not expected to be encountered during construction. While a perched groundwater condition can occur above bedrock level, due to the small size of the project site (1.3 acres), the lack of groundwater evidence, and the developed nature of the project site, the project is not likely to contribute to groundwater recharge, and development of the project would not impact groundwater supplies or management.

c) **Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:**

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

iv) **Impede or redirect flood flows?**

*No impact.* The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not create development that could potentially affect drainage in the area. As outlined above, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would reduce stormwater generated on-site and would incorporate filtration measures that could further reduce the amount of runoff generated by the site. The project would be required to incorporate BMP measures to treat and retain water on-site and excess runoff would drain into the existing storm drain system and would not result in erosion, flooding, or impacts to the drainage system. Thus, no impact would result.

d) **In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?**

*No impact.* According to the project Hydrology Report, the project area is outside the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 500-year annual chance floodplain and is not in a flood hazard area. In addition, the area is not in a tsunami or seiche zone and the likelihood of inundation of the site is low. Thus, implementation of the Senior Residential Care Overlay and Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would not increase the risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation, and no impact would result.

e) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?**

*No impact.* As previously identified, the project will be required to prepare a WQMP to identify BMPs to comply with the City’s LID requirements and ensure that water quality standards are achieved. To meet LID requirements, the project will need to treat a minimum of 3,540 cubic feet of stormwater through infiltration, reuse, or other measures. Compliance will ensure the project would not violate any water quality standards, and a less than significant impact would result.
XII. Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project physically divide an established community?**

No impact. The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could divide an established community. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is currently developed with an office/industrial building, is located in an urbanized area, and is surrounded by business park and related development. The proposed project would replace the existing building with a senior housing project with 128 units. The facility would take access off Cedarvalley Drive and would provide adequate on-site parking for the intended uses. The project would not modify or preclude access in or around the surrounding area and would not divide an established community. No impact would result.

b) **Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

City of Westlake Village General Plan

Less than significant impact. The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, including the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site, is designated North Business Park Specific Plan by the City of Westlake Village General Plan. The General Plan was amended in June 2020 in conjunction with adoption of the North Business Park Specific Plan (addressed below) to identify the specific plan area as Specific Plan Area 2.

The proposed project includes an amendment to the Land Use Element of the General Plan to add a goal regarding the establishment of a “Senior Residential Care Overlay” for housing for persons 60 years of age and over where 24-hour non-medical care and supervision are provided. Policy language would be added stating that development in the overlay should be high quality and complementary with the neighborhood, should incorporate adequate open space, and should allow for walkability. With the proposed general plan changes, senior residential care facilities, including the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project, would be permitted in the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project includes high quality of design that is compatible with the scale and eclectic nature of the surrounding area. In addition, the project includes courtyard and rooftop open space and would add sidewalks along Cedarvalley Drive and Via Rocas to enhance walkability. Thus, the project would be compatible with the General Plan as proposed to be amended, and a less than significant impact would result.
North Business Park Specific Plan

Less than significant impact. As outlined above, the North Business Park Specific Plan was adopted in June of 2020 and applies to a 200-acre specific planning area located in the northern portion of the City, north of the U.S. 101 Freeway (Figure 2 and Figure 4). The Specific Plan is subdivided into eight planning districts including the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. The intent of the district is to provide for “existing office and business park activities, as well as to accommodate the transition of several buildings to ministry and educational support uses, including student housing, administrative offices, and classrooms. . .”

The Specific Plan includes language stating that, near the conclusion of the Specific Plan preparation process, there were preliminary discussions about the potential for senior housing in the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. Although the Specific Plan does not currently permit this use, it acknowledges it may be appropriate in the area pending the approval of subsequent General Plan and Specific Plan amendments and environmental review. Thus, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project is being processed with proposed amendments to the General Plan and the Specific Plan to allow a senior residential care use.

The proposed Specific Plan Amendment would establish a Senior Residential Care Overlay that may be applied to sites in the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District through a North Business Park Specific Plan Amendment process. The Overlay would be only be applied to the 1.3-acre Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site at the present time on Figure 4-1 of the Specific Plan to accommodate the proposed project (Figure 4).

The Specific Plan Amendment includes language addressing the purpose of the Senior Residential Care Overlay, qualifications for eligibility, permit requirements, and development standards and requirements. The intent of the overlay is to encourage compatible senior residential care housing, ensure that it includes an affordable housing component, includes functional design, and meets the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would meet these thresholds in that it includes high quality design that is compatible with the bulk, scale, and architectural character of the surrounding area and would include functional universal design. In addition, the Specific Plan Amendment requires that a minimum of 15% of the senior housing be reserved for very low, low, or moderate income residents subject to a recorded covenant or other mechanism to ensure long-term availability. Per state law, only the 102 assisted living units would be eligible to count toward the City’s Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and thus the 15% affordability requirement would only be based on the 102 assisted living units, exclusive of the 26 memory care units. The project includes 16 moderate income assisted living units, which equates to 15.3% of the assisted living units and meets this requirement.

Regarding development standards and requirements, the overlay allows for design incentives, or exceptions, from the Specific Plan development regulations to be approved for qualifying senior housing projects. These include: 1) a reduction in required parking with a parking demand study; 2) a density bonus up to 1.75 FAR; 3) a height bonus up to 3 stories and 55 feet; and, 4) lot coverage up to 65%.

Regarding parking, the Specific Plan does not specifically address parking for senior housing projects. However, application of the Specific Plan residential parking standards would result in 222 parking spaces being required for the project where 65 are proposed. The applicant has
provided a parking demand study that demonstrates the adequacy of the proposed parking (Appendix F). A key point is that residents of the project will not be permitted to have personal vehicles on the site, except for the residents of the proposed two 2-bedroom units, which could amount to up to two residential vehicles for the entire project. The project would have up to a maximum of 35 staff on-site during the peak afternoon shift change and up to twenty visitors at any time, which could result in a peak demand of 57 parking spaces (2 resident spaces + 35 employee spaces + 20 visitor spaces). Because this demand is well below the 65 proposed spaces, adequate parking would be provided.

Regarding FAR, the North Business Park Specific Plan has a maximum FAR of 0.5, and the proposed amendment would permit up to 1.75 FAR for qualifying senior housing projects. With 92,500 square feet of above-ground floor space, and a site size of 57,063 square feet, the proposed project would have an FAR of 1.63, which would meet this requirement.

Regarding height, the North Business Park Specific Plan currently has a height limit of 2 stories and 35 feet for the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District. The proposed amendment would allow a height limit of 3 stories and 55 feet for qualifying senior residential care development. As previously identified, the primary project roof line would be 40 feet in height with architectural elements and projections extending up to 52 feet in height in conformance with the revised requirement.

Regarding lot coverage, the North Business Park Specific Plan has a maximum lot coverage limitation of 40%. The proposed Specific Plan Amendment would permit a lot coverage up to 65% for projects that meet the intent of the overlay. The proposed project would have a lot coverage of 52%, which would meet this requirement.

With the approval of the North Business Park Specific Plan Amendment to incorporate a Senior Residential Care Overlay and related standards and requirements, the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would conform with the Specific Plan, and a less than significant impact would result.
XIII. Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**No impact.** The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could affect mineral resources. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is currently developed with an office/industrial building that is underlain by artificial fill materials, alluvial deposits, and sandstones and siltstones. According to the State of California, Department of Conservation, the project site and vicinity are located in Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1), which indicates areas where no significant mineral deposits are present or where little likelihood exists for their presence. Because no mineral resources are known or expected to occur on-site, the project would have no impact on mineral resources.

b) **Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

**No impact.** The Westlake Village General Plan and the North Business Park Specific Plan do not identify any mineral resource recovery sites within the City. In addition, as outlined above, the State of California mineral resource maps indicate there are no known or expected mineral resources within the City. Also, the North Business Park Specific Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) indicates there are no mineral resources or extraction sites in the City other than an abandoned and plugged oil well located north of Via Colinas and Lindero Road. Thus, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no impact would occur.
XIV. Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such as plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

**Less than significant impact.** The City of Westlake Village General Plan Hazards Element contains goals and policies to minimize the effect of noise on the community. The Element identifies that traffic noise on Ventura Highway (Highway 101) and other major roads are the primary source of noise in the City. The Element identifies that noise levels averaged and weighted over a 24-hour period should normally not exceed 65 decibels in multi-family residential developments, 70 decibels in commercial and business park areas, and 75 decibels in industrial and manufacturing areas. In addition, City regulations limit maximum exterior noise levels, as shown on Table 1.

Table 1. **Westlake Village Maximum Exterior Noise Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use of Receptor Property</th>
<th>Time Interval</th>
<th>Exterior Noise Level dB(A)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designated noise-sensitive area</td>
<td>Anytime</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Anytime</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*dB(A) – A-weighted decibel
Source: Westlake Village General Plan, 2019

In addition to the General Plan, the Westlake Village Noise Ordinance (Westlake Municipal Code Article 4, Chapter 4.4) limits noise in the City. The Ordinance states that no person shall increase noise in excess of 5 dB(A) on a residential property line, or 8 dB(A) on a non-residential property line. In addition, construction activities that generate noise are limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays; and are prohibited on Sundays and holidays.
As previously identified, the Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could affect noise. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would generate noise during construction and operation. During construction, noise would be generated for a limited period by activities such as grading, heavy equipment operation, building construction, and paving. However, the project would comply with the Chapter 4 of the Municipal Code and all other requirements for construction noise including a limitation on construction hours of operation to avoid sensitive times of the day and night. Because construction activities would be short-term in nature, and would adhere to all applicable requirements, impacts related to noise would be less than significant.

During long-term operation of the project, a limited amount of noise would be generated by mechanical equipment and vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Mechanical equipment associated with the project would include rooftop heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment that will generate noise during operation. However, noise would be typical of that generated by standard HVAC equipment and would not result in excessive noise levels in surrounding areas. In addition, there are no residential uses immediately surrounding the project site that would be more sensitive to noise. Immediately surrounding uses include business park uses that primarily operate during the day. In addition, the project is anticipated to generate a minimal amount of vehicular traffic, which would not affect the traffic capacity of local roadways or increase noise in the area. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact on ambient noise levels in the area.

b) **Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Less than significant. As outlined above, the project would not generate excessive noise levels. Regarding vibration, the General Plan Hazards Element prohibits any device that generates vibration above the vibration threshold of any individual at or beyond the property line. In addition, the City’s Noise Ordinance prohibits extraordinary vibration that disturbs the peace and comfort of adjacent residences or that detrimentally affects the operators or customers of adjacent places of business. Mechanical equipment in the basement and on the roof of the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would generate a minimal amount of vibration next to the equipment which would not radiate out beyond the building. As such, the project would not increase vibration levels in the area and a less than significant impact would result.

c) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such as plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No impact. The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, including the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site, is located approximately 15 miles east of the City of Camarillo Airport, the closest public or private airport to the area. The area is not located within the Camarillo Airport Land Use Plan or the 2018 60-dBA CNEL noise contour for the airport. Thus, people residing in or working in the area would not be exposed to excessive airport noise levels, and no impact would result.
XV. Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

**a)**  *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through an extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

*Less than significant impact.* The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that could affect population and housing. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project is currently developed with an office/industrial building and does not contain any residents or housing. The project site is designated and zoned North Business Park Specific Plan and is not currently anticipated for residential development by existing City plans and policies. A General Plan Amendment and a Specific Plan Amendment are proposed to create a Senior Residential Care Overlay to accommodate the proposed 128-unit senior housing project.

According to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the City of Westlake Village has a population of 8,358 persons and 3,238 households (2018). Based on a potential maximum occupancy of 1 person per bed, the project could result in up to 135 new residents on the project site, which would represent a 1.6% direct increase in the City's 2018 population. This increase is considered minor and would not represent substantial unplanned population growth in the City. In addition, the project would not adversely impact City infrastructure, services, or facilities. Thus, a less than significant impact would result related to population and housing.

**b)**  *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

*No Impact.* The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site currently contains an office/industrial building and does not contain any housing units. Thus, the project would not displace any existing people or housing and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would result.
XVI. Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Parks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

1) Fire protection?

Less than significant impact. The Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) provides fire protection and suppression, inspection services, paramedic emergency medical services, and hazardous material response to the City. The closest fire station to the site is Fire Station 144 located in the central portion of the City at 31981 Foxfield Drive approximately 1.2 miles south of the project site. According to the North Business Park Specific Plan Final Program EIR, the station is staffed by four persons on duty at all times and is equipped with one engine company with paramedic supplies, a patrol vehicle, and a water tender. The average response time from this station is 4 to 6 minutes.

The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would not directly result in any development and would not affect fire protection services. Development of the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would add up to 135 residents and 52 employees to the project site where only 58 employees currently operate. This increase could incrementally increase the number of calls for fire and emergency services. However, the project is not anticipated to place a significant burden on fire protection services. In addition, project plans would need to be submitted for LACFD review and approval, and the LACFD would regularly inspect the structure for compliance with all applicable fire safety standards. The project would also be required to pay a Fire Department Development fee for the development of future fire facilities, and the project’s impact on fire protection would be less than significant.
2) **Police protection services?**

*Less than significant impact.* The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LACSD) provides police protection and law enforcement services to the City of Westlake Village, including the project area. The City is served through the Malibu/Lost Hills Sheriff’s Station located at 27050 Agoura Road in Calabasas. This station is located approximately 5.3 miles southeast of the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site and serves a 175-square-mile area, including the cities of Westlake Village, Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, and Malibu, and the unincorporated areas of Chatsworth Lake Manor, Malibou Lake, Topanga, and West Hills.

The proposed project would decrease non-residential floor area in the area by 31,173 square feet and would increase the resident population of the planning area by 135 with 52 employees. The City of Westlake Village determines the police contract size according to the needs of the City and level of protection needed. Thus, the City’s annual review process will ensure that adequate police protection is provided by the LACSD, and a less than significant impact would result.

3) **Schools?**

*No impact.* The Las Virgenes Unified School District provides public elementary, intermediate, and high schools to the City of Westlake Village and surrounding areas. In addition, a number of private schools serve the area. The proposed project includes the development of a senior housing facility and would not increase the school-age population of the area. Thus, the project would have no impact on school facilities in the area.

4) **Parks?**

*Less than significant impact.* The City of Westlake Village maintains seven parks with a variety of facilities, resources, and services. The closest park to the project area is Westlake Village Community Park located approximately one-half mile northeast of the project site. The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would not directly result in development and would not impact local parks. The proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would include activities for residents within the senior housing complex. Residents would also be able to participate in field trips to local restaurants, museums, and other points of interests. On occasion, field trips may be scheduled to City parks or other local recreational facilities, although it would not occur on a regular basis. As such, the project would not contribute to or accelerate the physical deterioration of park facilities, and a less than significant impact would result.

5) **Other public facilities?**

*No impact.* The proposed project would not impact other public facilities that are not addressed above or in Section XX, Utilities and Service Systems. Therefore, no impact would result.
**XVII. Recreation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

**a)** *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

*Less than significant impact.* As outlined above in Section XVI, Public Facilities, adoption of the proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would not result in any physical development other than the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project. As such, the overlay by itself would not impact recreational facilities. The Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would provide residents with self-contained activities as well as periodic field trips to restaurants and other venues. Visits to local parks or other recreational facilities, if any, are expected to be infrequent, and the project would not contribute to or accelerate the physical deterioration of recreational facilities. Thus, a less than significant impact would result.

**b)** *Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

*No impact.* The project would not include the development of neighborhood or regional parks or recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities. No impact would result.
XVIII. Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

a) **Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

*No impact.* Multiple plans, regulations, and policies address transportation in and around Westlake Village. These include, but are not limited to, the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program, the City of Westlake Village General Plan and Municipal Code, and the North Business Park Specific Plan. The application of the Senior Residential Care Overlay to the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District within the North Business Park Specific Plan area would not affect transportation in the Cedarvalley area. The application of the Overlay to the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site would accommodate the proposed 128-unit assisted living project. The project has been evaluated by the City Traffic Engineer, who has determined the project would not conflict with any transportation-related programs, plans, or policies. The project would include fewer employees than the existing use on-site, and residents would not have cars for the most part resulting in a lower traffic rate than existing conditions. In addition, sidewalks would be constructed adjacent to Cedarvalley Drive and Via Rucas, which would enhance pedestrian circulation in the area. Thus, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing circulation, and no impact would result.

b) **Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

*No impact.* In October 2015, the State of California adopted SB 379, which changed the way transportation impacts are analyzed. As outlined in § 15064.3(b) of the revised CEQA Guidelines, transportation impacts must now be analyzed based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rather than the intersection level of service (LOS) methodology previously used. VMT analyzes the number of trips and number of miles traveled by motor vehicles associated with a project.

In response to SB 379 and the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Westlake Village developed a methodology for evaluating VMT impacts for discretionary projects. The first step in evaluating VMT is to determine if the proposed project would generate more VMT than the prior use. If the project will generate the same or less VMT, it is deemed to not have a VMT impact, and no further analysis is required.

The City Traffic Engineer conducted VMT evaluation for the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project (Appendix G). VMT will be primarily generated by employees, because the vast majority of
tenants will not have vehicles and the facility must be staffed 24 hours per day. The proposed project would have a total of 52 employees compared with 58 employees for the prior wire manufacturing use. Based on this information, the City Traffic Engineer has concluded that the project would generate less traffic than the existing use and would not have a VMT impact. Thus, no further analysis is required, and the project would not conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3.

c) **Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No impact.** The proposed Senior Residential Care Overlay would not generate development that could increase traffic hazards in the area. Vehicular access to the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would be from two driveways off Cedarvalley Drive that would include one inbound driveway and one outbound driveway. An existing driveway off Via Rocas would be eliminated. Pedestrian access would be provided via new sidewalks along Cedarvalley Drive and Via Rocas. The project would not alter the alignment or configuration of any abutting roads, and no sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses would be introduced by the project. Thus, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use and no impact would result.

d) **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less than significant impact.** According to the City’s Disaster Route Map, emergency evacuation routes in the vicinity of the project site include Lindero Canyon Road and U.S. 101. Neither the Senior Residential Care Overlay nor the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would alter the existing or planned roadway network in the area, and no impacts to emergency access would occur. In addition, the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project is projected to generate slightly less traffic than the existing use and thus project-related traffic would not cause traffic congestion in the area that could potentially impede emergency access. Construction of the project may temporarily block traffic and access in the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, these occurrences would be infrequent, would not affect emergency access routes into and out of the City and a less than significant impact would result.
XIX. Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

i) *Is the project site listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*

**No impact.** The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District of the North Business Park Specific Plan area is highly urbanized and developed with a variety of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses. No historical resources are known to exist in the project area, and adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay would not affect historic resources. Likewise, the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site is developed with a 2-story office/industrial building that was constructed in 1981 and is not classified as historic. Thus, the project does not have the potential to impact historical resources, and no impact would result.

ii) *Is the project site a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

**Less than significant with mitigation.** A Sacred Lands File Search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in conjunction with the consideration of the North Business Park Specific Plan did not identify the presence of Native American cultural resources within the specific plan area, including the project site. In addition, an archaeological/historic records search was conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) for the area. Although several prehistoric sites were located within a 1-mile radius of the Specific Plan boundaries, none were located within the specific plan area, the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, or the project site. Nonetheless, the region is known to have been actively used in the past by Native American tribes.

Assembly Bill 52 requires that a lead agency begin consultation with California Native American tribes that request consultation prior to release of a project Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative
Declaration, or EIR. Tribes who receive a formal notification under AB 52 have 30 days to respond and request consultation.

In addition, Senate Bill 18 requires that a lead agency consult with Native American tribes for any project involving adoption of an amendment to a general plan or a specific plan. Tribes who receive a formal notification under SB 18 have 90 days to respond and request consultation. The proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment and an amendment to the North Business Park Specific Plan to add the Senior Residential Care Overlay to the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District, apply the overlay to the project site, demolish the existing office/industrial building, and construct a 128-unit senior residential care facility. On April 30, 2020, the City of Westlake Village, as lead agency on the project, formally initiated the AB 52 and SB 18 consultation process and provided formal notification to the Native American Tribes that have requested notification for consultation.

As of the date of publication of this document, one tribe, the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, has requested consultation for the proposed project. On July 16, 2020, the City conducted a consultation meeting with the Tribe. Topics addressed during the meeting included the scope of the project, the status of the cultural resources record search, and the potential for encountering resources during excavation of the underground basement. Subsequent to the meeting, the Tribe provided a letter dated August 6, 2020 (Appendix H) requesting the incorporation of three mitigation measures into the project as outlined in Section VI, Cultural Resources. The mitigation measures include CULT-1, which requires monitoring by a professional Native American monitor during excavation of the site; CULT-2, which requires the Lead Agency and/or the applicant to consult with affected Tribes on the treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during grading activities; and CULT-3, the proper disposition of any human remains or funerary objects encountered during grading and construction. With the incorporation of CULT-1, CULT-2, and CULT-3, impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.
## XX. Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

#### a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

**Less than significant impact.** The adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not cause development to occur and would not impact utilities and service systems. The Cedarvalley Senior Valley Housing Project would be located on a previously developed site that currently receives water, wastewater, storm drain, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications service from local providers. The project would be required to provide limited new infrastructure to connect to existing infrastructure. The applicant has received ‘will serve’ letters from Southern California Edison (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) indicating that electricity and natural gas service will be provided to the project. However, commitment to serve letters are not yet available from other utility providers due to the early stage of the project. Nonetheless, as the project site is in an urbanized area that is already served by existing utilities, it would not require the relocation or construction of substantially new or expanded facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Thus, a less than significant impact would result. Additional details and analysis regarding water, wastewater, and solid waste are provided below.

#### b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

**Less than significant impact.** The Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) currently provides potable, recycled, and fire flow water to the City of Westlake Village and surrounding areas. The LVMWD obtains the majority of its water supply from imported supplies through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Other major sources of water include recycled water and groundwater. LVMWD maintains a system of storage systems and tanks, pump stations and pipelines including the Las Virgenes Reservoir within the City of Westlake Village.
The LVMWD’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) outlines the District’s anticipated present and future water resource needs over a 20-year planning period. The UWMP water demand, generation and supply estimates are based on General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations and assumptions and included land use assumptions from an early draft of the North Business Park Specific Plan. It is anticipated that the 2020 update of the UWMP will reflect the final, adopted North Business Park Specific Plan and that supplies will be adequate to serve the anticipated uses (North Business Park Specific Plan Final Program EIR).

Adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not cause development to occur and would not generate a demand for water. However, the project includes an amendment to the North Business Park Specific Plan Land Use Map to change apply an overlay to Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project Site to allow senior housing on the project site. The proposed project would generate a slightly increased demand for water over what was estimated in the UWMP. In addition, as the project represents an intensification of use over the existing office/industrial building, water demand would increase over the existing use. However, the increased demand would be minor in comparison with water needs of the Business Park and could be offset by other land use changes within the LVMWD’s service area, ongoing water conservation efforts and expansion of the recycled water system. In addition, the project would be required to adhere to State and local water efficiency requirements and future updates of the UWMP would likely include the projected demand from the project. Thus, sufficient water supplies are anticipated to be available for the project and a less than significant impact would result.

c) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Less than significant impact. The LVMWD also provides wastewater service to the City of Westlake Village and surrounding areas. Local sewer lines are owned and operated by the City but maintained by the Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District of Los Angeles County. Wastewater from the area is treated at the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility on Malibu Canyon Road, which is operated by a joint powers authority of the Triunfo Sanitation District (TSD) and the LVMWD.

The Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not result in development that would generate wastewater. Regarding the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site, the existing office/industrial building generates and estimated 1,100 gallons per day of wastewater compared with an estimated 7,500 gallons per day estimated for the proposed building. LVMWD will not provide a commitment to serve letter at this early stage of project development. However, this increased amount of wastewater generation is considered minor and can likely be accommodated by existing infrastructure and treatment capacity. In addition, the project will be required to pay sewer connection fees and ongoing sewer fees which are used for LVMWD operations, maintenance and infrastructure. Thus, sufficient wastewater capacity is anticipated to be available for the project and a less than significant impact would result.


d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less than significant impact. The adoption of the Senior Residential Care Overlay, by itself, would not cause development to occur and would not impact solid waste reduction goals. The Cedarvalley
Senior Valley Housing Project would generate solid waste during demolition of the existing building and construction and operation of the project. Solid waste would be transported to two landfills serving the City, the Calabasas Landfill and the Simi Valley landfill. Both landfills operate with excess capacity at the present time and can accommodate waste generated by the project. However, the project will be required to incorporate waste reduction strategies as required by State and local ordinances, such as the City’s Integrated Waste Management Ordinance, to reduce the amount of waste generated by the project. Thus, the project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards and a less than significant impact would result.
## XXI. Wildfire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If located in or near state responsibility areas of lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis

**a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

*Less than significant impact.* As outlined in Section XVIII, Transportation, the project would not alter the existing or planned roadway network in the area and would not impede the flow of traffic on Lindero Canyon Road and U.S. 101, the two major emergency evacuation routes in the area. In addition, the project is projected to generate slightly less traffic than the existing use and thus project-related traffic would not cause traffic congestion in the area that could potentially impede emergency access. Construction of the project may temporarily block traffic and access in the immediate vicinity of the project site. However, these occurrences would be infrequent, would not affect emergency access routes into and out of the City; any impacts would be less than significant.

**b) Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**

*Less than significant impact.* Westlake Village and the surrounding communities are subject to wildfire as evidenced by recent fire incidents, such as the 2018 Woolsey Fire. In addition, portions of the southwestern and northeastern portions of the City are classified as having Very High Fire Hazard by CAL FIRE. However, the Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District includes an urbanized area that is not designated a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Development of the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would replace an existing industrial building and would not exacerbate wildfire risks or expose occupants to adverse pollutant wildfire-related effects, and a less than significant impact would result.
c) **Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

**Less than significant impact.** The entire Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District is located in a developed and urbanized area, and the site proposed for development is currently developed with a two-story industrial building with parking and landscaping. Adoption of the Overlay District and application to the project site would accommodate the proposed 128-unit senior housing project. The project would not require the installation or maintenance of any infrastructure that could exacerbate fire risk, and a less than significant impact would result.

d) **Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

**No impact.** As previously identified, the project is located in an urbanized area, and the proposed Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would replace an existing office/industrial building. The Mixed Use Cedarvalley Zoning District comprises relatively flat topography that is developed and not subject to fire or post-fire flooding, landslides, and slope instability. In addition, according to the project Hydrology Report (Appendix E), the project would manage stormwater generated on-site and would not increase runoff from preexisting conditions. Thus, the project would not expose people or structures to significant fire, flooding, or landslide risks.
XXII. Mandatory Findings of Significance

<p>| a) Does the project have 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 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? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| |

| c) Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| |

Analysis

**a)** _Does the project have 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 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?_

**Less than significant with mitigation.** As outlined in Section V, Biological Resources, the Mixed Use Cedar Valley Zoning District is a developed and urbanized area with non-native ornamental plant species. The area does not contain any threatened, endangered or sensitive plant or wildlife species and does not contain riparian or wetland areas. Therefore, the project would not have 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 plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. In addition, the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site would be surveyed for the presence of bird nests in advance of grading to ensure that nesting birds are not impacted per the MBTA.

Regarding California’s history and prehistory, the project area does not contain any historical resources. However, the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project site has a potential to contain archaeological and/or paleontological resources which could be exposed during excavation of the underground parking garage. The incorporation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1, CULT-2, CULT-3, and GEO-1 will ensure that any resources identified during earthwork activities are appropriately handled.

**b)** _Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?_

**Less than significant impact.** As outlined in this Initial Study, all environmental impacts related to the Cedarvalley Residential Care Overlay and the Cedarvalley Senior Housing Project would be less than...
significant with the incorporation of the identified mitigation measures. There are no impacts considered to be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable, associated with the project. The project would add a Senior Residential Care Overlay to the North Business Park Specific Plan, would replace an existing office/industrial building with a 128-unit assisted senior living project, and would not adversely affect the environment or surrounding area. Thus, the project would have a less than significant cumulative effect on the environment with mitigation.

c) **Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

*Less than significant.* As identified throughout this report, the project would not adversely affect human beings, either directly or indirectly. Project-related traffic generation would be less than current conditions and no impacts related to traffic, air quality or greenhouse gas generation would result. In addition, construction-related impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, the project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings and a less than significant impact would result.
XXIII. Summary of Mitigation Measures

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration includes the following mitigation measures related to Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources; and Geology and Soils.

V. Cultural Resources and XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources

\textit{Mitigation Measures:}

CULT-1 The project applicant shall retain a professional Native American monitor from the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians or consulting Tribe under AB 52 to observe all grading operations up to 5 feet below the surface of native soil, unless there is evidence to suggest cultural resources extend below the specified depth.

- Part-time or spot check monitoring shall be conducted in areas with fill or sediments that are highly disturbed. Full time monitoring shall be conducted when ground-disturbance occurs within native (non-fill) levels.
- If cultural resources are encountered, the Native American monitor will have the authority to request ground disturbing activities cease within 60 feet of discovery to assess and document potential finds in real time.

CULT-2 The Lead Agency and/or the applicant shall, in good faith, consult with the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians and consulting Tribes on the disposition and treatment of any Tribal Cultural Resource encountered during project grading.

CULT-3 If human remains or funerary objects are encountered during any activities associated with the project, work in the immediate vicinity (within a 100-foot buffer of the find) shall cease and the County coroner shall be contacted. If the human remains are determined to be Native American in origin by the County coroner, the applicant shall immediately notify the Lead Agency, the Fernandeño Tataviam Band of Mission Indians, and consulting Tribes.

VI. Geology and Soils

\textit{Mitigation Measure:}

GEO-1 Prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities, a qualified paleontologist shall be retained to monitor excavations that extend into sensitive rock formations (alluvial deposits and Topanga Formation rocks). The schedule and extent of monitoring activities shall be established by the supervising paleontologist in coordination with the contractor and the City at a pre-grade meeting. It shall be the responsibility of the supervising paleontologist to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City, the appropriate level of monitoring necessary based on the on-site soils and final grading plans, when available.

All paleontological work to assess and/or recover a potential resource at the project site shall be conducted under the direction of the qualified paleontologist. If a fossil discovery occurs during grading operations when a paleontological monitor is not present, grading shall be diverted around the area until the monitor can survey the area. Any fossils recovered during site development, along with their contextual stratigraphic data, shall be donated to the City of Westlake Village or, at the discretion of the City, to the County of Los Angeles or other appropriate institution with an educational and research interest in the materials. The paleontologist shall prepare a report of the results of any findings as part of a testing/mitigation plan following accepted professional practice.
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