Appendix A
NOP



LA COUNTY PLANNING

AMY J. BODEK, AICP
Director,
Regional Planning

DENNIS SLAVIN
Chief Deputy Director,
Regional Planning

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

DATE: October 7, 2022

TO: State Clearinghouse, Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, Organizations and Interested Parties

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report in Compliance with Title 14, section 15082(a) of the California Code of Regulations

The County of Los Angeles ("County") is the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the proposed Project identified below. The County has prepared this Notice of Preparation ("NOP") to provide Responsible Agencies and other interested parties with information describing the Project and to identify its potential environmental effects pursuant to State requirements.

AGENCIES: The County requests your agency's views on the scope and content of the environmental information relevant to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed Project, in accordance with Title 14, section 15082(b) of the California Code of Regulations. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by the County when considering any permits that your agency must issue, or other approval for the Project.

ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES: The County requests your comments and concerns regarding the environmental issues associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project.

PROJECT & PERMIT(S): Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, Project No. PRJ2021-002011-(1) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. TR83534 (RPPL2021007149) / General Plan Amendment No. RPPL2021004860 / Zone Change No. RPPL2021007152 / Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL2021007151 / Housing Permit No. RPPL2021007161 / Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2021007150

PROJECT APPLICANT: RV DEV, LLC
4 Park Place, Suite 700
Irvine, CA 92614

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located in Los Angeles County within the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights. The 75.64-acre Project Site consists of six parcels located both north and south of Colima Road: Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 8762-022-002, 8762-023-001, 8762-023-002, 8762-027-039, 8764-002-005, and 8764-002-006). The Project Site generally comprises 13 holes and the driving range of the existing 27-hole Royal Vista Golf Club.

Regionally, the Project Site is located north of the Puente Hills in the East San Gabriel Valley. Refer to **Figure 1**, *Regional Location Map*. Locally, the Project Site is south of State Route 60 Freeway ("SR-60" or Pomona Freeway) between Fairway Drive and Brea Canyon Road. Refer to **Figure 2**, *Local Vicinity Map*. The City of Diamond Bar is immediately east of the Project Site and the City of Industry is immediately north of the Project Site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Project would redevelop six parcels of the existing golf course into four residential planning areas and two recreational/open space planning areas, for a total of 360 dwelling units and a trails and park system. Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 would include 200 detached single-family residential (SFR) units on individual lots; 88 duplex and triplex units on 34 lots; and 13 open space lots which include parks, trails and open space. Planning Area 3 would include 72 condominium units within 14 townhome buildings on one lot. Seventy-two (72) townhouse units and 10 additional units scattered among the triplex units [equaling 82 (23%) of the total units), will be dedicated for sale to moderate- or middle-income households, consistent with the County's inclusionary affordable housing ordinance. Refer to **Table 1**, Proposed Development. The Project would include approximately 28.0 acres of onsite open space, including one 5.81-acre neighborhood park and one 1.59-acre pocket park. Refer to **Figure 3**, *Conceptual Site Plan*.

Table 1
Proposed Development

Planning Area	Residential Development (in Gross Acres)	Number of Units	Unit Type	Open Space (in Gross Acres)
PA-1	19.73 4.69	116 52	SFR Duplex / Triplex	7.18
PA-2	6.36	32	SFR	3.19
PA-3	4.22	72	Townhome	1.78
PA-4			Public Park	5.81
PA-5	9.66 2.98	52 36	SFR Duplex / Triplex	8.45
PA-6			Public Park	1.59
TOTALS	**47.64**	**360**		**28.0**

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-1 (Light Agricultural - One Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural - 10,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area). The Project Site is designated as OS (Open Space) in the Rowland Heights Community General Plan, a component of the General Plan. The Project would require the following entitlements:

- **General Plan Amendment** from OS to U-2 (Urban 2 - 3.3 to 6.0 Dwelling Units per Acre), U-3 (Urban 3 - 6.1 to 12.0 Dwelling Units per Acre) and U-4 (Urban 4 – 12.1 to 22.0 Dwelling Units per Acre);
- **Zone Change** from A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 to RPD-5,000 (Residential Planned Development);
- **Vesting Tentative Tract Map** to subdivide 75.64 acres into 200 single-family lots, 34 multi-family lots (34 duplex and triplex lots for 88 units, and one condominium lot for 72 attached condominiums in 14 buildings), 2 public park lots, 7 private park lots, and 3 open space lots for a total of 247 lots and 360 residential units;
- **Conditional Use Permit** for on-site Project grading exceeding of 100,000 cubic yards, off-site transport of 20,000 cubic yards offsite and 10,000 cubic yards onsite; a residential planned development; and to construct Public Parks and Private Parks within Zone A-1; and
- **Housing Permit** to reserve 23% of residential subdivision units (82) for sale as affordable moderate- or middle-income units with an average affordability level of 135%. Six units will be located in PA-1, 72 units will be located in PA-3, and four units will be located in PA-5.

Project grading will require approximately 300,000 cubic yards of cut and approximately 290,000 cubic yards of fill, with an export of approximately 20,000 cubic yards from and import of approximately 10,000 cubic yards to the Project Site. Over-excavation and re-compaction of up to approximately 1.5 million cubic yards are anticipated. (Project grading plus over-excavation and re-compaction totals 3.62 million cubic yards). Estimated start of construction is in the first Quarter of 2024 with estimated completion in the first Quarter of 2027.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

Based on a preliminary review of the proposed Project consistent with section 15060 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County has determined that an EIR should be prepared for this proposed Project. In addition, consistent with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County has identified the following probable environmental effects of the Project, which will be addressed in the EIR for this Project:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture/Forestry
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gases Emissions
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Services Systems
- Wildfire

NOTICE OF SCOPING MEETING: The County will conduct a virtual scoping meeting for the purpose of soliciting oral and written comments from interested parties as to the appropriate scope and content of the EIR.

All interested parties are invited to attend the virtual scoping meeting to assist in identifying issues to be addressed in the EIR. The scoping meeting will include a brief presentation of the Project to be addressed in the EIR and will provide attendees with an opportunity to provide input to the scope of the EIR. The virtual Scoping Meeting will be held online.

VIRTUAL PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING	**Tuesday, November 1, 2022** **6:00 PM (Pacific Time)—Via Zoom Meeting** Please click the following link to join the webinar: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84804065828 For call-in options or for more project information, please visit **https://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/prj2021-002011** Translation in other languages can be made available at the meeting upon request. Please submit translation requests at least 7 business days, or by October 19, 2022, in advance of the scheduled meeting to mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov. 我們可以在會議上提供普通話或廣東話翻譯服務。如果有需要，請在會議前 7 個工作日或 2022 年 10 月 19 日之前將翻譯請求提交至 mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov。 Si necesita más información sobre este aviso en español o asistencia durante la reunión en español, envíe un correo electrónico a mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov. Envíe las solicitudes de traducción al menos siete días hábiles antes de la reunión programada o antes del 19 de Octubre del 2022. Si necesita más información por favor llame al (213) 974-6411.

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: The County has determined to make this NOP available for public review and comment pursuant to Title 14, section 15082(b) of the California Code of Regulations. **The comment period for the NOP begins on October 13, 2022 and ends on November 28, 2022.**

Any comments provided should identify specific topics of environmental concern and your reason for suggesting the study of these topics in the EIR.

Please direct all written comments to the following address:

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Tel: 213-974-6433
mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov (preferred method)

All written responses will be included as Appendices in the Draft EIR and their contents considered in accordance with State and County environmental guidelines.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY: The NOP is available for public review during regular business hours at the following locations:

Rowland Heights Library
1850 Nogales Street
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

Walnut Library
21155 La Puente Road
Walnut, CA 91789

Diamond Bar Library
21800 Copely Drive
Diamond Bar, 91765

The public is also encouraged to visit LA County Planning's website to review Project documents at https://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/prj2021-002011.

Thank you for your participation in the environmental review of this Project.



SOURCE: ESRI

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Figure 1
Regional Location Map

ESA



SOURCE: Mapbox, 2020.

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Figure 2
Local Vicinity Map

ESA



D2020012880.00 - Royal Vista Redevelopment. Rowland Heights\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Bio

SOURCE: KTGY, 2022

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Figure 3
Conceptual Site Plan

ESA

LA COUNTY PLANNING

AMY J. BODEK, AICP
Director,
Regional Planning

DENNIS SLAVIN
Chief Deputy Director,
Regional Planning

EXTENDED DEADLINE FOR NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

DATE: November 2, 2022

TO: State Clearinghouse, Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, Organizations and Interested Parties

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report in Compliance with Title 14, section 15082(a) of the California Code of Regulations

The County of Los Angeles ("County") is the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the proposed Project identified below. The County has prepared this Notice of Preparation ("NOP") to provide Responsible Agencies and other interested parties with information describing the Project and to identify its potential environmental effects pursuant to State requirements.

AGENCIES: The County requests your agency's views on the scope and content of the environmental information relevant to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed Project, in accordance with Title 14, section 15082(b) of the California Code of Regulations. Your agency will need to use the EIR prepared by the County when considering any permits that your agency must issue, or other approval for the Project.

ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES: The County requests your comments and concerns regarding the environmental issues associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project.

PROJECT & PERMIT(S): Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, Project No. PRJ2021-002011-(1) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. TR83534 (RPPL2021007149) / General Plan Amendment No. RPPL2021004860 / Zone Change No. RPPL2021007152 / Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL2021007151 / Housing Permit No. RPPL2021007161 / Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2021007150

PROJECT APPLICANT: RV DEV, LLC
4 Park Place, Suite 700
Irvine, CA 92614

PROJECT LOCATION: The Project is located in Los Angeles County within the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights. The 75.64-acre Project Site consists of six parcels located both north and south of Colima Road: Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 8762-022-002, 8762-023-001, 8762-023-002, 8762-027-039, 8764-002-005, and 8764-002-006). The Project Site generally comprises 13 holes and the driving range of the existing 27-hole Royal Vista Golf Club. Regionally, the Project Site is located north of the Puente Hills in the East San Gabriel Valley. Refer to **Figure 1**, *Regional Location Map*. Locally, the Project Site is south of State Route 60 Freeway ("SR-60" or Pomona Freeway) between Fairway Drive and Brea Canyon Road. Refer to **Figure 2**, *Local Vicinity Map*. The City of Diamond Bar is immediately east of the Project Site and the City of Industry is immediately north of the Project Site.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Project would redevelop six parcels of the existing golf course into four residential planning areas and two recreational/open space planning areas, for a total of 360 dwelling units and a trails and park system. Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 would include 200 detached single-family residential (SFR) units on individual lots; 88 duplex and triplex units on 34 lots; and 13 open space lots which include parks, trails and open space. Planning Area 3 would include 72 condominium units within 14 townhome buildings on one lot. Seventy-two (72) townhouse units and 10 additional units scattered among the triplex units [equaling 82 (23%) of the total units), will be dedicated for sale to moderate- or middle-income households, consistent with the County's inclusionary affordable housing ordinance. Refer to **Table 1**, Proposed Development. The Project would include approximately 28.0 acres of onsite open space, including one 5.81-acre neighborhood park and one 1.59-acre pocket park. Refer to **Figure 3**, *Conceptual Site Plan*.

Table 1
Proposed Development

Planning Area	Residential Development (in Gross Acres)	Number of Units	Unit Type	Open Space (in Gross Acres)
PA-1	19.73 4.69	116 52	SFR Duplex / Triplex	7.18
PA-2	6.36	32	SFR	3.19
PA-3	4.22	72	Townhome	1.78
PA-4			Public Park	5.81
PA-5	9.66 2.98	52 36	SFR Duplex / Triplex	8.45
PA-6			Public Park	1.59

TOTALS	**47.64**	**360**		**28.0**

The Project Site is currently zoned A-1-1 (Light Agricultural - One Acre Minimum Required Lot Area) and A-1-10,000 (Light Agricultural - 10,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area). The Project Site is designated as OS (Open Space) in the Rowland Heights Community General Plan, a component of the General Plan. The Project would require the following entitlements:

- **General Plan Amendment** from OS to U-2 (Urban 2 - 3.3 to 6.0 Dwelling Units per Acre), U-3 (Urban 3 - 6.1 to 12.0 Dwelling Units per Acre) and U-4 (Urban 4 – 12.1 to 22.0 Dwelling Units per Acre);
- **Zone Change** from A-1-1 and A-1-10,000 to RPD-5,000 (Residential Planned Development);
- **Vesting Tentative Tract Map** to subdivide 75.64 acres into 200 single-family lots, 34 multi-family lots (34 duplex and triplex lots for 88 units, and one condominium lot for 72 attached condominiums in 14 buildings), 2 public park lots, 7 private park lots, and 3 open space lots for a total of 247 lots and 360 residential units;
- **Conditional Use Permit** for on-site Project grading exceeding of 100,000 cubic yards, off-site transport of 20,000 cubic yards offsite and 10,000 cubic yards onsite; a residential planned development; and to construct Public Parks and Private Parks within Zone A-1; and
- **Housing Permit** to reserve 23% of residential subdivision units (82) for sale as affordable moderate- or middle-income units with an average affordability level of 135%. Six units will be located in PA-1, 72 units will be located in PA-3, and four units will be located in PA-5.

Project grading will require approximately 300,000 cubic yards of cut and approximately 290,000 cubic yards of fill, with an export of approximately 20,000 cubic yards from and import of approximately 10,000 cubic yards to the Project Site. Over-excavation and re-compaction of up to approximately 1.5 million cubic yards are anticipated. (Project grading plus over-excavation and re-compaction totals 3.62 million cubic yards). Estimated start of construction is in the first Quarter of 2024 with estimated completion in the first Quarter of 2027.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

Based on a preliminary review of the proposed Project consistent with section 15060 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County has determined that an EIR should be prepared for this proposed Project. In addition, consistent with section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County has identified the following probable environmental effects of the Project, which will be addressed in the EIR for this Project:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture/Forestry
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gases Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources

- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Services Systems
- Wildfire

NOTICE OF SCOPING MEETING: The County will conduct a public scoping meeting for the purpose of soliciting oral and written comments from interested parties as to the appropriate scope and content of the EIR.

All interested parties are invited to attend a second in-person scoping meeting to assist in identifying issues to be addressed in the EIR. The scoping meeting will include a brief presentation of the project to be addressed in the EIR and will provide attendees with an opportunity to provide input to the scope of the EIR. The Scoping Meeting will be held on **December 6, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.** at the following location:

Rowland Heights Community Center
Located in Pathfinder Community Regional Park
18150 Pathfinder Road,
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

The first scoping meeting was held virtually on November 1, 2022, and a recording of the meeting will be made on the project page at the link provided below.

Translation will be provided in Mandarin, Cantonese, Spanish, Korean. Translation in other languages can be made available at the meeting upon request. Please submit translation requests by November 21, 2022, to mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov.

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: The County has determined to make this NOP available for public review and comment pursuant to Title 14, section 15082(b) of the California Code of Regulations. **The comment period for the NOP began on October 13, 2022 and the end date has been extended to December 12, 2022**.

Any comments provided should identify specific topics of environmental concern and your reason for suggesting the study of these topics in the EIR.

Please direct all written comments to the following address:

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Tel: 213-974-6433
mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov (preferred method)

All written responses will be included as Appendices in the Draft EIR and their contents considered in accordance with State and County environmental guidelines.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY: The NOP is available for public review during regular business hours at the following locations:

Rowland Heights Library
1850 Nogales Street
Rowland Heights, CA 91748

Walnut Library
21155 La Puente Road
Walnut, CA 91789

Diamond Bar Library
21800 Copely Drive
Diamond Bar, 91765

The public is also encouraged to visit LA County Planning's website to review Project documents at https://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/prj2021-002011.

Thank you for your participation in the environmental review of this Project.



SOURCE: ESRI

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Figure 1
Regional Location Map

ESA



SOURCE: Mapbox, 2020.

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Figure 2
Local Vicinity Map

ESA



D2020012880.00 - Royal Vista Redevelopment. Rowland Heights\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Bio

SOURCE: KTGY, 2022

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Figure 3
Conceptual Site Plan

ESA

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

State of California – Natural Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
South Coast Region
3883 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 467-4201
www.wildlife.ca.gov

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director

November 21, 2022

Marie Pavlovic
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
MPavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, SCH #2022100204, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) from the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP) for the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project (Project). CDFW appreciates the opportunity to provide comments regarding aspects of the Project that could affect fish and wildlife resources and be subject to CDFW's regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

CDFW's Role

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State [Fish & Game Code, §§ 711.7, subdivision (a) & 1802; Public Resources Code, § 21070; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, § 15386, subdivision (a)]. CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Id., § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect state fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA (Public Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code, including lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & Game Code, § 1600 et seq.). Likewise, to the extent implementation of the Project as proposed may result in "take", as defined by state law, of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (Fish & Game Code, § 2050 et seq.), or state-listed rare plant pursuant to the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & Game Code, §1900 et seq.) authorization as provided by the applicable Fish and Game Code will be required.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

Project Description and Summary

Objective: The Project would redevelop six parcels of the existing Royal Vista golf course to include four residential planning areas (PAs) 1, 2, 3 and 5, and two recreational/open space planning areas (PAs 4 and 6), for a total of 360 dwelling units and a trails and park system. PAs 1, 2, and 5 would include 200 detached single-family residential units on individual lots. They would also include 88 duplex and triplex units on 34 lots and 13 open space lots, which include parks, trails, and open space. PA 3 would include 72 condominium units within 14 townhome buildings on one lot. Seventy-two townhouse units and 10 additional units scattered among the triplex units will be for sale to moderate- or middle-income households, consistent with Los Angeles County's inclusionary affordable housing ordinance. The Project would include about 28.0 acres of open space, including a 5.81-acre neighborhood park and a 1.59-acre pocket park (PAs 4 and 6).

Location: The Project is in Los Angeles County within the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights. The 75.64-acre Project site consists of six parcels located both north and south of Colima Road: Assessor Parcel Numbers 8762-022-002, 8762-023-001, 8762-023-002, 8762-027-039, 8764-002-005, and 8764-002-006. The Project site generally comprises 13 holes and the driving range of the existing 27-hole Royal Vista Golf Club.

Comments and Recommendations

CDFW offers the comments and recommendations below to assist the LACDRP in adequately identifying, avoiding, and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct, and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources. The DEIR should provide adequate and complete disclosure of the Project's potential impacts on biological resources [Pub. Resources Code, § 21061; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15003(i), 15151]. CDFW looks forward to commenting on the DEIR when it is available.

Specific Comments

1) Dewatered Pond. The Project site contains two water features. CDFW was notified that the Project Applicant dewatered the water features prior to public review of the NOP. The dewatering may have resulted in a net loss of habitat available for fish and wildlife. These potential impacts should be disclosed during CEQA. Therefore, CDFW recommends that the Project's DEIR should discuss fish, wildlife, and habitats that may have been supported and provided by those water features before they were dewatered. The Project's CEQA document should disclose that those water features have already been dewatered. The Project's DEIR should provide measures to mitigate for any potentially significant impacts on fish and wildlife, which includes potential impacts resulting from habitat loss.

2) Impacts to Streams. Aerial photography from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) has indicated that there is an ephemeral stream that flows through the northwestern water feature on site. CDFW recommends the DEIR provide a discussion of the water source for the ephemeral stream. In addition, the DEIR should provide a stream delineation showing each stream feature within the Project site and where each feature enters and exits the Project site to show any potential for hydrological connectivity to other streams that may be adjacent to the Project.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, CDFW has authority over activities in streams and/or lakes that will divert or obstruct the natural flow, or change the bed, channel, or bank (including vegetation associated with the stream or lake) of a river or stream or use material from a streambed. For any such activities, the project applicant (or "entity") must provide written notification to CDFW pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 1600 *et seq*.

i. CDFW's issuance of a Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreement for a project that is subject to CEQA will require CEQA compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency, CDFW may consider the environmental document of the local jurisdiction (Lead Agency) for the Project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the environmental document should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring, and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement. Please visit CDFW's Lake and Streambed Alteration Program webpage for information about LSA Notification (CDFWa 2022).

ii. In the event the Project site may support aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats; a preliminary delineation of the streams and their associated riparian habitats should be provided in the environmental document. The delineation should be conducted pursuant to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetland definition adopted by CDFW (Cowardin et al. 1979). Be advised that some wetland and riparian habitats subject to CDFW's authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Section 404 permit and Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 Certification.

iii. In Project sites which may support ephemeral or episodic streams, herbaceous vegetation, woody vegetation, and woodlands also serve to protect the integrity of these resources and help maintain natural sedimentation processes. Therefore, CDFW recommends effective setbacks be established to maintain appropriately sized vegetated buffer areas adjoining ephemeral drainages. The DEIR should provide a justification for the effectiveness of the chosen distance for the setback.

iv. Project-related changes in upstream and downstream drainage patterns, runoff, and sedimentation should be provided and evaluated in the DEIR.

v. As part of the LSA Notification process, CDFW requests a hydrological modelling of the 100, 50, 25, 10, 5, and 2-year frequency storm events for existing and proposed Project conditions to provide information on how water and sediment is conveyed through the Project site. The LSA Notification should address avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures that may be necessary to reduce potential significant impacts on streams and associated natural communities.

3) Species of Special Concern – Birds. The Project would require ground disturbing activities such as grading and grubbing, which may result in removal or disturbance of habitat for birds, as well as cause injury or mortality of adults, juveniles, eggs, or hatchlings. In addition, review of California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) indicates occurrences of yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*) within two miles of the Project site. This species is currently designated as California Species of Special Concern (SSC).

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

The Project proposes to develop within or adjacent to open space and natural areas that likely supports a variety of nesting avian species. Accordingly, the Project may impact nesting birds and raptors. Project activities occurring during the bird and raptor nesting season could result in the incidental loss of fertile eggs or nestlings, or otherwise lead to nest abandonment.

i. Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 50, § 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). It is unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any raptor.

ii. CDFW recommends the DEIR discuss the Project's impact on nesting habitat. The DEIR should disclose the acreage of nesting habitat that could be impacted and lost as a result of the proposed Project.

iii. CDFW recommends that measures be taken to avoid impacts on nesting birds and raptors. CDFW recommends the DEIR provide a measure whereby the Project avoids ground-disturbing activities (e.g., mobilizing, staging, drilling, and excavating) and vegetation removal during the avian breeding season which generally runs from February 15 through September 15 (as early as January 1 for some raptors) to avoid take of birds, raptors, or their eggs.

General Comments

1) Disclosure. The DEIR should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about the effect which a proposed project is likely to have on the environment (Pub. Resources Code, § 20161; CEQA Guidelines, § 15151). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may provide comments on the adequacy of proposed avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures, as well as to assess the significance of the specific impact relative to plant and wildlife species impacted (e.g., current range, distribution, population trends, and connectivity).

2) Mitigation Measures. Public agencies have a duty under CEQA to prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in a project through the use of feasible alternatives or mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15002(a)(3), 15021]. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4, an environmental document "shall describe feasible measures which could mitigate for impacts below a significant level under CEQA."

i. Level of Detail. Mitigation measures must be feasible, effective, implemented, and fully enforceable/imposed by the lead agency through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6(b); CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4). A public agency "shall provide the measures that are fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures" (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081.6). CDFW recommends the LACDRP provide mitigation measures that are specific and detailed (i.e., responsible party, timing, specific actions, location) in order for a mitigation measure to be fully enforceable and implemented successfully via a mitigation monitoring and/or reporting program (Pub. Resources

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

Code, § 21081.6; CEQA Guidelines, § 15097).

ii. Disclosure of Impacts. If a proposed mitigation measure would cause one or more significant effects, in addition to impacts caused by the proposed Project, the DEIR should provide a discussion of the effects of proposed mitigation measures [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.4(a)(1)]. In that regard, the DEIR should provide an adequate, complete, and detailed disclosure about the Project's proposed mitigation measure(s). Adequate disclosure is necessary so CDFW may assess the potential impacts of proposed mitigation measures.

3) Scientific Collection Permit. Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, title 14, section 650, the LACDRP and/or a qualified biologist must obtain appropriate handling permits to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with Project construction and activities. Please visit CDFW's Scientific Collection Permits webpage for information (CDFWb 2022). An LSA Agreement may provide similar take or possession of species as described in the conditions of the agreement.

   CDFW has the authority to issue permits for the take or possession of wildlife, including mammals; birds, nests, and eggs; reptiles, amphibians, fish, plants; and invertebrates (Fish & G. Code, §§ 1002, 1002.5, 1003). Effective October 1, 2018, a Scientific Collecting Permit is required to monitor project impacts on wildlife resources, as required by environmental documents, permits, or other legal authorizations; and, to capture, temporarily possess, and relocate wildlife to avoid harm or mortality in connection with otherwise lawful activities (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 650).

4) Move Out of Harm's Way. CDFW recommends a qualified biological monitor be on site during initial ground disturbing activities and vegetation removal. Wildlife should be primarily allowed to move away on its own volition (non-invasive, passive relocation). No wildlife should be enclosed inside any work zone or otherwise impacted by Project-related fencing. Safe and suitable wildlife relocation areas should be identified by a qualified biological monitor prior to ground disturbing activities and vegetation removal.

5) Construction Fencing. CDFW recommends that any fencing used during and after the Project be constructed with materials that are not harmful to wildlife. Prohibited materials should include, but are not limited to, spikes, glass, razor, or barbed wire. Use of chain link and steel stake fence should be avoided or minimized as this type of fencing can injure wildlife or create barriers to wildlife dispersal. All hollow posts and pipes should be capped to prevent wildlife entrapment and mortality. These structures mimic the natural cavities preferred by various bird species and other wildlife for shelter, nesting, and roosting. Raptor's talons can become entrapped within the bolt holes of metal fence stakes resulting in mortality. Metal fence stakes used on the Project site should be plugged with bolts or other plugging materials to avoid this hazard. Fences should be installed in a manner that excludes any wildlife from entering the work zone (i.e., embedded fence such that wildlife cannot enter from under the fence). Fences should not have any slack that may cause wildlife entanglement.

6) Rodenticides. CDFW recommends that rodenticides and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides be prohibited both during and over the life of the Project.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

7) CESA. CDFW considers adverse impacts to a species protected by CESA to be significant without mitigation under CEQA. As to CESA, take of any endangered, threatened, candidate species, or CESA-listed plant species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by state law (Fish & G. Code §§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §786.9). Consequently, if the Project or any Project-related activity during the life of the Project will result in take of a species designated as endangered or threatened, or a candidate for listing under CESA, CDFW recommends that the Project proponent seek appropriate take authorization under CESA prior to implementing the Project. Appropriate authorization from CDFW may include an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or a consistency determination in certain circumstances, among other options [Fish & Game Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b) and (c)]. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a Project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that CDFW issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of an ITP unless the Project CEQA document addresses all Project impacts to CESA-listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of an ITP. For these reasons, biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA ITP.

8) Biological Baseline Assessment. An adequate biological resources assessment should provide a complete assessment and impact analysis of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the Project site and where the Project may result in ground disturbance. The assessment and analysis should place emphasis on identifying endangered, threatened, rare, and sensitive species; regionally and locally unique species; and sensitive habitats. An impact analysis will aid in determining the Project's potential direct, indirect, and cumulative biological impacts, as well as specific mitigation or avoidance measures necessary to offset those impacts. CDFW also considers impacts to SSC a significant direct and cumulative adverse effect without implementing appropriate avoidance and/or mitigation measures. The DEIR should provide the following information:

   i. Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region [CEQA Guidelines, § 15125(c)]. The DEIR should provide measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect Sensitive Natural Communities. CDFW considers Sensitive Natural Communities as threatened habitats having both regional and local significance. Natural communities, alliances, and associations with a State-wide rarity ranking of S1, S2, and S3 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by visiting the Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program - Natural Communities webpage (CDFWc 2022);

   ii. A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities following CDFW's Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities (CDFW 2018). Botanical field surveys should be comprehensive over the entire Project site, including areas that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the Project. Adjoining properties should also be surveyed where direct or indirect Project effects could occur, such as those from fuel modification, herbicide application, invasive species, and altered hydrology. Botanical field surveys should be conducted in the field at the times of year when plants will be both evident and identifiable. Usually, this is during flowering or

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

fruiting. Botanical field survey visits should be spaced throughout the growing season to accurately determine what plants exist in the Project site. This usually involves multiple visits to the Project site (e.g., in early, mid, and late-season) to capture the floristic diversity at a level necessary to determine if special status plants are present;

iii. Floristic alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted in the Project site and within adjacent areas. The Manual of California Vegetation (MCV), second edition, should also be used to inform this mapping and assessment (CNPS 2022). Adjoining habitat areas should be included in this assessment where the Project's construction and activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts off site;

iv. A complete and recent assessment of the biological resources associated with each habitat type in the Project site and within adjacent areas. CDFW's California Natural Diversity Database should be accessed to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat (CDFWd 2022). An assessment should include a minimum nine-quadrangle search of the CNDDB to determine a list of species potentially present in the Project site. A nine-quadrangle search should be provided in the Project's CEQA document for adequate disclosure of the Project's potential impact on biological resources. Please see CNDDB Data Use Guidelines – Why do I need to do this? for additional information (CDFW 2011);

v. A lack of records in the CNDDB does not mean that rare, threatened, or endangered plants and wildlife do not occur. Field verification for the presence or absence of sensitive species is necessary to provide a complete biological assessment for adequate CEQA review [CEQA Guidelines, § 15003(i)];

vi. A complete, recent, assessment of endangered, rare, or threatened species and other sensitive species within the Project site and adjacent areas, including SSC and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare, or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of the Project site should also be addressed such as wintering, roosting, nesting, and foraging habitat. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, may be required if suitable habitat is present. See CDFW's Survey and Monitoring Protocols and Guidelines for established survey protocol (CDFW 2018). Acceptable species-specific survey procedures may be developed in consultation with CDFW and USFWS; and,

vii. A recent wildlife and rare plant survey. CDFW generally considers biological field assessments for wildlife to be valid for a one-year period, and assessments for rare plants may be considered valid for a period of up to three years. Some aspects of the proposed Project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if Project implementation build out could occur over a protracted time frame or in phases.

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

9) Direct and Indirect Impacts on Biological Resources. The DEIR should provide a thorough discussion of direct and indirect impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources with specific measures to offset such impacts. The DEIR should address the following:

   i. A discussion regarding Project-related indirect impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands [e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (Fish & G. Code, § 2800 et. seq.)]. Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in areas adjacent to the Project, should be fully analyzed and discussed in the DEIR;

   ii. A discussion of both the short-term and long-term effects of the Project on species population distribution and concentration, as well as alterations of the ecosystem supporting those species impacted [CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.2(a)];

   iii. A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, temporary and permanent human activity, and exotic species, and identification of any mitigation measures;

   iv. A discussion of post-Project fate of drainage patterns, surface flows, and soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies. The discussion should also address the potential water extraction activities and the potential resulting impacts on habitat (if any) supported by the groundwater. Measures to mitigate such impacts should be provided; and

   v. An analysis of impacts from proposed changes to land use designations and zoning, and existing land use designation and zoning located nearby or adjacent to natural areas that may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be provided in the DEIR.

10) Project Description and Alternatives. To enable adequate review and comment on the proposed Project from the standpoint of the protection of fish, wildlife, and plants, CDFW recommends the following information be provided in the DEIR:

   i. A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of the proposed Project;

   ii. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a), an environmental document “shall describe a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project.” CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(f)(2) states if the lead agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, it must disclose the reasons for this conclusion; and,

   iii. A range of feasible alternatives to the Project location to avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts on sensitive biological resources and wildlife movement areas. CDFW recommends the LACDRP select Project designs and alternatives that

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

would avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts on biological resources. CDFW also recommends the LACDRP consider establishing appropriate setbacks from sensitive and special status biological resources. Setbacks should not be impacted by ground disturbance or hydrological changes from any future Project-related construction, activities, maintenance, and development. As a general rule, CDFW recommends reducing or clustering a development footprint to retain unobstructed spaces for vegetation and wildlife and provide connections for wildlife between properties and minimize obstacles to open space.

Project alternatives should be thoroughly evaluated, even if an alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the Project objectives or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6). The DEIR "shall" include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, public participation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines, § 15126.6).

iv. Where the Project may impact aquatic and riparian resources, CDFW recommends the LACDRP select Project designs and alternatives that would fully avoid impacts to such resources. CDFW also recommends an alternative that would not impede, alter, or otherwise modify existing surface flow, watercourse and meander, and water-dependent ecosystems and natural communities. Project designs should consider elevated crossings to avoid channelizing or narrowing of watercourses. Any modifications to a river, creek, or stream may cause or magnify upstream bank erosion, channel incision, and drop in water level and cause the watercourse to alter its course of flow.

11) Data. CEQA requires that information developed in environmental impact reports be incorporated into a database which may be used to make subsequent or supplemental environmental determinations [Pub. Resources Code, § 21003, subd. (e)]. Accordingly, please report any special status species and sensitive natural communities detected by completing and submitting CNDDB Field Survey Forms (CDFWe 2022). To submit information on special status native plant populations and sensitive natural communities, the Combined Rapid Assessment and Relevé Form should be completed and submitted to CDFW's Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program (CDFWf 2022). The LACDRP should ensure data collected for the preparation of the DEIR be properly submitted, with all data fields applicable filled out.

Filing Fees

The Project, as proposed, could have an impact on fish and/or wildlife, and assessment of filing fees is necessary. Fees are payable upon filing of the Notice of Determination by LACDRP and serve to help defray the cost of environmental review by CDFW. Payment of the fee is required in order for the underlying Project approval to be operative, vested, and final (Cal. Code Regs, tit. 14, § 753.5; Fish & Game Code, § 711.4; Pub. Resources Code, § 21089).

Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Project to assist the LACDRP in adequately analyzing and minimizing/mitigating impacts to biological resources. CDFW requests an opportunity to review and comment on any response that the LACDRP has to our comments and to receive notification of any forthcoming hearing date(s) for the Project. If you have any

DocuSign Envelope ID: F0F7ACC1-9F81-44AD-9450-0460B9F4FF54

questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Felicia Silva, Environmental Scientist, at Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov or (562) 292-8105.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:
B6E58CFE24724F5...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin
Environmental Program Manager I
South Coast Region

ec: CDFW
Erinn Wilson-Olgin, Los Alamitos – Erinn.Wilson-Olgin@wildlife.ca.gov
Victoria Tang, Los Alamitos – Victoria.Tang@wildlife.ca.gov
Ruby Kwan-Davis, Los Alamitos – Ruby.Kwan-Davis@wildlife.ca.gov
Julisa Portugal, Los Alamitos – Julisa.Portugal@wildlife.ca.gov
Felicia Silva, Los Alamitos – Felicia.Silva@wildlife.ca.gov
Frederic Reiman, Los Alamitos – Frederic.Reiman@wildlife.ca.gov
Cindy Hailey, San Diego – Cindy.Hailey@wildlife.ca.gov
CEQA Program Coordinator, Sacramento – CEQACommentLetters@wildlife.ca.gov
OPR
State Clearinghouse, Sacramento – State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov

References:

[CDFW] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities. Accessed at: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline
[CDFWa] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Lake and Streambed Alteration Program. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/LSA.
[CDFWb] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Scientific Collecting Permit. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Licensing/Scientific-Collecting#53949678.
[CDFWc] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Vegetation Classification and Mapping Program – Natural Communities. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities
[CDFWd] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. California Natural Diversity Database. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB
[CDFWe] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Submitting Data to the CNDDB. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB/Submitting-Data
[CDFWf] California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2022. Combined Rapid Assessment and Relelve Form. Available from: https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities/Submit
[CNPS] California Native Plant Society. A Manual of California Vegetation, 2nd ed. (2022) Available from: https://vegetation.cnps.org/
Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deepwater habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. FWS/OBS-79/31. Washington, DC.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 269-1124
FAX (213) 897-1337
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Making Conservation a California Way of Life

November 21, 2022

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project
SCH # 2022100204
Vic. LA-57/PM R3.16, LA-60/PM R21.50
GTS # LA-2022-04087-NOP

Dear Marie Pavlovic:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above-referenced NOP. The Project would redevelop six parcels of the existing golf course into four residential planning areas and two recreational/open space planning areas, for a total of 360 dwelling units and trails and a park system. Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 would include 200 detached single-family residential (SFR) units on individual lots; 88 duplex and triplex units on 34 lots; and 13 open space lots which include parks, trails and open space. Planning Area 3 would include 72 condominium units within 14 townhome buildings on one lot. Seventy-two (72) townhouse units and 10 additional units scattered among the triplex units [equaling 82 (23%) of the total units), will be dedicated for sale to moderate- or middle-income households, consistent with the County's inclusionary affordable housing ordinance. The Project would include approximately 28.0 acres of onsite open space, including one 5.81-acre neighborhood park and one 1.59-acre pocket park.

The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment. Senate Bill 743 (2013) has codified into CEQA law and mandated that CEQA review of transportation impacts of proposed development be modified by using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the primary metric in identifying transportation impacts for all future development projects. You may reference the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) for more information:

https://opr.ca.gov/cega/#guidelines-updates

As a reminder, VMT is the standard transportation analysis metric in CEQA for land use projects after July 1, 2020, which is the statewide implementation date.

Caltrans is aware of the challenges that the region faces in identifying viable solutions to alleviating congestion on State and Local facilities. With limited room to expand vehicular capacity, this development should incorporate multi-modal and complete streets transportation elements that will actively promote alternatives to car use and better manage existing parking assets. Prioritizing and allocating space to efficient modes of travel such as bicycling and public transit can allow streets to transport more people in a fixed amount of right-of-way.

Caltrans supports the implementation of complete streets and pedestrian safety measures such as road diets and other traffic calming measures. Please note the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) recognizes the road diet treatment as a proven safety countermeasure, and the cost of a road diet can be significantly reduced if implemented in tandem with routine street resurfacing. Overall, the environmental report should ensure all modes are served well by planning and development activities. This includes reducing single occupancy vehicle trips, ensuring safety, reducing vehicle miles traveled, supporting accessibility, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

We encourage the Lead Agency to evaluate the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications in order to better manage the transportation network, as well as transit service and bicycle or pedestrian connectivity improvements. For additional TDM options, please refer to the Federal Highway Administration's *Integrating Demand Management into the Transportation Planning Process: A Desk Reference* (Chapter 8). This reference is available online at:

http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahop12035/fhwahop12035.pdf

You can also refer to the 2010 *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures* report by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA), which is available online at:

http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf

Also, Caltrans has published the VMT-focused Transportation Impact Study Guide (TISG), dated May 20, 2020 and the Caltrans Interim Land Development and Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Safety Review Practitioners Guidance, prepared in

On December 18, 2020. You can review the SB 743 Implementation Resource at the following link:

https://dot.ca.gov/programs/sustainability/sb-743/sb743-resources

Potential environmental effects of the Project would include the Transportation section with VMT analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. Due to the project size and distance to the State facilities, Caltrans requests queuing analysis with actual signal timing at the northbound/southbound off-ramps on SR-57 to Pathfinder Rd. and Brea Canyon Road/S Diamond Bar Blvd. and westbound/eastbound off-ramps on SR-60 to Fairway Dr. and to S Lemon Ave.

Caltrans encourages lead agencies to prepare traffic safety impact analysis for this development in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process using Caltrans guidelines above on the State facilities so that, through partnerships and collaboration, California can reach zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2050.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 269-1124 and refer to GTS # LA-2022-04087AL-NOP.

Sincerely,

Miya Edmonson

MIYA EDMONSON
LDR/CEQA Branch Chief

email: State Clearinghouse

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
Oct 14 2022
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CHAIRPERSON
Laura Miranda
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON
Reginald Pagaling
Chumash

SECRETARY
Sara Dutschke
Miwok

COMMISSIONER
Isaac Bojorquez
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER
Buffy McQuillen
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki, Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER
Wayne Nelson
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER
Stanley Rodriguez
Kumeyaay

COMMISSIONER
[Vacant]

COMMISSIONER
[**Vacant**]

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Raymond C. Hitchcock
Miwok/Nisenan

NAHC HEADQUARTERS
1550 Harbor Boulevard
Suite 100
West Sacramento,
California 95691
(916) 373-3710
nahc@nahc.ca.gov
NAHC.ca.gov

October 12, 2022

Marie Pavlovic
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: 2022100204, Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, Los Angeles County

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit.14, §15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5 (b)). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines §15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)). **AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015.** If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). **Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements**. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments.

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:

- **a.** A brief description of the project.
- **b.** The lead agency contact information.
- **c.** Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
- **d.** A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).

2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe's Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)).

- **a.** For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).

3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:

- **a.** Alternatives to the project.
- **b.** Recommended mitigation measures.
- **c.** Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:

- **a.** Type of environmental review necessary.
- **b.** Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
- **c.** Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
- **d.** If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).

5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:

- **a.** Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
- **b.** Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).

7. Conclusion of Consultation: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:

a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or

b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).

8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document: Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).

9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation: If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).

10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:

a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:

i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.

ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.

b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:

i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.

ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.

iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.

c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.

d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).

e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).

f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).

11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource: An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:

a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.

b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.

c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf.

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. Tribal Consultation: If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation. There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. Confidentiality: Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).

4. Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation: Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:

- **a.** The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
- **b.** Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/.

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30331) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:

- **a.** If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
- **b.** If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
- **c.** If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
- **d.** If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.

- **a.** The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
- **b.** The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:

a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.

b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.

a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.

b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address: Andrew.Green@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Andrew Green
Cultural Resources Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse

SKYE PATRICK
Library Director

LA COUNTY LIBRARY

October 27, 2022

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

COMMENTS FOR ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT - PROJECT NO. PRJ2021-002011-(1)

Dear Marie Pavlovic:

This is to provide comments regarding the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project which proposes to redevelop six parcels of the existing golf course into four residential planning areas and two recreational/open space planning areas, for a total of 360 dwelling units and a trails and park system. Attached is a report of LA County Library's analysis of the development and the projected impact to services.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Elsa Muñoz at (562) 940-8450 or EMunoz@library.lacounty.gov.

Very best,

Skye Patrick
County Librarian

SP:YDR:GR:EM

c: Grace Reyes, Administrative Deputy, LA County Library
Jesse Walker-Lanz, Assistant Director, Public Services, LA County Library
Ting Fanti, Departmental Finance Manager, Budget and Fiscal Services, LA County Library

https://lacounty.sharepoint.com/sites/publiclibrary/docs/staffservices/Documents/EIR/Royal Vista Residential Project/DRP/Royal Vista Residential Project NOP response.doc

LA COUNTY LIBRARY
COMMENTS FOR ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT

LA County Library evaluated the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project located in Los Angeles County within the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights.

The project area is being serviced by the Rowland Heights Library, located at 1850 Nogales St., Rowland Heights, CA 91748, a facility with 14,863 sq. ft. of space, a collection of 67,754 books, magazines, and media, and 21 public access computers (as of June 30, 2022). LA County Library service level guidelines require a minimum of 0.50 gross square foot of library facility space per capita, 3.0 items (books and other library materials) per capita for regional libraries and 2.75 items per capita for community libraries, and 1.0 public access computer per 1,000 people served.

Rowland Heights Library is a community library and based on these guidelines does not currently meet the minimum requirements for the population of this service area. The current deficiency is 8,968 sq. ft. of facility space, 75,229 collection items, and 27 public access computers.

The proposed project involves the construction of a total of 360 dwelling units, with an estimated population increase of 1,127. This project will have a significant impact on library services since it will create a demand for additional materials and facility space and will affect the library's capacity to serve the residents of the area.

We estimate the total increased service cost related to the proposed project to be approximately $697K which is illustrated by the following chart:

Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project	Impact Per Capita (population of 1,127)	Estimated Costs	Total Costs
a. Building	564	$1,000 sq. ft.	$564,000
b. Land (4:1 land to building ratio)	2,256	$20 (Library Planning Area 4)	$45,120
c. Collections	3,099	$28	$86,772
d. Public Access Computers	1	$1,800	$1,800
Total			$697,692

In efforts to minimize the impact of residential projects on library services LA County Library collects a one-time Library Facilities Mitigation Fee (Developer Fee) at the time building permits are requested for all new residential dwellings located within the unincorporated areas of the County served by the LA County Library. The current Developer Fees are as follows, by Library Planning Area, these fees are subject to a CPI increase effective July 1:

FY 2022-23 Library Facilities Mitigation Fee Schedule

Planning Area	Fee per Dwelling Unit
Area 1 - Santa Clarita Valley	$1,096
Area 2 - Antelope Valley	$1,061
Area 3 - West San Gabriel Valley	$1,108
Area 4 - East San Gabriel Valley	$1,094
Area 5 – Southeast	$1,097
Area 6 – Southwest	$1,105
Area 7 - Santa Monica Mountains	$1,099

The Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project is within the LA County Library's Planning Area 4 – East San Gabriel Valley, current Developer Fee is $1,094 per dwelling unit for a total of $393,840 ($1,094 x 360 dwelling units).

LA County Library also collects an annual special tax which is levied on parcels within 10 cities (Cudahy, Culver City, Duarte, El Monte, La Cañada Flintridge, Lakewood, Lomita, Lynwood, Maywood, and West Hollywood) and unincorporated areas serviced by LA County Library. The Special Tax Rate for FY 2022-23 is $33.20 per parcel.

The LA County Library is open to discuss options regarding mitigation efforts and supporting the continued enhancement and delivery of library services to the residents of Rowland Heights.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ALEX VILLANUEVA, SHERIFF

November 30, 2022

Ms. Marie Pavlovic, Senior Planner
County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
REVIEW COMMENTS

Thank you for inviting the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (Department) to review and comment on the October 2022 Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project (Project). The proposed Project is located within the existing Royal Vista golf course in the unincorporated area of Rowland Heights in Los Angeles County (County). The proposed Project involves the re-development of the existing golf course into various residential lots and recreational/open space areas. Three of the residential lots would include 249 detached single-family units and 88 duplex and triplex units. The fourth residential lot would include 72 condominiums within 14 townhome buildings. The proposed Project would also include approximately 28 acres of onsite retained open space, of which 7.4 acres are dedicated for public parks.

The proposed Project is located within the service area of the Department's Walnut-Diamond Bar Sheriff's Station (Station). The proposed Project may impact the Station's law enforcement services. The proposed Project's building programs and the anticipated growth in residents, daytime, and evening population will add to the increase in the level of service required by the Station. The Draft EIR should clearly identify the anticipated population increases so that the Station can properly

assess the impacts to their services. To date, the Station is currently understaffed. However, assigning additional law enforcement personnel to the Station to meet an acceptable service ratio will require modification of the law enforcement service contract, additional support personnel and equipment assets. These requirements for additional law enforcement personnel and/or support staff will need to be evaluated and addressed to resolve the cumulative impacts.

The Department recommends that the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) are incorporated in the design plans. The goal of CPTED is to reduce opportunities for criminal activities by employing physical design features that discourage anti-social behavior, while encouraging the legitimate use of the site. The overall tenets of CPTED include defensible space, territoriality, surveillance, lighting, landscaping, and physical security. The Station recommends installation of security cameras to reduce opportunities for criminal activities. With advanced notice, Station personnel can be available to discuss CPTED with the Project developer.

A Construction Traffic Management Plan should also be established as part of the proposed Project to address construction-related traffic congestion and emergency access issues. If temporary lane closures are necessary for the installation of utilities, emergency access should be maintained at all times. Flag persons and/or detours should be provided as needed to ensure safe traffic operations, and construction signs should be posted to advise motorists of reduced construction zone speed limits.

The Station remains concerned that the continued growth and intensification of multi-use land uses within the service area will ultimately contribute to significant cumulative impacts on the Department's resources and operations. It is reasonable to expect that continued development will lead to a significant increase in the demand for law enforcement services. Meeting such demand will require additional resources, including law enforcement service personnel, support personnel, and attendant assets, such as patrol vehicles, support vehicles, communications equipment, weaponry, office furnishings/equipment, etc.

The Project Applicant will be required to pay all applicable development fees associated with the Project. Accordingly, the Station reviewed the NOP and provided the attached focused plan review comments (see correspondence dated November 23, 2022, from Captain Steven H. Tousey).

Also, for future reference, the Department provides the following updated address and contact information for all requests for review comments, law enforcement service information, California Environmental Quality Act documents, and other related correspondence:

Tracey Jue, Director
Facilities Planning Bureau
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
211 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Attention: Planning Section

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (323) 526-5657, or your staff may contact Ms. Rochelle Campomanes of my staff, at (323) 526-5614.

Sincerely,

ALEX VILLANUEVA, SHERIFF

Tracey Jue, Director
Facilities Planning Bureau

SH-AD-32A (8/17)-

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

"A Tradition of Service Since 1850"

DATE: November 23, 2022
FILE NO:

OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

FROM: STEVEN H. TOUSEY, CAPTAIN
WALNUT/DIAMOND BAR STATION

TO: TRACEY JUE, DIRECTOR
FACILITIES PLANNING BUREAU

SUBJECT: PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT

As requested by Facilities Planning Bureau (FPB), the Walnut-Diamond Bar Station (Station) of the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (Department) conducted a plan review of exhibits in the Subdivision Committee Review (SCR) conducted by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP) for the new Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project (Project) referenced in the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report. The proposed Project would redevelop the site with 200 single-family residential units, 88 duplex and triplex units, and two onsite open space areas on an approximately 75.67-acre former Royal Vista golf course site located in the unincorporated community of Rowland Heights.

The exhibits included in the SCR were submitted by RV DEV, LLC, the Project Applicant, to LACDRP in July 2022. As part of LACDRP's review and approval, these exhibits were submitted for the Department Station's review. The exhibits include site plans, exterior building elevations, wall and fence plans, and landscape drawings, describing the manner by which the proposed Project complies with various planning principles.

The Station reviewed the exhibits in the SCR and provided review comments on the attached exhibits in addition to the following comments:

1. ***Special Protection Requirements or Recommendations:***

    a. A Construction Traffic Management Plan should also be implemented as part of the proposed Project to address construction-related traffic congestion and emergency access issues. If temporary lane closures are necessary for the installation of utilities, emergency access should be maintained at all times. Flag persons and/or detours should also be

provided as needed to ensure safe traffic operations, and construction signs should be posted to advise motorists of reduced construction zone speed limits. On-site inspector shall be notify the Station when these measures are in place.

b. The proposed Project will benefit from a landscaping maintenance program that would minimize opportunities for individuals to hide. The surrounding areas have experienced an increase in the amount of homeless persons loitering on the streets and sleeping encampments, and improvements deterring this practice would be beneficial. The Station also recommends limiting the height of hedge-type plants around security gates to allow visibility from the street.

c. The building configuration and its relationship with the adjacent existing residential buildings would potentially create hiding places for criminal activities. The Station recommends the installation of security cameras with video monitoring system, and building lights with motion sensors. In addition, proposed locations of exterior building security cameras shall be located in areas where they can adequately identify vehicle license plates upon entry/exit into the proposed Project with adequate lighting to enhance visibility.

d. The Station reviewed site plans, which appears to indicate that there are no existing street lights installed; outdoor lighting, standard parking light posts and exterior lighting fixtures along the building frontage will be installed at the proposed Project. We recommend the installation of outdoor lighting and street lighting with shielding devices on the proposed types of light fixtures to ensure that the light distribution does not spillover into the neighborhood.

At this time, the Station has no further CPTED-related comments on the proposed Project. However, the Station reserves the right to amend or supplement our assessment upon subsequent reviews of the proposed Project once additional information becomes available.

Thank you for including the Station in the review process for the proposed Project. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Rochelle Campomanes, Departmental Facilities Planner II, at (323) 526-5614, of our Facilities Planning Bureau.

SHT:MA:ma

ATTACHMENT
11.29.2022



LEGEND

1. NOT USED
2. SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL
3. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL
4. SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL
5. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL LANDSCAPE
6. OPEN SPACE
7. NEIGHBORHOOD PARK
8. POCKET PARK

RECREATIONAL TRAIL LOCATION

ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT

Lot 1
Total LF of internal frontage: 7,338 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 293.52
Total number of trees provided: 294

Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 941 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 34.64
Total number of external street trees on Colima provided: 35

Lot 2
Total LF of internal frontage: 1,531 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 61.24
Total number of trees provided: 63

Total LF of external street frontage on E. Walnut Drive South: 385 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 15.4
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 35

Lot 3
Total LF of external street frontage on E. Walnut Drive South: 1,124 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 44.96
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 45

Lot 4
Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 4,309 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 172.36
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 174

Total LF of external street frontage on Tierra Luna: 193 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 7.72
Total number of external street trees on Tierra Luna provided: 8

Lot 5
Total LF of internal frontage: 4,309 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 172.36
Total number of trees provided: 174

Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 431 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 17.24
Total number of external street trees on Colima provided: 25

Lot 6
Total LF of external street frontage on Walnut Leaf Drive: 122 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 4.88
Total number of external street trees on Walnut Leaf Drive provided: 9

SHRUB PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	QTY
	ABELIA GRANDIFLORA 'PROSTRATE' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	1 GAL	4' O.C	M	
	ACACIA LONGIFOLIA 'DESERT CARPET' SYDNEY GOLDEN WATTLE	5 GAL	6' O.C	L	
	ACACIA REDOLENS 'DESERT CARPET' PROSTRATE ACACIA	5 GAL	6' O.C	VL	
	AEONIUM 'SALAD BOWL' SALAD BOWL AEONIUM	1 GAL	18" O.C	VL	
	AEONIUM 'ATROPURPUREUM' PURPLE AEONIUM	1 GAL	18" O.C	VL	
	AGAVE 'BLUE GLOW' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	5 GAL	24" O.C	VL	
	AGAVE 'BLUE FLAME' BLUE FLAME AGAVE	5 GAL	36" O.C	VL	
	ALOE ARBORESCEN TREE ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	ALOE BAINESII 'BARBEALE' ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	ALOE ETIADA CORAL ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	ALOE LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD ALOE RUDKOPPIE	1 GAL	18" O.C	L	
	ARBUTUS UNEDO STRAWBERRY TREE	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	ARTEMISIA ARBORESCENS 'POWIS CASTLE' POWIS CASTLE SAGE	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	ASPIDISTRA ELATIOR CAST IRON PLANT	1 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	ASPIDISTRA ELATIOR CAST IRON PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	1 GAL	4' O.C	L	
	BERBERIS T. 'HELMOND PILLAR' BE=BERIS PILLAR BARBERRY	5 GAL	36" O.C	M	
	BOUTELOUA G. 'LA JOLLA' LA JOLLA BOUGAINVILLEA	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	BUXUS MICROPHYLLA JAPONICA JAPANESE BOXWOOD	5 GAL	18" O.C	M	
	CALANDRINIA 'SHINING PINK' ROCK PURSLANE	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	CALLISTEMON 'LITTLE JOHN' DWARF BOTTLE BRUSH	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	CAREX DIVULSA BERKELEY SEDGE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	CAREX PANSA SAND DUNE SEDGE	1 GAL	12" O.C	M	
	CARISSA M. 'GREEN CARPET' NATAL PLUM	5 GAL	30" O.C	M	
	CEANOTHUS G. HORIZONTALIS 'YANKEE POINT' CARMEL CREEPER	5 GAL	5' O.C	L	
	CERATOSTIGMA PLUMBAGINOIDES DWARF PLUMBAGO	5 GAL	5' O.C	L	
	CISTUS SALVIFOLIUS WHITE ROCK ROSE	5 GAL	36" O.C	M	
	COPROSMA REPENS 'PINA COLADA' MIRROR PLANT	5 GAL	30" O.C	M	
	CORDYLINE A. 'SUNDANCE' GREEN AND RED GRASS PALM	15 GAL	48" O.C	M	
	COTONEASTER HORIZONTALIS 'PERPUSILLUS' CREEPING COTONEASTER	5 GAL	5' O.C	L	

SHRUB PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	QTY
	CASSULA ARBORESCENS SILVER JADE PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	CASSULA ARBORESCENS SILVER JADE PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	CHANELLA TASMANICA FLAX LILY	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	DIETES BICOLOR FORTNIGHT LILY	5 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	DODONEA VISCOSA 'PURPUREA' HOPSEED BUSH	24" BOX	5' O.C	L	
	DASYLIRION WHEELERI DESERT SPOON	5 GAL	4' O.C	VL	
	ECHIUM FASTUOSUM PRIDE OF MADERA	5 GAL	48" O.C.	L	
	ELAEAGNUS PUNGENS SILVERBERRY	1 GAL	48" O.C	L	
	ELYMUS ARENARIUS 'BLUE DUNE' BLUE DUNE LYME GRASS	1 GAL	12" O.C.	L	
	EQUISETUM HYEMALE HORSE TAIL	1 GAL	24" O.C	H	
	ESCALLONIA 'NEWPORT DWARF' DWARF ESCALLONIA	5 GAL	30" O.C	M	
	FEIJOA SELLOWIANA PINEAPPLE GUAVA	15 GAL	36" O.C	M	
	FESTUCA CALIFORNICA PINEAPPLE GUAVA	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	FESTUCA MAIREI ATLAS FESCUE	1 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	GREVILLEA LANIGERA 'PROSTRATE' PROSTRATE WOOLLY GREVILLEA	1 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	GREWIA OCCIDENTALIS LAVENDER STARFLOWER	15 GAL	9' O.C	M	
	HETEROMELES ARBUTIFOLIA TOYON	15 GAL	6' O.C	L	
	HEMEROCALLIS X 'HYPERION' HYMERION DAYLILY	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	KNIPHOFIA UVARIA RED HOT POKER	1 GAL	12" O.C	L	
	LAVANDULA ANGUSTIFOLIA ENGLISH LAVENDER	5 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	LANTANA CAMARA 'NEW GOLD' LANTANA	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	LANTANA MONTEVIDENSIS LANTANA	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	LEPTOSPERMUM SCOPARIUM NEW ZEALAND TEA TREE	15 GAL	48" O.C	M	
	LEUCOPHYLLUM FRUTESCENS TEXAS RANGER	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	LIGUSTRUM J. 'TEXANUM' JAPANESE PRIVET	5 GAL	18" O.C.	M	
	LIRIOPE SPICATA CREEPING LILY TURF	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON-LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GEIJERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA AMEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

NORTH
SCALE: 1" =200'- 0"
0 200 400 600 800

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/SWARTHOUT & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 310
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1670 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 955 8500 fax 213 955 8520 www.fuscoe.com

MAJOR LAND DIVISION
Preliminary Landscape Plan
Overall Concept Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0852-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L1.0 OF L7.0



LEGEND

1. NOT USED
2. SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL
3. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL
4. SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL
5. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL LANDSCAPE
6. NOT USED

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT

Lot 1

Total LF of internal frontage: 7,338 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 293.52
Total number of trees provided: 294

Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 941 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 34.64
Total number of external street trees on Colima provided: 35

Lot 2

Total LF of internal frontage: 1,531 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 61.24
Total number of trees provided: 63

Total LF of external street frontage on E. Walnut Drive South: 385 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 15.4
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 35

Lot 3

Total LF of external street frontage on E. Walnut Drive South: 1,124 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 44.96
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 45

SHRUB PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	QTY
	ABELIA GRANDIFLORA 'PROSTRATE' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	1 GAL	4' O.C	M	
	ACACIA LONGIFOLIA 'DESERT CARPET' SYDNEY GOLDEN WATTLE	5 GAL	8' O.C	L	
	ACACIA REDOLENS 'DESERT CARPET' PROSTRATE ACACIA	5 GAL	8' O.C	VL	
	AEONIUM 'SALAD BOWL' SALAD BOWL AEONIUM	1 GAL	18" O.C	VL	
	AEONIUM 'ATROPURPUREUM' PURPLE AEONIUM	1 GAL	18" O.C	VL	
	AGAVE 'BLUE GLOW' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	5 GAL	24" O.C	VL	
	AGAVE 'BLUE FLAME' BLUE FLAME AGAVE	5 GAL	36" O.C	VL	
	ALOE ARBORESCEN TREE ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	ALOE BAINESII BARBERAE ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	ALOE STIADA CORAL ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	ALOE LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD ALOE RUDKOPPE	1 GAL	18" O.C	L	
	ARBUTUS UNEDO STRAWBERRY TREE	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	ARTEMISIA ARBORESCENS 'POWIS CASTLE' POWIS CASTLE SAGE	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	ASPIDISTRA ELATIOR CAST IRON PLANT	1 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	ASPIDISTRA ELATIOR CAST IRON PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	1 GAL	4' O.C	L	
	BERBERIS T. 'WILMOND PILLAR' BERBERIS PILLAR BARBERRY	5 GAL	36" O.C	M	
	BOUTELOUA G. 'LA JOLLA' LA JOLLA BOUGAINVILLEA	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	BUXUS MICROPHYLA JAPONICA JAPANESE BOXWOOD	5 GAL	18" O.C	M	
	CALANDRINIA 'SHINING PINK' ROCK PURSLANE	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	CALLISTEMON 'LITTLE JOHN' DWARF BOTTLE BRUSH	5 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	CAREX DIVULSA BERKELEY SEDGE	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	CAREX PANSA SAND DUNE SEDGE	1 GAL	12" O.C	M	
	CAREXEA M. 'GREEN CARPET' NATAL PLUM	5 GAL	30" O.C	M	
	CRANOTHUS G. HORIZONTALIS 'YANKEE POINT' CARMEL CREEPER	5 GAL	5' O.C	L	
	CERATOSTIGMA PLUMBAGINOIDES DWARF PLUMBAGO	5 GAL	5' O.C	L	
	CISTUS SALVIFOLIUS WHITE ROCK ROSE	5 GAL	36" O.C	M	
	COPROSMA REPENS 'PINA COLADA' MIRROR PLANT	5 GAL	30" O.C	M	
	CORDYLINE A. 'SUNDANCE' GREEN AND RED GRASS PALM	15 GAL	48" O.C	M	
	COTONEASTER HORIZONTALIS 'PERPUSILLUS' CREEPING COTONEASTER	5 GAL	5' O.C.	L	
	CASSULA ARBORESCENS SILVER JADE PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	CASSULA ARBORESCENS SILVER JADE PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	DIANELLA TASMANICA FLAX LILY	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	DIETES BICOLOR FORTNIGHT LILY	5 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	DODONEA VISCOSA 'PURPUREA' HOPSEED BUSH	24" BOX	5' O.C	L	
	DASYLIRION WHEELERI DESERT SPOON	5 GAL	4' O.C	VL	
	ECHIUM FASTUOSUM PRIDE OF MADEIRA	5 GAL	48" O.C	L	
	ELAEAGNUS PUNGENS SILVERBERRY	1 GAL	48" O.C	L	
	ELYMUS ARENARIUS 'BLUE DUNE' BLUE DUNE LYME GRASS	1 GAL	12" O.C	L	
	EQUISETUM HYEMALE HORSE TAIL	1 GAL	24" O.C	H	
	ESCALLONIA 'NEWPORT DWARF' DWARF ESCALLONIA	5 GAL	30" O.C	M	
	FEIJOA SELLOWIANA PINEAPPLE GUAVA	15 GAL	36" O.C	M	
	FESTUCA CALIFORNICA PINEAPPLE GUAVA	1 GAL	24" O.C	L	
	FESTUCA MAIREI ATLAS FESCUE	1 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	GREVILLEA LANIGERA 'PROSTRATE' PROSTRATE WOOLLY GREVILLEA	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	GREWIA OCCIDENTALIS LAVENDER STARFLOWER	15 GAL. VINE	5' O.C.	M	
	HETEROMELES ARBUTIFOLIA TOYON	15 GAL	5' O.C	L	
	HEMEROCALLIS X 'HYPERION' HYMERION DAYLILY	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	
	KNIPHOFIA UVARIA RED HOT POKER	1 GAL	12" O.C	L	
	LAVANDULA ANGUSTIFOLIA ENGLISH LAVANDER	5 GAL	30" O.C	L	
	LANTANA CAMARA 'NEW GOLD' LANTANA	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	LANTANA MONTEVIDENSIS LANTANA	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	LEPTOSPERMUM ECOPARIUM NEW ZEALAND TEA TREE	15 GAL	48" O.C	M	
	LEUCOPHYLLUM FRUTESCENS TEXAS RANGER	1 GAL	36" O.C	L	
	LIGUSTRUM J. 'TEXANUM' JAPANESE PRIVET	5 GAL	18" O.C	M	
	LIRIOPE SPICATA CREEPING LILY TURF	5 GAL	24" O.C	M	

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GELIERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

KEY MAP



EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 1-3 - Neighborhood Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0952-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L1.1 OF L7.0

REVISIONS | NO. | DATE | BY

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY. SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8532 fax 213 955 8533 www.fuscoe.com
Name Date



NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING PARKING LOTS, SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

LEGEND

1. ENTRY MONUMENT
2. RESIDENTIAL ALLEY
3. LOUNGE PATIO
4. ACTIVITY LAWN
5. PARKING LOT
6. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL LANDSCAPE

ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT

Lot 3

Total LF of external street frontage on E. Walnut Drive South: 1,124 LF

Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 44.96

Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 45

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GEIJERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

KEY MAP



NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 40'-0"
0 40 80 120 160

SMP
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 3 - Enlargement

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.988.8892 fax 213.988.8803 www.fuscoe.com

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY
		Name	Date

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0682-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L1.2 OF L7.0

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.



Entry Aerial View

POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES?



COLIMA ROAD

LOCATION MAPS MAY BE BENEFICIAL AT ENTRANCES TO THE COMMUNITY

LEGEND

1. MONUMENT STRUCTURE
2. ENTRY MEDIAN
3. NOT USED
4. LOW STONE ENTRY WALL
5. RESIDENTIAL UNITS
6. SIDEWALK
7. PARKWAY LANDSCAPE
8. PICNIC TABLE / EXERCISE EQUIPMENT
9. NOT USED
10. ENHANCED CONCRETE UNIT PAVING
11. TURN AROUND LANE
12. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL



Entry View

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	-
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	-
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	-
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	-
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	-
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			-
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	-
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	-
	GEIJERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	-
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	-
	RHUS LANCEA * AFRICAN SUMAC		L	-
	LAURUS NOBILIS * SWEET BAY			-
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	-
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	-
PARK CANOPY TREES				-
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	-
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	-
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	-
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	-
SCREEN TREES				-
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			-
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	-
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	-
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				-
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	-
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			-
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			-
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			-
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	-
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			-
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	-
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	-
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	-

KEY MAP



NORTH 1"=500'

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
0 20 40 60 80

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/SMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.988.8282 fax 213.988.8283 www.fuscoe.com

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 1 - Entry Enlargement Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0682-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L2.1 OF L7.0

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY



LEGEND

1. MONUMENT STRUCTURE
2. ENTRY MEDIAN
3. NOT USED
4. LOW STONE ENTRY WALL
5. RESIDENTIAL UNITS
6. SIDEWALK
7. PARKWAY LANDSCAPE
8. NOT USED
9. ENHANCED CONCRETE UNIT PAVING
10. TURN AROUND LANE
11. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GEIJERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS ' CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	'CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALIBZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

KEY MAP



NORTH
1"=500'

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
0 20 40 80 160

SMP
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERSMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34185 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 2 - Entry Enlargement Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.988.8592 fax 213.955.8593 www.fuscoe.com

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

Name Date

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0682-004
SCALE: PCR PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L2.2 OF L70



'A' Trail Respite Plan



'B' Trail Respite Plan



'C' Trail Respite Plan

NORTH

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
	ENTRY ACCENT TREES			
T13-20-6	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
T22-20-2	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA MEDJOOL DATE PALM		L	
T12-30-8	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
T16-20-13	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
T22-10-7	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
	ON LOT STREET TREES			
T11-20-10	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH		L	
T5-20-3	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
T14-20-3	GELEIRA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
T10-20-8	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY		L	
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
	PARK CANOPY TREES			
T20-20-14	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
T15-20-13	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
T13-20-4	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
	SCREEN TREES			
T9-20-2	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE		L	
T16-20-1	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
T6-20-2	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
	ARROYO ACCENT TREES			
T13-30-6	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA AMEURA MULGA ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA		L	
T15-20-15	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE		L	
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
T18-20-7	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE		L	
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
T5-20-13	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

LEGEND

1. PICNIC TABLE / EXERCISE EQUIPMENT
2. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL LANDSCAPE
3. RECREATIONAL TRAIL
4. LOUNGE SEATING
5. OVERHEAD LOUNGE AREA WITH BOCCE AREA
6. NOT USED
7. BENCH SEATING

KEY MAP



NORTH 1"=500'

EXHIBIT "A"

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

0 20 40 60 80

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34156 COAST HWY SUITE 203
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1449

PROJECT DIMENSIONS

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 1-3 - Trail Enlargement Plans
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8832 fax 213 988 8853 www.fuscoe.com
Name Date

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0662-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L2.3 OF L7.0



LEGEND

1. NOT USED
2. NEIGHBORHOOD PARK
3. POCKET PARK
4. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL
5. SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL
6. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL LANDSCAPE

ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT

Lot 4
Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 4,309 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 172.36
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 174

Total LF of external street frontage on Tierra Luna: 193 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 7.72
Total number of external street trees on Tierra Luna provided: 8

Lot 5
Total LF of internal frontage: 4,309 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 172.36
Total number of trees provided: 174

Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 431 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 17.24
Total number of external street trees on Colima provided: 25

Lot 6
Total LF of external street frontage on Walnut Leaf Drive: 122 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 4.88
Total number of external street trees on Walnut Leaf Drive provided: 9

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.
2. PROVIDE LOW LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GEIJERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

SHRUB PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	QTY
	ABELIA GRANDIFLORA 'PROSTRATE' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	1 GAL	4' O.C.	M	
	ACACIA LONGIFOLIA DESERT CARPET SYDNEY GOLDEN WATTLE	5 GAL	8' O.C.	L	
	ACACIA REDOLENS 'DESERT CARPET' PROSTRATE ACACIA	5 GAL	8' O.C.	VL	
	AEONIUM 'SALAD BOWL' SALAD BOWL AEONIUM	1 GAL	18" O.C.	VL	
	AEONIUM 'ATROPURPUREUM' PURPLE AEONIUM	1 GAL	18" O.C.	VL	
	AGAVE 'BLUE GLOW' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	5 GAL	24" O.C.	VL	
	AGAVE 'BLUE FLAME' BLUE FLAME AGAVE	5 GAL	36" O.C.	VL	
	ALOE ARBORESCEN TREE ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C.	L	
	ALOE BAINESII NATAL PLUM	1 GAL	24" O.C.	L	
	ALOE STIADA CORAL ALOE	1 GAL	24" O.C.	L	
	ALOE LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD ALOE RUDKOPPE	1 GAL	18" O.C.	L	
	ARBUTUS UNEDO STRAWBERRY TREE	5 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	ARTEMISIA ARBORESCENS 'POWIS CASTLE' POWIS CASTLE SAGE	5 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	ASPIDISTRA ELATIOR CAST IRON PLANT	1 GAL	24" O.C.	M	
	ASPIDISTRA ELATIOR CAST IRON PLANT	1 GAL	24" O.C.	M	

SHRUB PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	QTY
	BACCHARIS PILULARIS 'PIGEON POINT' PROSTRATE GLOSSY ABELIA	1 GAL	4' O.C.	L	
	BERBERIS T. 'HELMOND PILLAR' BERBERIS PILLAR BARBERRY	5 GAL	36" O.C.	M	
	BOUTELOUA G. 'LA JOLLA' LA JOLLA BOUGAINVILLEA	5 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	BUXUS MICROPHYLLA JAPONICA JAPANESE BOXWOOD	5 GAL	18" O.C.	M	
	CALANDRINIA 'SHINING PINK' ROCK PURSLANE	5 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	CALLISTEMON 'LITTLE JOHN' DWARF BOTTLE BRUSH	5 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	CAREX DIVULSA BERKELEY SEDGE	1 GAL	24" O.C.	L	
	CAREX PANSA SAND DUNE SEDGE	1 GAL	12" O.C.	M	
	CARYSSA M. 'GREEN CARPET' NATAL PLUM	5 GAL	30" O.C.	M	
	CEANOTHUS G. HORIZONTALIS 'YANKEE POINT' CARMEL CREEPER	5 GAL	5' O.C.	L	
	CERATOSTIGMA PLUMBAGINOIDES DWARF PLUMBAGO	5 GAL	5' O.C.	L	
	CISTUS SALVIFOLIUS WHITE ROCK ROSE	5 GAL	36" O.C.	M	
	COPROSMA REPENS 'PINA COLADA' MIRROR PLANT	5 GAL	36" O.C.	M	
	CORDYLINE A. 'SUNDANCE' GREEN AND RED GRASS PALM	15 GAL	48" O.C.	M	
	COTONEASTER HORIZONTALIS 'PERPUSILLUS' CREEPING COTONEASTER	5 GAL	5' O.C.	L	

SHRUB PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	SPACING	WUCOLS	QTY
	CASSULA ARBORESCENS SILVER JADE PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C.	M	
	CASSULA ARBORESCENS SILVER JADE PLANT	5 GAL	24" O.C.	M	
	DIANELLA TASMANICA FLAX LILY	5 GAL	24" O.C.	M	
	DIETES BICOLOR FORTNIGHT LILY	5 GAL	30" O.C.	L	
	DODONEA VISCOSA 'PURPUREA' HOPSEED BUSH	24" BOX	6' O.C.	L	
	DASYLIRION WHEELERI DESERT SPOON	5 GAL	4' O.C.	VL	
	ECHIUM FASTUOSUM PRIDE OF MADERA	5 GAL	48" O.C.	L	
	ELAEAGNUS PUNGENS SILVERBERRY	1 GAL	48" O.C.	L	
	ELYMUS ARENARIUS 'BLUE DUNE' BLUE DUNE LYME GRASS	1 GAL	12" O.C.	L	
	EQUISETUM HYEMALE HORSE TAIL	1 GAL	24" O.C.	H	
	ESCALLONIA 'NEWPORT DWARF' DWARF ESCALLONIA	5 GAL	30" O.C.	M	
	FEIJOA SELLOWIANA PINEAPPLE GUAVA	15 GAL	36" O.C.	M	
	FESTUCA CALIFORNICA PINEAPPLE GUAVA	1 GAL	24" O.C.	L	
	FESTUCA MAIREI ATLAS FESCUE	1 GAL	30" O.C.	L	
	GREVILLEA LANIGERA 'PROSTRATE' PROSTRATE WOOLLY GREVILLEA	1 GAL	30" O.C.	L	
	GREWIA OCCIDENTALIS LAVENDER STARFLOWER	15 GAL VINE	5' O.C.	M	
	HETEROMELES ARBUTIFOLIA TOYON	15 GAL	5' O.C.	L	
	HEMEROCALLIS X 'HYPERION' HYMERION DAYLILY	5 GAL	24" O.C.	M	
	KNIPHOFIA UVARIA RED HOT POKER	1 GAL	12" O.C.	L	
	LAVANDULA ANGUSTIFOLIA ENGLISH LAVENDER	5 GAL	30" O.C.	L	
	LANTANA CAMARA 'NEW GOLD' LANTANA	1 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	LANTANA MONTEVIDENSIS LANTANA	1 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	LEPTOSPERMUM SCOPARIUM NEW ZEALAND TEA TREE	15 GAL	48" O.C.	M	
	LEUCOPHYLLUM FRUTESCENS TEXAS RANGER	1 GAL	36" O.C.	L	
	LIGUSTRUM J. 'TEXANUM' JAPANESE PRIVET	5 GAL	18" O.C.	M	
	LIRIOPE SPICATA CREEPING LILY TURF	5 GAL	24" O.C.	M	

KEY MAP



EXHIBIT "A"

NORTH 1"=500'

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 80'-0"
0 80 160 240 320

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34787 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.955.1200 fax 213.955.1211 www.fuscoe.com

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 4-5 - Neighborhood Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0862-004

SCALE: PER PLAN

DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW

L3.1 OF L7.0



LEGEND

1. MONUMENT STRUCTURE
2. ENTRY MEDIAN
3. NOT USED
4. LOW STONE ENTRY WALL
5. RESIDENTIAL UNITS
6. SIDEWALK
7. PASEO RECREATIONAL TRAIL
8. NOT USED
9. ENHANCED CONCRETE UNIT PAVING
10. TURN AROUND LANE
11. BOCCE BALL LOUNGE AREA
12. PICNIC PLAZA
13. EXERCISE EQUIPMENT

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
IN LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GEIJERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	ACONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

KEY MAP



NORTH 1"=50'

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

0 20 40 60 80

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

SUMMERSMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8692 fax 213 988 8693 www.fuscoe.com

Name Date

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 5 - Entry Enlargement Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0862-004

SCALE	DRAFTED BY: EC CHECKED BY: AW	L-4.1 OF L-7.0
PER PLAN		



LEGEND

1. EXISTING SIDEWALK
2. OVERLOOK PLAZA
3. SMALL PICNIC PAVILION
4. 8' TRAIL
5. OUTDOOR EXERCISE EQUIPMENT
6. 6-12 YEAR OLD CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA
7. 1-5 YEAR OLD CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA
8. BENCH SEATING OVERLOOK
9. GROUP PICNIC GATHERING PAVILLION
10. LOUNGE SEATING OVERLOOK
11. ACTIVITY LAWN
12. KING OF THE HILL LAWN SLOPE
13. ADA PARKING
14. PARENT LOUNGE AREA
15. CHILDREN'S SLIDE
16. SAND BOX PLAY AREA
17. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL
18. BIKE PARKING
19. PARKING LOT

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

DUE TO LIMITED PARKING SPACES AT THE PARKS TRAILS, CONSIDER POTENTIAL PARKING ISSUES AND TRAFFIC FLOW - ESPECIALLY FOR EMERGENCY VEHICLES (i.e. FIRE ENGINES, AMBULANCES, ETC.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GELEERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

KEY MAP



NORTH 1"=500'

ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT

Lot 4

Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 4,309 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 172.36
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 174

Total LF of external street frontage on Tierra Luna: 193 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 7.72
Total number of external street trees on Tierra Luna provided: 8

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 40'-0"

0 40 80 120 160

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMNERSAUNPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 4 - Neighborhood Park

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVISION, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.955.8500 fax 213.955.8520 www.fuscoe.com

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0682-004
SCALE: PER PLAN	DRAFTED BY: EC / CHECKED BY: AW

L4.2 OF L7.0





NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

EXHIBIT "A"

SMP
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34157 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 643-1446

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

Name Date

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8282 fax 213 988 8803 www.fuscoe.com

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 4 - Neighborhood Park Perspectives
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0052-004

SCALE:	DRAFTED BY: EC CHECKED BY: AW	L.4.2A OF L7.0
PER PLAN		



LEGEND

1. EXISTING SIDEWALK
2. OVERLOOK PLAZA
3. SMALL PICNIC PAVILION
4. 8' TRAIL
5. CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA
6. LOUNGE SEATING OVERLOOK
7. ACTIVITY LAWN
8. DOG PARK GATED ENTRY
9. LITTLE DOG PARK AREA
10. BIG DOG PARK
11. SAND BOX PLAY AREA
12. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL
13. ADA PARKING
14. PARKING LOT

ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT

Lot 6

Total LF of external street frontage on Walnut Leaf Drive: 122 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 4.88
Total number of external street trees on Walnut Leaf Drive provided: 9

NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS, ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'NACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
	GELIERA PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY			
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

KEY MAP



NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"
0 20 40 60 80

SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34187 COAST HWY SUITE 203
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1448

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 6 - Pocket Park

FOR LOT MERGER, SUBDIVISION, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1670 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.988.8897 fax 213.988.8593 www.fuscoe.com

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY
	Name	Date	

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0860.004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L.4.3 OF L.7.0





NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT COMMON PUBLIC SPACES INCLUDING SIDEWALKS, TRAILS, PARKS, SEATING AREAS, LOUNGE AREAS ACTIVITY LAWNS, ETC.

EXHIBIT "A"

SMP
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 203
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.948.8282 fax 213.948.8553 www.fuscoe.com

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

Name Date

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 6 - Pocket Park Perspectives
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0662-004

SCALE:	DRAFTED BY: EC	
PER PLAN	CHECKED BY: AW	L.4.3A OF L.7.0



'A' Trail Respite Plan



'B' Trail Respite Plan



'C' Trail Respite Plan

NORTH

SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

0 20 40 80 80

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 203
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1448

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

TREE PLANTING LEGEND

SYMBOL	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	WUCOLS	QTY
ENTRY ACCENT TREES				
T15-20-6	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
T22-20-3	PHOENIX DACTYLIFERA 'MEDJOOL' DATE PALM		L	
T12-20-6	SCHINUS MOLLE CALIFORNIA PEPPER		VL	
T18-20-13	LAGERSTROEMIA INDICA 'MACHEZ' CREPE MYRTLE		M	
T22	CHAMAEROPS HUMILIS MEDITERRANEAN FAN PALM		L	
ON LOT STREET TREES				
T-1-20-10	FRAXINUS VELUTINA 'RIO GRANDE' ARIZONA ASH			
T5-20-3	QUERCUS ILEX HOLLY OAK		L	
	PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR FERN PINE		M	
T14-20-3	CELTIS PARVIFOLIA AUSTRALIAN WILLOW		L	
	AGONIS FLEXUOSA PEPPERMINT TREE		L	
	RHUS LANCEA AFRICAN SUMAC		L	
T18-20-8	LAURUS NOBILIS SWEET BAY		L	
	ARBUTUS 'MARINA' STRAWBERRY TREE		L	
	PRUNUS CAROLINIANA CHERRY LAUREL		M	
PARK CANOPY TREES				
T20-20-14	PLANTANUS RACEMOSA CALIFORNIA SYCAMORE		M	
T15-20-15	JACARANDA MIMOSIFOLIA JACARANDA		M	
T13-20-4	OLEA EUROPAEA COMMON OLIVE		VL	
	PISTACIA CHINENSIS CHINESE PISTACHE		M	
SCREEN TREES				
T9-20-7	PINUS ELDERICA AFGAN PINE			
T16-20-1	CEDRUS DEODARA DEODAR CEDAR		L	
T-20-2	QUERCUS VIRGINIANA SOUTHERN LIVE OAK		M	
ARROYO ACCENT TREES				
T15-20-4	ACACIA SMALII SWEET ACACIA		L	
	ACACIA ANEURA MULGA ACACIA			
	ACACIA STENOPHYLLA SHOESTRING ACACIA			
T15-20-15	CERCIDIUM FLORIDUM BLUE PALO VERDE			
	CERCIDIUM 'DESERT MUSEUM' DESERT MUSEUM PALO VERDE		VL	
T18-20-7	PROSOPIS ALBA 'COLORADO' ARGENTINE MESQUITE			
	ALBIZIA JULIBRISSIN SILK TREE		L	
T5-20-15	CERCIS OCCIDENTALIS WESTERN RED BUD		L	
	OLEA EUROPAEA 'WILSONII' FRUITLESS OLIVE		VL	

LEGEND

1. PICNIC TABLE / EXERCISE EQUIPMENT
2. LANDSCAPE
3. RECREATIONAL TRAIL
4. LOUNGE SEATING
5. EXISTING SIDEWALK
6. NOT USED
7. ACTIVITY LAWN

KEY MAP



EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.955.1200 fax 213.955.1210 www.fuscoe.com

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Lot 5 - Trail Enlargement Plans
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0882-004

SCALE:	DRAFTED BY: EC CHECKED BY: AW	L4.5 OF L7.0
PER PLAN		

POTABLE WATER - SERVICE CONNECTION #2 (2")

WATER METER ELEV	1,291 FT
METER STA #	48+00
HIGHEST AREA SERVED	760 FT
STATIC WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
REQUIRED WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
AREA SERVED	732,000 SQ FT

120V ELECTRICAL PEDESTAL XX+XX

POTABLE WATER - SERVICE CONNECTION #3 (1.5")

WATER METER ELEV	1,251 FT
METER STA #	48+00
HIGHEST AREA SERVED	580 FT
STATIC WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
REQUIRED WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
AREA SERVED	1,000,000 SQ FT

120V ELECTRICAL PEDESTAL XX+XX

RECYCLED WATER - SERVICE CONNECTION #4 (2")

WATER METER ELEV	1,000 FT
METER STA #	48+00
HIGHEST AREA SERVED	600 FT
STATIC WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
REQUIRED WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
AREA SERVED	220,000 SQ FT

120V ELECTRICAL PEDESTAL XX+XX

RECYCLED WATER - SERVICE CONNECTION #5 (2")

WATER METER ELEV	1,000 FT
METER STA #	48+00
HIGHEST AREA SERVED	760 FT
STATIC WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
REQUIRED WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
AREA SERVED	732,000 SQ FT

120V ELECTRICAL PEDESTAL XX+XX

RECYCLED WATER - SERVICE CONNECTION #1 (2")

WATER METER ELEV	1,000 FT
METER STA #	48+00
HIGHEST AREA SERVED	580 FT
STATIC WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
REQUIRED WATER PRESSURE	114 PSI
AREA SERVED	1,000,000 SQ FT

120V ELECTRICAL PEDESTAL XX+XX

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is filled out by the project applicant and is required from all the Landscape Documentation Package.

Select your city: Walnut — Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5

Project name or address: Royal Vista — POC # 3 POTABLE WATER

California Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet

Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5 — Project Type: Non-Residential — MAWA: 0.45

Hydrozone # / Planting Description	Plant Factor (PF)	Irrigation Method	Irrigation Efficiency (IE)	ETAF (PF / IE)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	ETAF x Area	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU)
Regular Landscape Areas							
Low Water Use (Shrub)	0.3	Drip	0.81	0.37	97,826	36,215	1,667,859
Med Water Use (Shrub)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	21,905	13,575	625,231
Med Water Use (Tree)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	0	0	-
High Water Use (Turf)	0.8	Overhead	0.75	1.07	4,971	5,319	245,005
				Average	Total	Total	
				0.62	123,703	55,107	

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas: In Compliance

Special Landscape Areas

SLA 1	1	0	0
Pervious Water Area	Acres	0	0

Total Landscape Area: 123,703 sf
Statewide ETAF: 0.62
ETWU Total: 1,535,164
Maximum Allowed Water Allowance (MAWA): 1,643,570

ETAF Calculations

Regular Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	55,107
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.63

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas must be 0.55 or below for residential areas, and 0.45 or below for non-residential areas.

Percentage of MAWA: 87%

All Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	55,107
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.63

0.63	Regular
0.55	Residential
0.45	Non-Res
0.75	Average

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is filled out by the project applicant and is required from all the Landscape Documentation Package.

Select your city: Walnut — Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5

Project name or address: Royal Vista — POC # 2 POTABLE WATER

California Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet

Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5 — Project Type: Non-Residential — MAWA: 0.45

Hydrozone # / Planting Description	Plant Factor (PF)	Irrigation Method	Irrigation Efficiency (IE)	ETAF (PF / IE)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	ETAF x Area	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU)
Regular Landscape Areas							
Low Water Use (Shrub)	0.3	Drip	0.81	0.37	97,826	36,215	1,667,859
Med Water Use (Shrub)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	20,025	12,415	571,671
Med Water Use (Tree)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	0	0	-
High Water Use (Turf)	0.8	Overhead	0.75	1.07	4,971	5,319	245,005
				Average	Total	Total	
				0.62	122,822	53,949	

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas: In Compliance

Special Landscape Areas

SLA 1	1	0	0
Pervious Water Area	Acres	0	0

Total Landscape Area: 122,822 sf
Statewide ETAF: 0.62
ETWU Total: 1,522,499
Maximum Allowed Water Allowance (MAWA): 1,522,499

ETAF Calculations

Regular Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas must be 0.55 or below for residential areas, and 0.45 or below for non-residential areas.

Percentage of MAWA: 92%

All Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

0.61	Regular
0.55	Residential
0.45	Non-Res
0.75	Average

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is filled out by the project applicant and is required from all the Landscape Documentation Package.

Select your city: Walnut — Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5

Project name or address: Royal Vista — POC # 1 POTABLE WATER

California Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet

Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5 — Project Type: Non-Residential — MAWA: 0.45

Hydrozone # / Planting Description	Plant Factor (PF)	Irrigation Method	Irrigation Efficiency (IE)	ETAF (PF / IE)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	ETAF x Area	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU)
Regular Landscape Areas							
Low Water Use (Shrub)	0.3	Drip	0.81	0.37	97,826	36,215	1,667,859
Med Water Use (Shrub)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	20,025	12,415	571,671
Med Water Use (Tree)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	0	0	-
High Water Use (Turf)	0.8	Overhead	0.75	1.07	4,971	5,319	245,005
				Average	Total	Total	
				0.62	122,822	53,949	

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas: In Compliance

Special Landscape Areas

SLA 1	1	0	0
Pervious Water Area	Acres	0	0

Total Landscape Area: 122,822 sf
Statewide ETAF: 0.62
ETWU Total: 1,522,499
Maximum Allowed Water Allowance (MAWA): 1,522,499

ETAF Calculations

Regular Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas must be 0.55 or below for residential areas, and 0.45 or below for non-residential areas.

Percentage of MAWA: 92%

All Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

0.61	Regular
0.55	Residential
0.45	Non-Res
0.75	Average

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is filled out by the project applicant and is required from all the Landscape Documentation Package.

Select your city: Walnut — Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5

Project name or address: Royal Vista — POC # 3 RECYCLED WATER

California Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet

Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5 — Project Type: Non-Residential — MAWA: 0.45

Hydrozone # / Planting Description	Plant Factor (PF)	Irrigation Method	Irrigation Efficiency (IE)	ETAF (PF / IE)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	ETAF x Area	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU)
Regular Landscape Areas							
Low Water Use (Shrub)	0.3	Drip	0.81	0.37	97,826	36,215	1,667,859
Med Water Use (Shrub)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	20,025	12,415	571,671
Med Water Use (Tree)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	0	0	-
High Water Use (Turf)	0.8	Overhead	0.75	1.07	4,971	5,319	245,005
				Average	Total	Total	
				0.62	122,822	53,949	

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas: In Compliance

Special Landscape Areas

SLA 1	1	0	0
Pervious Water Area	Acres	0	0

Total Landscape Area: 122,822 sf
Statewide ETAF: 0.62
ETWU Total: 1,522,499
Maximum Allowed Water Allowance (MAWA): 1,522,499

ETAF Calculations

Regular Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas must be 0.55 or below for residential areas, and 0.45 or below for non-residential areas.

Percentage of MAWA: 102%

All Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

0.61	Regular
0.55	Residential
0.45	Non-Res
0.75	Average

WATER EFFICIENT LANDSCAPE WORKSHEET

This worksheet is filled out by the project applicant and is required from all the Landscape Documentation Package.

Select your city: Walnut — Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5

Project name or address: Royal Vista — POC # 2 RECYCLED WATER

California Water Efficient Landscape Worksheet

Reference Evapotranspiration (ETo): 47.5 — Project Type: Non-Residential — MAWA: 0.45

Hydrozone # / Planting Description	Plant Factor (PF)	Irrigation Method	Irrigation Efficiency (IE)	ETAF (PF / IE)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	ETAF x Area	Estimated Total Water Use (ETWU)
Regular Landscape Areas							
Low Water Use (Shrub)	0.3	Drip	0.81	0.37	97,826	36,215	1,667,859
Med Water Use (Shrub)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	20,025	12,415	571,671
Med Water Use (Tree)	0.5	Drip	0.81	0.62	0	0	-
High Water Use (Turf)	0.8	Overhead	0.75	1.07	4,971	5,319	245,005
				Average	Total	Total	
				0.62	122,822	53,949	

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas: In Compliance

Special Landscape Areas

SLA 1	1	0	0
Pervious Water Area	Acres	0	0

Total Landscape Area: 122,822 sf
Statewide ETAF: 0.62
ETWU Total: 1,522,499
Maximum Allowed Water Allowance (MAWA): 1,522,499

ETAF Calculations

Regular Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

Average ETAF for Regular Landscape Areas must be 0.55 or below for residential areas, and 0.45 or below for non-residential areas.

Percentage of MAWA: 92%

All Landscape Areas

Total ETAF x Area	53,949
Total Area	87,796
Average ETAF	0.61

0.61	Regular
0.55	Residential
0.45	Non-Res
0.75	Average

NORTH

SCALE: 1" =200' - 0"

0 200 400 800 800

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

SUMMERWINDRUPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8992 fax 213 988 8593 www.fuscoe.com
6/09/2021
Name Date

EXHIBIT "A"

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Plan
Irrigation Master Plan

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0952-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L7.0 OF L7.0



EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Details
Overall Wall and Fence Plan
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34157 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 955 8592 fax 213 955 8813 www.fuscoe.com

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0682-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L5.0 OF L7.0



WALL AND FENCE LEGEND:

- 6'-0" HIGH SOLID MASONRY COMMUNITY WALL AND PILASTER
- 5'-6" HIGH VINYL SIDE YARD FENCE AND GATE
- 6'-0" HIGH ENHANCED SOLID MASONRY ENTRY WALL
- 5'-6" HIGH TUBULAR STEEL VIEW FENCE
- 4'-0" HIGH ENHANCED SOLID MASONRY COMMUNITY WALL WITH CALL BOX
- 5'-0" VINYL COATED CHAINLINK DOG PARK FENCE & GATE
- 5'-6" HIGH PEDESTRIAN VINYL

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Details
Lot 1-3 - Neighborhood Wall and Fence Plan

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0662-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L5.1 OF L7.0

NO. | REVISIONS | DATE | BY

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 955 8992 fax 213 955 8993 www.fuscoe.com
Name Date

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/SMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34157 COAST HWY SUITE 203
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1648



WALL AND FENCE LEGEND:

- 6'-0" HIGH SOLID MASONRY COMMUNITY WALL AND PILASTER
- 5'-6" HIGH VINYL SIDE YARD FENCE
- 6'-0" HIGH ENHANCED SOLID MASONRY ENTRY WALL
- 5'-6" HIGH TUBULAR STEEL VIEW FENCE
- 4'-0" HIGH ENHANCED SOLID MASONRY COMMUNITY WALL
- 5'-0" VINYL COATED CHAINLINK DOG PARK FENCE & GATE
- 5'-6" HIGH PEDESTRIAN VINYL GATE

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Details

Lot 4-5 Neighborhood Wall and Fence Plan

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 203
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.955.8592 fax 213.955.8001 www.fuscoeng.com

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0662-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW



FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"



ROOF PLAN
SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"

LEGEND

1 FACIA
2 METAL SEAM ROOF
3 METAL SEAM RIDGE
4 STONE VENEER
5 BUILDING WALL
6 WINDOW OPENING
7 MOUNTED LETTERS
8 UPLIGHTING FOR LETTERS
9 DOWN LIGHTING
10 BOARD & BATT SIDING
11 STONE CAP
12 BUILDING TRIM
13 DOOR TRIM



SIDE ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"



FRONT ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/8" = 1'-0"

Royal Vista

SECONDARY ENTRY VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN GATES
Scale: 3/8" = 1' - 0"

EXHIBIT "A"

SMP
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

FUSCOE
ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8532 fax 213 988 8803 www.fuscoe.com
Name Date

MAJOR LAND DIVISION
Preliminary Landscape Details
Wall and Fence Typical Details
FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DATE	JOB NUMBER
January 05, 2022	0862-004

SCALE: PER PLAN | DRAFTED BY: EC | CHECKED BY: AW | **L6.1** OF L7.0



5'-6" HIGH TUBULAR STEEL VEHICULAR GATE WITH KNOX BOX
Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"

LEGEND

1. ENHANCED PAVING
2. NOT USED
3. 6' HEIGHT STONE CLAD WALL
4. CURB & GUTTER
5. FINISHED GRADE

EXHIBIT "A"

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Details
Wall and Fence Typical Details

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213 988 8532 fax 213 988 8803 www.fuscoe.com

NO	REVISIONS	DATE	BY
			Name Date

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0562-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L6.2 OF L7.0



LEGEND

1. STONE VENEER
2. 8"x8"x16" CMU BLOCK -GROUT FILL SOLID ALL VOIDS
3. FINISH GRADE, TYP.
4. COMPACTED SUB-GRADE
5. CONCRETE FOOTING

4' HIGH ENHANCED SOLID MASONRY COMMUNITY WALL WITH CALL BOX

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"



LEGEND

1. PRECAST CONCRETE WALL CAP -REFER TO FINISH SCHEDULE
2. 8X8X16 COLORED CMU BLOCK WALL & SPLIT FACE PILASTER -REFER TO FINISH SCHEDULE
3. FINISH GRADE
4. CONCRETE FOOTING- REFER TO STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING PLANS
5. COMPACT SUBGRADE

NOTE:
* REFER TO STRUCTURAL ENGINEER'S PLANS FOR ALL CONNECTIONS, CALCULATIONS, FOOTING, AND REINFORCING INFORMATION

6' HIGH SOLID SOLID MASONRY COMMUNITY WALL AND 6'-6" PILASTER

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"



LEGEND

1. STRAIGHT PLUG (1)
2. BOTTOM HINGE (1)
3. TOP HINGE (1)
4. CORNER ELBOW (4)
5. LATCH FORK (1)
6. FORK CATCH (1)
7. ORNAMENTAL TOPS (4)
8. TRUSS RODS (2)
9. STRETCHER BAR (2)
10. HOOK BOLTS (8)
11. CHAINLINK FENCE PER SEPARATE DETAIL

NOTES:
* ALL COMPONENTS TO BE BLACK PAINTED AND/OR BLACK VINYL-COATED GALVANIZED METAL
* REFER TO STRUCTURAL PLANS FOR FOOTING INFORMATION, TYP
* CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL BLACK OPEN MESH WIND SCREEN TO GATE PANEL

5' VINYL COATED CHAINLINK DOG PARK FENCE & GATE

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"



LEGEND

1. 2"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL POST
2. 1½"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL TOP RAIL
3. ½"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL PICKETS @ 4½" MAXIMUM O.C.
4. 1½"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL BOTTOM RAIL
5. COMPACTED SUBGRADE
6. FINISH GRADE
7. SINK POST INTO FOOTING
8. CONCRETE FOOTING
9. PILASTER

5'-6" ' HIGH TUBULAR STEEL VIEW FENCE

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"



NOTES:
* ALL WELDS TO BE CONTINUOUS AND GROUND SMOOTH
* ALL EXPOSED SURFACES SHALL RECEIVE TWO (2) COATS MOISTURE PROOF PRIMER AND TWO (2) FINISH COATS - REFER TO FINISH SCHEDULE FOR COLOR.
* ALL CONNECTORS, FASTENERS AND OTHER HARDWARE TO BE HOT DIPPED GALVANIZED

LEGEND

1. 8"x8"x16" COLORED CMU BLOCK WALL.
2. FINISH GRADE, TYP
3. COMPACTED SUB-GRADE
4. CONCRETE FOOTING
5. 2"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL POST
6. 1½"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL TOP RAIL
7. ½"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL PICKETS @ 4½" MAXIMUM O.C.
8. 1½"SQ. TUBULAR STEEL BOTTOM RAIL
9. DRAIN & GUTTER

LOW SOLID CMU MASONRY WALL

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"



LEGEND

1. 8X8X16 COLORED CMU BLOCK WALL & SPLIT FACE PILASTER -REFER TO FINISH SCHEDULE
2. FINISH GRADE
3. CONCRETE FOOTING- REFER TO STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING PLANS
4. COMPACT SUBGRADE

NOTE:
* REFER TO STRUCTURAL ENGINEER'S PLANS FOR ALL CONNECTIONS, CALCULATIONS, FOOTING, AND REINFORCING INFORMATION.

6' HIGH ENHANCED SOLID MASONRY GATE ENTRY WALL

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"



LEGEND

1. SQ MERAL INSERT WELDED TO UPRIGHT AND TEX SCREWED AT RAILS
2. 2"x 7" OR 1-1/2" x 5-1/2" PVC TOP AND BOTTOM RAILS-
3. 1"x 6" T&G PVC BOARD
4. 2" 160A PREGALV POWDER COATED UPRIGHT OR 2"x6" PVC UPRIGHT
5. T-HINGE
6. LATCH
7. ADJACENT VINYL FENCING
8. 5"x 5" VINYL POST W/ DOMED CAP

5'-6" HIGH VINYL SIDE YARD FENCE & GATE

Scale: 1/2" = 1' - 0"

EXHIBIT "A"

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

SUMMERS/MURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34187 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1449

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

MAJOR LAND DIVISION

Preliminary Landscape Details Wall and Fence Typical Details

FOR LOT MERGING, SUBDIVIDING, AND CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES
LOCATED IN UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY
OF THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FUSCOE ENGINEERING
600 Wilshire, Suite 1470 Los Angeles, California 90017
tel 213.988.8500 fax 213.988.8963 www.fuscoe.com

NO.	REVISIONS	DATE	BY

Name Date

DATE: January 05, 2022
JOB NUMBER: 0682-004
SCALE: PER PLAN
DRAFTED BY: EC
CHECKED BY: AW
L6.3 OF L7.0



NOTE:

1. IMPLEMENT LANDSCAPING MAINTENANCE PROGRAM TO LIMIT OBSCURITY OF DOORS AND WINDOWS FROM THE STREET AND LIMIT THE POTENTIAL HIDING AREAS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

2. PROVIDE LOW-LEVEL SECURITY LIGHTING AND SECURITY CAMERAS AT GARAGE, PATIO AND BACKYARD.

STANDARD CONDITION

NORTH

LEGEND

LANDSCAPE AREA 508 SF

HARDSCAPE AREA 406 SF

OVERALL LANDSCAPE / HARDSCAPE AREA 914 SF

BACKYARD LANDSCAPE 1,970 SF

PERCENT LANDSCAPE COVERAGE

STANDARD CONDITION 55%

MINIMAL FRONTAGE CONDITION

NORTH

LEGEND

LANDSCAPE AREA 521 SF

HARDSCAPE AREA 387 SF

OVERALL LANDSCAPE / HARDSCAPE AREA 908 SF

BACKYARD LANDSCAPE 2,700 SF

PERCENT LANDSCAPE COVERAGE

MINIMAL FRONTAGE CONDITION 57%

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT | TYPICAL LANDSCAPE COVERAGE PLAN | 47' X 107' LOT PROGRAM

Project Dimensions | Rowland Heights, CA | August 26, 2021

SCALE: 1" = 10'-0"

0 10 20 30 40

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34157 COAST HWY SUITE 200
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1646



STANDARD CONDITION

NORTH

LEGEND

LANDSCAPE AREA 732 SF

HARDSCAPE AREA 551 SF

BACKYARD LANDSCAPE 1,563 SF

OVERALL LANDSCAPE / HARDSCAPE AREA 1,283 SF

PERCENT LANDSCAPE COVERAGE

STANDARD CONDITION 57%



MINIMAL FRONTAGE CONDITION

NORTH

LEGEND

LANDSCAPE AREA 753 SF

HARDSCAPE AREA 512 SF

BACKYARD LANDSCAPE 3,531 SF

OVERALL LANDSCAPE / HARDSCAPE AREA 1,265 SF

PERCENT LANDSCAPE COVERAGE

MINIMAL FRONTAGE CONDITION 59%

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL PROJECT | TYPICAL LANDSCAPE COVERAGE PLAN | 60' X 84' LOT PROGRAM

Project Dimensions | Rowland Heights, CA | August 26, 2021

SCALE: 1" = 10'-0"

0 10 20 30 40

SMP ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUMMERSMURPHY & PARTNERS, INC.
34197 COAST HWY SUITE 202
DANA POINT CA 92629
(949) 443-1446

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
"Parks Make Life Better!"
Norma E. García-González, Director Alina Bokde, Chief Deputy Director

December 12, 2022

TO: Ms. Marie Pavlovic
Subdivisions Section
Department of Regional Planning

FROM: Sean Woods
Chief of Planning

SUBJECT: **NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT PROJECT NO. PRJ2021002011-(1) / VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. TR83534 (RPPL2021007149)**

The Notice of Preparation of the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project (Project) has been reviewed for potential impacts on the facilities of the Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). The Project would redevelop six parcels of the existing golf course into four residential planning areas and two recreational/open space planning areas, for a total of 360 dwelling units and a trails and park system. The Project proposal includes one 5.81-acre neighborhood park and one 1.59-acre pocket park. Public Services and Recreation sections of the EIR should include the following information:

Park Obligation
The Project has a Quimby obligation of 3.26 acres of parkland or $912,668 in-lieu fees per Los Angeles County Code Section 21.28.140. Further discussions with the applicant are necessary to determine how this obligation will be met. The Project proposes two parks which have not been formally reviewed or approved by DPR.

2016 Los Angeles Countywide Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment (PNA)
The Project is located in the Unincorporated La Habra Heights - Rowland Heights study area established as part of the 2016 PNA. The study area has approximately 1.2 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, which is much lower than the countywide average of 3.3 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents and the General Plan goal of 4 acres of local parkland per 1,000 residents. In total, there are 64.7 acres of parkland located throughout the community. Only 27% of the study area's residents are within walking distance (half-mile) of a park compared to the countywide average of 49%. Even though

the study area was determined to have a Moderate level of park need, the community lacks a variety of park amenities. As part of the 2016 PNA, community members in the Unincorporated La Habra Heights – Rowland Heights study area identified the following need for new community parks, new community centers, grass soccer, skate parks, picnic shelters, basketball courts, and playgrounds.

2022 Los Angeles Countywide Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment (PNA+)
The Project is also located in the East San Gabriel Valley regional study area established as part of the 2022 PNA+. Based on community input, the PNA+ report for the East San Gabriel Valley identifies safety and accessibility as barriers to park use for residents who live in the study area. The report also indicates the need for more shade, splash pads, water access, accessible facilities, campsites, trails, and trail networks, multilingual signs and information, as well as affordable and open access to park facilities. The needs identified in the 2022 PNA+ and the 2016 PNA reports should be considered when planning and designing new parks in the area.

Thank you for including DPR in this environmental review process. If we may be of further assistance, please contact Jui Ing Chien, Park Planner, of my staff at (626) 588-5317 or by email at jchien@parks.lacounty.gov.

CL:JIC:nr

WALNUT VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

271 South Brea Canyon Road • Walnut, California 91789-3002
(909) 595-7554 • (626) 964-6551
www.wvwd.com • Fax: (909) 444-5521

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Jerry Tang
President
Election Division I

Edwin M. Hilden
First Vice President
Election Division II

Kevin Hayakawa, Ph.D.
Second Vice President
Election Division IV

Theresa Lee
Assistant Treasurer
Election Division III

Scarlett P. Kwong
Director
Election Division V

STAFF

Erik Hitchman, P.E.
General Manager
Chief Engineer
Secretary

Jared Macias
Assistant General Manager

Sheryl L. Shaw, P.E.
Director of Engineering

Lily Lopez
Director of External Affairs

Joshua Byerrum
Director of Finance
Treasurer

Alanna Diaz
Director of Administrative Services

Thomas M. Monk
Director of Operations

Lucie Cazares, MPA
Executive Secretary

LEGAL COUNSEL

James D. Ciampa

November 2, 2022

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report
Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, Rowland Heights

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments to be considered for the Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to the subject project.

The Walnut Valley Water District ("District") is a California Water District and the agency that will be supplying water to the development. The District purchases imported water from Three Valleys Municipal Water District, a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).

The District is completely dependent on imported water from MWD as its sole supplier of water for domestic purposes and does not guarantee specific pressures or flows. Consequently, water service for the proposed development within the District's boundary shall be subject to the availability of water from MWD. Also, the "project" or "subdivision" consists of fewer than 500 dwelling units (360 units); therefore, the requirements for reliable water supply stipulated under Senate Bills SB 221 and SB 610 do not apply. However, the District believes there to be sufficient supply for the proposed development.

The District has the following comments:

- The District has an existing 6" PVC recycled water main on Walnut Drive (South) terminating approximately 260 feet east of Fairway Drive, and an existing 12" PVC on Colima Road. To comply with the water conservation requirements under California State Law and Section 4.07 Water Conservation in the District's Rules and Regulations, the District intends

to service the proposed development with recycled water for its landscape irrigation purposes.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at Ext. 234.

Very truly yours,

WALNUT VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

Sheryl L. Shaw

Sheryl L. Shaw, P.E.
Director of Engineering

SLS:VD:cf

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
SANITATION DISTRICTS
Converting Waste Into Resources

Robert C. Ferrante
Chief Engineer and General Manager

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
(562) 699-7411 • www.lacsd.org

December 6, 2022

Ref. DOC 6732577

Ms. Marie Pavlovic
Los Angeles County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

NOP Response to Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (Districts) received a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on October 19, 2022. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. A portion of the project area is outside the jurisdictional boundaries of the Districts and will require annexation into District No. 21 before sewerage service can be provided to the proposed development. For a copy of the Districts' Annexation Information and Processing Fee sheets, go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater Program and Permits and select Annexation Program. For more specific information regarding the annexation procedure and fees, please contact Ms. Donna Curry at (562) 908-4288, extension 2708.

2. The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts' District No. 21 Outfall Trunk Sewer, located northwest of the intersection of Fairway Drive and Business Parkway. The Districts' 30-inch diameter trunk sewer has a capacity of 22.2 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 6.5 mgd when last measured in 2014.

3. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the San Jose Creek Water Reclamation Plant located adjacent to the City of Industry, which has a capacity of 100 mgd and currently processes an average recycled flow of 62.7 mgd.

4. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the project, described in the NOP as 200 single family homes, 88 duplex and triplex units, and 72 townhomes, is 79,502 gallons per day, after all structures on the project site are demolished. For a copy of the Districts' average wastewater generation factors, go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater Program and Permits and select Will Serve Program, and click on the Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use link.

5. The Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee to connect facilities (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System or to increase the strength or quantity of wastewater discharged from connected facilities. This connection fee is used by the Districts for its capital facilities. Payment of a connection fee may be required before this project is permitted to discharge to the Districts' Sewerage System. For more information and a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to www.lacsd.org, under Services, then Wastewater (Sewage) and select Rates & Fees. In determining

the impact to the Sewerage System and applicable connection fees, the Districts will determine the user category (e.g. Condominium, Single Family Home, etc.) that best represents the actual or anticipated use of the parcel(s) or facilities on the parcel(s) in the development. For more specific information regarding the connection fee application procedure and fees, the developer should contact the Districts' Wastewater Fee Public Counter at (562) 908-4288, extension 2727.

6. In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specific policies included in the development of the SCAG regional growth forecast are incorporated into clean air plans, which are prepared by the South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts in order to improve air quality in the South Coast and Mojave Desert Air Basins as mandated by the CAA. All expansions of Districts' facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts' treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service but is to advise the developer that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform the developer of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2743, or mandyhuffman@lacsd.org.

Very truly yours,

Mandy Huffman

Mandy Huffman
Environmental Planner
Facilities Planning Department

MNH:mnh

cc: D. Curry
A. Howard
A. Schmidt

South Coast
Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

SENT VIA E-MAIL: December 12, 2022

mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov
Marie Pavlovic, Senior Planner
The County of Los Angeles
Planning Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. Our comments are recommendations on the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the Proposed Project that should be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Please send a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion and public release directly to South Coast AQMD as copies of the Draft EIR submitted to the State Clearinghouse are not forwarded. **In addition, please send all appendices and technical documents related to the air quality, health risk, and greenhouse gas analyses and electronic versions of all emission calculation spreadsheets, and air quality modeling and health risk assessment input and output files (not PDF files). Any delays in providing all supporting documentation for our review will require additional review time beyond the end of the comment period.**

CEQA Air Quality Analysis

Staff recommends that the Lead Agency use South Coast AQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook and website[1] as guidance when preparing the air quality and greenhouse gas analyses. It is also recommended that the Lead Agency use the CalEEMod[2] land use emissions software, which can estimate pollutant emissions from typical land use development and is the only software model maintained by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association.

South Coast AQMD has developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. South Coast AQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency quantify criteria pollutant emissions and compare the emissions to South Coast AQMD's CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds[3] and localized significance thresholds (LSTs)[4] to determine the Proposed Project's air quality impacts. The localized analysis can be conducted by either using the LST screening tables or performing dispersion modeling.

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the Proposed Project and all air pollutant sources related to the Proposed Project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of

[1] South Coast AQMD's CEQA Handbook and other resources for preparing air quality analyses can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook.
[2] CalEEMod is available free of charge at: www.caleemod.com.
[3] South Coast AQMD's CEQA regional pollutant emissions significance thresholds can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf.
[4] South Coast AQMD's guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/localized-significance-thresholds.

heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips, and hauling trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers and air pollution control devices), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, such as sources that generate or attract vehicular trips, should be included in the analysis. Furthermore, emissions from the overlapping construction and operational activities should be combined and compared to South Coast AQMD's regional air quality CEQA ***operational*** thresholds to determine the level of significance.

If the Proposed Project generates diesel emissions from long-term construction or attracts diesel-fueled vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, it is recommended that the Lead Agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment[5].

Sensitive receptors are people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants and include schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, elderly care facilities, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The Proposed Project will include, among others, 360 residential units and is located in close proximity to State Route 60, and to facilitate the purpose of an EIR as an informational document, it is recommended that the Lead Agency perform a mobile source health risk assessment[5] to disclose the potential health risks[6].

In the event that implementation of the Proposed Project requires a permit from South Coast AQMD, South Coast AQMD should be identified as a Responsible Agency for the Proposed Project in the Draft EIR. The assumptions in the air quality analysis in the EIR will be the basis for evaluating the permit under CEQA and imposing permit conditions and limits. Questions on permits should be directed to South Coast AQMD's Engineering and Permitting staff at (909) 396-3385.

The California Air Resources Board's (CARB) *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*[7] is a general reference guide for evaluating and reducing air pollution impacts associated with new projects that go through the land use decision-making process with additional guidance on strategies to reduce air pollution exposure near high-volume roadways available in CARB's technical advisory[8].

Mitigation Measures

In the event that the Proposed Project results in significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized to minimize these impacts. Any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be analyzed. Several resources to assist the Lead Agency with identifying potential mitigation measures for the Proposed Project include South Coast AQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook,[9] South Coast AQMD's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan,[10] and Southern California Association of

[5] South Coast AQMD's guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/mobile-source-toxics-analysis.
[6] *Ibid*.
[7] CARB's *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* can be found at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf.
[8] CARB's technical advisory can be found at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm.
[9] https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook
[10] South Coast AQMD's 2022 Air Quality Management Plan can be found at: http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan (Chapter 4 - Control Strategy and Implementation).

Government's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.[11].

Mitigation measures for operational air quality impacts from other area sources that the Lead Agency should consider in the Draft EIR may include the following:

- Maximize use of solar energy by installing solar energy arrays.
- Use light colored paving and roofing materials.
- Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances.
- Use of water-based or low VOC cleaning products that go beyond the requirements of South Coast AQMD Rule 1113.

Many strategies are available to reduce exposures, including, but are not limited to, building filtration systems with MERV 13 or better, or in some cases, MERV 15 or better is recommended; building design, orientation, location; vegetation barriers or landscaping screening, etc. Enhanced filtration units are capable of reducing exposures. However, enhanced filtration systems have limitations. For example, in a study that South Coast AQMD conducted to investigate filters[12], a cost burden is expected to be within the range of $120 to $240 per year to replace each filter panel. The initial start-up cost could substantially increase if an HVAC system needs to be installed and if standalone filter units are required. Installation costs may vary and include costs for conducting site assessments and obtaining permits and approvals before filters can be installed. Other costs may include filter life monitoring, annual maintenance, and training for conducting maintenance and reporting. In addition, because the filters would not have any effectiveness unless the HVAC system is running, there may be increased energy consumption that the Lead Agency should evaluate in the Draft EIR. It is typically assumed that the filters operate 100 percent of the time while residents are indoors, and the environmental analysis does not generally account for the times when the residents have their windows or doors open or are in common space areas of the project. These filters have no ability to filter out any toxic gases. Furthermore, when used filters are replaced, replacement has the potential to result in emissions from the transportation of used filters at disposal sites and generate solid waste that the Lead Agency should evaluate in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the presumed effectiveness and feasibility of any filtration units should be carefully evaluated in more detail prior to assuming that they will sufficiently alleviate exposures to diesel particulate matter emissions.

South Coast AQMD staff is available to work with the Lead Agency to ensure that air quality, greenhouse gas, and health risk impacts from the Proposed Project are accurately evaluated and mitigated where feasible. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at swang1@aqmd.gov.

Sincerely,

Sam Wang

Sam Wang
Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR
Planning, Rule Development & Implementation

SW
LAC221108-06
Control Number

[11] Southern California Association of Governments' 2020-2045 RTP/SCS can be found at: https://www.connectsocal.org/Documents/PEIR/certified/Exhibit-A_ConnectSoCal_PEIR.pdf.

[12] This study evaluated filters rated MERV 13 or better. Accessed at: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/aqmdpilotstudyfinalreport.pdf. Also see 2012 Peer Review Journal article by South Coast AQMD: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ina.12013.

December 12, 2022 **SENT VIA EMAIL to mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov**

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) FOR THE ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

Thank you for providing the City of Diamond Bar with a copy of the NOP for the proposed Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project ("Project"), and the opportunity to provide preliminary comments prior to the preparation of the Draft EIR (DEIR). Because an Initial Study was not prepared prior to releasing the NOP, our comments are limited to the information provided in the NOP. Additional comments may be submitted after the publication of the DEIR.

1. **Blight.** The Project site encompasses 75.64-acres of the existing 156-acre golf course, and the Project will result in the removal of the driving range and 13 fairway holes (out of 27). We understand that even if no project was proposed, the golf course could cease operations at any time. However, development of the Project will almost certainly lead to the closure of those portions of the golf course currently not planned for development. If there are no plans to repurpose the approximately 80 acres of golf course land that lies outside of the Project boundaries, and the land remains unutilized for an indefinite period of time, there is a potential risk for blight. The EIR should consider potential blight impacts to surrounding properties, including the neighboring homes in the City of Diamond Bar. In your analysis, please address potential long-term maintenance plans, security needs and mitigations options.

2. **Land Use and Public Safety.** The EIR should analyze the impact of converting portions of the Project site from privately-managed, secured open space to public parks and trails. Specifically, the EIR should consider how changes in land use, including the addition of publicly accessible trails and playgrounds, may affect public safety and the quality of life for the neighboring residences. Many of the surrounding homes—including those in Diamond Bar—were developed or adapted to coexist with the golf course, which was established nearly 60 years ago. For example, there are homes that do not have solid, six-foot tall rear yard walls or fences that would typically be provided for homes located at the perimeters of subdivisions or when abutting public parks. The proposed land use changes may thus result in those existing homes becoming more vulnerable to property crimes, and generate more calls for service to the L.A. County Sheriff's Department.

3. **Transportation.** The NOP states that potential transportation impacts will be addressed in the DEIR. Among other things, the transportation impact analysis should address existing safety hazards along the Project site's Colima Road frontage, such as the mid-block crossing east of Terra Luna, and the sightline limitations resulting from the curvature of the roadway segment.

4. **Vesting Tentative Tract Map.** Lead agencies typically expect to receive "something in return" for approving tentative maps, such as precise architectural plans for the product types proposed, and other project-specific details. Diamond Bar requests that the DEIR's project description explain in detail what the applicant is proposing in return for receiving the benefit of a vesting map entitlement.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Royal Vista residential and Parks Project. We look forward to reviewing the DEIR when it becomes available.

Sincerely,



Greg Gubman
Community Development Director

cc: Dan Fox, City Manager

EARTHJUSTICE
BECAUSE THE EARTH NEEDS A GOOD LAWYER

Via Electronic Mail

October 13, 2022

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Planning – Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov

Re: Earthjustice Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

Earthjustice appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project ("Project"), which contemplates development of 200 detached single-family homes, 88 duplex and triplex homes, and 72 condominium units, as well as parks and trails. Our initial comments focus on the importance of incorporating building electrification requirements into the Project. New construction that relies on burning gas for end uses such as cooking and space and water heating has significant greenhouse gas ("GHG"), energy, and health impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). All-electric buildings avoid these impacts. Moreover, all-electric buildings are typically less costly to construct due to avoided costs of gas infrastructure. With the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") now ending subsidies for gas lines to new development, cost savings from all-electric construction will further increase. Accordingly, to comply with CEQA's obligation to adopt all feasible mitigation to reduce significant environmental impacts, the County must require an all-electric Project design that is not connected to the gas system.

I. Projects Connecting to the Gas System Have Significant GHG, Energy and Public Health Impacts.

A. The GHG Impacts of Projects Connecting to the Gas System Are Significant.

CEQA requires a DEIR to identify all the significant impacts of a proposed project, including impacts from the project's GHG emissions.[1] One option to determine the significance of the Project's GHG impacts is to apply a net-zero emissions threshold. In addition to being CEQA-compliant, a net-zero threshold is also consistent with the severity of the climate crisis and the recognition that any increase in GHG emissions exacerbates the cumulative impacts of climate change.

[1] CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2; Appendix F.

Another option is to apply the approach recently adopted by the Bay Area Quality Management District ("BAAQMD"). In determining the significance of project impacts, a lead agency "must ensure that CEQA analysis stays in step with evolving scientific knowledge and state regulatory schemes." *Cleveland National Forest Foundation v. San Diego Assn. of Gov'ts* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 497, 519. To stay in step with evolving scientific knowledge and state policy, the Bay Area Quality Management District ("BAAQMD") updated its previous CEQA GHG guidance for buildings this year to require all new projects to be built without natural gas and with no inefficient or wasteful energy usage in order to receive a finding of no significant impact.[2] BAAQMD's previous 1,100 MT GHG significance threshold was derived from Assembly Bill ("AB") 32's 2020 GHG reduction targets, but did not reflect later developments, such as Senate Bill ("SB") 32's requirement to reduce GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, nor Executive Order B-55-18's requirement to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045.[3] As BAAQMD properly noted in its justifications for its updated GHG threshold, "[f]or California to successfully eliminate natural gas usage by 2045, it will need to focus available resources on retrofitting existing natural gas infrastructure. This task will become virtually impossible if we continue to build more natural gas infrastructure that will also need to be retrofit within the next few years."[4]

Even outside of BAAQMD's jurisdiction, the analysis supporting its zero-gas threshold provides substantial evidence to support an EIR' s finding of significance, particularly where, as here, GHGs are a globally dispersed pollutant. Indeed, state agencies have made similar findings regarding the incompatibility of gas in new construction with achievement of state climate requirements. As the California Energy Commission ("CEC") determined in its 2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report ("IEPR") Update:

> New construction projects, retrofitting existing buildings, and replacing appliances and other energy-consuming equipment essentially lock in energy system infrastructure for many years. As a result, each new opportunity for truly impactful investment in energy efficiency and fuel choice is precious. If the decisions made for new buildings result in new and continued fossil fuel use, it will be that much more difficult for California to meet its GHG emission reduction goals. Parties planning new construction have

---

[2] *See* BAAQMD, *Justification Report: CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts from Land Use Projects and Plans*, at 11 (Apr. 2022) ("BAAQMD 2022 Update"), https://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa-thresholds-2022/justification-report-pdf.pdf?la=en.

[3] *See* BAAQMD, *CEQA Guidelines Update, Proposed Thresholds of Significance* at 10-22 (Dec 7, 2009), http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/proposed-thresholds-of-significance-dec-7-09.pdf?la=en (explaining methodology for previous project-level GHG threshold).

[4] Justification Report at 12.

> the opportunity instead to lock in a zero- or low-carbon emission outcome that will persist for decades.[5]

Consistent with the CEC's findings, the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") recently adopted a Decision that would end gas line extension allowances, finding that "gas line subsidies encourage gas use by providing incentives to builders to install more gas appliances, perpetuating a continued reliance on the gas system both now and over the life of the appliance, and offsetting if not reversing any GHG emission reduction benefits secured through other decarbonization measures."[6] Accordingly, the CPUC found, subsidies for these new gas connections "work against today's climate goals and conflict[] with SB 32 and 1477."[7] This reflects the growing consensus that aggressive electrification will be needed to achieve the state's climate goals. Indeed, the 2022 Title 24 update already requires heat pumps as a baseline for either space or water heating in single-family homes, as well as a heat pump space heating standard for new muti-family homes and businesses.[8] In addition, any new mixed-fuel single-family homes must already be electric-ready so they can "easily convert from natural gas to electric in the future."[9]

Earthjustice strongly cautions against using approaches to determine the significance of Project GHG impacts that involve comparisons against "business-as-usual" emissions or a per capita emissions metric. In *Center for Biological Diversity v. Cal. Dept of Fish & Wildlife* (2015) 62 Cal.4th 204, the California Supreme Court held that determining the significance of project GHG impacts by comparing project emissions with emissions under a business-as-usual scenario derived from statewide emissions reduction goals under AB 32 lacked substantial evidence. For similar reasons, use of statewide per capita emissions metrics to determine the significance of project emissions has also been rejected for the purpose of determining project GHG impacts under CEQA. As the court held in *Golden Door Properties LLC*, "using a statewide criterion requires substantial evidence and reasoned explanation to close the analytical gap left by the assumption that the 'level of effort required in one [statewide] context . . . will suffice in the other, a specific land use development.'" *Golden Door Properties LLC v. County of San Diego* (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 892, 904 (quoting *Center for Biological Diversity*, 62 Cal.4th at 227). While use of a statewide per capita metric to determine the significance of GHG impacts may be useful for a General Plan, which examines collective community emissions of

---

[5] CEC, *2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update, Vol. II* at 18 (Jan. 2019)("2018 IEPR Update"), https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/getdocument.aspx?tn=226392

[6] D.22-09-026, Phase III Decision Eliminating Gas Line Extension Allowances, Ten-Year Refundable Payment Option, and Fifty Percent Discount Payment Option Under Gas Line Extension Rules, at 27 (Sep. 20, 2022), https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M496/K987/496987290.PDF.

[7] *Id*.

[8] *See* CEC, 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards Summary, at 9 (Aug. 2021), https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-08/CEC_2022_EnergyCodeUpdateSummary_ADA.pdf.

[9] Id.

existing and proposed new development, it is not appropriate for projects that only govern new development.

B. The Energy Impacts of Projects Connecting to the Gas System are Significant.

A key purpose of the evaluation of project energy impacts under CEQA is "decreasing reliance on fossil fuels, such as coal, natural gas and oil."[10] Addressing energy impacts of proposed projects requires more than mere compliance with Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards.[11] Including gas hook-ups in new projects, and thereby perpetuating reliance on fossil fuels, is contrary to California's energy objectives and should be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

In addition to the lock-in effect discussed above and its perpetuation of reliance on fossil fuel infrastructure, gas appliances are also inherently wasteful because they are significantly less efficient than their electric alternatives. Heat pumps for space and water heating are substantially more efficient than their gas counterparts. Because heat pumps use electricity to move heat around rather than creating heat, their efficiency is far greater than 100 percent (energy services delivered are much greater than energy input). For example, gas water heaters advertised by Rheem, a major water heating manufacturer, have uniform efficiency factor ("UEF") of 0.58 – 0.83.[12] In contrast, Rheem's heat pump water heaters have UEFs between 3.7 and 4.0, making them roughly four to seven times more efficient than gas alternatives.[13] As recognized by the CEC, "[u]sing heat pumps for space and water heating, as well as other uses, is cost-effective in the long run simply because electrification technologies can be significantly more efficient than natural gas technologies."[14] Given the low inherent efficiencies of gas space and water heating as compared to heat pump options, homes that continue to rely on gas cannot be reasonably construed as "the wise and efficient use of energy" and therefore result in significant energy impacts under CEQA.

C. The Health/Air Quality Impacts of Projects Connecting to the Gas System are Significant.

CEQA also requires consideration of "health and safety problems" that may result from a project's emissions.[15] Indeed, Section III.(d) of Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines

---

[10] CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F, Sec. I.
[11] See California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 173, 211.
[12] Rheem, *Gas Water Heaters*, https://www.rheem.com/products/residential/water-heating/tank/residential_gas/.
[13] Rheem, *Professional Prestige Series ProTerra Hybrid Electric Water Heater with LeakGuard, https://www.rheem.com/group/rheem-hybrid-electric-water-heater-professional-prestige-series-hybrid-electric-water-heater*.
[14] 2018 IEPR Update at 32.
[15] CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2; *see also Sierra Club v. County of Fresno* (2018) 6 Cal. 5th 502, 520 (requiring an EIR to not only discuss air quality impacts and human health impacts separately, but to draw a connection between the two segments of information, to "meet CEQA's requirements.").

specifically asks a lead agency to evaluate if the project would "[e]xpose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations."[16] The health and safety hazards of gas-burning appliances in buildings are well-documented by the California Air Resources Board ("CARB"), the CEC, and numerous peer-reviewed academic studies. In a Board-adopted resolution, CARB determined that that "cooking emissions, especially from gas stoves, are associated with increased respiratory disease."[17] Children in homes with gas stoves are particularly at risk. A meta-analysis examining the association between gas stoves and childhood asthma found that "children in homes with gas stoves have a 42 percent increased risk of experiencing asthma symptoms (current asthma)" and "a 24 percent increased risk of ever being diagnosed with asthma by a doctor (lifetime asthma)."[18] Other health effects observed in children from exposure to nitrogen dioxide ("NO_x"), which is a byproduct of gas combustion, include cardiovascular effects, increased susceptibility to allergens and lung infections, irritated airways and other aggravated respiratory symptoms, and learning deficits.[19] As found repeatedly by peer-reviewed studies, combustion of gas in household appliances produces harmful indoor air pollution, including carbon monoxide, nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide, formaldehyde, acetaldehyde, and ultrafine particles, often in excess of the levels set out by the California Ambient Air Quality Standards and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.[20] CARB has therefore recognized "the conclusion of recent studies that 100 percent electrification of natural gas appliances in

---

[16] CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Sec. III(d).

[17] CARB, *Combustion Pollutants & Indoor Air Quality*, https://perma.cc/J6YH-VVZH (as of March 30, 2022).

[18] Brady Seals & Andee Krasner, *Gas Stoves: Health and Air Quality Impacts and Solutions*, Rocky Mountain Institute, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Sierra Club, at 13 (2020), https://rmi.org/insight/gas-stoves-pollution-health/.

[19] *Id.*

[20] *See, e.g.*, Jennifer M. Logue et al., *Pollutant Exposures from Natural Gas Cooking Burners: A Simulation-Based Assessment for Southern California*, 122 Env't Health Perspectives 43, 43–50 (2014), http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1306673 (modeling exposure rates for gas stove pollutants and finding that "62%, 9%, and 53% of occupants are routinely exposed to NO_2, CO, and HCHO levels that exceed acute health-based standards and guidelines" and that "reducing pollutant exposures from [gas stoves] should be a public health priority."); John Manuel, *A Healthy Home Environment?*, 107 Env'tl. Health Perspectives 352, 352–57 (1999), https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.99107a352 (finding that gas furnaces and other gas appliances can be sources of unsafe indoor carbon monoxide concentrations); Nasim A. Mullen et al., *Impact of Natural Gas Appliances on Pollutant Levels in California Homes*, Lawrence Berkeley Nat'l Lab'y (Dec. 2012), https://eta-publications.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/impact_of_natural_gas_appliances.pdf (finding that concentrations of NO_2, NO_x, and carbon monoxide were associates with use of gas appliances); Dr. Zhu et al., *Effects of Residential Gas Appliances on Indoor and Outdoor Air Quality and Public Health in California*, UCLA Fielding School of Pub. Health, (Apr. 2020), https://ucla.app.box.com/s/xyzt8jc1ixnetiv0269qe704wu0ihif7 (finding that gas combustion appliances are associated with higher concentrations of NO_2, NO_x, CO, fine particulate matter, and formaldehyde in indoor air, and discussing the health impacts of acute and chronic exposure to each pollutant).

California would result in significant health benefits."[21] Accordingly, projects that permit gas appliances such as stoves have significant air quality impacts under CEQA.

Gas appliances contribute to indoor air pollution even when they are not turned on. A recent study sampling the gas supply to home appliances also found additional harmful pollutants present, including the Hazardous Air Pollutants benzene and hexane in 95% and 98% of samples, respectively, among others.[22] These pollutants have serious health impacts, particularly given that residential appliances can last for upwards of ten years, and residents may be repeatedly exposed to their pollution multiple times daily. For example, in addition to being a known carcinogen, non-cancer long-term health effects of exposure to benzene include "harmful effects on the bone marrow," "excessive bleeding," and can compromise the immune system.[23] Similarly, "[c]hronic inhalation exposure to hexane is associated with sensorimotor polyneuropathy in humans, with numbness in the extremities, muscular weakness, blurred vision, headache, and fatigue," and animal studies have shown "pulmonary lesions" as well as damage to reproductive organs following chronic inhalation exposure.[24] These pollutants were present in the gas supplied to home appliances prior to combustion, and a 2022 study also found that most gas stoves leak supply gas "continuously" even while turned off.[25]

II. Building Electrification is Feasible and Effective Mitigation to Reduce Project GHG, Energy, and Health Impacts.

A lead agency may not lawfully approve a project where "there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen [its] significant environmental effects."[26] Only when feasible mitigation measures have been exhausted may an agency find that overriding considerations exist that outweigh the significant environmental effects. [27] This mandate—to avoid, minimize and mitigate significant adverse effects where feasible—has been described as the "most important" provision of the law.[28]

---

[21] CARB Resolution 20-32, *California Indoor Air Quality Program Update*, at 2 (Nov. 19, 2020), https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/board/res/2020/res20-32.pdf.
[22] Drew R. Michanowicz et al., *Home is Where the Pipeline Ends: Characterization of Volatile Organic Compounds Present in Natural Gas at the Point of the Residential End User*, Environ. Sci. Technol. 2022, 56, 10258–10268 at 10262 (Jun. 2022), https://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acs.est.1c08298.
[23] *See* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Facts about Benzene*, https://emergency.cdc.gov/agent/benzene/basics/facts.asp#:~:text=(Long%2Dterm%20exposure%20means%20exposure,increasing%20the%20chance%20for%20infection.
[24] U.S. Env. Prot. Agency, *Hexane*, https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-09/documents/hexane.pdf.
[25] Eric D. Lebel, et al., Methane and NO_x Emissions from Natural Gas Stoves, Cooktops, and Ovens in Residential Homes, Environ. Sci. Technol. 2022, 56, 4, at 2534 (Jan. 27, 2022), https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c04707.
[26] Pub. Res. Code § 21002.
[27] *Id.* § 21081; *see also* CEQA Guidelines 15091(a).
[28] *Sierra Club v. Gilroy City Council*, 222 Cal. App. 3d 30, 41 (1990).

Eliminating natural gas use in new buildings is feasible mitigation that will substantially lessen the Project's GHG, energy, and air quality/health impacts. For example, in *Residential Building Electrification in California*, Energy and Environmental Economics ("E3") determined that "electrification is found to reduce total greenhouse gas emissions in single family homes by approximately 30 to 60 percent in 2020, relative to a natural gas-fueled home."[29] Moreover, "[a]s the carbon intensity of the grid decreases over time, these savings are estimated to increase to approximately 80 to 90 percent by 2050, including the impacts of upstream methane leakage and refrigerant gas leakage from air conditioners and heat pumps."[30] As shown in the graph below, the GHG savings from heat pumps are substantial today and will only increase as California continues to decarbonize its grid as required under SB 100.



Figure 3. Carbon intensity of water heater technologies, as a function of renewable electricity percentage.
Source: Author's calculations [31]

In contrast, because gas appliances will generate the same level of pollution over their lifetime, their emissions relative to electric alternatives will increase over time and increasingly interfere with achievement of California's climate objectives.

Numerous local jurisdictions have also adopted all-electric building policies for a variety of building types, demonstrating the feasibility of all-electric new construction. For example, San Francisco adopted an ordinance effective June 2021 prohibiting gas in new construction for

[29] E3, *Residential Building Electrification in California*, at iv (Apr. 2019), https://www.ethree.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/E3_Residential_Building_Electrification_in_California_April_2019.pdf.
[30] *Id.*
[31] Amber Mahone et al., *What If Efficiency Goals Were Carbon Goals*, at 9-7, American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (2016), https://aceee.org/files/proceedings/2016/data/papers/9_284.pdf.

all building types, with narrow exceptions.[32] Several other California municipalities have adopted similar legislation, including Berkeley, San Luis Obispo, and Half Moon Bay, and the City of Los Angeles is close behind.[33]

All-electric new construction is also a feasible mitigation measure to avoid the health impacts of gas, particularly the indoor air pollution impacts in residential buildings. For example, Marin Clean Energy developed its Low-Income Families and Tenants ("LIFT") Pilot Program to reduce energy burdens and improve quality of life for residents in income-qualified multifamily properties through energy efficiency, electrification, and health, safety, and comfort upgrades.[34] An evaluation of the LIFT Pilot found that on a per dwelling basis, participants who received heat pump replacements for gas or propane heating equipment saw reductions of greenhouse gases by over one ton of CO_2 per dwelling, NO_x reductions of close to 1 pound, and carbon monoxide reductions of more than 2 pounds.[35] Notably, because the national health and safety limit for carbon monoxide is 1 pound annually, residents had been living with unsafe carbon monoxide levels. Heat pump installation virtually eliminated this pollution source.[36] In addition to direct health benefits from reduced pollution, tenants reported increased comfort, with "indoor air temperature being just right even on very hot days," better air quality and reduced noise.[37] Electrifying gas end uses in buildings demonstrably mitigates not only building emissions but their associated health and safety impacts.

All-electric building design is also economically feasible under CEQA. When considering economic feasibility of alternatives under CEQA, courts consider "whether the marginal costs of the alternative as compared to the cost of the proposed project are so great that

---

[32] San Francisco Building Code § 106A.1.17.1, https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_building/0-0-0-92027.

[33] *See, e.g.,* San Luis Obispo Ordinance No. 1717, http://opengov.slocity.org/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=162695&dbid=0&repo=CityClerk, (prohibiting natural gas in new construction effective January 1, 2023, with narrow commercial availability and viability exceptions); Los Angeles City Council Motion, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KLrBqAT2sj2sQJjD2NKGTME8WX5ZEn_9/view, (directing Los Angeles city agencies to develop a plan within six months that will "require all new residential and commercial buildings in Los Angeles to be built so that they will achieve zero-carbon emissions," to be effective January 1, 2023); Half Moon Bay Municipal Code § 14.06.030, https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/HalfMoonBay/#!/HalfMoonBay14/HalfMoonBay1406.html#14.06.030, (requiring all-electric construction for all new buildings, effective March 17, 2022). *See also* Sierra Club, *California's Cities Lead the Way on Pollution-Free Homes and Buildings*, https://www.sierraclub.org/articles/2021/07/californias-cities-lead-way-pollution-free-homes-and-buildings, (running list of California municipalities with gas-free buildings commitments and electrification building codes).

[34] DNV, MCE Low-Income Families and Tenants Pilot Program Evaluation at 1 (Aug 5. 2021) https://www.mcecleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/MCE-Low-Income-Families-and-Tenants-Pilot-Program-Evaluation.pdf.

[35] *Id.* at 28.

[36] *Id.* at 29.

[37] *Id.* at 4, 35 (Aug 5. 2021) https://www.mcecleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/MCE-Low-Income-Families-and-Tenants-Pilot-Program-Evaluation.pdf.

a reasonably prudent [person] would not proceed with the [altered project]."[38] That is, even if an alternative is *more* expensive than the original plan, "[t]he fact that an alternative may be more expensive or less profitable is not sufficient to show that the alternative is financially infeasible."[39]

All-electric building design for new construction is indisputably financially feasible because it is now cheaper than mixed-fuel construction.[40] The CEC has found that capital costs for all-electric single family homes are "several thousand dollars less expensive than mixed-fuel homes."[41] For mid-rise multi-family homes, "[a]n average reduction of $3,300 per unit was found" by avoiding the costs of gas piping, venting, and trenching to connect to the gas system.[42] Indeed, as noted in Redwood Energy's A Zero Emissions All-Electric Multifamily Construction Guide, "[i]n the downtown of a city like Los Angeles, just trenching and piping gas to an apartment building in a busy street can cost $140,000."[43] Moreover, there are additional embedded savings from faster build-out (related to not having to install gas plumbing and piping inside of the home), and by installing one heat pump instead of a separate furnace and air conditioning. As the CPUC is eliminating gas line extension allowances for all customer classes starting in July 2023, the infrastructure buildout to support gas hookups will raise costs of projects connecting to the gas system even more than before, when line extensions were subsidized.[44] Additionally, as discussed above, the 2022 update to the Title 24 Building Code already requires heat pumps as a baseline for space or water heating, and requires panel upgrades and other space modifications in any new mixed-fuel homes to ensure they are electric-ready when they inevitably convert to all-electric.[45] As a result, mixed-fuel design in new construction

---

[38] *SPRAWLDEF v. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Comm'n* (2014) 226 Cal. App. 4th 905, 918 (citing *Uphold Our Heritage v. Town of Woodside* (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 587, 600).
[39] *Id.* (citing *Center for Biological Diversity v. Cty. of San Bernardino* (2010) 185 Cal. App. 4th 866, 833).
[40] *See* CARB, Draft 2022 Scoping Plan, Appendix F: Building Decarbonization, at 14–15 (May 2022) (finding that "all-electric new construction is one of the most cost-effective near-term applications for building decarbonization efforts," and that all-electric new construction is crucial in particular because "it is less costly to build, avoids new pipeline costs to ratepayers, and avoids expensive retrofits later."), https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-05/2022-draft-sp-appendix-f-building-decarbonization.pdf.
[41] *See* CEC, Final 2021 Integrated Energy Policy Report Volume I: Building Decarbonization at 89 (Feb. 2022), https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=241599, (citing E3, *Residential Building Electrification in California: Consumer Economics, Greenhouse Gases and Grid Impacts*, https://www.ethree.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/E3_Residential_Building_Electrification_in_California_April_2019.pdf.).
[42] CEC, *California Building Decarbonization Assessment*, at 83 (Aug. 13, 2021) ("CEC Building Decarbonization Assessment"), https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/GetDocument.aspx?tn=239311.
[43] Redwood Energy, A Zero Emissions All-Electric Multifamily Construction Guide at 2 (2019), https://fossilfreebuildings.org/ElectricMFGuide.pdf
[44] R. 19-01-011, Phase III Decision Eliminating Gas Line Extension Allowances, Ten-Year Refundable Payment Option, and Fifty Percent Discount Payment Option Under Gas Line Extension Rules, (Aug. 8, 2022), https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Efile/G000/M496/K415/496415627.PDF.
[45] *See* CEC, 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards Summary, at 9 (Aug. 2021), https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2021-08/CEC_2022_EnergyCodeUpdateSummary_ADA.pdf.

is likely *less* financially feasible than all-electric design, in addition to imposing significant GHG, energy, and health impacts.

Now is the critical window for the County to jump-start this transition away from gas to clean energy buildings. CEQA is an essential vehicle to take all feasible action to reduce GHGs and limit further expansion of gas infrastructure. To comply with CEQA, we urge incorporation of all-electric building design into the Project.

Please contact Rebecca Barker at rbarker@earthjustice.org, and Matt Vespa at mvespa@earthjustice.org with any questions or concerns, and please include each of us in future notifications on the Project's development.

Sincerely,

Matt Vespa
Senior Attorney
Earthjustice
50 California Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Email: mvespa@earthjustice.org
Telephone: (415) 217-2123

Rebecca Barker
Associate Attorney
Earthjustice
50 California Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94111
Email: rbarker@earthjustice.org
Telephone: (415) 217-2056

PIERCE LAW FIRM
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

WWW.PIERCEFIRM.COM

1440 NORTH HARBOR BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
FULLERTON, CALIFORNIA 92835
TELEPHONE (714) 449-3333

OUR FILE NO.
7696.001
SENDER'S EMAIL ADDRESS
BPierce@piercefirm.com

November 1, 2022

VIA EMAIL ONLY
Marie Pavlovic - mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Project PRJ 2021-002011

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

This letter is for Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning's consideration in connection with review of Project PRJ 2021-002011, the related requests for consideration by DRP[1] and the upcoming scoping meeting. Please make this correspondence part of the administrative record for the Project.

As you know, we represent Royal Vista Open Space "RVOS", a non-profit whose members include concerned citizens and property owners surrounding the Royal Vista Golf Course, including owners of benefitted parcels under the Declaration of Protective Restrictions (the "Restrictive Covenant") that burdens a number of the parcels (collectively the "servient tenements") that are the subject of the Project.

There is no basis for DRP to proceed with the scoping meeting or other environmental review at this time. The Restrictive Covenant expressly prohibits the change in use of the servient tenements contemplated by the Project. In addition to the numerous adverse environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated, as discussed by the agencies and departments commenting on the proposed project, any environmental analysis, including the scoping meeting, is unrelated to the environmental conditions that may exist fifteen years in the future, if the conditions to termination of the Restrictive Covenant are ever met.

As DRP is aware, the Restrictive Covenant, dated December 16, 1961, recorded with the County Recorder December 29, 1961, limits the use of six of the large parcels

[1] Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, Project No. PRJ2021- 002011-(1) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. TR83534 (RPPL2021007149) / General Plan Amendment No. RPPL2021004860 / Zone Change No. RPPL2021007152 / Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL2021007151 / Housing Permit No. RPPL2021007161 / Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2021007150

that make up the Project, to golf course and country club uses. The language is unambiguous and provides:

> All property described herein shall be used only for the purpose of a golf and country club and its appurtenances, including golf tees, greens, fairways and rough, water storage and landscaping. (Art. II, ¶ 1.)

The changes in use proposed by the proponent of the Project violate this restriction. The Restrictive Covenant is not optional or a guideline, it is the obligation of the owner(s) of the servient tenements, that benefits the surrounding homeowners. It remains in full force and effect until January 31, 2036, and only terminates then if certain conditions are met, regardless of changes to the zoning or permitted land uses. Accordingly, the scoping meeting and the associated work and review by the responsible governmental departments and agencies are premature and a waste of resources.

The Restrictive Covenant provides for an initial term that ran through January 31, 2016, which automatically renewed at that time, for a period of 20 years. The Covenant provides:

> All of the conditions and restrictions set forth in this declaration shall run with the land and continue to be in full force and effect until January 31 2016, and shall, as then in force, be continued automatically and without further notice from that time for a period of twenty (20) years, and thereafter for a successive period of twenty (20) years, unless, within the six months prior to expiration of any period as set forth hereinabove, the then owners of the property covered in this declaration shall be able to show that the property is no longer suitable for use as a golf course. (Art. III.)

Accordingly, as of February 1, 2016, the Restrictive Covenant was renewed for an additional 20 years. It happened automatically at that time. No subsequent act of any party changes what occurred in the past.

While the proponent has argued that the six months language only qualifies the time frame for suitability, they are incorrect. In fact, we have requested that they provide legal authority or common-sense rationale for rewriting the language that required the then owners to provide proof that the property "**is** [not 'was'] **no longer suitable**" for use as a golf course six months **prior to expiration** of any period provided for in the declaration. They were unable to provide any legal authority or rationale.

The limited explanation provided to DRP that the document recorded five and a half years after the deadline, by the owner of a portion of the servient tenement and

operator of the business, is somehow effective to wipe the Restrictive Covenant relied upon by hundreds of surrounding homeowners, is specious. If the proponent's rationale was correct, there would be no need to limit the time frame to six months before the natural expiration. It would simply read that after the initial term, once the property is no longer suitable, the restriction would terminate. The six-month provision is a notice provision, it does not qualify when the course becomes unsuitable.[2]

Before additional resources are wasted, DRP should require the proponent to demonstrate that it has obtained title to the rights described in the Restrictive Covenant. Until then, any environmental review is premature, including the scoping meeting. No one can predict the environment that will be in place in 2036 or 2056 when the Restrictive Covenant has run its course.

The proponent of the Project does not dispute that the Restrictive Covenant exists. They do not dispute that the restriction prevents the development they propose. Their only argument is that five and a half years after the Restrictive Covenant automatically renewed by its own terms, they wanted to change the use so they claim that five and a half years earlier the golf course was not profitable.

If you have any questions or need clarification concerning the enforceability of the Restrictive Covenant, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or email at the contact information above.

Thank you,



Bradley D. Pierce

BDP/dot

[2] Additionally, the after-the-fact declaration does not address suitable of the property as a golf course, it simply claims that 5 ½ years earlier the way the course was managed, it was not profitable. Even if that statement is accurate, profitability is not synonymous with suitability.

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Royal Vista Open Space <saveroyalvista@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 8:31 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; David DeGrazia <DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; Moreno, Andrea <amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov>; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe <GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov>; Serrano, Ryan RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Marie Pavlovic,

Royal Vista Open Space consists of over 2,000 community members opposed to the proposed development of the Royal Vista Golf Course. The following points are some of our major objections.

1. The aesthetics of our community will be impaired by the loss of 76 acres of undeveloped land and the loss of our open space in an underserved area of Rowland Heights.

2. The soil upheaval which will occur during construction will have the potential of igniting Valley Fever spores or any other currently unknown contaminants to emerge and can potentially cause or aggravate asthma or related lung illnesses.

3. Cultural resources, such as schools, will be impacted by children having to dangerously cross Colima and Fairway to get to Ybarra Elementary. Schools will be further impacted by overcrowded conditions.

4. Increased traffic with the additional thousand plus cars will only exacerbate the already packed Colima Rd., a street that is already compromised with the freeway access and exit points on Lemon. In case of emergencies, such as wildfire in an area that is already identified as a very high fire hazard severity zone, the potential for gridlock along the only main road out of this area and its possible consequential loss of life is a very real one indeed.

5. Increased costs for public services, such as police, school, CHP, and fire, will most assuredly result in increased taxes for existing homeowners.

6. Safety concerns, such as security, homeless encampments, and maintenance of public bathrooms, water fountains, and trails, abound with the plan for public parks and public walking trails.

7. The irreplaceable loss of trees and the permeable landscape of our unpaved space, which is to be replaced by housing and cement, is not only environmentally unsound, but nothing short of tragic.

8. Increased traffic as a result of hundreds of more vehicles on Colima will directly impact the air quality of our community, adding more greenhouse gasses and pollutants contributing to disease.

9. Daily we are bombarded with warnings from major water districts that mandatory water conservation is imminent. Yet, we are looking at a plan for hundreds of more houses which will further stress our water allocations. Our community will be paying the price for the needs of this development.

Royal Vista Open Space is a registered applicant to the California 30x30 program, and is represented by the Southland Power in Nature Coalition, and is also supported by the Diamond Bar - Pomona Valley Sierra Club Task Force, under the jurisdiction of the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter Conservation Committee.

We call upon the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning to recognize this effort of preserving the designated open space as essential in contributing to the state and nationwide goals of the 30x30 program.

We expect the LA Planning Commission to take these concerns very seriously. We expect the Commission to honor your constituents' needs, not the needs of a property developer. We expect environmental justice. We expect you to deny changing the zoning designation of this Open Space.

Sincerely,

Royal Vista Open Space
--
Royal Vista Open Space
Nonprofit Organization
SaveRoyalVista.com

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Save Our Open Space <contactsaverv@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 2, 2022 7:00 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Joshua Huntington; Amy Bodek; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista NOP/DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Attached photos and video are submitted as evidence of flooding and heavy creek flow on Royal Vista Golf Course on November 9, 2022







Video Below

Royal Vista Golf Course Flooding 11-9-22.MOV

--
Royal Vista Open Space
Nonprofit Organization
SaveRoyalVista.com

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: natapi007 <natapi007@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 11:13 AM
To: Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; Wanda Ewing <wanda649@aol.com>; Susan Trautz <dstrautz81@gmail.com>; Linda Kuo <mynameiskuo@gmail.com>; Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Mary Price <dbodine@roadrunner.com>; Venk <vbcadambi@gmail.com>; Ivan Wong <ivan.f.wong@gmail.com>; charlie.xia.ca@gmail.com <charlie.xia.ca@gmail.com>; Angela Pai <angelapai88@yahoo.com>; antngu86@gmail.com <antngu86@gmail.com>; Tom Prince <des48@earthlink.net>; Issa Hsieh <yhsieh101@hotmail.com>; Frank Louie <fjlouie@hotmail.com>; frieda223@aol.com <frieda223@aol.com>; Chris Woolley <Yelloow7@aol.com>; Patti Childs <pkchilds2003@yahoo.com>; Kwang Cho <dr.kwangcho@gmail.com>; Jeff Liao <Perfectalliedhl@gmail.com>; jameslai88@msn.com <jameslai88@msn.com>; Tiger Neighbor <wjp1202@gmail.com>; Yahoo <garyzhou71@yahoo.com>; Karla Garcia <karla.garcia@propropmgmt.net>; Save Our Open Space <saveroyalvista@gmail.com>; assemblymember.chen@assembly.ca.gov <assemblymember.chen@assembly.ca.gov>; surprise.yi.min@gmail.com <surprise.yi.min@gmail.com>; Melissa <melmiamichelson@gmail.com>; Leslie Luque <amadbee2008@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: EIR Scoping Meeting Location Nov 1, 2022 at 6pm

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

My apologies to everyone, I mistyped Marie's email address from my initial email below. I made the correction in this email. Thank you.

Hello Marie,

Our community saw the notice that there will be a scoping meeting for EIR for the proposed development to build nearly 400 homes on Royal Vista Golf Course. We wanted to confirm date/time/location, so please provide that more through this email chain. In addition some of us will need to have other accomodations since we have a lot of seniors and elderly in our community, then there are those who are working and may not physically attend the Scoping meeting and may want to attend through another medium.

Also a big question came up about Diversity Housing and Low Income Housing as Josh Huntington talked to our community last time that if there are Inclusionary Housing for both Lower Income and Diversity proposed by the developer, then there will be a relief to the number of dwelling units or some kind of reduction. Our community has gathered that the project now has **ballooned in size from 321 homes to now 360 homes**. Our community feels the County Supervisors and the Planning department has either misled our community or there is some kind of misunderstanding.

In addition please let us know do we now direct letters of opposition to you now, since we were working with Peter Chou. I'm only a concerned voting constituent in the community, but we have a great group of ladies who

are on the To: line that you should have closer dialogue going forward with and be better in touch with as they are more in touch with Supervisor Solis's constituents as well and we all have big concerns with this proposed development and hopefully the County is not tone deaf with what the constituents desires are to keep Royal Vista Golf Course still as a vibrant and financially feasible operating golf course. Thank you Marie and I'm sure the community will be united and hopefully the County and the Supervisors will be united with us.

-Nat Apihunpunyakij-

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Edna Ashuncion <ed_asuncion@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 2:19 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; cchen@bos.lacountygov; contactsaserv@gmail.com
Subject: Royal Vista Open Space

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hello Madam Marie Pavlovic,

I'm concerned about the new housing that is being planned to be built on the Royal Vista Golf Course. I have lived at 20201 Wyn Terrace since November of 1997 and I saw first hand how the traffic congestion has grown. The noise, the pollution that the increased traffic has brought in has affected our commute and our health. The golf course is the only remaining place where we can breath fresh air because of it's green space. Also, we have wild rabbits and other wildlife that made the golf course their home. We have migrating birds such as wild ducks, geese and other kinds of birds that made the golf course their resting place. I personally guide back a wild mother duck and it's chicks to the fairway as they wander through the streets.

The new housing development would immensely increase the traffic congestion and more thrash in the neighborhood. Also, the golf course allows the rain water to permeate underground and recharge the water table which we badly need.

We do not want the new housing development and please consider our situation.

Very truly yours,

Edmundo and Edna Asuncion
20201 Wyn Terrace,
Walnut Ca. 91789

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: marianna breton <marianna2pep@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Serrano, Ryan
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Greetings.....my name is Marianna Breton and I am a 30 year resident, homeowner of Diamond Bar/Rowland Hts community. I am submitting my concern and opposition to the proposed housing development at the current Royal Oaks Golf Course. The project calls for construction of 300 dwelling units in an already heavily congested region of the county. A short 2 miles down the road on Golden Springs Rd at Grand is another large project occurring which commenced last year and continues involving heavy earth moving equipment, the removal of 50 old growth trees and shrubs, road expansion at the Diamond Bar Golf Course. Traffic at times is reduced to 1 lane in each direction creating a massive traffic jam at rush hour. Residents have endured this inconvenience for over 1 year and now another major project on Colima-Golden Springs to make our commute intolerable!

This proposed project will create noise, traffic, congestion and further deplete wildlife habitat of the Puente Hills Corridor. At present the area is home to raccoons, coyotes, squirrels, rabbits and migratory birds. Human habitation has already encroached into wildlife habitat in a very destructive manner. I no longer see deer grazing on the hillsides as I did twenty-thirty years ago, habitat has been destroyed by high density housing.

This housing project is to be constructed on Colima Blvd which is the alternative road that commuters use when the 60 freeway is backed up due to police activity or a collision. It is already heavily traveled and 300 additional housing units will only worsen the congestion and lead to more auto collisions and incidents involving pedestrians.

Another land use option must be considered not 300 high density housing units.
Marianna Breton

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Peter Butzloff <drpete@sinaputech.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 4:52 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com
Subject: Urgent Firebreak Concerns

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

To: Marie Pavlovic and team:

Please be advised of the significant concerns we all have about the potential loss of our watered clear space and firebreak in our neighborhood. The reason we live here is because of the reclaimed watered open space via an income balancing golf course, which in what is becoming an even worse fire danger region near a ridge subject to Santa Ana winds in an era of worsening drought and destructive climate change.

Adding more wooden housing with asphalt composite roofs will significantly destroy the perception of value and fire safety which attracts good people to this somewhat more fire-safe neighborhood.

Please do not fail to also understand the human impact as well. Anxiety and violence are abundantly associated with loss of open and green space in any urban and suburban area. Short term profits with envisioned tax revenues will collide with the loss of businesses as crime increases and stable income producing families move out of increasingly dangerous and vulnerable neighborhoods. Our property values will plummet. Do not sell off our biggest source of safety, stability, and neighborhood desirability by giving up our local golf course to meet economic rather than human based safety with recreational services and attractions with a good history and reasonable performance.

Sincerely,

Peter Butzloff, Ph.D
1510 Hallgreen Drive
Walnut, CA 91789

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Victor Chen <vchen0@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2022 5:19 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project NOP/NOS comments

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

I live right next to the golf course. WIth all the dirt that is being excavated. How do I know the air quality is safe for me and my child? My child has respiratory related difficulties. These are old homes that are not airtight. I do not want my home to be unsafe to breathe.

Should there be netting of a certain feet so that if excavating happens, the pollutants will not contaminate my home? My home sits 20 feet above the golf course.

The traffic on colima is already horrible. I believe it makes more sense to use underutilized commercial space, which already has a foundation to build homes. More homes walking distance to commercial spaces means less cars on the road.

Thanks

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Victor Chen <vchen0@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2022 3:57 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project NOP/NOS comments

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hi LA Planning Team.

I would like to add noise concern to the environmental study impact. Now in the era of post covid, many people work from home, so noise between the hours of 7am and 7pm will be an issue as I work from home with frequent conference calls. What is their plan in regards to noise mitigation so that I'm able to work at home without the use of a headset. As I shouldn't be negatively impacted on construction.

Also to elaborate on traffic, there have already been 2 deaths on south walnut leaf drive and colima. A traffic sign is necessary if more traffic is going to flow in that area to mitigate accidents that are bound to happen.

Also to elaborate on the air quality, they estimate construction if approved would take 3 years. Would I not be able to step outside to my backyard for 3 years or risk potentially health hazards? This is quite a leap to ask from existing homeowners that have no benefit from this project. We did not ask for this project.

Thanks,

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: James Chu <jameswchu@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 9:40 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Save Our Open Space
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Marie,

My name is James Chu and I am a resident of the Royal Vista Golf Course community.

I have many concerns regarding the environmental impact this proposed project will have on the residents within and surrounding the community.

Below are just a few of the concerning environmental impact issues the proposed project will have;

- Potential health hazards during soil removal and grading due to residual soil and groundwater contamination related to the legal use of agro-chemicals such as fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and fungicides over a long period of time. ;
- Increased harmful air pollution due to added numbers of vehicles;
- Increased traffic hazards due to added number of vehicles;
- Increased reliance on an already stressed public utility system;
- Loss of natural landscape and habitat that have made the Royal Vista Golf Course their homes for many years;

I hope the DRP takes the community's concerns seriously and objectively. There is a public perception that the DRP is biased towards the proposed project and the developer. We as taxpayers have a right to a fair process.

Thank you

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Barbara Donley <Bbdon007@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 7:43 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Royal Vista Residential Development

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

My wife and I have resided in the eastern portion of Rowland Heights for 48 years. We have seen and experienced a tremendous influx of residents and vehicles in our community. We are opposed to the current project that would allow more housing, traffic congestion, and the removal of open space in our community. We already experience traffic on Colima Road and lack of parking spaces at our local grocery market due to the increase population in Rowland Heights. We would like to go on record of opposing this project due to its negative environmental impact on the entire Rowland Heights, Walnut, Diamond Bar communities.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert G. Donley
2107 Pepperdale Drive Rowland Heights CA 91748
909 598 1011 Bbdon007@aol.com

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Nina Espinoza <ninaespinoz@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:48 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: PRJ2021-002011RoyalVistaDEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you to address my concern of the impact of the house development that is planned in our community. The noise, traffic, and the ecology impact to the wild life in our open space is terrifying and detrimental to the community.

The Police department and Sheriff department will be overwhelmed also with that amount of additional houses so the service to the community will be strained and deficient.

With all the respect Supervisor Hilda Solis and as one of your voter and who trust your judgment, I am writing to you once more to please oppose the rezoning of our community open space at Royal VistaGolf Course and help us to conserve our healthy, peaceful green open space.

Sincerely,

Nina Espinoza
Sent from my iPad

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Lauren Ewing <ewingmusic517@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 11:09 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; Moreno, Andrea; Serrano, Ryan; Chen, Cindy; ContactSaveRV@gmail.com
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Marie Pavlovic and Representatives,

Historically, Royal Vista Golf Course floods during periods of rain and there is a seasonal stream which flows heavily through the proposed development, as documented by the photo below taken January 2017. Paving over the permeable landscape that acts as a vital carbon sink, to build streets and houses would tragically divert the natural stream, to storm drains filled with contaminants flowing directly to the ocean. The streams and rain must be retained on site in order to replenish the Puente Basin aquifer. This is a serious environmental concern for the local and greater community.

There is an even greater concern regarding the climate crisis that scientists have been warning us about for years - we only have 8 years before our damage to the planet is irreversible. We are in the 6th great mass extinction, this time solely caused by humans. We are experiencing local extinction and loss of biodiversity which has a ripple effect on everything, such as our food and agriculture sources. This is a far greater concern than the "housing crisis." It is imperative that our representatives and officeholders act in compliance with the state and nationwide 30x30 program to save 30% of our land and waters by 2030. There are defunct malls and parking lots already paved that are perfectly suited for transit oriented development. This community is not in need of more single family homes. This community is park poor and in need of open space with clean air to breathe. When all the trees are cut down, all the open space is paved, creating an urban heat island effect, increasing greenhouse gases and pollutants, we will then realize we cannot breathe or live on money.



In partnership with the Royal Vista Open Space community, dedicated to preserving our last undeveloped acreage for current and future generations,

Ren Ewing

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: wanda649@aol.com <wanda649@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 3:07 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; David DeGrazia <DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov>; Susan Tae <stae@planning.lacounty.gov>; Alejandrina Baldwin <ABaldwin@planning.lacounty.gov>; Moreno, Andrea <amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov>; Thiel-Maiz, Eva <EMaiz@bos.lacounty.gov>; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe <GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov>; Serrano, Ryan <RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov>; Feldman, Benjamin <BFeldman@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Royal Vista NOP Scoping Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Good morning Marie,

We learned today that at least 2 Notices of Preparation (visible only to persons on foot) have been posted on Colima regarding project PRJ2021-002011-(1). Members of our community non profit organization RVOS, as well as our legal council, has asked DRP to be apprised of project updates a number of times. We were **not** informed that the developers application is deemed complete. Updated project documents, showing an increase of 38 units from the original plan to a total of 360 units including 88 duplexes and triplexes, are not available on https://planning.lacounty.gov/view/prj2021-002011 beginning on October 13, 2022 as the posted signs indicate.

The posted DRP signage allows only 15 days notice of the NOP scoping meeting November 1. **We are requesting 30 days notice to the public** of the NOP scoping meeting in order to prepare our comments on the environmental concerns regarding the project. The posted DRP signage allows the community only 2 days to submit translation requests by October 19, 2022. **We request translation of this NOP virtual meeting in Chinese, Korean and Spanish.** Additionally, many senior members of our community are not able to access or participate in online meetings. **We request an in person or hybrid meeting at the Rowland Heights Community Center for the NOP scoping meeting.**

Wanda Ewing

RHCCC Member

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Wanda Ewing <wanda649@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2022 4:09 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Joshua Huntington; Amy Bodek
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista NOP scoping/EIR

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

November 1, 2022

The proposed development on 76 acres of Royal Vista will have a substantial adverse effect on the acreage now zoned as open space. The EIR draft content should address the following:

Biological Resources - The land currently occupied by the golf course is a tree-filled green space that is a wildlife habitat, migration route and connectivity corridor to the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area 1.2 miles away. I have personally observed blue heron, coyotes, possums, cotton tail rabbits, racoons, foxes, skunks, frogs, great horned owls and barn owls. There are populations of Canada geese that appear in September and October migrating from Alaska and the north. They are dependent on the golf course lakes, feeding and wintering here. RV DEV drained the 2 lakes three weeks ago. The land owners have intentionally altered the environment before the draft EIR study. Biologists studying the land during the EIR will not be able to determine an accurate account of the migratory birds living here, which includes the protected swallows. Growing urbanization negatively impacts wildlife.

Air Quality and Green House Gas Emissions - Royal Vista is 1 mile from the 57/60 freeway junction, one of the worst freight congested interchanges in California, as well as the City of Industry's Goods Transit Corridor, both heavy carbon sources. This community is already at a heightened risk of poor health from vehicle pollutants. Removing the open space carbon sink with more development will further endanger the health of the residents of Rowland Heights.

Hydrology - The open space is a watershed with streams and lakes. Currently, 76 acres of rainwater and lake surface water permeates the open space filtering down into the Puente Basin Aquifer. Developing the land with streets and housing units will not allow water to penetrate the soil and will deplete the aquifer over time, especially during the drought. The golf course floods during periods of rain and the streams flow heavily.

Wildfire - The lakes, fed by the aquifer, are also a water source for LA and Orange County Fire Department air tankers fighting wildfires. The LA county fire department stated the golf course open space was a location for community members to gather during emergencies. The open space of the golf course is a buffer that provides protection from development in our very high risk wildfire zone.

Aesthetics- The proposed project does not conform to the surrounding neighborhood averages of 10,000 sq ft lots. The project is extremely dense with the addition of triplexes and duplexes. The view shed of the San Gabriel mountains will be altered by the project. The nighttime illumination of streetlights and house lighting and the daytime glare of project windows into my yard will alter the quality of life I have experienced for 43 years in this residence.

You requested my reasons for the above environmental studies. We are currently in the 6th mass extinction on earth due exclusively to human activity, and have lost 3 billion birds in North America in the past 50 years. I care deeply for the health and fate of our environment, which indigenous people understand is tied to health and fate of

ourselves and future generations. For those reasons, a careful study of the environmental effects is crucial before developing the last open space in park poor east Rowland Heights.

Wanda Ewing

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: vincent ferrara <4speedss@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:09 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Project no. Prj2021-0020211 Royal Vista

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Marie.
I'm writing to ask that the Royal Vista golf course not be rezoned and developed. The developers are already proceeding illegally, forcing my community to seek legal counsel. This town can not handle any more people, traffic,homes, crime and loss of nature. Is it rite to ruin a community so a developer can make more money? The greatest loss will be to the thousands of animals that live in the protected open space. We need our open space. Please help us protect what can never be replaced.
Thank you.
Vincent Ferrara

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Sue Fitch <randsfitch@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:51 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Royal Vista project!

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hi,
I am Sue Fitch. I have lived in Rowland Heights for 50 plus years! I am very concerned about this project coming to our community because the traffic is already so BAD I CAN'T believe how serious this project would impact the homeowners in so many disruptive ways! I and my neighbors are hoping you will consider our concerns and needs for the future! Thank you for listening to these special concerns!

Respectfully,
Sue Fitch

Sent from my iPhone

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: JG Galvey <jggalvey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 8:33 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic; Amy Bodek; David DeGrazia; Joshua Huntington; Moreno, Andrea; Thiel-Maiz, Eva; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe; Serrano, Ryan; Chen, Cindy
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Madam Marie Pavlovic and other respected leaders:

I am a resident living in the area of the Royal Vista Golf Course/Club in Rowland Heights unincorporated community, which is now being considered for a housing development. I would like to respectfully request you to consider our community's petition of not allowing the housing development to proceed due to numerous and severe environmental impact this would cause.

Converting the Royal Vista Golf Course to residential will bring more congestion and traffic. The Developer is proposing for 360 units. Assuming each unit/family has 2 vehicles, that will bring additional at least 720 vehicles within a 5 mile radius. In reality and with the current environment, that number of vehicles will be greater. With that said, it will increase traffic, noise and air pollution. This will also impact the current and surrounding residents quality of life.

Royal Vista is the last sizable green-space in the community, and development will destroy the wildlife habitat (geese, swallows, rabbits, other bird species, etc.) and corridor to the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA). And loss of green space contributing to climate crisis with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will limit ground permeability for rain water, and further deplete the water table.

According to the LA County Fire Department, communities need open spaces to serve as a fire break, and evacuation point. The lakes on Royal Vista are used as a source of water for air tankers to fight our increasingly frequent fires due to drought.

The 3+ years of construction noise and moving enormous amount of earth is significant, causing fugitive dust, increasing airborne fungal spores which can cause valley fever & harm the health of the community, especially individuals with an impaired immune system, and respiratory or heart conditions.

Having to live near the course and surrounding greenery, it brings cool breeze and fresh air to our neighborhood. I am hoping that you will consider and listen to the sentiments of the current residents in this area in regards to this project.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Jose Galvey

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Coleen Garcia <coleengarcia33@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:11 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Royal Vista flooding

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Mr. Pavlovic,

I hope you're doing well. I would like to share with some pictures with you from flooding on the Royal Vista GC in 2017.







Please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,
Coleen García
Morning Sun Ave
908-964-5933

Sent from my iPhone

Shelley Gentry
1223 Calboure Drive ♦ Diamond Bar, CA 91789
Email: ShelleyG5@msn.com

October 31, 2022

Via Email: mpavlovic@planning.lacounty,gov

LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Attn: Marie Pavlovic

Re: Scoping Meeting Tuesday November 1, 2022
Applicant: RV DEV LLC
Project No.: PRJ2021-002011/ Plan Amendment No. 2021004860 / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 83534 / TR83534

Dear Ms. Pavlovic,

I am writing to you regarding the Scoping Meeting for the Applicant and Project number set forth above.

First, I would be remiss if I failed to point out that RV DEV LLC has no legal right to develop anything but a golf course on the proposed land for this project. I am sure you are already aware, the property owner can sell the property if they wish, but the property needs to operate as a golf course until 2036, as stated in the deed restrictions on the property. Just as I am required, as a homeowner, to comply with any deed restrictions, easements and the like that exist on my property, the landowner for the golf course needs to comply with the conditions that exist on his property. See the attached Exhibit A, and note the parcels in blue that are deed restricted. Los Angeles County is in no position to provide special dispensation to the owners of the golf course when it comes to deed restrictions, especially when doing so will have a negative affect on hundreds of other homeowners as a result. I am also confused as to why the Environmental Study is moving forward before the project has even been approved.

The problems with the proposed project are too vast to cover in one letter, so I will limit my input to the objections I feel are most important. These items will cause irreversible damage to property value and will put homeowners in peril. Potential environmental effects I will discuss fall into the following categories: a.) Air Quality, b.) Transportation, c.) Land Use and Planning, d.) Noise, e.) Population and Housing and f.) Recreation.

This project is unique in the aspect that it is not one single piece of land that is being developed as is usually the case. Instead, it's 5 separate parcels that are dispersed within 6 different residential neighborhoods that were fully developed long ago, with at least one starting in the early 1960's. This project will not just disturb a handful of homes on one side of Colima or the other, but instead intrudes on small parcels throughout several city blocks in the middle of long established neighborhoods which will for years have to deal with the dust, dirt, noise and other inconveniences that take place during construction projects. Afterwards homeowners will be living with overcrowding, traffic gridlock, increased air pollution and on various blocks within their neighborhood, aesthetics will be a patchwork of older construction and new construction that, when looking at the plan, makes no effort whatsoever to "blend in" with the existing environment.

When looking at the plan, it appears the old and new construction is separated by 75 foot wide "buffer zones", which the developer plans to market as "walking trails". These trails will invite the entire general public to meander through all the existing neighborhood homes, some of which are left with fully exposed backyards that were originally designed with the purpose of enjoying the once open space of the golf course on private land. The trails will encourage the general public to gawk into the backside of homes, robbing the owners of any privacy and instead providing them noise and disruption. This exposure increases the likelihood of crime, such as break-ins to these homeowners, since the rear entry access to their homes will be accessible to the general public, especially at night when the "trails" will provide a less obvious point of entry to the property. While "walking trails" are a marketing gimmick for the land developer's benefit, I'm pretty sure they don't live in a home backed up to one.

Another, and honestly puzzling feature of the "walking trails", is the area where the general public will be drawn to and encouraged to cross over to the opposite side of Colima Road on foot. Its puzzling to me because the current owners of the golf course property and Los Angeles County are well aware of the dangers at the light and crosswalk that the plan is going to drive even more foot traffic to. Attached hereto, please see Exhibit B, which is an article from the local Patch news, detailing the horrific ordeal of the Park family, who lost Lisa Park in 2017 when she was killed by a hit and run driver in that very crosswalk. She left behind a grieving husband and children, who sued the golf course, Los Angeles County, and the golf cart manufacture. As Ms. Park's family pointed out, Ms. Park was not the first, nor will she be the last to be killed or injured there. As a resident of this area for the last 22 years, I have long been aware of the danger. I have witnessed first-hand many people blow through the traffic light at this crosswalk, as if it did not exist. Yet the developer thinks it's a good idea to drive more foot traffic there, especially when you consider the additional 700 to 800 cars this development will bring into the area. Los Angeles County, the current property owner, and now the developer have been on notice about this condition, and yet instead of taking the time to mitigate an existing danger, they seek to exasperate the danger by increasing both foot and auto traffic there.

When crossing to the north side of Colima, you will enter onto a small scrap of land I can only surmise was unsuitable for homebuilding. The developer is proposing to develop the land as a park and then gifting the park to Los Angeles County to operate. The backyard of my home in the city of Diamond Bar backs to the east middle corner of this land.

The plan for the park is completely flawed. Was the land looked at in person or was just a map showing the land used? A map of the proposed park is attached hereto as Exhibit C, for ease of reference. The east side of the land, which backs to homes in the city of Diamond Bar was build in the early 1960's. The homes that overlook the golf course are all at or close to ground level with the golf course, and many have very small backyard setbacks (maybe 15-20 feet max) to enhance the view. From the Colima entrance, to near to the center of the land on that east side runs a county storm drainage system. Being an older area, electrical wires are not buried in the ground, but instead wires are on polls that then attach to high voltage lines at the end of the property lines, many of which are above the storm drainage system. Just north of the center east corner, there is an opening that is a buffer zone between the older Diamond Bar houses and the elevated newer homes that belong to a different housing development in Rowland Heights. The buffer zone is not well known and runs behind more homes on Calbourne Drive in Diamond Bar. It ends at Walnut Drive, and is not visible to the general public. This path between old and new is often used by coyotes who travel the path to reach the storm drain, as it's their source of water. I am not a fan of coyotes, but I acknowledge that we have to co-exist with them.

Despite homes being ground level (and easily accessible from the golf course), a storm drain system, overhanging high voltage wires and a path that coyotes use, the park plan shows this corner area as the perfect place for the 5- to 12-year-old play area. It should be obvious to everyone that this is a clear and present danger for everyone involved. Should a play area be built yards in front of someone's ground level

backyard? Near the storm drain? Near high voltage wires? Near a path used by coyotes? The plan does not include any fencing to protect existing homes and homeowners, but does show plantings including many tall trees. Tall trees near high voltage wires? I am not understanding the logic. Even the current golf course had sense enough to configure its current golf cart path on the complete opposite side of the proposed play area, where the path is well below homes that are elevated and somewhat protected by a steep slope between them and the golf course. It seems obvious that the golf course realized it was not a good idea to drive traffic into someone's unprotected backyard. Let's also keep in mind that the golf course is on private land, has signage warning not to trespass and a locked entrance at Colima every evening. Golfers identify themselves and pay to play golf at Royal Vista. The golf course does not invite the general public to come and just "hang out" on the course, and the course is regularly monitored by a golf course marshall throughout the day, benefits afforded to homeowners now, that the county park will not provide.

Building a park that abuts to someone's ground level backyard will also have an adverse effect on the value of every single property on the Diamond Bar side.

The homes will be stripped of all privacy, compounded by the aforementioned walking trails whose aim is drive even more foot traffic through the park. Worse, these homes will become completely unsafe, with homeowners no longer able to feel secure in their own homes. Statistics support the fact that parks have become crime magnets, and Los Angeles County does not have a good track record of keeping their parks safe and under control, coupled that with the slow response times of the overworked Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and you've created a situation that is untenable. Many of my neighbors are elderly and already venerable, with the possibility of a county park on the other side of the back fence is leaving people in the most desperate of situations, and this group is least able to just up and relocate when things get bad.

To further devalue homes on Calbourne Drive, the proposed plan for the condominiums on Walnut Drive proports that all the additional traffic these condominiums will create can easily be handled by Fairway Drive. This plan fails to acknowledge that Walnut Drive is a small residential street that will quickly become overwhelmed with the addition of over 100 cars in the already tight area. Once the traffic becomes overwhelming, cars will begin to turn the opposite direction and proceed up Calbourne Drive, also a small residential street, but has a traffic light, to get to Golden Springs (called Colima in Rowland Heights.) It saddens me to think that the county of Los Angeles would approve a project that would have such a detrimental effect on my property by leaving the back of my property unsafe and susceptible to break-ins and other crimes and at the same time creating a traffic nightmare outside the same home's front yard adding to the pollution already caused by my home's proximity to the 60 freeway.

Lastly, I'd like to point out that the properties that abut to the park will be even more noisy than they are now. There is already existing noise from the 60-freeway traffic and it's helicopter fly overs every morning and evening during the weekdays. We hear the local train horns at all hours of the day and night, even with double pane windows. The park will add quite a bit of additional noise, especially with play areas just feet away from the backyard, and taking away the quite enjoyment of my property which I am able to enjoy today.

Respectfully,

Shelley Gentry

Shelley Gentry
1223 Calbourne Drive
Walnut, CA 91789

Email: ShelleyG5@msn.com

EXHIBIT A



Red=sold White=sold Blue=escrow Yellow=for sale

EXHIBIT B

Golf Course Death Triggers Flurry of Lawsuits

By Brandi Shaffer | November 8, 2017

FacebookTwitterPinterestLinkedInShare

Lisa Park, 59, was killed after the golf cart she was driving across a street at the Royal Vista Golf Club in Walnut, Calif., was hit by a car. The driver of the car was never identified, and Park's family has filed lawsuits against the club, the county, the construction company that renovated that portion of the golf course, and the golf cart manufacturer.

The family of a woman who died from injuries sustained in a golf cart hit and run is suing both the Royal Vista Golf Club in Walnut, Calif., and the golf cart manufacturer, the *Rancho Santa Margarita* (Calif.) *Patch* reported.

Lisa Park, 59, was playing a round of golf with her husband at the club when she noticed that she'd left her golf club at the 4th hole. Park drove her cart across the street, which had a signalized crosswalk, to get it, *Patch* reported.

After grabbing her club, she returned across the roadway toward the 5th hole when a westbound car collided with her cart, causing injuries that led to her death the following day. The driver and the car were never identified or caught, *Patch* reported.

Park left behind her husband, James, and two adult children, Jessica and Peter Park, who are now suing the Royal Vista Golf Club and Los Angeles County, according to the Los Angeles Superior Court lawsuit filed Friday. The suit, which seeks unspecified damages, also names as defendants Eagle Golf Construction Inc., which renovated part of the golf course, and Textron Inc., which manufactured the golf cart in which Park was riding, *Patch* reported.

Representatives for the defendants could not be immediately reached by *Patch.*

The lawsuit alleges that despite a history of prior fatal accidents involving Royal Vista golfers crossing in the same or surrounding area, Royal Vista and Eagle Golf did not provide safer alternatives such as a bridge or tunnel. The suit also alleges that Los Angeles County is negligent for not providing proper warnings to drivers that golfers cross at that location, and because the 45 mph speed limit is excessive given that so many carts cross there during the day, *Patch* reported.

"Golfers traveling by golf cart are particularly vulnerable as their movement is restricted and they are limited in their ability to make quick evasive maneuvers," the suit said.

The suit further alleges that Textron is liable because the golf cart did not have seat belts or other restraints that could have prevented Park's ejection, *Patch* reported.

EXHIBIT C


West
60 FREEWAY
East
Homes elevated from golf course
Original/Newer Build Buffer zone
1223 Calbourne Dr., Diamond Bar
LEGEND
1. EXISTING SIDEWALK
2. OVERLOOK PLAZA
3. SMALL PICNIC PAVILION
4. 8' TRAIL
5. OUTDOOR EXERCISE EQUIPMENT
6. 6-12 YEAR OLD CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA
7. 1-5 YEAR OLD CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA
8. BENCH SEATING OVERLOOK
9. GROUP PICNIC GATHERING PAVILION
10. LOUNGE SEATING OVERLOOK
11. ACTIVITY LAWN
12. KING OF THE HILL LAWN SLOPE
13. ADA PARKING
14. PARENT LOUNGE AREA
15. CHILDREN'S SLIDE
16. SAND BOX PLAY AREA
17. EXISTING RESIDENTIAL
18. BIKE PARKING
19. PARKING LOT
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
TREE PLANTING LEGEND
LIMIT OF WORK
LOT 4
LIMIT OF WORK
Storm Drain
ONSITE TREE PLANTING COUNT
Lot 4
Total LF of external street frontage on Colima: 4,309 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 172.36
Total number of external street trees on E. Walnut Drive South provided: 174
Total LF of external street frontage on Tierra Luna: 193 LF
Total tree required at 1 tree per 25 LF of frontage: 7.72
Total number of external street trees on Tierra Luna provided: 8
Homes elevated from the golf course
Houses located at golf course level
Above Ground Power Lines
COLIMA ROAD
KEY MAP

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Marilyn Hewlett <dignamm@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 5:21 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

I am writing to express my adamant opposition to the Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project. I have lived in my home since 1976 and have witnessed many changes to Rowland Heights and surrounding communities over the years. There have been other attempts by different developers in the past to change the zoning outlined in the 1981 Rowland Heights Community General Plan, from agriculture (open spaces) to various zones for residential. LA Department of Planning and the LA Board of Supervisors should by now realize that this project is opposed by the majority of Rowland Heights and surrounding community residents.

Some of our major concerns include major traffic congestion on Fairway Drive, Colima Road and Lemon. Those roads are overly congested right now. More traffic will result in more accidents/injuries. We are concerned about the loss of open spaces and the quality of life afforded by same. We see a decrease in current property values, since homes on and around the golf course are more desirable than those in congested developments. We fear less police, fire and emergency protection services. We anticipate more crime that comes with more densely populated neighborhood areas. We are concerned that the proposed tiny parks in this development will attract more homeless folks. Where is the water coming from to support these almost 360 new homes? We anticipate major rate increases for this precious commodity. This development will cause destruction of the current wildlife habitat these open spaces currently provide. During construction years we will be constantly disrupted by and exposed to noise, pollution, hazardous materials, cancer causing chemicals, construction traffic and other inconveniences.

Attempts by developers in the past have been rejected because the LA Department of Planning and the Board of Supervisors members have listened to the residents in our community who oppose development of the golf course for some of the reasons outlined above. Of course there are many other issues that have been expressed and I hope you have sincerely listened to the concerns of residents here. People who support this project include the owners of the golf course, the property developers and contractors, sales agents and, of course, the county people who get to spend the massive tax dollars that will be generated by this new development. Once this project is approved and completed, those people will be gone and happily spending their money, leaving us residents is a congested mess. It is not right.

Please stand with our community to reject this project in its entirety.

Thank You,

Marilyn Hewlett
20360 Lake Canyon Drive
Walnut, CA 91789

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: thewl62452@aol.com
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 8:50 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL / PARKS PROJECT

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

This is to express my sincere opposition to the proposed project to develop what is considered open spaces at the Royal Vista Country Golf Course.

This proposed project will add to the current traffic hazard now experienced on Colima Road. Other concerns are loss of wild life habitat, more problems for the police, fire department and or emergency services.

Please help our community stay as it is. We enjoy our open spaces.

This project would only benefit the developers. They do not reside in this area. It is a money grab at the expense of us the home owners that have lived in the community for years.

Please stand with us and our community and reject this project.

T J Hewlett
20360 Lake Canyon Drive
Walnut, Ca. 91789

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Linda Himes <familycat2@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 3:27 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic; Joshua Huntington; abodek@plamnning.lacounty.gov; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Serrano, Ryan; cntactsaverrv@gmail.com
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To whom it may concern:
I have been a resident of Rowland Heights since 1977. Having lived and worked in this community for over 40 years, I have seen tremendous residential growth and the elimination of almost every empty space in our community. Even our hilltops, which were to be preserved according to our community plan, have been built upon.
I have concerns on many fronts:
Potentially Significant Impacts:

- Aesthetics: The current golf course provides significant aesthetic value to our community. As you drive or walk down Colima Road, The open space is an oasis in a very built-up town. It provides a place of calm and open green spaces dotted with trees. It helps to maintain the rural atmosphere outlined in our community plan and a break between all the business and residential growth.
- Air Quality: With the heavy traffic on Colima Road as well as the proximity of the 60 and 57 freeways, we are already subject to much pollution. Additional housing adds to the congestion. the removal of trees and grass eliminates a source of oxygen and a place where carbon dioxide can be mitigated. The San Gabriel Vallet was named the valley of smokes by indigenous peoples for a reason. This valley traps harmful pollutants. We need every tree and open space we can have. we need fewer, not more cars, trucks, and housing.
- Geology and Soils: I am not a geologist. I do know that between 1979 and 1984 Ybarra elementary School (Now Ybarra Academy) suffered from flooding due to underground streams under the golf course. Several years ago, there was a significant landslide near Chapel Hill and Morning Sun. The homes had to be evacuated. There are a significant number of underground streams flowing under this area. Grading and earth removal could expose disruption in these flows. We live close to the Puente Hills fault and liquefaction is a concern, especially with additional grading.
- Greenhouse gas emissions: I worry not only about GHG emissions during construction but the increase in GHG emissions caused by heavier traffic and more cars idling while waiting during peak traffic times.
- Hydrology and Water quality: The golf course provides a natural space for water to be returned to the existing water table. I understand that Royal Vista has it's own well water that is pumped for irrigation. Additional homes using that water would significantly impact the levels in underground wells which in turn may lead to lowering of land levels like we have seen in Central California. We are already in a huge drought. Adding additional homes in this area is a significant impact on the available water supply.
- Land Use and Planning: Changing the zoning changes the character of our community as outlined in our Community Plan. We chose to live here in Rowland Heights because of the open hills, the feeling of not living among millions. The open space was a promise to us who bought here. To change zoning laws for profit is wrong.

- Transportation/Traffic: Colima Road is the one main street that runs through Rowland Heights. While the building of Pathfinder has taken some of the traffic off of Colima, that second choice ends as you approach Brea Canyon Cutoff/Fairway. Drivers get back onto Colima at either Nogales or Fairway/Bread Canyon Cutoff. The traffic here is extremely heavy. In the afternoons, it is blocked from Calbourne to Grand Avenue. The off and onramps at Lemon back up into Rowland Heights. This makes it difficult for emergency vehicles and creates more pollution and noise.
- Utilities and Services: There is already not enough water for our community.
- Wildfires: We live near the hills with few exit roads. There have been several fires in the Puente /Chino Hills, some just over the hill in Diamond Bar.

We are not living in isolation here in Rowland Heights. Our neighboring communities of Industry and Walnut, continue to build upon what was a few years ago open space. the project to expand the 57/60 interchange has taken out miles of trees. Surely, we can find a way to maintain this little piece of open space. Looking at the parking lot at the golf course daily, I question the judgement that a golf course is not financially feasible. But, if it cannot remain a golf course, then surely, we can find creative ways to maintain this open space with a natural habitat, wildlife sanctuary, or park. While traveling in Virginia, and Massachusetts, I was heartened by the communities' foresight as I walked through multiple areas where they set aside land to preserve the area's plant and animal habitats. These designated areas reduce traffic, pollution, and do much to enhance the lives of the humans who live and visit.

Sincerely,
Linda Himes
Candleflame Court, Walnut
91789

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: JH, JYH <anotherworld07@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 5:12 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

* Visit https://saveroyalvista.com/nop/ for more information

Reasons to Save Our Open Space:

• Development will increase **traffic, noise, crime, pollution** (greenhouse gasses) and overuse area resources including water.

• According to the LA County Fire Department, communities need open spaces to serve as a fire break, and evacuation point. The lakes on Royal Vista are used as a source of water for air tankers to fight our **increasingly frequent fires due to drought**.

• 3+ years of construction noise and moving **1,000 olympic swimming pools** of earth is significant, causing **fugitive dust, increasing airborne fungal spores which can cause valley fever & harm the health of the community**, especially individuals with an impaired immune system, and respiratory or heart conditions.

• **Royal Vista is the last sizable green-space in the community**, and development will destroy the wildlife habitat and corridor to the **Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area** (SEA)

• **Development will contribute to the climate crisis**, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will **limit ground permeability for rain water**, and further **deplete the water table**.

Thank you,

Jerry Hsieh
Monday - Friday, 10:30am - 6:00pm

16057 Kaplan Ave | City of Industry, CA 91744 | Phone: (626) 410-8159

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Todd Hsu <todd@epochnetwork.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:39 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com
Subject: Royal Vista Proposed Development Environment Concerns

Importance: High

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Local Representatives,

My name is Todd Hsu, and I reside here in Walnut, where the proposed Royal Vista development will directly impact my family and other residents' quality of life. I am totally against the proposed project due to many environmental concerns.

I moved to this area 5 years ago because of my love for the golf course and the mild local traffic. The proposed development will bring on many undesirable consequences. Colima/Golden Spring traffic will have an additional influx of thousands of cars; more traffic lights will have to be installed to regulate this traffic, causing more delays from point to point. The overcrowded local school in the area, such as Ybarra Academy, will see more crowded classrooms and affect the quality of education for our children.

Last but not least, the environment will be significantly affected. We have no water, and our power grid cannot handle the current load, let alone more homes. The development will also destroy wildlife's natural habitats, generating more crime and pollution. The local residents will have to pay the most significant consequence of this environmental impact! Imagine if this proposed development is at your home. Would you agree with it?

Sincerely,

Todd Hsu
Walnut Resident, LA County

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: CJ L <jochristina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 1:52 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com
Subject: re: Royal Vista Gold Course Development

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hi,
My name is Christina Jo, and we live on Tam Oshanter Dr, directly above the greens of Royal Vista Golf Course. For a long time, my family has had concerns with the development of the green fields in our neighborhood.
We are extremely concerned for the traffic and noise this development will bring to our community. Certainly, wildlife in this large piece of land will inevitably be destroyed with this development.
For our family, our biggest concern of all is our three-year-old son who is suffering from allergies and respiratory issues that are still being evaluated and treated. We take daily walks very early in the morning, and we cannot imagine doing such things during the several years of construction.

This has been our home for 23 years (for many of our neighbors, it has been longer). Please consider the many challenges the people of this community and the wildlife will suffer because of this development.

Sincerely,
Christina Jo

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Linda Kuo <mynameiskuo@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 11:00 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Re: responses to community questions

Hi Marie,

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

A few questions for you.

Is it possible to have a scoping meeting if the application has not been deemed complete?

What is the mailing requirement for a public meeting? Is it 30 days before a public meeting?

Regards,

Linda

On Fri, Sep 30, 2022 at 5:08 PM Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov> wrote:

> Hello Linda,
> Thank you for distributing my reply.
>
> Due to the five meeting limit, we have switched from Subdivision Committee meetings held for every tentative map submittal for all projects to Interdepartmental Subdivision Team (IST) meetings held following a tentative map submittal only if requested by the applicant. Subdivision Committee meetings were open to the public, IST meetings are not.
>
> You are correct that the five-meeting limit does not apply to projects that are inconsistent with the General/Area/Community/Specific Plan. However, the operational move to IST team meetings applies to all projects regardless of a particular project's consistency with an applicable plan. The Subdivision Committee meetings suspension is announced on our website: https://planning.lacounty.gov/agenda/sc.
>
> At this time, the application has not been deemed complete.
>
> Kind regards,

MARIE PAVLOVIC, AICP

SENIOR PLANNER, Subdivisions
Office: (213) 974-6433 • Direct: (213) 893-7003
Email: mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012
planning.lacounty.gov

Our field offices are currently open to the public. Please visit planning.lacounty.gov for information about available services, public meeting schedules, and planning projects.

From: Linda Kuo <mynameiskuo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 11:06 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Re: responses to community questions

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Marie,

Thank you for the below email. I was not aware you were waiting for a point of contact. I would have reached out to you sooner if I had known. I have forwarded your email to the stakeholders that were present at the August 16th meeting.

Regarding the limit of number of public meetings per SB 330 , it is my understanding that this limit does not apply to discretionary projects that require legislative approval (i.e. approval from Board of Supervisors) to general plan amendment, specific plan adoption or amendment, or zoning amendment. Please advise if I have misinterpreted SB330.

In addition, has the application been deemed complete by Planning? If it has, please provide the date the application has been deemed complete.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,

Linda Kuo

On Mon, Sep 26, 2022 at 4:36 PM Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov> wrote:

Hello Linda,

I meant to provide responses earlier to questions raised at the community meeting held in August. I was waiting for community point of contact information which never reached me, so I'm sending the responses to you with the hope that you can distribute the info to your neighbors. Please let me know if I should direct this email to another person(s) charged with organizing the community effort.

When we gathered, members of the community asked whether meetings regarding Subdivision Committee review would be reopening to the public and if a certain number of new housing units are required in Rowland Heights. As of now, we are not holding Subdivision Committee meetings to ensure the County complies with the state limitation on the number of public meetings/hearings held for the processing of a housing development project pursuant to State law. We do convene Interdepartmental Subdivision Team meetings, which are not open to the public and are only held at the request of the applicant to go over Subdivision Committee Report comments. The Subdivision Committee Reports are posted on the Department's website.

Here is a link to the Royal Vista project page which contains the Subdivision Committee Reports issued for the project: https://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/prj2021-002011

As for the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation, it is not broken down by community. The Countywide number for the unincorporated area is 90,052 (36,533 market-rate units and 53,519 affordable units). The following break-

down is excerpted from the County's Housing Element which is a component of the General Plan:

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), as the regional planning agency, is responsible for allocating the RHNA to each local jurisdiction within its six-county region. For the Sixth Revision of the Housing Element, the County has been allocated a RHNA of 90,052 units for unincorporated Los Angeles County, which is broken down as follows:

- Extremely Low/Very Low Income (up to 50 percent of Area Median Income [AMI]): 25,648 units (28.5 percent)
- Low Income (up to 80 percent of AMI): 13,691 units (15.2 percent)
- Moderate Income (up to 120 percent of AMI): 14,180 units (15.7 percent)
- Above Moderate Income (more than 120 percent of AMI): 36,533 units (40.6 percent)

Found on pg 3 Executive Summary or pg 187 Table III-35.

Link to Housing Element: https://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/housing_revised_housingelement-20220517.pdf

As always, please reach out if you have any follow up questions.

Thank you,

MARIE PAVLOVIC, AICP
SENIOR PLANNER, Subdivisions
Office: (213) 974-6433 • Direct: (213) 893-7003
Email: mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, 13th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90012
planning.lacounty.gov

Our field offices are currently open to the public. Please visit planning.lacounty.gov for information about available services, public meeting schedules, and planning projects.

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Linda Kuo <mynameiskuo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 9, 2022 1:15 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic; First District; Save Our Open Space
Subject: Royal Vista Housing Development Scoping Comments

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Marie,

Below are my scoping comments regarding the Royal Vista Housing Development.

1. Total grading has now increased from 2.2 to 3.6 million cubic yards. This is an extremely large volume of earthwork. One square mile by one yard is the size of 3 million cubic yards. How long is this going to take? Four months, eight months, one year, two years? A couple of residents have contracted Valley Fever, a fungal infection which attacks the respiratory tract the last time homes were built in this area. I believe that some of the residents will get sick if the soil is disturbed again.

I would like to know the mitigation protocols to ensure that we will not contract Valley Fever or other fungal airborne diseases such as mucormycosis. With mucormycosis, this fungal, often found in soil, is deadly for people with weak immune systems. We have an assisted living facility less than half a mile from the site with many older residents in their 80s and 90s. The grading proposed could be deadly for these residents. We are talking about people's health and lives here. Rowland Heights demands environmental justice. We all have a right to a healthy living environment. This is a basic human right that the county needs to protect.

2. Wet soil and groundwater – wet soil was found as shallow as 2.5 feet on the north side of the course near where the two ponds were drained two months ago. When there is a heavy storm, you can see sheets of water flowing from the south side to the north side of the golf course which is at a lower elevation. The water collects on the north side of the course and this is why the soil wet at 2.5 feet. This is also why one of the ponds that was drained two months ago is now filled with water. The golfers tell me there are ducks swimming in the pond again.

With the quantity of earth movement and wet soil, there are concerns of possible landslides on some of the existing homes in the Harvest Estates development which is right next to the proposed development. This is a disaster in the making. I urged the planning department to

carefully perform due diligence on these matters to prevent health issues, possible landslides and sinking houses in the future.

Regards,

Linda Kuo

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Lan La <laphoi@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 5:30 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com

Subject: Royal Vista Open Space

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Los Angeles Planning Committee,

I am a resident of the Los Angeles Royal Vista (Rowlands Height) for over 25 years. I am enjoying living this area, especially the green golf course surrounding the Colima Road and Walnut Leaf, that keep the temperature a few degrees cooler in the summer time and it please the eyes when walk by or drive by .

I am concerned about the proposed new residential development in this neighborhood. I live around Wyn Terrance and Walnut Leaf Street, and it takes a long time to turn left onto the Colima Road as of today. I can't imaging what the traffic will be like when thousands of new residents to move in with this proposed development. That will cause traffic nightmare, noise, pollution, crime and harm to wildlife (rabbits) in this neighborhood.

I am oppose this proposed new development. Please keep the Royal Vista open space!

Thank you for your consideration in this matter!

Regards,
Lan L
Royal Vista Resident

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: ccc <tiger911411@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 10:22 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: EIR on Royal Vista Golf Course

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Marie Pavlovic
LA County Regional Planning
Subdivisions Section

Dear Marie,

My name is Caroline Lam resides in Padrino Ave, Walnut→in The Royal Vista Golf Course.

I am writing to express my concern about the new houses and apartments that might be approved to build in my community.

Especially, the planning map showed my backyard will be a Park instead of an open space with view that I am now enjoying very much.

I bought the house in 1990 because of the nice open space!

I would appreciate if you could consider all residents in this area that their life will be impact horribly because of the new houses that bring so many people to the area that mess The traffic, The environment, etc ...

BLOCK the case! Thank you.

Rgds.

Caroline Lam

Resident in Royal Vista
golf course

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: miuyyc6@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 5:13 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic; Amy Bodek; David DeGrazia; Joshua Huntington; Moreno, Andrea; Thiel-Maiz, Eva; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe; firstdistrict@bos.county.gov
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To Marie Pavlovic, LA County Regional Planning and fellow planning and Solis staffs:

I'm a concern citizen of Rowland Heights and a concern citizen of LA county environmental health. And I also understand the importance of having a balance development for county growth and the impact global warming has that affecting our present and our future. I'm in disagreement with taking away the open space and changing the zoning to building 360+ units that are $800,000 to over $1,000,000 housing due to environmental concerns and I believe LA County has better options than taking away this open space that is really needed for the community and benefiting the developer's financial greed.

There will be significant impact to all the aspects related to the community environment!

1. Asethetics - No concrete cement block can replace the green aesthetics of open space. Even though the developer claimed they will hv lightings, decoration, etc which will only further stress on utilities, energy and water.
2. Agriculture/ Forestry - there are many valuable old trees in this open space and taking them down will definitely hurt the environment
3. Air Quality - heat will be trapped in the concrete during summer and without the open space and the trees, air quality can only get worse. With over 360+ household, with average 3 cars per household that over 1000 cars driving on the road along 60 Fwy, Colima and the local streets, carbon monoxide emission further affect the air quality of LA county.
4. Biological resources - there are many wild animals taking this open space as their home. Without the water and trees, the county and the developer are killing them. WHY IS THE DEVELOPER DRAINING THE POOLS OF WATER IN THE OPEN SPACE NOW BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT?
5. Cultural Resources - many in the community and around the LA County use the golf course and the club house for various events. Local Middle school and High school use this for their team training. LA County Recreation and Parks host summer events here for the neighborhood kids. Many organization use this golf course for fund raising. Many neighbors' wedding and banquet take place at the club house. PLEASE DO NOT LET THE DEVELOPER TAKE AWAY THIS IMPORTANT CULTURAL RESOURCES FOR OUR COMMUNITY.
6. Energy/ Soil / Greenhouse Gas Emissions - Needless to say, by taking out the open space and replace with 360+ higher density housing of triplex and duplex will increase greenhouse gas emissions, affect energy consumption in the neighborhood.
7. Noise / Transportation / Traffic - Noise level will definitely increase with additional 1000+ cars and the population running around the area. The freeway access near the open space is Lemon and Fairway. And Lemon access is really a major problem at peak hours with all the trucks coming from City of Industry. There have been numerous accidents due to the access to 60W from Lemon North bound needed a left turn that has no signal to direct the traffic and the same vice versa from 60E access, consequently created a big blind spot for making those turns. There is huge back up on Lemon already without the additional 360+ housing.
8. Public Services, Utilities and Services - There have been many reports that LA Sheriff was not able to attend situation happened in Rowland Heights. The report time for Sheriff in response to calls are very slow and some reports reflect over an hour. We all try to conserve water, and Rowland water district will further stressed with the water consumption with additional 360+ households, so is the public services in this neighborhood.
9. Land use / Planning - The developer purchase this open space knowing it is open space and paid the open space land price. For them to try to convert this golf course to be 360+ housing is totally neglecting this community and straightly for their own financial interest. (Sending notification to only 500 yds -1000 yds is a reflection of their

selfish intend) Once this is rezone, the other parts of land owners are all considering to change to building housing for financial interest and neglect the environmental impact and cultural impact to this community.

10. Recreation - The proposed plan from the developer of walking path, some area of playground, etc. is a joke when compare to keeping the golf course and the club house for the community recreation, holding events, fund raising, school team training and kids learning ground. WE REALLY NEED TO KEEP THIS OPEN SPACE FOR THE COMMUNITY, FOR THE LA COUNTY RESIDENTS, INCLUDING HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CITY OF WALNUT, CITY OF DIAMOND BAR, CITY OF INDUSTRY, AND OTHERS THAT TRAVEL TO ROYAL VISTA GOLF COURSE.

I hope the LA County planning team can see that with all these environmental impacts, the zone should really remains as open space and not side with the developer whose only interest is their financial benefits.

It will really call into question if the Board of Supervisors will pass this zoning change which will leave us no options but to vote our district supervisor out of office that seems not hearing our voices.

Sincerely,
Bea Lau

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Jason Luo <luoboy2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 10:45 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com

Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To the Department of Regional Planning,

On behalf of my family, I am writing today to express our strong objection to the proposed development project on the Royal Vista Golf Course. The project will be detrimental to our community and individual well-being in many ways including:

- Development will increase **traffic, noise, crime, pollution** (greenhouse gasses) and overuse area resources including water.
- According to the LA County Fire Department, communities need open spaces to serve as a fire break, and evacuation point. The lakes on Royal Vista are used as a source of water for air tankers to fight our **increasingly frequent fires due to drought**.
- 3+ years of construction noise and moving **1,000 olympic swimming pools** of earth is significant, causing **fugitive dust, increasing airborne fungal spores which can cause valley fever & harm the health of the community**, especially individuals with an impaired immune system, and respiratory or heart conditions.
- **Royal Vista is the last sizable green-space in the community**, and development will destroy the wildlife habitat and corridor to the **Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area** (SEA)
- **Development will contribute to the climate crisis**, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will **limit ground permeability for rain water**, and further **deplete the water table**.

Due to all the aforementioned reasons and many more, I strongly urge the Department to reconsider going ahead with the project.

Sincerely,
Jason Luo

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Monique Marcelo <moniquemar14@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2022 9:04 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>; Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; David DeGrazia <DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; Moreno, Andrea <amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov>; Thiel-Maiz, Eva <EMaiz@bos.lacounty.gov>; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe <GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov>; Serrano, Ryan <RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Royal Vista Residential and Park Project - Rowland Height

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Madam Marie Pavlovic,

I am a resident living in the area of the Royal Vista Golf Course/Club in Rowland Heights unincorporated community, which is now being considered for a housing development. I would like to respectfully inform you that our family strongly opposes this project to convert the Royal Vista golf course to residential units, and I am hoping that you will take our concerns for consideration.

The golf course is the only open space left along this area. There are so many wildlife here (geese, swallows, rabbits, coyotes, other bird species, etc.) that has made this course as their habitat. We are already living in a highly polluted area being within 1 mile of the 60 freeway and 57 freeway plus the many businesses along Colima road, so you can imagine how precious it is for the residents around here to have the golf course as the only remaining open space with greenery, trees and nature. Please do not allow that to be taken away from us.

This area is already very congested, and traffic on Colima and the major cross streets has been really bad already, and any addition of traffic lights and increased number of cars will definitely impact our quality of life. We are hoping to preserve whatever good air quality is left as this is important for all our health, especially our elderly. Further congestion and increased population with less open space and trees will definitely impact our air quality.

This area is already quite hot during the summer months, but the golf course and its greenery and open space lessens that heat as it allows more breeze coming to our homes and general environment. Removing it and building more housing and paved roads will contribute to more heat for the surrounding areas.

I am hoping that you can come and visit our area, and tour around the residential neighborhood around the golf course so that you may see how this plan to remove it will impact us all negatively both physically and mentally. I am hoping that you will consider and listen to the sentiments of the current residents in this area. As good citizens who care for our neighborhood, we would like to be able to enjoy our surroundings that we have chosen to be our home.

We have moved in to this neighborhood right on the Royal Vista golf course in April 2021. We take pride of ownership in our newly purchased home because it sits on the golf course, and having the golf course was a major factor for us in our decision to purchase this house. Our 3 children were all very excited to move in here as well because of the fact that we are by the golf course. Removal of the golf course will totally devastate us having just moved in here.

I sincerely hope for your kind consideration.

Monique Marcelo

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Monique Marcelo <moniquemar14@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 9:19 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>; Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; David DeGrazia <DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; Moreno, Andrea <amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov>; Thiel-Maiz, Eva <EMaiz@bos.lacounty.gov>; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe <GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov>; Serrano, Ryan <RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Madam Marie Pavlovic and other respected leaders:

I am a resident living in the area of the Royal Vista Golf Course/Club in Rowland Heights unincorporated community, which is now being considered for a housing development. I would like to respectfully request you to consider our community's petition of not allowing the housing development to proceed due to numerous and severe environmental impact this would cause.

The Developer is proposing 360 units to be built within this already highly populated and congested area. With 360 units, there could be an average of at least 2 cars per unit, although in reality in today's environment, it would be expected that it will at least be 3 cars per unit, which would bring roughly 1,000 more vehicles in this relatively small area. Colima Road is very congested and it already has a lot of traffic especially during the morning and afternoon rush hours. In my cross street of Walnut Leaf Drive, they are proposing a 4-WAY STOP. Please know that Colima Road is a very busy road, without any STOP signs. It only has traffic lights for a reason. Adding a 4-way STOP would most certainly have a huge back-up of cars in all directions. Just the other day, one of the pedestrian/golf cart traffic lights on Colima Road near Walnut Leaf Drive was inoperable and blinking red, and this has caused a long back up of cars stopping and going.

We are already living in a highly polluted area being within .5 to 1 mile of the 60 freeway and 57 freeway plus the many businesses along Colima road, so you can imagine how precious it is for the residents around here to have the golf course as the only remaining open space with greenery, trees and nature. We are hoping to preserve whatever good air quality is left as this is important for all our health, especially our elderly. Further congestion and increased population with less open space and trees will definitely impact our air quality and our quality of life in general. Furthermore, there are so many wildlife here (geese, swallows, rabbits, coyotes, other bird species, etc.) that has made this course as their habitat. Just in our street at Wyn Terrace/Leanne Terrace, we have many rabbits that come on a daily basis.

This area is already quite hot during the summer months, but the golf course and its greenery and open space lessens that heat as it allows more breeze coming to our homes and general environment. Removing it and building more housing and paved roads will contribute to more heat for the surrounding areas.

I am also very concerned about how this will affect our utilities and services. We are already experiencing low water pressure, and adding 360 more homes will make this worse for us.

I am hoping that you can come and visit our area, and tour around the residential neighborhood around the golf course so that you may see how this plan to remove it will impact us all negatively both physically and mentally. I am hoping that you will consider and listen to the sentiments of the current residents in this area. As good citizens who care for our neighborhood, we would like to be able to enjoy our surroundings that we have chosen to be our home.

I sincerely hope for your kind consideration.

Monique Marcelo

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Melissa M. <melmiamich@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2022 5:57 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>; Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; David DeGrazia <DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; Moreno, Andrea <amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov>; EMaiz@boslacounty.gov <EMaiz@boslacounty.gov>; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe <GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov>; Serrano, Ryan <RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>; ContactSaveRV@gmail.com <ContactSaveRV@gmail.com>
Subject: Public Comment: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

I am concerned about Population & Housing element and open space of this project.

Please do not approve this project as is. Have them increase the open space so as to not harm the natural life that has made that space their home. There are fewer and fewer natural spaces that exist. The 28 acres of onsite open space is broken up, with a pocket park designed as an afterthought off to the side of the development, easily accessible to the 4-5 homes adjacent to it is nothing to be excited about. The developers should re-think this and stop putting their bottom line in the name of "housing" at the forefront.

Yes, the area needs housing, no argument there. But housing for who? Only 23% of the proposed 360 luxury and market-rate units will be set aside for sale to moderate /middle income households, that is not enough 1/4th. Looking at the 2022 LA County affordable housing income limits (see attached chart), these units - and more of them - should be available to so called "low income" households, like a 4 person household of $95,300/income a year. And when you hear that more housing inventory will make other housing more affordable keeping rates down, supply and demand, just know we're already tired of that false dichotomy. Maybe prices will go down temporarily for other market-rate houses of the same size with the same features (comps) in the area, but that only for those who can actually afford to buy in that market. It's supply and demand for like properties and like residents of a certain socio-economic level.

The City Council should insist on increasing the number of affordable housing units so that it will indeed make a dent in the RHNA numbers for this area. This is going to be one of the last chances to really create a lot of housing, so do it right, while increasing the development of open space. Increase the number of affordable units, make them also availale for lower income residents (in other words, those that make less than $76,00 in a two-person household for example, and give the residents more open space. The City should also protect that open space from future development, because what I've seen in other areas, developers will sell off properties and others will come in and develop.

Finally, to avoid any conflicts of interests, perceived or real, and any ethical codes in the city statutes, any realtor, whether their office is in this area or not, should recuse themselves from voting. We all know that more inventory means more commissions for realtors, whether for them, or the CA real estate lobby that donates millions of dollars to realtor candidates running for publically elected office.

Your constituents and voters are watching what you do here, and will remember at the ballot box.

Thank you for reading and considering.

Melissa Michelson
LA County Democratic Party elected delegate in Assembly District 49, and California state Democratic Party

member

Number of Persons in Household:		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Los Angeles County Area Median Income: $91,100	Acutely Low	9550	10900	12300	13650	14750	15850	16950	18000
	Extremely Low	25050	28600	32200	35750	38650	41500	44350	47200
	Very Low Income	41700	47650	53600	59550	64350	69100	73850	78650
	Low Income	66750	76250	85800	95300	102950	110550	118200	125800
	Median Income	63750	72900	82000	**91100**	98400	105700	112950	120250
	Moderate Income	76500	87450	98350	109300	118050	126800	135550	144300

December 11, 2022

RE: Royal Vista Development

Marie Pavlovic,

I am a member of Royal Vista Open Space and have lived in Rowland Height for 38 years.

I object to the additional traffic, pollution, water usage, and loss of our green open space.

I object to the likelihood of crime and homeless people in the public park, putting a strain on our police and fire departments.

The golf course is irrigated with water from their own well which is non-potable. Where will potable water come from for 360 units? We are being asked to conserve water yet even with low flow faucets and toilets the development will demand more water.

The proposed 360 units will not add 360 cars or 720 cars but more like 1,440 cars. Since many adult children are living with their parents, there is likely to be 4 cars at each house. How will all these new cars plus those in our neighborhood be able to evacuate in an emergency?

I am concerned about the pollution and fungal spores that will be overturned with the grading process. Do we have to stay in our houses with the windows closed for 3 years? Who is going to pay our electric bills and provide us with air purifiers?

Overall, the project is very damaging to our neighborhood and the quality of our lives. Stress from the possibility of this project being built, is already taking a toll on our health.

The Planning Commission should deny this project unanimously.

Beverly Pekar

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Bradley D. Pierce <bpierce@piercefirm.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2022 7:31 AM
To: wanda649@aol.com <wanda649@aol.com>; Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; David DeGrazia <DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov>; Susan Tae <stae@planning.lacounty.gov>; Alejandrina Baldwin <ABaldwin@planning.lacounty.gov>; Moreno, Andrea <amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov>; Thiel-Maiz, Eva <EMaiz@bos.lacounty.gov>; Duran-Medina, Guadalupe <GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov>; Serrano, Ryan <RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov>; Feldman, Benjamin <BFeldman@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>
Subject: RE: Royal Vista NOP Scoping Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

I do not understand this. I was personally assured by DRP that my firm was on the list to be notified of any activity. The lack of notice to my firm or the community and the surreptitious on-site posting suggest that DRP does not want this project vetted in the public, particularly in light of the CC&Rs that prohibit the development and instead are pushing for a preordained outcome that ignores the rights of the neighboring owners and the public's right to comment.

Bradley D. Pierce, Esq.
PIERCE LAW FIRM
A Professional Corporation
1440 N. Harbor Blvd., Suite 900
Fullerton, California 92835
Telephone (714) 449-3333
Facsimile (714) 449-3337
Email: BPierce@piercefirm.com
www.piercefirm.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files attached may contain privileged and confidential information. The information is also protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC §§ 2510-2521). If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (or in any attachment) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed in this communication (or in any attachment).

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: wanda649@aol.com <wanda649@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 3:07 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov; jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov; DDegrazia@planning.lacounty.gov; stae@planning.lacounty.gov; ABaldwin@planning.lacounty.gov; amoreno@bos.lacounty.gov; EMaiz@bos.lacounty.gov; GDuran-Medina@bos.lacounty.gov; RSerrano@bos.lacounty.gov; BFeldman@bos.lacounty.gov; cchen@bos.lacounty.gov
Subject: Royal Vista NOP Scoping Meeting

Good morning Marie,

We learned today that at least 2 Notices of Preparation (visible only to persons on foot) have been posted on Colima regarding project PRJ2021-002011-(1). Members of our community non profit organization RVOS, as well as our legal council, has asked DRP to be apprised of project updates a number of times. We were **not** informed that the developers application is deemed complete. Updated project documents, showing an increase of 38 units from the original plan to a total of 360 units including 88 duplexes and triplexes, are not available on https://planning.lacounty.gov/view/prj2021-002011 beginning on October 13, 2022 as the posted signs indicate.

The posted DRP signage allows only 15 days notice of the NOP scoping meeting November 1. **We are requesting 30 days notice to the public** of the NOP scoping meeting in order to prepare our comments on the environmental concerns regarding the project. The posted DRP signage allows the community only 2 days to submit translation requests by October 19, 2022. **We request translation of this NOP virtual meeting in Chinese, Korean and Spanish.** Additionally, many senior members of our community are not able to access or participate in online meetings. **We request an in person or hybrid meeting at the Rowland Heights Community Center for the NOP scoping meeting.**

Wanda Ewing

RHCCC Member

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Bradley D. Pierce <bpierce@piercefirm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 2:05 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Joshua Huntington; Roland Trinh
Subject: Royal Vista NOP Scoping Meeting
Attachments: 11 01 22 LT DRP.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Attached please find comments in connection with the scoping meeting. As explained in detail, the scoping meeting and any environmental review of the proposed project is premature and a waste of resources. The Restrictive Covenant in place and recorded against 6 of the large parts of the proposed project prohibit the project regardless of changes to the zoning and/or permitted land uses for the subject parcels. The properties will not be available for changed use until 2036 at the earliest.

Bradley D. Pierce, Esq.
PIERCE LAW FIRM
A Professional Corporation
1440 N. Harbor Blvd., Suite 900
Fullerton, California 92835
Telephone (714) 449-3333
Facsimile (714) 449-3337
Email: BPierce@piercefirm.com
www.piercefirm.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files attached may contain privileged and confidential information. The information is also protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (18 USC §§ 2510-2521). If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (or in any attachment) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed in this communication (or in any attachment).

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

PIERCE LAW FIRM
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

WWW.PIERCEFIRM.COM

1440 NORTH HARBOR BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
FULLERTON, CALIFORNIA 92835
TELEPHONE (714) 449-3333

OUR FILE NO.
7696.001
SENDER'S EMAIL ADDRESS
BPierce@piercefirm.com

November 1, 2022

VIA EMAIL ONLY
Marie Pavlovic - mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov
LA County Planning
Subdivisions Section
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Project PRJ 2021-002011

Dear Ms. Pavlovic:

This letter is for Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning's consideration in connection with review of Project PRJ 2021-002011, the related requests for consideration by DRP[1] and the upcoming scoping meeting. Please make this correspondence part of the administrative record for the Project.

As you know, we represent Royal Vista Open Space "RVOS", a non-profit whose members include concerned citizens and property owners surrounding the Royal Vista Golf Course, including owners of benefitted parcels under the Declaration of Protective Restrictions (the "Restrictive Covenant") that burdens a number of the parcels (collectively the "servient tenements") that are the subject of the Project.

There is no basis for DRP to proceed with the scoping meeting or other environmental review at this time. The Restrictive Covenant expressly prohibits the change in use of the servient tenements contemplated by the Project. In addition to the numerous adverse environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated, as discussed by the agencies and departments commenting on the proposed project, any environmental analysis, including the scoping meeting, is unrelated to the environmental conditions that may exist fifteen years in the future, if the conditions to termination of the Restrictive Covenant are ever met.

As DRP is aware, the Restrictive Covenant, dated December 16, 1961, recorded with the County Recorder December 29, 1961, limits the use of six of the large parcels

[1] Royal Vista Residential and Parks Project, Project No. PRJ2021- 002011-(1) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. TR83534 (RPPL2021007149) / General Plan Amendment No. RPPL2021004860 / Zone Change No. RPPL2021007152 / Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL2021007151 / Housing Permit No. RPPL2021007161 / Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2021007150

that make up the Project, to golf course and country club uses. The language is unambiguous and provides:

> All property described herein shall be used only for the purpose of a golf and country club and its appurtenances, including golf tees, greens, fairways and rough, water storage and landscaping. (Art. II, ¶ 1.)

The changes in use proposed by the proponent of the Project violate this restriction. The Restrictive Covenant is not optional or a guideline, it is the obligation of the owner(s) of the servient tenements, that benefits the surrounding homeowners. It remains in full force and effect until January 31, 2036, and only terminates then if certain conditions are met, regardless of changes to the zoning or permitted land uses. Accordingly, the scoping meeting and the associated work and review by the responsible governmental departments and agencies are premature and a waste of resources.

The Restrictive Covenant provides for an initial term that ran through January 31, 2016, which automatically renewed at that time, for a period of 20 years. The Covenant provides:

> All of the conditions and restrictions set forth in this declaration shall run with the land and continue to be in full force and effect until January 31 2016, and shall, as then in force, be continued automatically and without further notice from that time for a period of twenty (20) years, and thereafter for a successive period of twenty (20) years, unless, within the six months prior to expiration of any period as set forth hereinabove, the then owners of the property covered in this declaration shall be able to show that the property is no longer suitable for use as a golf course. (Art. III.)

Accordingly, as of February 1, 2016, the Restrictive Covenant was renewed for an additional 20 years. It happened automatically at that time. No subsequent act of any party changes what occurred in the past.

While the proponent has argued that the six months language only qualifies the time frame for suitability, they are incorrect. In fact, we have requested that they provide legal authority or common-sense rationale for rewriting the language that required the then owners to provide proof that the property "**is** [not 'was'] **no longer suitable**" for use as a golf course six months **prior to expiration** of any period provided for in the declaration. They were unable to provide any legal authority or rationale.

The limited explanation provided to DRP that the document recorded five and a half years after the deadline, by the owner of a portion of the servient tenement and

operator of the business, is somehow effective to wipe the Restrictive Covenant relied upon by hundreds of surrounding homeowners, is specious. If the proponent's rationale was correct, there would be no need to limit the time frame to six months before the natural expiration. It would simply read that after the initial term, once the property is no longer suitable, the restriction would terminate. The six-month provision is a notice provision, it does not qualify when the course becomes unsuitable.[2]

Before additional resources are wasted, DRP should require the proponent to demonstrate that it has obtained title to the rights described in the Restrictive Covenant. Until then, any environmental review is premature, including the scoping meeting. No one can predict the environment that will be in place in 2036 or 2056 when the Restrictive Covenant has run its course.

The proponent of the Project does not dispute that the Restrictive Covenant exists. They do not dispute that the restriction prevents the development they propose. Their only argument is that five and a half years after the Restrictive Covenant automatically renewed by its own terms, they wanted to change the use so they claim that five and a half years earlier the golf course was not profitable.

If you have any questions or need clarification concerning the enforceability of the Restrictive Covenant, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone or email at the contact information above.

Thank you,



Bradley D. Pierce

BDP/dot

[2] Additionally, the after-the-fact declaration does not address suitable of the property as a golf course, it simply claims that 5 ½ years earlier the way the course was managed, it was not profitable. Even if that statement is accurate, profitability is not synonymous with suitability.

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Mike Popovec <mpopovec@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 10:50 PM
To: firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Marie A. Pavlovic; Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista Golf Course

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To my friends and elected officials within the Los Angeles County and planning commission, I would like to weigh in on the above-referenced project that will have a substantial impact on our community.

First of all, you may or may not know that I am a past president and co-founder of the Rowland Heights Community Coordinating Council and past Parks and Recreation Commissioner for former 4th District Supervisor, Don Knabe. I also contributed greatly to the current Community General Plan.

Amazingly, that plan has held up for more than 30 years. To be certain, it needs to be updated as there are many sections that make no sense due to changing demographics and the overall retail business dynamic that has enveloped our community.

Regardless, the proposed development on a portion of Royal Vista Golf Course raises many red flags ... chief of which is a planned zoning change from open space to residential. Aside from providing financial relief to a public golf course operator and owner, my greatest fear is the "slippery slope" that we may be creating .... namely, additional development of our beautiful hills to the south.

Furthermore, this proposal does not include development of the entire golf course. It raises the question as to what adjacent residents might come to expect when the water is turned off and there's no one to maintain the greenbelt formally known as a golf course. For comparison, the nearest example is the now-defunct Sierra LaVerne County Club.

I have attended as many hearings and presentations as possible on this subject. Public comment on issues like this haven't changed in almost half a century. Traffic concerns are probably the most universal complaint of any. I would venture to say that not a single intersection within Rowland Heights has improved beyond a grade of "F". I dare say that the planning commission had something to do with that. Where we used to have a gas station on every corner, we now have two story buildings without setbacks. The possibility of having dedicated right turn lanes no longer exists.

The first presentation I saw for this project included a four-way stop sign on Colima. I commented that the traffic on Colima is bad enough as it is. A planned four-way stop sign on the busiest street in Rowland Heights is a non-starter. Shockingly, the developer failed to mention the intersection at the last meeting ... as if they were trying to gloss it over.

Other commentators registered concerns over water usage. I ask why there are no plans for recycling water. It would seem to me that the terrain would be ideal for such a system. I guess I'm also surprised that it wouldn't be required.

I know the parks are mandated, but the plans are rather sophomoric ... one lawn for small dogs, and the other for big dogs??!

My question to the commission is simply what benefit would this development have for Rowland Heights … or the county?

Respectfully,

Mike Popovec
2635 Hayride Ct
Rowland Heights, CA 91748
626-347-8057

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Adele Prince <adelemprince@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 4:27 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: Royal Vista Golf Course

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Madam Pavlovic :

My name is Thomas S Prince and I live at 1441 Fairlance, Diamond Bar, Calif My property lies contiguous to Royal Vista Golf Course, The purpose of this communication is not primarily to complain about the loss of a beautiful view, that is a given, but to inform this body that an approval of the developers request to build 360 residences will inflict a permanent wound on this community which can never be healed. I realize that an EIR is now progressing, yet this report can never adequately represent how this community will be impacted. There are so many aspects of this injury to consider but I will only deal with the increase of traffic associated with this proposal.

With 360 new residences it is fair to say that there will be at least 1000 new persons living in these homes, with at least 700 cars needed to transport these people. Now, according to the presentation by the developer, section PA 5 will have 90 new construction pieces and all of those residents will exit and enter this section using one access to Colima Road. Section PA 1 and Pa 2 will also be using Colima Road for access. Colima Road is at this time already overburdened with a high volume of vehicles. This entire area is now experiencing continuing road construction and maintenance almost daily. On the west side of the development , Fairway is under additional construction north of the 60 freeway. On the east side of the development, Grand Ave. is under a widening project which will continue for years to come. These ongoing projects clearly impact this area in a negative manner as the traffic is either radically slowed down or rerouted. This new development will only exacerbate an already difficult transportation system. Moreover, the additional pollution generated by these extra vehicles will add to the health issues for all the residents. The primary entry/exit to the 60 Freeway is Lemon Ave, east of the development. Currently during peak traffic hours, use of this on/off ramp is severely impacted. One can expect to wait for an extended period to complete their route. If the development is approved, this location will turn into gridlock.

I am aware that cities and counties are mandated by the state government to provide housing for additional citizens. This mandate, however, should not be at the expense of existing citizens to enjoy the quiet use of their own property. There has not been any showing by the developer of their attempt to locate alternate land to build this project that would be beneficial to that area and concurrently satisfy the government mandate.

This proposal is clearly injurious to the community, and I request that the project be rejected in its entirety.

Regards,

Thomas Prince

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Jerry Ramos <jerryramoscpa7@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 3:17 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Subject: save our open space, royal vista

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

I am opposed to use royal vista other than the present status as a golf course. if you convert this space into residential, it will create more noise, traffic, crime and pollution.

I have lived here for the past 30 years and i love the present condition in this area. i want to protect the green space for the next generation.

please keep the area as an open space for the next generation in this community.

Agustin J Ramos
Resident of 20645 E. Climber Dr,
Walnut, Ca 91789

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: naveen reddy <ndreddy2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 11:59 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com

Subject: Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Good evening Marie Pavlovic
I am a concerned resident and I oppose the development of this new choosing project on Royal Vista Golf Course. And want to keep our opens spaces for the following reasons:
Development will increase **traffic, noise, crime, pollution** (greenhouse gasses) and overuse area resources including water.

- According to the LA County Fire Department, communities need open spaces to serve as a fire break, and evacuation point. The lakes on Royal Vista are used as a source of water for air tankers to fight our **increasingly frequent fires due to drought**.
- 3+ years of construction noise and moving **1,000 olympic swimming pools** of earth is significant, causing **fugitive dust, increasing airborne fungal spores which can cause valley fever & harm the health of the community**, especially individuals with an impaired immune system, and respiratory or heart conditions.
- **Royal Vista is the last sizable green-space in the community**, and development will destroy the wildlife habitat and corridor to the **Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area** (SEA)
- **Development will contribute to the climate crisis**, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will **limit ground permeability for rain water**, and further **deplete the water table**

Sincerely
Concerned resident on Starshine Rd, Walnut.

interested in meeting record

Public Input Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista
Project No. 2021-00211

December 6, 2022

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Project would redevelop six parcels of the existing golf course into four residential planning areas and two recreational/open space planning areas, for a total of 360 dwelling units and a trails and park system. Planning Areas 1, 2, and 5 would include 200 detached single-family residential (SFR) units on individual lots; 88 duplex and triplex units on 34 lots; and 13 open space lots which include parks, trails and open space. Planning Area 3 would include 72 condominium units within 14 townhome buildings on one lot. Seventy-two (72) townhouse units and 10 additional units scattered among the triplex units [equaling 82 (23%) of the total units), will be dedicated for sale to moderate- or middle-income households, consistent with the County's inclusionary affordable housing ordinance. The Project would include approximately 28.0 acres of onsite open space, including one 5.81-acre neighborhood park and one 1.59-acre pocket park.

PROJECT & PERMIT(S): PRJ2021-002011-(1) / Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. TR83534 (RPPL2021007149) / General Plan Amendment No. RPPL2021004860 / Zone Change No. RPPL2021007152 / Conditional Use Permit No. RPPL2021007151 / Housing Permit No. RPPL2021007161 / Environmental Assessment No. RPPL2021007150

Thank you for your interest in the proposed project identified above. If you have any environmental issues or concerns you believe should be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), please complete and submit this Input Form at the scoping meeting or mail to the Lead Agency Contact listed below. To ensure your input is considered, please submit your written comments by December 12, 2022. If additional space is needed, you may use the back of this Input Form or attach additional sheets.

Comments: I live at starshine Rd, South of colima Rd, Dairy Summer time, I feel a temperature drop everytime crossing or arriving to my house, I could said 2 or 3 degree at lowest. I thought I have lived in a wonderful area, who does not like to have natural cooler environment. I also have close encounter with a lot of wild birds and animals. They fly over my roof and sometimes land rest on it we love this area currently. please DO NOT disturb it.

If you would like to receive future notices regarding this project, please clearly print your full name and address below. The EIR will be available at the Department listed below, the local libraries, and on the Department's website.

Name: Hung Shih

shihhung78@hotmail.com

CC.103116

Address: 1759 Starshine Rd.

City/State/ZIP: Walnut CA 91789.

Lead Agency Contact:

Marie Pavlovic
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street, Room 170
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3225
Phone: (213) 974-6433; FAX: (213) 626-0434
Email: mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Susan Trautz <dstrautz81@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 16, 2022 4:50 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Joshua Huntington < jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; Save Our Open Space <saveroyalvista@gmail.com>; Wanda Ewing wanda649@aol.com; Linda Kuo <mynameiskuo@gmail.com>
Subject: Notice of Scoping Meeting

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hello Marie,

I have questions and concerns about the Notice of Scoping Meeting that I came across on my walk this morning.

1. Rowland Heights Library does not have a copy of the Notice of Preparation as of today, 10/16/22. After a thorough review of possible places the NOP could be held, the library manager recommended I call the number on the Notice to advise the document is not available at their library. The other two libraries listed on the Notice are closed today. Are there plans to post the NOP online? I urge you to make it available online and extend the period the NOP will be made available for public review. The NOP has not been available for review beginning 10/13/22 as written in the Notice.
2. The Notice encourages the reader to review Project documents at a provided link. The last posted update to that link is 6/30/22, and it does not reflect the information provided in the Notice. When will your website have the updated documents available for review?
3. The map provided on the Notice does not number the "Planning Areas." Where may I find a map with the Planning Areas defined?
4. I have logged into RoyalVistaResidential.com hoping to find an updated map or information there, but the site is under construction.

I find it challenging to gather information regarding this Project. I hope that is not intentional. Stakeholders should not have to spend a significant amount of time tracking down information that should be readily available. Please help.

Sincerely,
Susan Trautz



Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Susan Trautz <dstrautz81@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 10:21 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington < jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov <firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov>; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>; contactsaverv@gmail.com <contactsaverv@gmail.com>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Thank you for soliciting the community's comments as part of the EIR process. I have already spoken at both Scoping Meetings. I would like to submit the following additional comments.
If the development is approved, it will encourage more pedestrian traffic on Colima Road. You will want to put the following or similar protections in place for public safety. Besides neighborhood residents, the local high school uses Colima for their long-distance running students. The proposed park on the north side of Colima will encourage more pedestrian traffic, particularly back-and-forth across Colima. Public safety should be prioritized.

-
-
- Monthly cleaning and maintenance of
- sidewalks - There are several slip and fall hazards along the south side of Colima from Walnut Leaf east toward the Golf Course through to Calbourne caused by tree debris, water coming down the retaining walls, puddling of water, and poor maintenance of trees.
- We know the locations of these hazards, and we navigate around them. Walkers new to the area will not have the benefit of experience.
-
-
-
- Creation of bike lanes protected by
- a barrier similar to this image. It is not pretty, but it will protect pedestrians and cyclists.
-



-
-

- Funding for replacement and maintenance
- of existing single family homes' retaining walls along Colima adjacent to the development. These are in disrepair and will need updating after years of neglect.
-
-
-
- A traffic signal is safer than a 4-way
- stop on Colima and Walnut Leaf.
-
-
-
- At the December scoping meeting, the
- traffic study proposed is standard protocol. Consider studying the number of homes whose residents' only egress is Colima Road. The Lennar Diamond Bar housing development's residents are not to use Walnut Leaf or Lake Canyon as egress points. However, it
- is a regular occurrence. In a major emergency where evacuation must take place, there will be major congestion thwarting quick evacuation.
-
-
-
- If the proposed development includes
- building of any retaining walls, have a fund in place for maintenance and repair.
-
-
-
- Trails and parks maintained by the
- HOA, not Los Angeles County as the County is historically woefully inadequate in maintaining our area.
-
-
-
- More parking spaces at the proposed
- dog park and park north of Colima.
-
-
-
- Beautify the landscaping along Colima.
- Plant trees (natives such as Palo verde or western sycamore). Build and landscape a center divider as exists in Diamond Bar at the Rowland Heights border. Use a landscape plan that includes native plants, widened green belts, and pollinator gardens.
-
-
-
- Landscape the dirt patch on the south
- side of Colima (southeast Colima between Walnut Leaf and PA-5). This is a no-man's land with L.A. County declining responsibility for maintenance or landscaping.
-

Other considerations:

-
-

- Place solar panels on all the proposed
- residential units. Upgrade the electrical grid.
-
-
-
- Include all California native plantings
- in the proposed residential project. If you landscape outside the development's boundaries, have a fund and plan for the maintenance of the landscape.
-
-
-
-
- Water, water, water. What is the plan?
- Yes,we need to build residential units, but infill projects should be prioritized for building. The underutilized Puente Hills Mall land is a prime example. There are several infill possibilities in that area (with the added bonus of mixed use) without adding
- further congestion to Rowland Heights. Unincorporated, underserved communities should not lose the last vestiges of open space while underutilized infill lands are allowed to languish without purpose.
-
-
-
-
- This area of Rowland Heights needs
- a shuttle to local shopping and recreation, particularly between us and the City of Industry, Metrolink, parks, and into adjoining Diamond Bar. Service the seniors and disabled free of charge.
-
-
-
- Maintain some ponds for firefighting
- water resources. Maintain enough green space for evacuation points during wildfires and emergencies.
-
-
-
- What is the plan to build a local hospital?
- Our closest hospital is Pomona Valley, a 25-minute drive on a good day. Considering the congestion on local streets and the 60 and 57 freeways, timely emergency care is being jeopardized.
-
-
-
- Make housing equity a goal. Sell the
- proposed residential units to owner-occupied only. Place affordable housing throughout the development, not just along the 60 freeway. Investors abound in our community. They are not committed to facilitating and sustaining a supportive and nurturing community
- which is one of our values.
-

Communities matter. People and animals matter. Build responsibly.

Sincerely,
Derrick and Susan Trautz

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Lisa Valladares <jewels4lisav@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 2:24 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; contactsaverv@gmail.com

Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Good Evening.

I am writing to you to ask you to respect the people of our community and save our open spaces. The development of new facilities will increase crime, pollution, traffic, and noise. These are very serious things. The LA County Fire Department is not in support and have stated that communities should have open spaces to serve as evacuation points and fire break facilities.

The Royal Vista lakes are used by air tankers to fight wildfires due to the drought. Over the years, construction has disrupted the natural water supply and created a significant amount of dust and fungal spores in the air. It can also affect the health of the community's residents, especially those with a poor immune system.

The economic impact of housing affordability can start a ripple effect for an entire community. There are already many empty rental houses in our community just sitting there. Development of houses on this community will effect us all because it can contribute to the climate crisis, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will limit ground permeability for rain water, and further deplete the water table.

Royal Vista is the last remaining green space in the community. It is additionally the gateway to the Puente Hills' significant ecological area. The development will destroy the area's wildlife habitat and severely affect the water table. The wildlife in this area deserve to have their natural and rightful space. We have geese that come every year for nesting. I have been in this area for fifty years and without fail they always return. Not only will we be taking their space we will also be risking their lives. Not to mention native plants and species of flowers, trees, and bushes give wild animals food, shelter, and a place to raise families. Animals today are an endangered species because of people and developers who just want to make money. It is not fair to our wildlife and it is not fair to this community.

Please take into consideration all these important factors and do not allow for housing in our community. Please help us to keep the integrity of our community and let us live in our beautiful and open green space. Please do not allow us to endure an increase in traffic, pollution, increased crime, and noise.

Please try to think of me as your mother who is being affected. Wouldn't you fight for her? I am asking you to fight for me. Many of us moved here to retire and or raise families because it is the last peaceful place in our area. This situation is causing great stress among our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Linda <linda5646@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 6:30 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>; Francis Pierce <fpierce@ph.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR and Environmental Hygiene Program
abodek@planning.lacounty.gov jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov rserrano@bos.lacounty.gov firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov webinquiry@aqmd.gov asantos@diamondbarca.gov. contactsave

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

December 1, 2022

Los Angeles County Health Department
Department of Regional Planning

Dear Francis Pierce and Marie Pavlovic,

I reside near the Royal Vista Golf Course located in Rowland Heights. I am writing to you regarding a grave health concern that will affect many residents near the Royal Vista Golf Course should the county approve the building of 360 homes on the golf course. As you may or may not know, part of the Royal Vista Golf Course was sold to a developer in 2021. The developer is in the process of obtaining approval to build homes on the 50+ year old golf course with over 300 mature trees and rolling hills.

In reading the Notice of Preparation dated October 7, 2022, total earthwork quantities of 3.62 million cubic yards will be excavated and re-compacted to level the course so homes can be built on bedrocks. That is 1,000 Olympic size swimming pools of soil and it is estimated that it will take between 4 to 8 months to excavate depending on the size of the hauling trucks. As a result of this major movement of soil, I am extremely concerned Valley Fever (coccidioidomycosis), a fungal infection caused by coccidioides organisms, will once again affect me and possibly many residents in the area.

In 2019**,** I was diagnosed with Valley Fever because Lennar Home excavated the hillside 800 feet from my home to build 97 homes in the City of Diamond Bar. The excavation started in 2017. Soon after I was experiencing fatigue that led to coughing, extreme weight loss and loss of appetite. The MRI showed a mass on my lungs. During this period, I was very fearful and anxious. The initial prognosis was lung cancer. This took an emotional toll on me and my family. After further testing and an invasive biopsy, I was diagnosed with acute coccidioidomycosis (aka Valley Fever). I am under the care of an infectious disease doctor, who performs blood tests every 3 months and x-rays every 6 months. Additionally, the treatment consists of taking antifungal medication for life, as the spores stay in the system forever. I personally know another case of Valley Fever that developed during the Lennar Home construction. The resident on Tierra Luna nearly died from this.

Currently, there are no soil tests that can be performed to determine whether the coccidioides spores are in the soil prior to excavation. We will only know once excavation starts. It is likely the spores are present in the Royal Vista Golf Course soil.

What are the mitigation protocols should the county decide to approve the project? Will the county provide full face respirators or HEPA filters to surrounding residents during excavation? How long will the excavation last? Will we be able to go out to garden and take walks, or will we be confined to our

homes like prisoners? Will we be able to open windows to let the morning/evening breeze in or do we have to shut the windows for the duration of the excavation? What about residents with asthma? Walnut Valley Senior LIving sits on the west side of the golf course, about 0.4 miles from the development. This 125 beds full service assisted living and memory care facility serves residents in their 80s and 90s. Many residents living in this facility have underlying medical conditions and weaken medical conditions with an increased risk of contracting Valley Fever. Valley Fever can affect people of all ages but is most common in adults age 60 or older. Acute Valley fever can be fatal.

It is the duty and care of LA County to protect the health and welfare of the residents. If it is known that there are possible coccidioides spores present, the county needs to proceed with extreme caution so the health and welfare of its residents are not compromised at the expense of building new homes. Given the facts presented above, I strongly urge the county to deny the development. Failure to do so will result in legal actions against the county should residents develop Valley Fever due to construction of homes on Royal Vista Golf Course.

Sincerely,

Linda White

Cc: Supervisor Hilda Solia, District 1
Department of Regional Planning
South Coast Air Quality Management District
City of Diamond Bar

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Johnny Wong <johnnywyt@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 6:32 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic
Cc: Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy; Save Our Open Space
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To Whom It May Concern:

Our names are Johnny and Tin-Mei Wong. We live at 1237 Calbourne Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91789. Our house is directly next to and below the Royal Vista Golf Course.

We are writing to express our serious concerns and opposition to the proposed rezoning and development of the Royal Vista Golf Course to 360 dwelling units (which include 200 detached single-family residential units, 88 duplex and triplex units, and 72 condominium units).

We are concerned about the proposed size of this development and the impact of the increased traffic, noise, pollution and safety issues on the existing communities. Our opposition is based on the following potential/probable negative effects:

- Increased heavy traffic, noise, crime, and pollution (greenhouse gasses). It is anticipated that adding 360 dwelling units will bring about 720 and more vehicles to this small area. This will increase traffic congestion, noise and pollution on the 3 main roads at the boundary (Colima and Fenway/Lemon), as well as the neighborhood streets inside the boundary that are quiet and safe.

- Multiple years of construction works will cause fugitive dust, increase airborne fungal spore, valley fever, harming the health of the nearby community, which include senior residents who receive care at the Brookdale Assisted Living Center near Colima Road and Fairway Drive.

- Destruction of green space and mature trees, driving animals out of the area, destroying the wildlife habitat and corridor to the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA).

- Aggravation of the climate and water issues, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will limit ground permeability for rainwater and further diminish the preservation of underground water resources.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Johnny and Tin-Mei Wong
Phone: (626) 371-5596

Marie A. Pavlovic

From: Jack Yao <jyao.dci@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 4:36 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic; contactsaverv@gmail.com
Cc: Wanda Ewing; Amy Bodek; Joshua Huntington; Chen, Cindy; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov

Subject: concerns of evironmental impact from Royal vista development project

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Mr/Ms.

The recent Royal Vista golf course development planning really concerns me a lot, and the concerns have been repeated multiple times and many years.
As a current resident in the area for many years, I think this is definitely a **NO-GO** project, which will negatively affect our living environment/property value lifestyle/Safety conditions and etc. especially since we all believe this project will need to go through a very **long long time of processing** and end up **failure without 100% of residents agree,** and you know it's **not** going to be happening. when Change of the land use/change of the Zoning / sub-division / Public work related --- trigging the PLA or CMA policy/conditional use, and all the other aspects.

It just sounds like a waste of public resources by doing something not feasible and practical, of course, people have the right to think/plan to do something, but we also have the right to say NO to this.

> The development will increase traffic, noise, crime, pollution (greenhouse gasses) and overuse area resources including water.
• According to the LA County Fire Department, communities need open spaces to serve as a fire break, and evacuation point. The lakes on Royal Vista are used as a source of water for air tankers to fight our increasingly frequent fires due to drought.
• 3+ years of construction noise and moving 1,000 olympic swimming pools of earth is significant, causing fugitive dust, increasing airborne fungal spores which can cause valley fever & harm the health of the community, especially individuals with an impaired immune system, and respiratory or heart conditions.
• Royal Vista is the last sizable green-space in the community, and development will destroy the wildlife habitat and corridor to the Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area (SEA)
• Development will contribute to the climate crisis, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will limit ground permeability for rain water, and further deplete the water table.

So on and so for, could be endless.
Furthermore, whoever is involved in managing/reviewing/discussing/approving this project needs to be really cautioned about the voice from the neighborhood, it is NOT a simple regular commitment, it is related to everybody's lifetime savings, and could be our life change.

NO NO NO to royal vista development

Thanks,

Jack Yao

1620 Chapel hill Dr. Walnut Ca 91789

From: Charlie Xia <charliexia.ca@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 5:10 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Cc: Amy Bodek <ABodek@planning.lacounty.gov>; Joshua Huntington <jhuntington@planning.lacounty.gov>; firstdistrict@bos.lacounty.gov; Chen, Cindy <cchen@bos.lacounty.gov>; Save Our Open Space <contactsaverv@gmail.com>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Hi,
My name is Zhaoliang Xia. My house address is 20018 Iluso Ave, walnut, CA. My backyard is back to the Golf Course.
My wife and I work from home. 3+ years of construction noise and earth grading will impact our health and life significantly. My wife and my son have asthma and my wife has heart conditions. The construction definitely degrades our quality of life, damages our health and may cause the loss of our lives. We don't know what to do if the project starts.
This is not something about the environment. This is the only cry out from the helpless people.
Please reject the project to protect our lives!

Zhaoliang (Charlie) Xia
6263733650

From: George Funk <georgefunk74@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:34 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: ROYAL VISTA GOLF COURSE, SAVE THIS OPEN SPACE

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

I am sure you have heard ALL of the reasons not to change the zoning of this open space. I plead with all of you to hear the voice of the PEOPLE who will be impacted by this proposed project, not the least of which is that this change of zoning will mean that the rest of the properties making up Royal Vista golf course will also be changed. So the impact will be 4 or 5, perhaps even more, times what this proposed project will do to the quality of life to the people, the animals, birds, water we don`t have and the AIR we all need to breathe. Please hear our cry for your help to stop this desecration of the last sizeable open space for miles around! Thank You & STAY SAFE, George Funk, 20421 Tam Oshanter Drive, Walnut, California, 91789

From: Mary Happy Price <maryhprice1968@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 4:36 PM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 | Scoping comments

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Dear Marie,

I have been a resident here next to the golf course since 1996. My property is on Emerald Meadow Drive and my backyard is next to the golf course. My house is on flat ground and was built in 1973. After all these years I still noticed the soil or land by and in my backyard is shifting, especially after the heavy rain season. I am very concerned about when the developer starts to do the grading of the soil will that cause more ground movement? Will that cause any landslides?

I am also very worried about Valley Fever or and serious allergic reaction that might harm my family. My son has really bad allergic reaction to the current environment already. The current golf course with all the green grass and trees helps filter out some of the pollution from the 60fwy and Colima Road.

The golf course also helps keep the summer hot temperature a few degrees lower and the evening breeze helps cool down the area quickly.

I understand we need more housing but we are also dealing with global warming as well.

Sincerely,

Mary Happy Price/Daniel Bodine

From: Mike Whitman <whitmanelectric@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 11:12 AM
To: Marie A. Pavlovic <mpavlovic@planning.lacounty.gov>
Subject: Project No. PRJ2021-002011 Royal Vista DEIR

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

To Whom It May Concern,

Before the public open comment forum is closed, I wanted to voice my comments and concerns regarding the environmental impact of the proposed land development project on Royal Vista land. Being a resident of over 25 years, we have already seen major changes in our community, some good, and some not so good. The 1 constant has been Royal Vista Golf Club, it's pretty much remain untouched and has provided a landscape/scenery and home to not only people but a multitude of wildlife. Developing this land to squeeze more people in would be not only detrimental to the current residents, but have a major negative impact by displacing the wildlife. The main points have been conveyed enough, but I would also like to reiterate them in my comment to further stress their importance.

• Development will increase **traffic, noise, crime, pollution** and overuse area resources including water.

• According to the LA County Fire Department, communities need open spaces to serve as a fire break, and evacuation point. The lakes on Royal Vista are used as a source of water for air tankers to fight our **increasingly frequent fires due to drought**.

• 3+ years of construction noise and moving **1,000 olympic swimming pools** of earth is significant, causing **fugitive dust, increasing airborne fungal spores which can cause valley fever & harm the health of the community**, especially individuals with an impaired immune system, and respiratory or heart conditions.

• **Royal Vista is the last sizable green-space in the community**, and development will destroy the wildlife habitat and corridor to the **Puente Hills Significant Ecological Area** (SEA)

• **Development will contribute to the climate crisis**, with multi-level dense housing and road paving, which will **limit ground permeability for rain water**, and further **deplete the water table**.

Thank you,

Michael Vildosola
Cell: (626) 255-1091

(1)

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak?	Want future notices on project?
~~No show~~	Dat Tran	—	Rowland Heights	Email: Frandattran@gmail.com	☐	☐
1 x	Name: Mike Popovic	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP: "	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak: ☒	Want future notices on project? ☐
2 x	Name: MARY PRICE	Organization (if applicable): RVOS	Street Address/City/State/ZIP: 20043 Emerald Meadow Dr	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☒
3 x	Name: Shelley Gentry	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☐
	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☐
	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☐
	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☐

CC.103116

4

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak?	Want future notices on project?
4 x	Adele PRINCE	Save Our Open Space	1441 Fairlance Walnut CA	(909)598-1086	X	X
No Show	Chim W Park		1329 Fairlance. Diamond Bar	(9) 598-5875	☑	☐
No Show	Alex Flores	Rowland School District			☐	☐
No Show	Oscar Leong			503-936-0302	☐	☑
					☐	☐
					☐	☐
					☐	☐

CC.103116

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak?	Want future notices on project?
NORMAN LAU		18589 FIELDBROOK 91748	B / NORMANLAU2013@GMail.com	☐	☑
EDMUNDO ASUNCION		20201 WYN TERRACE WALNUT, 91789	909-5695697 / ed.asuncion@verizon.net	☐	☑
Ryan Serrano	LACBOS	1441 Santa Anita Ave So Elmonte 91733	213 713-6127 / rserrano@bos.lacounty.gov	☐	☐
C.C. Weng Kuo		20433 Tam O'Shanter Walnut CA 91789	909-645-0965	☑	☐
Victor Chen				☐	☐
				☐	☐
				☐	☐

CC.103116

(9)

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak?	Want future notices on project?
7	Natalie Moreno		17779 Costra Costa Dr. Rowland	Phone (626) 712-7107 Email Natalie Moreno	☒	☐
8	Hung Shih		1759 starshine Rd	Phone 9096286899 Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☒
X	Jung Park		1329 Fairlawn PK	Phone ~~909 598 5875~~ Email	Check if wish to speak ☒	Want future notices on project? ☐
9	Linda Himes		20131 Candleflame	Phone Email familycat2@msn.com	Check if wish to speak ☒	Want future notices on project? ☐
X	Ki Shin		1220 Sandy Hill	Phone Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☒
X	PHEBE JACKSON		164 CHAPEL HILL	Phone 323-428-5070 Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☐
X	LAN LA		20225 Wyn Tex. Walnut CA	Phone 9097732280 Email	Check if wish to speak ☐	Want future notices on project? ☐

CC.103116

(10)

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak? / Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
14	Jack Yao		1620 Chapel Hill Dr.	Email: jyao.dct@gmail.com	☒	☐
15	Susan Trautz			Email: dstrautz2816@protonmail.com	☑	☐
–	Sergio Morales			Email	☐	☐
16	Robert Liu.		1411, Fairlance Dr.	Email: lufa719@hotmail.com	☑	☐
–	John C. White		1645 Chapel Hill Dr	Phone: 9095986465 / Email	☐	☐
17	Jerry Sorenson			Phone / Email	☐	☐
18	Lin			Phone / Email	☐	☐

CC.103116

(5)

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

	Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak?	Want future notices on project?
X	Earlene Smith	—	20162 Pa Brisa Dr, Walnut, CA	909 578-6945 / catsur@aol.com	☐	☒
10	Linda Kuo		20433 Tam O'Shanter Walnut CA 91789	909-645-0965	☑	☐
11	Wanda Ewing		20467 Tam O'Shanter Walnut CA 91789	909 4555103	☑	☑
12	Ren Ewing		11		☑	☐
X	Johnny Charng		1548 Leanne Ter 91789	909-569-4620	☐	☑
X	Hannah Charng		11		☐	☑
13	Mzrianna Breton		P.O. Box 5619 Diamond Bar CA	323 622-5460 / 626 715-2087	☒	☒

CC.102116

Sign-In Form
Scoping Meeting
Royal Vista Project
December 6, 2022

*Please indicate if translation is needed.

Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Do you wish to speak?	Want future notices on project?
Vincent Ferrara		20400 Huntelift Ln. Walnut CA 91789	Phone 4Speed55@gmail.com Email 4Speed55@gmail.com	☐	☒
Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
				☐	☐
Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
				☐	☐
Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
				☐	☐
Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
				☐	☐
Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
				☐	☐
Name	Organization (if applicable)	Street Address/City/State/ZIP	Phone / Email	Check if wish to speak	Want future notices on project?
				☐	☐

CC.103116

ROYAL VISTA RESIDENTIAL AND PARKS PROJECT
NOTICE OF PREPARATION - SCOPING MEETING #2 TRANSCRIPT
12-6-22

18:06:42 Josh Huntington
Welcome to the scoping meeting for the Royal Vista Project. Thank you for participating in the environmental review process for this proposed project. The purpose of a scoping meeting is to get input from the community regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.

You will hear a presentation, and have an opportunity to comment at this meeting. Everyone wanting to comment will be given 3 minutes to speak. If you provided comments at the first scoping meeting, your comments are in the record and there's no need to repeat the same points. However, you are still welcome to add additional comments if you so choose. You may also submit written comments after the meeting, and if you give us your email address, the planner in charge of this case, Marie Pavlovic, will inform you a future public hearings.

Lastly, I ask that everyone be respectful to each other, to the Presenters and to County staff, and with that I think we're ready to start we're ready to start the meeting with a presentation from Steve Letterly. Steve are you ready?

18:07:41 Steve Letterly
Good evening everybody. Can everyone hear me ok? I've never been known for being silent. So thank you. We already provided the introductions from County staff. I'm the meeting facilitator, Steve Letterly. The environmental consultant is here, and the applicant's name is up on this slide. These are some things for this meeting, for us to remember is that the scoping meeting is an opportunity to provide comments. Thank you. This is an opportunity to provide comments regarding the type and extent of environmental analysis to be undertaken. This is the first of several opportunities for the public to discuss aspects of the proposed project. Other opportunities include comments on the Draft EIR before the Hearing Examiner, a public hearing on the Project before the Regional Planning Commission, and public hearing on the Project before the Board of Supervisors. There are some things that a scoping meeting is not, and Josh already went over some of those. This is a forum to discuss the merits of the proposed Project, that is, it is not a forum to discuss the merits of the proposed Project. It is not a forum for answering questions, about analysis outcomes. That's because the Environmental document is still being prepared. This is not a public hearing as whether the proposed Project should be approved, or not and this is not a hearing at which any Project decisions are made. This is a listening meeting. The slide before you now shows you the Project location which I'm sure you're all very well familiar with. It's up in the northeast corner of Rowland Heights. Immediately adjacent to the City of Industry, and the City of Diamond Bar. It is just South of State Route 60, the Pomona Freeway, and near the Fairway interchange. Here's a closer up look at the Project Area. The project boundaries are shown in yellow. To get your bearings, you could see State Route 60 just to the north of the Slide. And you see, Colima Road bisects the

Project through the middle. So what you have before you here is the existing and proposed zoning. The Existing Zoning is A-1-1 and A-1-10,000, and the proposed zoning is RPD-5,000 and A-1-1 for the parks. There will be no change on the parks. This is the existed and proposed land use. The existing land use is Open Space. The proposed land use is Urban 2, which is shown in the Yellow. Urban 3, which is shown in the purple. Urban 4 in the orange and Open Space is shown in green. So those are different land use designations for the different types of residential development and the parks. Some additional background on the Project. The County of Los Angeles received an application for subdivision of approximately 75 Acres, located in the 20100 Block of Colima Road. It's 6 planning areas for development with the following. I have the development outlined there on the slide. There you see different types of development single family, duplex, triplex, townhomes, public parks, and public use trails. So CEQA requires the County to define required entitlements, review potential environment effects prior to any approvals. That's what the environmental impact report is about. The County determined there was potential for significant impacts. The County has determined that this Project requires a full EIR. There are different types of EIRs. There can be EIRs that are specific to just certain issues, but the County has decided that all issues that have been identified in the State's checklist should be discussed in the environmental document. The EIR is required to provide public disclosure of physical changes to the environment. Feasible mitigation measures, how can impacts for the project be reduced? And feasible alternatives. So the County identifies the potential significant effects, impacts and issues a Notice of Preparation, which they already have. The County issued that Notice of Preparation on October 13, 2022. The NOP comment period was extended to December 12th, 2022. So for 59 days total, which is longer than the State mandate. The EIR process, 1st is, you have to put out a Notice of Preparation, which the County has, and you do scoping during that Notice of Preparation period. Then you proceed with preparing an EIR. So, what we are doing here today, is collecting information that should be addressed in the EIR. That Environmental Impact Report will then come out to the public for a 45-day public review period. The Hearing Examiner will have a hearing during the draft EIR comment period, and then there will be responses provided to all the comments provided, and that is what is known as a Final EIR. So you have a draft that comes out. It evaluates the different issues. You have the public comment period. Those comments come in. And Then there are responses provided to those comments. The Regional Planning Commission will have a hearing, following the Final EIR and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors considers the Regional Planning Commission's recommendation for the Project and decides whether or not to approve certification of the EIR. Now, we're gonna move on to project description. As identified earlier, existing conditions, approximately 75 acre site with open space land uses. Existing improvements are being utilized as the Royal Vista Golf Course and Driving Range. Here's an outline of the proposed Project. I would leave this up for a minute, so you can digest this, but you have Planning Area Lots 1 and 5, with 52 acres, and identified as a different type of land uses that will be in that those two Planning Areas. Planning Area Lot 2, Planning Area Lot 3 and Planning Area Lots 4 and 6. So these are all either residential or open space. So the existing use for parks, trials, open space currently there's no public, this is not public use open space. This is a private golf course. The Project is subject to the County calculated park land application or in-lieu fee payment. That is the County has a requirement for how much park land is required for a project. The Project is providing 5.81

acres of public neighborhood park. This exceeds the County park land obligation. There is a 1.59 acre public pocket park, there are multiple private parks that will be open to the public and there will be approximately 18 acres of open space buffers, with over 2 miles of public use recreational trails. Approximately 37% of the Project site is either parks, trials or open space. This slide here provides you the different building heights and the parking requirements. These are all typical of residential development. You have building heights not to exceed 35‘ and 38’ within the townhomes. Parking, they are actually providing more parking than is actually required. The required parking is 740 spaces. The Project is designed to provide 973. Again, a description of the Project there'll be entrances and exits at each new residential neighborhood, with access points on East Walnut Drive South and Colima Road. There will be a new traffic signal at Colima Road, at Tierra Luna. The golf cart crossing signal on Colima will be removed. There will be 2 new driveway entrances on the south side of East Walnut Drive for the townhomes. There will be a new street connecting East Walnut Drive South and Colima Road, and there will be internal circulation on new private streets but there will be no gates, and so there will be public access to those streets. As far as infrastructure, East Walnut Drive South will be widened to meet County standards, with new curb, gutter, sidewalk, lighting, and landscaping. The new sidewalk will connect to existing sidewalks to the east and west. All of the Infrastructure will be assessed and upgraded as necessary. That's your water, sewer, storm drain, and electric, phone, etc. new roadways, curb, gutter, sidewalks, fire hydrants, street lights, landscaping and irrigation to serve the proposed site. Here is a Conceptual Site Plan, the areas that are in yellow are the Single Family. The purple dictates the Duplexes and the Triplexes. The orange is the Townhomes and the green is the Open Space and the Public Parks. Now we're going to move on to issues that are going to be addressed in the EIR, so again, as a reminder to everybody here again, the County has determined that a full EIR is required. These are all the topical areas that are identified in the State CEQA checklist, Appendix G, of what should be addressed in a full EIR. So I’ll go quickly through this list so everybody's aware we have aesthetics, agriculture/forestry, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology/soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, tribal cultural resources, utilities and services, and wildfire. So again, this is a complete list, sorry to run you through that whole list, but this will be a reminder that every issue is being examined in this EIR. Here are the type of issues that are adressed in aesthetics. I'll give you a chance to digest that. You have issue associated with vistas, visibility, change in visual character, shadows, nighttime lighting and glare impacts. Under agriculture/forestry, you'll be looking at the zone change from agricultural to RPD residential. Air quality, there is quite a list of air quality issues that need to be looked at in an environmental impact report that have consistency with the air quality management plan. You have short-term emissions and long-term operational emissions, cumulative emissions and proximity to sensitive receptors, including residential, schools and parks. I think at our last meeting, someone was concerned about congregate care, and that is also a sensitive receptor. We also had a comment raised at the last meeting about making sure Valley Fever is addressed and we appreciate that comment and that will be addressed under air quality.
Under biological resources, you have potential losses to sensitive or special status species. Project impact to sensitive natural communities. Impacts of Federally or State protected

wetlands or waters of the United States. Potential impacts of wildlife movement. A lot, of people made comments about that at the last meeting. Potential oak tree impacts off-site and conflict with any local policies, or ordinances protecting biological resources. Cultural resources. Will there be a change of significance to a historical, or archaeological resource. Or a potential disturbance to human remains during earth movement. Energy. Will there be wasteful or inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and they are listed there for you. Is there a state or local plans consistency, for renewable energy or energy efficiency and is it consistent with those plans. Geology and soils. These are the issues that will be addressed under geology and soils, everything from ground shaking, to land slide movement, increased soil erosion, and any potential impacts to unique paleontological resources. Green House Gas Emissions. Will there be an increase in ghg emissions because of construction and operation? Is the Project consistent with applicable greenhouse gas emission plans? Hazards / Hazardous Materials will be looking at such issues as fire and emergency access response and evacuation, potential impacts for fire hazards, and is there adequate water supply and water pressure to meet a fire flow standards. Hydrology and Water Quality. Construction, related, water contaminants, changes to existing drainage patterns was a concern that was brought up quite frequently at the last meeting. Increase their rate or amount of surface run-off resulting from imperious surfaces. Again, it was an issue as brought up several times. Compliance with national permit requirements having to do with urban runoff consistency with the County's low impact development ordinance. And the local impact development ordinances to decrease the amount of runoff, that comes off from developed sites. Under land use and planning, is the Project in compliance with the County's General Plan? Look at compliance with the Rowland Heights Community General Plan. Compliance with the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Compliance with the County Zoning Ordinance and the potential for the Project to physically divide an established community. Mineral Resources. This is usually looking at whether or not there are unique mineral resources in the area that could be impacted. An example of that would be sand of gravel resources. Noise. I know that was a concern that was brought up at the previous meeting. Construction noise adjacent to sensitive receptors. Noise impacts resulting from change in an ambient noise levels from traffic generated from the Project and construction vibration impacts. Under Population and Housing, will the Project create substantial growth in the area? Or would it displace a substantial number of existing people or housing? Under Public Services, there were quite a few concerns about the availability of public services at the last meeting. So all public services will be evaluated, fire protection, sheriff protection schools, and libraries. Recreation. Will there be deterioration of existing neighborhoods, or regional parks by increase use or will the project involve the construction of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Transportation / Traffic, this is another issue that was brought up quite frequently at our last scoping session. So will there be impacts caused by the additional of the Project. From a vehicle miles traveled perspective that is a metric that is now used in the State of California. Consistency with congestion management programs. Is there adequate emergency access or will there be any increase hazards due to roadway geometric design features. Tribal Cultural Resources will be evaluated. Will there be a substantial adverse change to tribal cultural resources? Utilities and Services. Construction of new utilities with significant effect. Is there sufficient Water supply? Several commenters brought up the availability of

water at the last meeting. Sufficient wastewater treatment capacity. Sufficient solid waste capacity. Wildfire. Another issue that is on everybody's mind these days. And again, brought up quite frequently, at the last meeting. Is there adequate emergency evacuation? Is there potential to exasperate wild fire risk and post wildfire flooding or landslides? There's a section, another section that's required in the environmental impact report, is what's required other CEQA considerations, so are there alternatives to the proposal Project to avoid significant impacts. Is there something that could be done, if the Project identifies that there are significant impacts in certain areas, is there an alternative that could reduce those impacts or eliminate those impacts. Are there one or more alternatives to the proposed project that would avoid or reduce the significant impacts, while meeting the majority of the Project objectives? Are there cumulative effects? Are there are growth inducing effects. So additional opportunities for public input. We actually, this was was a slide from November 1st, when we had the virtual scoping session. Obviously I just were today, we're at December 6th for this in-person meeting. The Notice of Preparation, please provide your comments by December 12th. You can either hand in those comments, by US Mail, or email. The draft EIR will be out for 45-day, public review period, as identified earlier. That will give you a chance to review the evaluation that was done and then provide any comments that you have on that. There will be a Hearing Examiner public hearing, to solicit comments during the Draft EIR and then as we identified earlier, the Final EIR and the Project will be presented to the Regional Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors. That actually concludes the presentation. This is again just to a reminder to please provide comments today or tonight as we identified but you're also welcome to provide any written comments, but please submit those by December 12th. That'll be actually next week and Marie is identified there as a primary lead. She's, the lead planner on the Project. Here is her email address as the preferred method of contact and her telephone number is provider here as well. That actually concludes the presentation thank you.

18:29:35 Josh Huntington
Thank you, Steve, and also for anyone who wants to provide comment, during the public comment period, please sign in with Marie now. You can still sign in, but we have lots of people who have signed in already. And I think Darrell are you gonna time?
Thank you, and when the timer is ready, we'll get started. And each speaker has 3 min and I'll call 2 names at a time. So feel free to both, come to the mic. The first person I have is that Dat Tran. Also, I'm very sorry for any pronunciation errors. Is that Dat Tran available to speak? And the second name is Mike Popova. Mike, are you available?

18:31:16 Mike Popova
You ready to go? I thought last time I was here and saw the presentation that there was a plan for a 4-way stop sign on Colima Road, but I didn’t see that here on this presentation. Is that true? Can you answer that question, or not.

Josh Huntington - I'm not sure about the traffic signalization.

Mike Popova. Because that is kind of a non-starter for us. Ok? Because in the past we've had, you know. Stop signs and stop sign outages its calamity here…. Okay, so we cannot have a 4-

way stop sign? Period. Secondly, has there been any consideration for reclaimed water. I didn't see or hear anything like that, so I'll assume that about the entire water supply is gonna be driven or derived from municipal water. Is that correct? And lastly, you know my major concern is the zoning change. I think that's a slippery slope for us. Because once this is plan is approved, okay, other developers are gonna look to our beautiful slopes to the south here. Ok, our beautiful hills, it is gonna be rampant folks… and let's see, I think I had one more. I don't know how much time I have left. So this you know, I understand the school district situation. I asked what their attitude is about this. And frankly, they derive their source of revenue from ADA, Average Daily Attendance so they are probably not going to be against this. My other major concern is this. You guys are only a planning to develop a portion of the golf course. What's gonna happen with the rest okay, that's not planned for development. Those people that surround that particular portion of the golf course are going to see something horrific. Such as what's happened, at Sierra La Verne Country Club in San Dimas, ok. You know those people, were against development and all of a sudden, saw the golf course go fallow. You know, so instead of looking out at beautiful fairways and greens, you know they saw weeds. So this is why I'm also here. Alright I thank you very much. So if there is many other input, you guys can possibly provide we would all appreciate it.

18:34:08 Josh Huntington
And next we have Mary Price, and Shelley Gentry, Mary and Shelly.

18:34:21 Mary Price
My name is Mary Price. I actually live on the other side of the golf course. My backyard is on the south nine of the back corner which is not going to be part of the development [unintelligible] water is mostly coming from underground to water the grass right now. Is that supply going to be turning off? Then who is going to be watering and keeping the other side maintained? Because originally all you guys… all three…all the land is all under one lease agreement and because of one parcel you guys purchased the land and breaking this agreement and now the golf course is not able to be run efficiently because of the lease. And so it's not because they do not [unintelligible] the land owner is not allowing [unintelligible] so thank you.

Josh Huntington
Thank you, is Shelley? Here. Would you like to provide comment?
Go ahead. And please state your name for the record

18:35:57 Mary Price
My name is Shelly Gentry. I have spoken before but I would like to reiterate some concerns I have. One is follow up on the 4-way stop on Colima. This is a dangerous street. There have been people killed there, which is why introducing a 4-way stop and 2 lights within like a 100 feet of each other. And this is going to cause massive traffic, and it's going to be a disaster. Also you're taking these trails and you are dragging them behind those homes…their backyards that were originally designed for the backyards to have full view of the golf course, now people ar going to have a full view of their backyards. Its unsafe. The park is a hazard. The park is going to be open on two ends, so it's just gonna be a pass through. So you are going to have crime. And

you're not gonna be able to stop the crime because you have one way…. most parts have one way in one way, the same way out. This one is a pass through. You're also dragging people across the street to continue on these trails. When you that, you're gonna encourage jay walking, because they are not going to walk the 50 feet down the street to cross at Leanne Terrace. It's not gonna happen. You're gonna have people jay walking across. You need to close that Park on Colima, because you're also going to get parents that are going to drop off their kids on Colima. If you stop on Colima, you pull over pull over to the side, this is a 45 mile an hour road. You're going to cause a hazard. There's going to be accidents, and I want the builder to be held accountable when people are hurt, mamed or injured there. They have been warned they have been told and unless they address those concerns they are liable, and I will be the first one to point out that they were all they were notified and everybody told them not to do it. My house backs to the golf course, I have a chain link fence they say they're not going to provide fencing, and they want to put a playground for 5 to 12 year old's smack in front of my fence, but across the way you have houses that are elevated from the golf course. I'm golf course level. What kind of sense does that make? How is my house going to be safe? What kind of safety am I gonna have when somebody could just step over my fence? You're ruining the value of my property. Also the condos on the side that you're gonna build, you think all those people can go through Walnut Drive? No, what they're gonna do is they're gonna come around and they're going to go to Colima. So not only are you getting them back to my house, you are not they're come, they're going to come up Calbourne, to Colima. I live on Calbourne. So not only are you ruining the front of my house, you're gonna ruin the back of my house. My house will have no value anymore. I will fight this tooth and nail. You will always hear from me. That's it.

18:39:09 Adele Prince
Adele, can you hear me? Adele Prince.

1441 Fairlance Drive. I for one, do not see how a proposal for a 6 acre park surrounded by housing and cement is somehow to make up for the loss of 76 acres of beautiful nature, nor do I for a moment see this proposal as an altruistic answer to provide more housing for the State of California. If that were the true motive, there's plenty of land available without destroying a designated open space in an underserved community. I personally believe the true motive here is purely a financial one. A week ago today, the LA Times ran an article stating the 2 of the major water districts of Southern California, stated that we are headed toward mandatory water conservation because of a lack of sufficient amount of water. At what point do the LA County officials realize that approval of this development will only exacerbate our water crisis? Such plans as these put availability of water for all of us at great risk. At what point do the LA County Officials realize that their duty is to their existing constituents, not to a developer. I wonder who will be held accountable for any potential increased crime we see in the newly formed public park, the developer, or the LA Planning Commission? Who will be accountable for the decreased value of surrounding homes? Especially those who paid more for their homes, because they were adjacent to or near a golf course? The developer or the LA Planning Commission? Who will be responsible for the inevitable increase in traffic with hundreds more cars on Colima with the potential for more accidents resulting in loss of property, or much more

importantly loss of lives? The developer or the LA Planning Commission? To whom do we address any increase in crime, on public walking trails surrounding this development and would apparently be adjacent to our homes? The developer, or the LA Planning Commission? To be clear, I for one see absolutely nothing positive in this proposal, and I vehemently oppose it.

18:42:34 Ko
My my name is Ko. My neighborhood is similar to Central Park in New York. The golf course to us is as beautiful and charming as Central Park in New York. Royal Vista has lot of trees. More than 300 of them. I heard that we have to cut down all of those trees if we have to develop some residentials out there. Let's say that one tree, only takes 10 years to grow. Let's just say that, 300 trees would take us 3,000 years to grow all together? It is a pity if we cut down trees like that. I believe that this project will impact in the negative ways and change the ecosystem. It's not healthy. Just like, if you change the humans in ecosystem, but nature is the same. Trees and the humans interactive, they creating a better housing environment by exchanging the oxygens that the trees release. It is important for us humans to take and enjoy the trees, what the trees can offer us. If you cut down all of those trees, our living environment and our life quality will be impacts. That is my first point. The golf course has existed for 50 years. Everyday it takes a lot of water to maintain that space. The underneath of that soil is quite wet. It is not good for humans body and health if you put any kind of residential on top of that kind of soil. It is very easy to get sick. That's why I oppose this proposal.

18:48:51 Victor
My name is Victor, my comments are directly in regards to the grading or specifically the construction period when they're grading and building and the noise of the construction. Clearly, currently we're still in the Covid environment where most of us are working from home. The noise of the construction, as well as the [?]. I think it's going to be a major detriment to those that are working from home. Especially with older buildings, the windows are older, so you don't get as much protection. I think there's a lot of wind and dust that comes in from the exteriors. Also the other concern is that our homes are higher than the golf course land which means that to be able to protect us current homeowners, from the pollutants, something needs to be done so that you know, we can still use our backyard and not be affected by the by the construction, if this does move forward. That being said, I do not agree with this development. Thank you.

18:50:11 Natalie Moreno
My name is Natalie Moreno. One of the I didn't see on the bullet points. You do have air quality, but is it going to show the mitigation of the pollutants, and the greenhouse gases that are being pulled from the 60 by the vegetation in direct correlation to the added greenhouse gases, from what a 1,000 new Cars? For the Traffic Study how far out are you guys going? I'm on this side of the town. I have kids that go to school on this side of the town. You add a couple 1,000 car trips on Colima, my 12-minute commute is now going to be 35-minute commute. With the compliance for the Rowland Heights General Plan this Project's already non-compliant. The residents were to have buy-in to give permission for this study to even be done and overwhelmingly the residents and constituents said no. There were hundreds there and the

developer. Yet here we stand. I also would like to know for those who may have needed a Spanish interpreter, why, none of the LA County sponsored vendors, such as Language Line, Avasa. They are not called, they do not have an interpreter here, for this public meeting.

Josh Huntington
We have 2 interpreters which were stuck in traffic, but I speak Spanish and that's why I said if anyone needs a Spanish interpreter I would be happy to help.

Natalie Moreno
But in real time it was not being…. it disenfranchises okay, yeah, I mean. Okay

Spanish Interpreters stated "We are here".

Will LA County be providing a subsidy for the rate hikes our water is gonna cost? The of law supply and demand already says, water prices are going up, availability is going up. Once the demand goes up, so does the price. That is going to be pricing out most of our seniors that are already having a hard time paying rent and food. Rent, food and utilities, plus medication… that's almost a pipe dream for most of the residents. And we don't see, we see problems that are going to be compiled with problems, I mean somebody thought it would be a great idea to put a stop sign on Colima. Colima, has its own social media page called, "Oh my God, I hate Colima Road", and let's help things by that putting a stop sign. I just I don't. I didn't see these in here, and I'm hoping in the final that those would be addressed because the traffic study, right there, around there may only affect hundreds to a 1,000 people, but if you circle out that traffic study, we're now talking tens of thousands of people. Will the traffic study also show how much longer the bus services are going to be because if the traffic is there then people getting to and from school, work, County buildings, that's, all gonna take longer. There there are so many things about this, thank you.

18:53:56 Hung Shi
Hi, my name is Hung Shi. My first point is, I don't know if everybody feels the same way I do. Every time I pass from east side of Colima or west side of Colima, through the golf course, I can feel 2 or 3 degrees temperature drop, because of the golf course. So I don't know. Anyone feel the same way I do? I feel that way. And if we gonna replace that temperature drop with concrete, which were increased 2 or 3 degrees. I don't know, are we coming to live in a wonderland, or not? I believe I want to leave in a wonderland. That second point is I move in 4 years ago because of a golf course. If you gonna construct a concrete again, maybe I have to move out, so I don't know. Thank you.

18:55:36 Linda Hymes
My name is Linda Hymes. I come here tonight to ask you all to be forward thinking. Forward thinking for our community and for all of Los Angeles County. Surely with imagination and thoughtful planning we can create a new vision for unincorporated LA County. One that maintains dedicated open space, because it's good for all living creatures. Instead of creating large profits for individuals and development companies. I've lived here in Rowland Heights

since 1977. The first map I share with you shows the portions of our open hillside and open space that have given way to housing developments over the years look how much of it is gone. Notice in this map how little green space still exists just a few parks dotted here and there. Where I zoom out, you could see how much of neighboring Industry and Walnut have also taken out hillsides, and natural habitat for the construction of more homes and lots of warehouses in Industry. Enough is enough. It's time for us to protect our open spaces while we still have some. Look at the solid line that goes from left to right, this town Rowland Heights has one main street that carries the great majority of the traffic. We indeed have one main drag. The traffic on this road is already heavy. It parallels the 60 freeway, and the 60/57 junction, which is one of the worst connections in LA County. The on ramps at Fairway and Lemon create additional traffic jams every afternoon and evening. Adding more intersections, more traffic lights, and more importantly, more cars makes no sense at all. This would make an already intolerable situation even worse. The second map shows a closer view of the area in question. Look at the density of the buildings surrounding our current open space zoning. Surely we can find a way to maintain this little piece of space. Looking at the parking lot daily, I question the judgment that the golf course is not financially feasible. But if it cannot remain a golf course, then surely, we can find creative ways to maintain this open space with a natural habitat wildlife sanctuary or park. While traveling in Virginia and Massachusetts, I was heartened by the community's foresight as I walked through multiple areas where they set aside land to preserve the areas plant and animal habitats. These designated spaces reduce traffic pollution, and they do much to enhance the lives of the humans who live and visit. Surely, we can also have such foresight and plan with more than profits in mind. There is a huge negative impact of the overuse of our land with additional development in an already crowded area that takes away the rural nature that is part of our community plan, and that's what brought us all to live here. The developers will come, destroy our community and move on with their millions and millions of profits. We are left to live with what they have left us. More traffic, more pollution, less peace, less green space, and loss of wildlife habitat. Please, can we set a precedent for a new vision for Los Angeles County, one that plans for the health of all living things.

18:59:35 Linda Kou
Linda Kou. I have 2 comments. Total grading has now increased from 2.2 to 3.6 million cubic yards. This is an extremely large volume of earthwork. This is about one square mile by one yard high. Let me repeat that one square mile by one yard high of earth, movement. How long is this gonna take, 4 months, 8 months, one year, 2 years? We don't have that information yet. A couple of residents have already contracted Valley Fever, a fungal infection, which attacks the respiratory tract, the last time homes were built in this area. I believe that some of the residents will get sick if the soil is disturbed again. I would like to know the mitigation protocol to ensure that we will not contract Valley Fever, or other fungal airborne diseases such as Mucomycosis. With Mucomycosis, this fungi often found in soil, is deadly for people of weak immune system. We have an assisted living facility, less than half a mile from the site, with many residents in their eighties, and nineties. The grading proposed could be deadly to these residents. We are talking about people's health and lives here. Rowland Heights demands environmental justice. We all have a right to a healthy living environment. This is a basic human right that the County needs to protect. Point 2. Wet soil and groundwater. Wet soil was found

as shallow as 2.5 feet on the north side of the course, near where 2 Ponds, were drained 2 months ago. When there is heavy storm, you could actually see the sheets of water flowing from the south side to the north side of the course, which is at a lower elevation. The water collects on the north side of the course and this is why the soil is wet at 2.5 feet. This is also, why one of the ponds that was drained 2 months ago, is now filled with water. The golfers tells me there are duck swimming in the ponds again. With the quantity of earth movement and wet soil, there are concerns of possible landslides on some of the existing homes in the Harvard Estate Development, which is right next, to the proposed development. This is a disaster in the making. I urge the Planning Department to carefully perform due diligence on this matter to prevent health issues, possible landslide and sinking houses in the feature. Thank you for your time.

19:02:27 Wanda Ewing
Wanda Ewing. Drought has been a long term reality in California. However, today's drought conditions are unlike anything previously documented. This is largely a result of human activities, including water diversion, and overextraction of groundwater. The Royal Vista housing project will convert 76 acres of carbon sink, to concrete asphalt and 360 units diverting the golf course's natural water during the rain to storm drains filled with contaminants, such as motor oil, detergents, pet waste, fertilizers, and pesticides, flowing directly to the ocean. The rainwater will no longer permeate into the Puente Hills Aquifer, with the loss of the watershed of the open Space. We have documented the heavy flow of streams and flooding of the land during periods of rain, including the most recent on November 8th 2022. California is the most diverse State in the nation. The drought has had a large-scale impact on plant life and whole ecosystems with documented changes in plant and animal distributions and extinctions. North America has experienced the decline of 3 billion birds, since 1970. The open space of Royal Vista is currently home to many birds and animals. To name a few we have photographed on the golf course, the Blue Heron, Great Horned Owl, swallows, Barn Owls, Canada Geese, Coyotes, skunks, cottontail rabbits, and racoons. DRP must stop the local extinction crisis by leaving the open space zoned as open and allow nature to rebound. There has never been a more urgent moment, where all of us must join together in conserving the few open spaces remaining, providing the community with a local natural climate solution to save not only human well-being, but also our future. Thank you.

19:04:45 Wren Ewing
My name is Wren. Regarding the air quality in greenhouse gas emissions in our sensitive receptor zone, Royal Vista is one mile from the 57/60 freeway interchange, the worst in California as well as the City of Industry's goods transit corridor, both very heavy carbon sources. This community is already at a heightened risk of poor health from vehicle pollutants. Destroying the open space carbon sink with more development, will further endanger the health of the residents of Rowland Heights. This project unfortunately proposes the planting of non-natives in the small parks and trails, encouraging the toxic spread of invasive species, further impacting the biodiversity of our area only one mile from the Puente Hills significant ecological area. It is crucial the EIR considers the developer's environmentally harmful landscape plan. According to the Metropolitan Water District, planting California natives, is a

sustainable landscaping approach. They are naturally drought tolerant and support local ecosystems, providing habitat for birds, butterflies, and pollinators, unlike, the ornamental plants from around the world, listed in the developer's landscape plans. Developing these last acres of open space in Rowland Heights will have a huge impact on local wildlife and our community members. DRP has a golden opportunity to protect the health and fate of our environment, which we should all understand is tied to the health and fate of ourselves, and future generations.

19:06:20 [Name? Woman]
With this project my concerns are with the solid waste that will be generated. As we already know, the Puente Hills Landfill has closed. The landfill here, Spadra Landfill is closed. We're going to have more trash vehicles collecting waste and transporting it further along Colima, Fullerton Boulevard, creating unsanitary conditions, and destroying the pavement with those heavy equipment that they use when they collect on trash day. You mentioned that the Royal Vista is not a open space. It's privately owned but In our eyes, it's always been an open space. It's not strictly, for golfers. I've been there many times to enjoy the breakfast with my dad. When he was still alive, we would eat breakfast and relax and enjoy the green, the lawns, the fresh air, and just relax there and you don't have to have membership, so even though it's privately owned it's always been open to the community not just for golfers. My other concern is the impact to emergency response. I'm over in Industry, Diamond Bar Area, and I'm wondering if my first responders are going to have to leave my area. My EMT's, my fire department, my sheriff's deputies will they have to service, these, how many? 360 units they're gonna be constructed here. LA County is already. We don't have enough employees as it is in terms of fire, in terms, of deputy sheriff's we are severely understaffed. And now we've got more people coming here that we need to service. That's another concern that I have. Emergency response teams. My other concern is everyone is already mentioned is the greenhouse gases, as you know we already have this horrible project they've got going on. As you know, Colima becomes Golden Springs Road. On the corner of Golden Springs and Grand, the Diamond Bar Golf Course, look at how many trees they have fallen. You're driving East on the 60 Freeway, before it was a canopy of trees and now it's just though they've raped the land if you ask me it's it's horrible to look at and all of those trees, were taking all this poisonous greenhouse gases from the atmosphere and they are gone. I've lived here since the late eighties, and I'm just…. the density…the overpopulation, is the Traffic…. talk about anxiety, I mean I'm I'm just I just It's, because of the density that this project is going to bring that I am vehemently opposed to it, not even, and of course the wildlife, the open spaces, the destruction, and then as I mentioned also the lack of EMT', emergency response teams, where are they going to be coming from? My neighborhood? That's a concern that I haven't heard anyone mention. The under staff of the… Because we are LA County, so we'll be LA County personnel that will be responding to emergencies in this area. And I think that's all I have to say. Thank you.

19:09:42 Jack Yow
Good evening, my name is Jack Yow. I'm living 1620 Chapel Hill. Back on the golf course directly. Okay so, I believe while we are discussing the scoping here and the must be the the developer,

behind the scene, probably they already had a calculation conclusions about how much money they are making. And my point is, would you please also you know like adjust this concern, why they make money, how much value or impacted to our current residents? And I believe most of the residents are same as my situation. When we decided to purchase the property on to the golf course, we already have been considered, you know first, personally I went to the County to verify the all those zoning adjacent the area. It is defined as the open space, and of course, on the scoping meeting, we have M.1.1. Now we are talking about 1, change in zoning. 2, subdivide into a 10,000 square foot into a 5,000 square foot, I believe if I am not wrong. And also with the high density residential to be developed, and I can assuming all the money they are making for the current homeowner because they probably bought that open space land that's totally changed the use into a highest value highest the price of the residential land, right? Of course I'm not jealous, of they making money make the quick rich. Meantime developer will make a money opportunity. Of course, County will also benefit from those development, but remember all those money making are based on the loss of the value to my current house, lost impact on our values to my improvement to my house, because to be honest with that I spend a lot of money right against that you know the golf course make a beautiful deck, and the canopies, and the gazebo right? So I want to my back house, really like in a you know, good attractive places. But now, okay, when I step out, I will see you, all those house, all the roofing right? and all those jumps from the new houses backyard. Which is I totally not acceptable, and also since this is a scope, right? So I would highly request to consider adjust those you know, impacted to our current house values. And I would definitely stand it to the last minutes to defense this project. That's my personal you know opinions. Thank you very much.

19:13:05 Susan Trautz
Hello, my name is Susan Troutz. I just want to thank everybody who showed up today and spoke. This is not easy for us. We have expertise in our fields, not in yours, but we are here because we care and many signed up to speak and didn't speak because this is difficult.
But we care. Rowland Heights, is an unincorporated area, we've always been considered a no man's land. Because nobody represents us. They come and they go, and they don't speak for us. Even though we need them to. We already brought the land use restriction up and the County said, Supervisor said, that's a private matter between you (us) and the developers. Well that sounds fair doesn't it? Anyways, I did prepare some things while I was in back the room. The subdivision committee report indicates it has been revised. It's difficult to determine to determine what has been updated. Please be more transparent in these reports, for the impacted communities. If you're goal with affordable housing is to increase equity, spread the affordable housing within the development. Don't put them along the 60 Freeway, where the air quality is the worst. Equity? Don't put them there. Spread them around. Study how many existing neighborhoods have their only egress to Colima. In the event of a major emergency where we have to evacuate such as a wildfire, which we've had in the past, closed our schools, the area will be gridlocked and you know who will be impacted the most… the elderly, and the ones with mobility concerns. They won't be able to get out. There are many neighborhoods that just egress to Colima they have no other way out. When Lennar built those homes the only way they have out is Colima also. They can't come through our neighborhood. They do, but that's

beside the point. As everyone here knows, Colima is not pedestrian friendly, particularly during morning and evening commutes. When the freeway has closures or problems, most of those cars come through Colima. Another problem for the walkers around here, existing sidewalks have mud and tree debris, which leads to slip and fall injuries. If there are similar roles of residential units in this development, who share sloped land areas and retaining walls, determine who is responsible for maintaining that land and wall structures. The existing neighborhood with these features are no man's land. The County does nothing to help maintain those walls and that land that shared by multiple single family homeowners. I have to skip to this, the landslide area mapped in the subdivision committee report needs the light of day and residents near that area, and i'm not one, but I care about everybody here, the area near that area should be, those residents should be told about the mitigation efforts. Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

19:16:31 Robert Lou
My name is Robert Lou obviously if this project is a go, then all of our quality of life will be great gravely affected, and then lots of our neighbor has already elaborated on that eloquently. Today, when I came over here, when I look at those presentation, the EIR, the category. It was overwhelming, almost cover all categories, but one. You, know I can know this, probably not a good time to ask question, but I have a question. Who will make the final decision? Is it the Planning Committee, Supervisor, or who because the impact is so big. For developer, lots of money, for us, my backyards to the golf, course. So this is pretty bad. I've been here for 30 years now. But if it is for the better, you know, for the good of the whole community, well what can I say? This is a very well-developed, integrated community. Is not a community, that is, you know, gradually developing. Most neighbors here probably you know 20 -30 years, the golf course is 50 years. This is not a vacant land. So we can build something? Solve the housing crisis. This is a well developed community, including people, vegetation and wildlife. Change the zoning if the reason is only because of financial gain? I obviously don't understand and then so that's why the question, who can make that decision? Obviously, not us. And then you know so that's my comment, and I leave a question there, and that's why I signed up because I'm dumbfounded. I'm puzzled. Thank you.

19:19:20 Jerry Soresnson
I signed up on the list, and now, my name is not there. My name is Jerry Sorenson. I've lived here for 30 years couple of questions for the presenters your first slide said this is gonna show the merits of this project first bullet item on your first slide. Did I see any merits of this project for our community. There was merits for the developers who want to ruin our community, but there were no merits listed on any of your slides, not one. Did I miss it? Maybe that's why my name is not on the list to speak or ask questions. I didn't see any of it. We went through this most of us, went through all this about 7 years ago, when they wanted to do the same thing, and a developer wanted to make is a beautiful area, and get rid of the golf course. We voted it down. As I understand, the developers who are looking at this project right now have been working over at the Westridge Country Club for 7 years, to do the same thing to there. They finally pulled out, because the community said no. So they're not doing it anymore. The community said, no, we want to keep the golf course. We don't want more development. We

don't need it. We need open space that we have here. This golf course opened in 1963. Where did these developers come from, that now want to build houses on it? Yeah, we need to have houses, but not on the golf course. Leave our golf courses and our open spaces alone, and let us keep our community and you guys go someplace else and ruin somebody else's community, not ours.

18 19:22:21 Mr. Lin
My name in Lin. I'm a resident of LA County. I just have questions. When the presenter mentioned that we have only 6 days to provide our input. I think it's a grocery unfair. You go ahead with the information, we don't, and you give us only 6 days, 6 days in the Christmas season? This is the first time…are you the boss or we are the boss? Can you please extend the time a little bit so we can do a proper study? You have expertise. We have expertise, too. But we need time. Thank you

00:24:07.000 --> 00:24:11.000
So thank you all for your patience, and good evening, My name is Josh.

00:24:11.000 --> 00:24:13.000
Huntington. I'm the subdivision section.

00:24:13.000 --> 00:24:19.000
I'm with the La County Department of Regional planning Welcome to the sculpting meeting for the royal visit project.

00:24:19.000 --> 00:24:25.000
Thank you for your participation in the environmental review process for this proposed project.

00:24:25.000 --> 00:24:36.000
The purpose of the scoping meeting is to get input from from the community regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project.

00:24:36.000 --> 00:24:42.000
If you require interpretation service, you may use the pop-up at the bottom of your screen.

00:24:42.000 --> 00:24:47.000
That says interpretation available. There is an interpretation button.

00:24:47.000 --> 00:24:57.000
You can click and select another language, feed. The options, are Spanish, Korean, mandarin, and Cantonese.

00:24:57.000 --> 00:25:05.000
You'll hear a presentation about you will hear a presentation about the project, and have an opportunity to comment at this meeting.

00:25:05.000 --> 00:25:25.000
You may also submit written comments. After the meeting, and if you give us your email address, the planner in charge of the case, Marine Pavlovitch will inform you of future public hearings, the county takes your Privacy and security, seriously your Microphones will be muted until it is your turn to

00:25:25.000 --> 00:25:41.000
provide comments at that point you may unmute yourself if you're calling in, you can unmute yourself, using Star 6, you Will not be able to screen share or video share at any point during the meeting.

00:25:41.000 --> 00:25:45.000
Lastly, I ask that everyone be respectful to each other.

00:25:45.000 --> 00:25:49.000
The presenter, and to county staff, and with that we're ready to start.

00:25:49.000 --> 00:25:54.000
The meeting with a presentation from Steve. Letterley. Steve, are you ready

00:25:54.000 --> 00:26:01.000
alright. Ready, Thank you, Josh. Please proceed as noted.

00:26:01.000 --> 00:26:06.000
This is a public scoping meeting for the Royal Guest Residential parks Project.

00:26:06.000 --> 00:26:12.000
the. There are various applications that are part of this process.

00:26:12.000 --> 00:26:20.000
There's investing tentative track map, a plan amendment, a zone change, hey?

00:26:20.000 --> 00:26:24.000
Conditional use, Permit, hey? How's he permit?

00:26:24.000 --> 00:26:30.000
Add an environmental assessment. They're all listed on the bottom now can pour out the side next slide.

00:26:30.000 --> 00:26:35.000
Please.

00:26:35.000 --> 00:26:43.000
How's already? Do the introductions, Josh and Maria, or with the Department of Richard planning with the county of Los Angeles as identified earlier.

00:26:43.000 --> 00:26:47.000
My name is Steve Letterly. Hi, Facilitator for the project.

00:26:47.000 --> 00:26:51.000
I work for Lsa. But I've already been consultant.

00:26:51.000 --> 00:27:11.000
I have not a a consultant. Environment consultant working on this project There is a remote environment I'll be preparing the environmental document that is, Yeah, And then there is also an applicant for the project which is Rv: TV Lc: next slide.

00:27:11.000 --> 00:27:17.000
Please.

00:27:17.000 --> 00:27:28.000
As was mentioned earlier by Josh. A scoping meeting is an opportunity to provide comments regarding the type and extent of an environmental analysis to be undertaken.

00:27:28.000 --> 00:27:34.000

The first of separate opportunities for the public to discuss aspects of the proposed project.

00:27:34.000 --> 00:27:39.000
Other opportunities include comments on the draft environmental impact report.

00:27:39.000 --> 00:27:42.000
That's what er stands for is environmental impact report.

00:27:42.000 --> 00:27:54.000
Before a hearing Examiner public carried out a project before the regional Planning Commission at a public hearing on the project before the Board of Supervisors.

00:27:54.000 --> 00:27:59.000
Next slide, please

00:27:59.000 --> 00:28:06.000
There are some things that scoping media is not, is not a forum for discussing the merits of the proposed project.

00:28:06.000 --> 00:28:14.000
Those will be opportunities when you're at when you're at the public meetings with the planning commissioners, or with the Board of Supervisors.

00:28:14.000 --> 00:28:18.000
It's a for for answering questions about analysis outcomes.

00:28:18.000 --> 00:28:27.000
We are still early in the environment impact process. A public hearing as to whether a proposed project should be approved or not approved.

00:28:27.000 --> 00:28:34.000
That's not what this meeting, the scopey meeting is about, and it is not a hearing at which he project.

00:28:34.000 --> 00:28:40.000
Decisions are made. This is strictly a meeting to take in your considerations.

00:28:40.000 --> 00:28:46.000
For what are there potential environmental issues associated with this project?

00:28:46.000 --> 00:28:51.000
Next slide, please

00:28:51.000 --> 00:29:06.000
Site location I don't know if you pull that up just a little bit little bit tough to read, but the project is located in the northeast portion the unincorporated community Roland Heights.

00:29:06.000 --> 00:29:13.000

It is no, the intersection of fairway drive and state route, 60 highway, 63 or 60.

00:29:13.000 --> 00:29:19.000
Excuse me, and it is up. Currently used as a Royal Vista Golf Club.

00:29:19.000 --> 00:29:38.000
You can see the project Location is the black symbol down, or kind of the bottom right hand side of the on the slide between where it says Roland Heights and Diamond Bar next Slide please.

00:29:38.000 --> 00:29:42.000
Here here is a or a photograph of the project location.

00:29:42.000 --> 00:29:50.000
You could see Huh! 3 boy, 60 just to the north. Cleaner world goes through the middle of the project.

00:29:50.000 --> 00:29:57.000
Railway drive is this: to the left, and New Golf Club.

00:29:57.000 --> 00:30:06.000
Have the How's the surrounding the golf code next slide, please.

00:30:06.000 --> 00:30:10.000
This is existing and proposed zoning the existing zone.

00:30:10.000 --> 00:30:20.000
You know that is on the property At this time is a 1 one which stands for light agriculture, one acre minimum block area.

00:30:20.000 --> 00:30:29.000
Also there was a 1 10,000 right hour. Cultural That's 10,000 square feet minimum area.

00:30:29.000 --> 00:30:33.000
Propose zoning will be Rb. D Rb. D.

00:30:33.000 --> 00:30:41.000
Zoning residential plan development, 5,000 square feet minimum area

00:30:41.000 --> 00:30:45.000
Next slide, please

00:30:45.000 --> 00:30:51.000
Existing and proposed land uses

00:30:51.000 --> 00:30:57.000
The existing uses

00:30:57.000 --> 00:31:02.000

Is open up the space at a proposed is urban.

00:31:02.000 --> 00:31:06.000
2, which is a maximum of $6 units per acre for grocery.

00:31:06.000 --> 00:31:17.000
Excuse me, Urban, which is 3 cool. Over 3, which is a maximum 12 do I use for gross acre at Urban 4, which is a maximum of 22, to one is for growth.

00:31:17.000 --> 00:31:20.000
Acre.

00:31:20.000 --> 00:31:27.000
Next slide, please, I that I should. Excellent

00:31:27.000 --> 00:31:34.000
So background on the project. So county of Los Angeles has received an application for subdivision.

00:31:34.000 --> 00:31:44.000
I set 75, point, 6, 4 acre parcel, located at 2,000 20,100 block of Kalima Road.

00:31:44.000 --> 00:32:07.000
It's a 6 plan areas for development with the following these they sort of propose within a project area 200 single family detach phones, 58 duplex units Those are your side are attached 35 plus units, 10 monitor affordable for sell within those 30

00:32:07.000 --> 00:32:16.000
72 town homes, and there we submit to moderate, affordable 2 public parks and public use.

00:32:16.000 --> 00:32:22.000
Trails with an open space buffer areas surrounding the project Next, slide.

00:32:22.000 --> 00:32:28.000
Please.

00:32:28.000 --> 00:32:51.000
California environmental quality act. So what sequel stands for requires accounting to define required entitlements which were described at the beginning of the presentation review The potential environmental effects prior to any approvals county is determined here that there is a potential for significant impacts a pop report is required for

00:32:51.000 --> 00:33:01.000
everyone. Public disclosure of physical changes to the environment, peaceful mitigation measures and feasible alternatives.

00:33:01.000 --> 00:33:06.000

Next slide, please

00:33:06.000 --> 00:33:21.000
County identifies potential significant impacts and issues a notice of preparation of an er the county issued that notice of preparation on October thirteenth, 22 to solicit public agency a community.

00:33:21.000 --> 00:33:27.000
Input August of analysis to be included in the environmental impact report.

00:33:27.000 --> 00:33:30.000
There was a 45 day goes a preparation.

00:33:30.000 --> 00:33:36.000
Comic period, which was extended. And we'll close on December twelfth, 2,022.

00:33:36.000 --> 00:33:49.000
So 59 days total So if you would like your comments to be received prior to the problem of environmental pack report starting, it would be best to have those comments in, hey?

00:33:49.000 --> 00:33:57.000
There provide them during his public sc through meetings, or provide them prior to December twelfth, 2,022 Next slide.

00:33:57.000 --> 00:34:02.000
Please.

00:34:02.000 --> 00:34:23.000
So for next after, the A. Np. Is out, the there will be a preparation of the draft Environment impact report and it's considered a draft because it has not product that document has got for public review, and it also has to be considered by the decision makers, at the county but both the

00:34:23.000 --> 00:34:29.000
planning Commission has to review and consider consider it in the Board Supervisor has to take action on it.

00:34:29.000 --> 00:34:33.000
There's a 45 day public review period.

00:34:33.000 --> 00:34:46.000
The Harry Examiner, Harry Durry There'll be a here in Examiner Harry, during the draft er commentarian. So the Drowki I will come out I'll be circulated for public review you have a 45 day.

00:34:46.000 --> 00:34:53.000
Period. To make comments on the draft ir, and also be a hearing before the hearing examiner.

00:34:53.000 --> 00:34:59.000
During that time which comments can be made as well. Comments received.

00:34:59.000 --> 00:35:05.000
That'll be there. A process called responded comments, and to prepare for our Eir.

00:35:05.000 --> 00:35:23.000
So all the comments that are received on the project whether they're from an agency or from a public participant, or responded to, and they're part of the final eir that is, then presented to the reach our planning commission, hearing and then as a board, and the board of supervisors, so

00:35:23.000 --> 00:35:31.000
they, if they consider the regional planning Commission's recommendation, add a project, approval and certification

00:35:31.000 --> 00:35:39.000
Next slide, please. We'll never move into the project. Description

00:35:39.000 --> 00:35:46.000
I also stated Previously the project area covers 75, point, 6, 4 gross acres.

00:35:46.000 --> 00:35:50.000
It's with that unincorporated La county, Roland Heights.

00:35:50.000 --> 00:35:59.000
With an ex existing open space land use areas so meet me adjacent to the city of industry and the city of Diamond Bar.

00:35:59.000 --> 00:36:09.000
Existing improvements, a portion of the existing private royal visit, golf course, and driving range, or the existing purpose that occur on the property next slide.

00:36:09.000 --> 00:36:15.000
Please.

00:36:15.000 --> 00:36:21.000
Sorry, and for there are 6 planning areas for the project.

00:36:21.000 --> 00:36:28.000
There's planning areas and find areas, one and 5 that may comprise 52 point, 6, 9 acres.

00:36:28.000 --> 00:36:42.000
Okay. Residential units and open space with those planning areas that planet air will be comprised of 168 single family detached units, 58 duplex units and 30 top trucks. Here.

00:36:42.000 --> 00:36:53.000
So there'll be a combination of various product type within that planning area will

also be open space parks and trails that are available to a public find.

00:36:53.000 --> 00:36:57.000
An area 2 comprises 9, point, 5, 5 acres. I guess. So.

00:36:57.000 --> 00:37:16.000
Units are open space, that planning area will be comprised of 32 single family decach units and open space and trails again, that are open that will be available for public use 5 in area 3 surprise of 6 acres 72 town home units add again.

00:37:16.000 --> 00:37:21.000
They'll be open space and trials that will be publicly accessible.

00:37:21.000 --> 00:37:32.000
Planning areas. 4 and 6 are comprised completely of just public open space and parks, and make apply 7 point, 4 acres of the total project.

00:37:32.000 --> 00:37:39.000
Area, next slide, Please

00:37:39.000 --> 00:37:44.000
So that will discuss parks, trials, or open space existing.

00:37:44.000 --> 00:37:51.000
There is no public use. Open space. There is a golf course out of it is currently there require.

00:37:51.000 --> 00:38:00.000
The project is subject to county calculated park land obligation, or what they call in lou fee payment.

00:38:00.000 --> 00:38:05.000
The project is providing 5, point 8, One acre is a public neighborhood park.

00:38:05.000 --> 00:38:14.000
The succeeds the county parkland obligations, It'll be a 1.5, 9 acre public park pup, public pocket.

00:38:14.000 --> 00:38:31.000
Park. There'll be multiple private pocket parks within the project that will be open to the public There'll be approximately 18 acres of open space buffers with over 2 miles of public use recreational trials approximately 37% of the product site will be an open

00:38:31.000 --> 00:38:35.000
space.

00:38:35.000 --> 00:38:42.000
Next slide, please

00:38:42.000 --> 00:38:51.000
Building heights and planning, and PA, one which is comprised of signal family, detached duplex and triplex students.

00:38:51.000 --> 00:39:04.000
Okay, a maximum up to 2 stories, 30 foot, approximately, but not to exceed 35 foot and planet area 2, but y'all single family attached.

00:39:04.000 --> 00:39:08.000
2 story, again, average is about 30 foot and height, but not took C.

00:39:08.000 --> 00:39:14.000
35 foot finding area, 5 is single family detached.

00:39:14.000 --> 00:39:22.000
Doplex and triplex. 2 story units again, Same height of 34 about 2 C, 35 foot.

00:39:22.000 --> 00:39:26.000
Yeah, planning area 3 is surprise of talent homes.

00:39:26.000 --> 00:39:43.000
There'll be 3 story and 38 foot maximum parking required on the project site is this: required to have 740 spaces for parking The project is actually providing 973 spaces.

00:39:43.000 --> 00:39:49.000
And You can see the breakdown is a type of parking that's available, and and planning area.

00:39:49.000 --> 00:40:10.000
One that'd be too. Car attached garages, planning area 2 again, 2 car task garages planning area, 5 2 car cats, garages, kind of area, 3 2 car tax garages, and 63 guest spaces plan to area lot find there is 4 6 which are the public parks

00:40:10.000 --> 00:40:22.000
there'll be 16 spaces next slide. Please.

00:40:22.000 --> 00:40:26.000
So access to the project will provide it, and several different matters.

00:40:26.000 --> 00:40:35.000
There'll be inferences of exits at each new residential neighborhood, but access clients on East Wallet drive south.

00:40:35.000 --> 00:40:42.000
What? On the south Side and Collibr road, one on the north side and one on the south side.

00:40:42.000 --> 00:40:48.000
So we had new traffic circle provided at Kleimer Road, at Pierre Luda.

00:40:48.000 --> 00:40:54.000
The golf cart Crossing signal on cleaner road will be removed.

00:40:54.000 --> 00:41:03.000
2 new driveway entrances, exits on the south side of East Wall, and the drives south will be provided for the town homes.

00:41:03.000 --> 00:41:12.000
There'll be a new street connected east, Wall that drive south, and Kalima road and then there'll be an internal circulation on new private streets.

00:41:12.000 --> 00:41:17.000
There'll be no gates. But then the community next slide.

00:41:17.000 --> 00:41:21.000
Please.

00:41:21.000 --> 00:41:38.000
infrastructure improvements, each one the drive south will be widened to meet county standards with new curb gutter, sidewalk lighting it, landscaping. A new. Sidewalk will connect to existing sidewalks to the east and west all existing

00:41:38.000 --> 00:41:47.000
infrastructure, water, sewer, storm, drain, electric phone will be assessed and upgraded as necessary.

00:41:47.000 --> 00:41:52.000
You roadways curve, got our sidewalks, fire hydrants, street lights.

00:41:52.000 --> 00:41:58.000
Nice day. Cream and irrigation will be provided to serve the proposed site.

00:41:58.000 --> 00:42:09.000
Next slide, please

00:42:09.000 --> 00:42:13.000
So here's the conceptual lab client site plan for the project.

00:42:13.000 --> 00:42:21.000
you can see PA is up to the northeast of the orange, or just color.

00:42:21.000 --> 00:42:27.000
This is the very northeast of the slide, and that is that where the count homes will be located.

00:42:27.000 --> 00:42:35.000
Okay, one is immediately to the left, and that's where the Sigma family homes will be provided.

00:42:35.000 --> 00:42:45.000
And you have pas and 5 Watch are the larger residential areas which have which are the yellow and the purple.

00:42:45.000 --> 00:42:52.000
That's real. Comprise both single family. Tryplex and duplex And the 2 other planning areas are the park locations.

00:42:52.000 --> 00:43:07.000
Those are identified by the green, the one just up above Kalima Road, and the one just south of Clamor Road, at the very bottom of the slide. Next, slide.

00:43:07.000 --> 00:43:10.000
Please.

00:43:10.000 --> 00:43:13.000
So next is the issues to be addressed in the Ir.

00:43:13.000 --> 00:43:18.000
one thing the county has determined. Next slide

00:43:18.000 --> 00:43:26.000
Well, then, the county has determined is that this project will require a full er, or different types of irs that could be provided for.

00:43:26.000 --> 00:43:33.000
A project. Sometimes projects have a focused dir, and they only focus on particular issues.

00:43:33.000 --> 00:43:50.000
All these issues are issues that are identified by this and the State sequel guidelines that are issues that should be addressed in an eir and they open address as they are applicable to the project site so those issues that will be covered and bye the county has a term could have potentially significant

00:43:50.000 --> 00:44:07.000
effects, our aesthetics, agriculture, forestry, air, quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology, and soils.

00:44:07.000 --> 00:44:13.000
Great has gas emissions, hazards, and hazardous materials.

00:44:13.000 --> 00:44:43.000
Hi hydrology water quality Land use planning and planning metal resources, noise, population, housing, public services, recreation, transportation, traffic, tribal cultural resources, utilities and services and wildfire So this is a very comprehensive list issues that will be addressed in the environmental

00:44:44.000 --> 00:44:48.000
document, next slide, please

00:44:48.000 --> 00:44:53.000
I have. What we're gonna do is we're gonna walk through each of the different topics that are going to be evaluated.

00:44:53.000 --> 00:45:00.000
Hi! To provide you an idea of of what issues will be discussed in those different sections.

00:45:00.000 --> 00:45:13.000
So, under aesthetics. Although the discussion regarding the project development potential impacts to state vistas, visibility of the project from off-site locations such as trails, etc.

00:45:13.000 --> 00:45:22.000
The change and visual character to the neighborhood into the surrounding area, and any issues associated with shadows.

00:45:22.000 --> 00:45:32.000
Nighttime lighting angular impacts. Next, slide please.

00:45:32.000 --> 00:45:47.000
X. Category is agricultural forestry. Have the issues that have to be addressed is whether or not the project would convert prime far land, unique farm, lad or farmland of statewide importance.

00:45:47.000 --> 00:45:58.000
Well. The project involves us Don't change from agricultural to our we key residential, and it it will and we'll project conflict with force, land zoning or lost a force.

00:45:58.000 --> 00:46:10.000
Land. Some of these issues may not apply to the project, and if they do not apply, it will be explained why in the environmental document next slide, please

00:46:10.000 --> 00:46:16.000
Air, quality, is the type of co topics that will be addressed in the air Quality section.

00:46:16.000 --> 00:46:20.000
It's the project consistency with the air quality management plan.

00:46:20.000 --> 00:46:40.000
Each region has air, quality, management, plan, and it will be identified whether or not this project, consistent with that plan there'll be an evaluation of short term construction emissions, and long-term operational missions, a short term construction would be from from construction operations and

00:46:40.000 --> 00:46:48.000
equipment, that would be utilized on the site and long term operational missions

would be for vehicles, etc. Awesome?

00:46:48.000 --> 00:46:55.000
Well, evaluate cumulative emissions relative to ozone, carbon, monoxide, pm.

00:46:55.000 --> 00:47:16.000
10 and Pm. 2.5. We'll also evaluate proximity to sensitive receptors there's a potential that there'll be air quality impacts to adjacent residential areas schools and or parks next slide please

00:47:16.000 --> 00:47:28.000
Next topic I'll cover would be biological resources, hyper type of issues that will be addressed at this section are the potential loss of sensitive or special stack species.

00:47:28.000 --> 00:47:44.000
No, that's the special stat species by Federal or State law Pron the projects impact just sensitive, natural communities, potential impacts with Federal or state protected wetlands or waters of the us.

00:47:44.000 --> 00:47:50.000
So waters of the Us. Would be such or the state you, such things as streams, etc.

00:47:50.000 --> 00:47:56.000
That may be on the project site potential impact on a wildlife movement.

00:47:56.000 --> 00:48:05.000
Potential oak tree impacts and then conflict with any local policies or ordinances protected by biological resources.

00:48:05.000 --> 00:48:09.000
And those would be local. Policies or ordinances.

00:48:09.000 --> 00:48:16.000
from the county of Los Angeles. Next Slide please.

00:48:16.000 --> 00:48:20.000
Next topic to be addressed to be cultural resources.

00:48:20.000 --> 00:48:31.000
So will there be any change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource That is, on the problem site, and next topic would be a possible disturbance to human remains.

00:48:31.000 --> 00:48:42.000
That during Earth movement, quite often during projects, there are times where you'll find cultural resource, and they'll they'll be native American.

00:48:42.000 --> 00:48:48.000
there could be a potential negative American remains on the project site. Next

slide.

00:48:48.000 --> 00:48:52.000
Please.

00:48:52.000 --> 00:49:03.000
And the topic to be addressed would be energy. Hey, Well, it'll be wasteful and efficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or construction or operation.

00:49:03.000 --> 00:49:10.000
So that would include electricity and fossil fuels, such as natural gas and petroleum.

00:49:10.000 --> 00:49:19.000
And it was and will implementation of the project involve any consistency issues with state or local plans related to renewable energy or energy.

00:49:19.000 --> 00:49:23.000
Efficiency.

00:49:23.000 --> 00:49:27.000
Side, please

00:49:27.000 --> 00:49:33.000
Next topic to be covered will be geology and soils is a potential for strong segment ground.

00:49:33.000 --> 00:49:38.000
Shaking, all aware of earthquake hazards with him.

00:49:38.000 --> 00:49:45.000
California seismic related ground failure, including liqufaction and lateral spreading

00:49:45.000 --> 00:49:51.000
Potential for seismically induced landslide impacts potential for increase.

00:49:51.000 --> 00:49:59.000
Soil, erosion, or top soil, loss, potential pro property risk from expansive soil.

00:49:59.000 --> 00:50:10.000
Sure, potential impact, unique paleontological resources. Next, slide please.

00:50:10.000 --> 00:50:20.000
Next topic would be greenhouse gas, emissions, and what product implementation of the project increase, increase construction, not racial ghg emissions.

00:50:20.000 --> 00:50:30.000
So there'll be additional missions that were not part of a alright Have any kind of

planning for a mission.

00:50:30.000 --> 00:50:35.000
Reductions, and then is a project consistent with any apple goal.

00:50:35.000 --> 00:50:41.000
White house, gas, emission plans, policies, and regulations Next, slide.

00:50:41.000 --> 00:50:44.000
Please.

00:50:44.000 --> 00:50:55.000
Hazards and houses, materials, different color that will be a value way to include construction risk associated with potentially hazardous Material use.

00:50:55.000 --> 00:51:03.000
Is a project. Site on a hazardous material site, or is it near one fire?

00:51:03.000 --> 00:51:09.000
An emergency access response and evacuation is that will that be adequate?

00:51:09.000 --> 00:51:19.000
Oh, the potential impacts for fire hazards! And will be adequate Water supply or water pressure to beat fireflow standards. Next slide.

00:51:19.000 --> 00:51:22.000
Please.

00:51:22.000 --> 00:51:28.000
Hi, Hydrology and water quality. Will it be anything impacts associated with construction?

00:51:28.000 --> 00:51:46.000
Really, and water contaminants that could run off from the project or in project instruction Well, that'll be changes to the existing drainage patterns that occur in the area It could be adversary affects from that Well, there'll be an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting

00:51:46.000 --> 00:51:58.000
from impervious services Will that be compliance with any permits related to water quality standards such as a man, national pollutant, discharge, elimination system permit?

00:51:58.000 --> 00:52:03.000
That's what the Mpdes stands for.

00:52:03.000 --> 00:52:07.000
Is there consistency with the county's low Impact Development Ordinance.

00:52:07.000 --> 00:52:21.000

The county has an ordinance, requires projects. 2 retain as much of the water on site as possible, to decrease any ron off from the Imperial Surfaces Next, slide.

00:52:21.000 --> 00:52:25.000
Please.

00:52:25.000 --> 00:52:33.000
Thank you for planning. Is it? How is it? Is it project and compliance with the county's general plan?

00:52:33.000 --> 00:52:38.000
well, the issues associated with compliance with the role in highest community.

00:52:38.000 --> 00:52:45.000
General plan. It's a project in compliance with the counties and clues and inclusionary Housing Ordinance.

00:52:45.000 --> 00:52:53.000
You'll see that some of the units that were proposed earlier, or propose to be in compliance with that ordinance.

00:52:53.000 --> 00:52:57.000
Is there compliance with the counties, zone, or ordinances?

00:52:57.000 --> 00:53:03.000
And is it the potential for the project to physically divide and establish community?

00:53:03.000 --> 00:53:13.000
Next slide please, Mineral resources. Is there a loss of availability, but no mineral resource within The project?

00:53:13.000 --> 00:53:22.000
Area, or so the loss of availability of locally important, better resource, recovery Quite often that'll be signed a gravel operation.

00:53:22.000 --> 00:53:29.000
So it's type of mental resources that are already found in certain locations.

00:53:29.000 --> 00:53:33.000
Next slide, please

00:53:33.000 --> 00:53:39.000
Noise, will be construction noise at Jason to sensitive a reset receptive. This is Jason.

00:53:39.000 --> 00:53:52.000
Residential units, schools and parks. Will there be any impact resultsing from change in the ambient noise, level, other words, the noise levels that you're accustomed to.

00:53:52.000 --> 00:54:13.000
Now in your neighborhood? Will they change that ambient noise, level, that existing noise that will change due to traffic, circulation, and generation for the project, and will there be any construction. Vibration impacts associated with project implementation next slide please

00:54:13.000 --> 00:54:32.000
Population of housing, but the project results Substantial population growth in the area. Well, the project displace a substantial number of existed people or housing next slide

00:54:32.000 --> 00:54:44.000
Public services, the evaluation of any potential impacts to service levels, to fire, protection, to share protection schools and libraries.

00:54:44.000 --> 00:54:47.000
Next slide, please

00:54:47.000 --> 00:54:55.000
Recreation, a deterioration of existing neighborhood or regional parks by increased use with a new population.

00:54:55.000 --> 00:55:03.000
great increased impacts on existing park resources.

00:55:03.000 --> 00:55:10.000
Well will the project involve the construction of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

00:55:10.000 --> 00:55:14.000
That is the other topic evaluated at the recreation.

00:55:14.000 --> 00:55:21.000
Next slide please. Transportation traffic. Well, there'll be any impacts caused by addition.

00:55:21.000 --> 00:55:29.000
A project generated traffic I The new metric that is used in the State of California, is vehicle miles traveled.

00:55:29.000 --> 00:55:51.000
Add, the county has standards relative to make a miles traveled, and it'll be evaluated whether or not this project, it's consistent with that metric It's a project consistent with any congestion management program that has been developed is there adequate emergency access to the

00:55:51.000 --> 00:56:09.000
project, and will there be any increased hazards due to roadway gym at metric design features such as a roadway coming in at a curve location on the street that

creates a hazard next slide please.

00:56:09.000 --> 00:56:15.000
Tribal cultural resources? Is there a substantial, adverse change to tribal cultural resources?

00:56:15.000 --> 00:56:25.000
And there will be a consultation with any interested tribes that would like to consult on the project.

00:56:25.000 --> 00:56:35.000
That is, a government to government, consultation, and that will be conducted between the county of Los Angeles and any tribes that are interested.

00:56:35.000 --> 00:56:39.000
Next slide, please

00:56:39.000 --> 00:57:00.000
Utilities and service. Oh, well, it'll be construction new utilities, with a significant effect, such as an extension of a storm drain or water Water line, is there sufficient water supply to serve the project is There sufficient wastewater treatment, capacity to serve The project and is there sufficient

00:57:00.000 --> 00:57:05.000
solid waste capacity handle, solid, solid waste generated for the project.

00:57:05.000 --> 00:57:25.000
Next slide, Please, Wirefire. Is there adequate emergency evacuation provided as a project has a potential to exasperate wildfire risk is a potential for post wildfire flooding or landslides

00:57:25.000 --> 00:57:29.000
Next slide, please

00:57:29.000 --> 00:57:36.000
So those are the those are the air, the potentially significant impacts of the different topical areas that will be covered.

00:57:36.000 --> 00:57:46.000
There are other requires secret Air environmental talk. Okay, report sections And one section is alternative to the proposed project.

00:57:46.000 --> 00:57:51.000
So they'll need to look at. Are there alternatives that could be provided that could avoid a significant impact?

00:57:51.000 --> 00:57:56.000
So if any of those previously topics, those areas that we discussed.

00:57:56.000 --> 00:58:00.000

If there was, I significant impact that could be avoided.

00:58:00.000 --> 00:58:06.000
Is there an alternative that could be implemented that would avoid that significant impact?

00:58:06.000 --> 00:58:10.000
You also have to evaluate what is known as a no project alternative.

00:58:10.000 --> 00:58:21.000
This is required of the California Environmental quality act. So are they implications of knowing no project occurring on the site and then give one or more additional turn.

00:58:21.000 --> 00:58:25.000
Those to the proposed project that would avoid or reduce significant effects.

00:58:25.000 --> 00:58:34.000
While still meeting the majority of the price project objectives. So part of the project that'll be identified by other projects, objectives.

00:58:34.000 --> 00:58:43.000
And then, if there are significant impacts that could be reduced, but still meet the project objective, what are those alternatives?

00:58:43.000 --> 00:58:47.000
You also need to evaluate Shiva to effects.

00:58:47.000 --> 00:58:54.000
So the project cannot be just. People. Okay, Reviewed: by itself.

00:58:54.000 --> 00:59:01.000
You have to consider any other projects or radical touches could be implemented that would have impacts as well.

00:59:01.000 --> 00:59:10.000
So? Is Is there a shopping center nearby that is proposed that could generate traffic, and then what are the effects of that traffic in combination with the traffic?

00:59:10.000 --> 00:59:16.000
From this project? Is there not? Is there a residential project that could impact the same school district?

00:59:16.000 --> 00:59:21.000
So you have to evaluate. What are those potential projects?

00:59:21.000 --> 00:59:35.000
one of the projects that could be implemented at the same time as this project, And then are there any growth induced and affectionate projects sometimes projects

extent, sore lines, water, lines etc.

00:59:35.000 --> 00:59:42.000
Or improve roadway capacity, and then you have to evaluate whether or not that could actually induce additional growth.

00:59:42.000 --> 00:59:47.000
Next slide, please

00:59:47.000 --> 00:59:55.000
So the additional opportunities for public input as we discussed right now, we're in the notice of preparation period.

00:59:55.000 --> 00:59:58.000
You can hand in comments, or or mail comments.

00:59:58.000 --> 01:00:02.000
you are supposed to service or email and please do so.

01:00:02.000 --> 01:00:07.000
By December twelfth of this year the common period has been extended 2 weeks from.

01:00:07.000 --> 01:00:12.000
It's a problem that's a pretty. The previous commentary.

01:00:12.000 --> 01:00:29.000
Second, you can provide in purses in person comments. There'll be a scopey meeting in person, sculpting meeting, and December sixth that will be held, in Roland Heights draft er once it is available.

01:00:29.000 --> 01:00:34.000
it will be distributed for a full 45 day public view period?

01:00:34.000 --> 01:00:39.000
That's another opportunity, for that will be opportunity for you to review the environment.

01:00:39.000 --> 01:00:50.000
See how these different, these different about environmental issues were evaluated, and for you to provide any input relative to whether or not you think the evaluation was appropriate.

01:00:50.000 --> 01:01:10.000
If there are issues that were not considered, is there mitigation that could be considered, or other alternatives that should be considered There'll be a regional planning commission hearing to consider recommending project approval and er certification there'll be a time for you to provide input on the merits of the

01:01:10.000 --> 01:01:17.000
project, and whether or not the eir should be certified, and then there'll be a

Harry before the county Board of Supervisors.

01:01:17.000 --> 01:01:22.000
Get you consider whether or not they will consider approval. The project they have to consider.

01:01:22.000 --> 01:01:30.000
The original planet conditions recommendation, and also whether or not they'll have to determine where I'm not.

01:01:30.000 --> 01:01:37.000
They want to certify the environment Impact Report next slide, please.

01:01:37.000 --> 01:01:45.000
So a So public input during the draft environment, the draft about red pack scope, hey?

01:01:45.000 --> 01:01:47.000
Is a notice of preparation which we already discussed.

01:01:47.000 --> 01:01:52.000
Written comments by December twelfth, as previously notified.

01:01:52.000 --> 01:01:58.000
That's previously identified, and Riah Pavlov has been, is a lead planner.

01:01:58.000 --> 01:02:04.000
Her contact Information is here at the La Account. Original planning Subdivision section.

01:02:04.000 --> 01:02:09.000
Her email address is a preferred method providing any comments.

01:02:09.000 --> 01:02:20.000
next slide, please

01:02:20.000 --> 01:02:26.000
So that's what I thought. I apologize. That is it? So that's the end of the presentation.

01:02:26.000 --> 01:02:34.000
And I will now turn it back over to the county, and we're available to take any comments.

01:02:34.000 --> 01:02:50.000
And can you explain how they want that process to proceed?

01:02:50.000 --> 01:02:54.000
thank you to you now. The public comment portion of the meeting will start.

01:02:54.000 --> 01:03:24.000
Everyone will get 3 min to provide their comments, and I'll go through all of the commenters in the order that they signed up, and who will be calling the names?

01:03:30.000 --> 01:03:38.000
and Thomas, you'll have to unmute on your end.

01:03:38.000 --> 01:03:42.000
at all. I'm like coming through. Okay, my name is Thomas Prince.

01:03:42.000 --> 01:03:50.000
I live in 1441 Parland and Diamond Bar regarding the transportation and transportation portion of this the Nlp.

01:03:50.000 --> 01:03:55.000
Exhibits indicate the development will consist of 360 new homes.

01:03:55.000 --> 01:03:59.000
It's safe to say that each home will have a minimum of 2 cars per home.

01:03:59.000 --> 01:04:04.000
Accordingly there will be at least 720 additional cars for this development.

01:04:04.000 --> 01:04:08.000
Primary street utilize, for these cards will be calling a road.

01:04:08.000 --> 01:04:18.000
There will be street on north and south side of a calling road for all of these residents to exit and enter as per the map.

01:04:18.000 --> 01:04:29.000
Once again the 2 main access streets to from these rows to the 60 freeway will be lemon on the east side of the Development and fair way on the west side of the development.

01:04:29.000 --> 01:04:33.000
At this time utilization of the Colonel Lemon Avenue.

01:04:33.000 --> 01:04:41.000
60 freeway is extremely crowded, coming easy down on Colina from the development at 7, 30 Am.

01:04:41.000 --> 01:04:50.000
Or 5 30 Pm. Must wait. One must wait at least 2 complete lane changes to you approach the on-ramp heading east.

01:04:50.000 --> 01:04:58.000
Now, in the event this is approved, it will be at least 500 more home moral cars.

01:04:58.000 --> 01:05:05.000

On this stress. Who knows what kind of danger? Well, room at these intersections at that time?

01:05:05.000 --> 01:05:11.000
It's certainly plausible that waiting for the light, at Lemon and Calima can be dangerous, and so many cars.

01:05:11.000 --> 01:05:17.000
We, backing up of Collina. In order to access this, drivers will be at risk.

01:05:17.000 --> 01:05:23.000
These additional vehicles will add an excessive amount of air pollution to a very small area.

01:05:23.000 --> 01:05:28.000
These additional cars will increase the amount of carbon monoxide, and oxygen.

01:05:28.000 --> 01:05:47.000
Hydrogen oxide in the air, Each gallon of gas burned by a car, creates £20 of greenhouse gas, which causes cancer asthma irritation, heart disease, and birthday facts Moreover, the EPA days and vehicles call 75% of carbon

01:05:47.000 --> 01:05:48.000
monoxide in a year, us yearly. It's well settled that anyone you know like resides in a particular area isn't titled to the quiet right and joiner of your home the county and granting this application will be interfering with that right and we respectfully request the application be

01:05:48.000 --> 01:06:05.000
So thank you for listening to the presentation. I hope it was helpful and and receiving your input Thank you.

01:06:05.000 --> 01:06:10.000
denied. Thank you.

01:06:10.000 --> 01:06:14.000
Thank you for your comment.

01:06:14.000 --> 01:06:22.000
next speaker, Adele Prince. Yeah, 3 min, and stick the your name for the record

01:06:22.000 --> 01:06:33.000
Adele Prince? No? Okay, and that Adele prints

01:06:33.000 --> 01:06:42.000
Measure a authored by Ms. Solise, authorized an assessment for parks generating 96 point, 8 million for the county yearly.

01:06:42.000 --> 01:06:46.000
It indicates all residents live within one half mile above a park.

01:06:46.000 --> 01:06:56.000
The county average is 49% in rolling heights, only 27% live within one half mile of a park of 6 parks in Roland Heights.

01:06:56.000 --> 01:07:15.000
Only 2 are an east role in heights. Open spaces provide natural drains for storm water and flood attenuation. They act, as sinks for carbon dioxide, encounter, the urban heat island effect open spaces of home values in oakland a 3 mile green area added

01:07:15.000 --> 01:07:37.000
41 million dollars to surrounding property values. Owners of small companies ranked open space as the highest priority in choosing locations, quote In some instances a community's bond rating may actually rise after his has shown it can control growth by purchasing open space and quote another analysis

01:07:37.000 --> 01:07:45.000
predicts, the quote many communities will suffer lower land values because of various factors, such as increasing traffic.

01:07:45.000 --> 01:07:50.000
It states there is no greater risk to land values than unrestrained development.

01:07:50.000 --> 01:08:10.000
The cost of development outpaces, tax revenues. This plan will require more tax supported infrastructure, such as roads, civilized police, fire services, schools, in Nantucket, Massachusetts, each housing unit was found to cost taxpayers an average of $265 a year

01:08:10.000 --> 01:08:17.000
more than the unit contributed in taxes near new dwellings do not carry their own weight on the tax. Roles.

01:08:17.000 --> 01:08:22.000
Open space mitigates, affects the pollution, reducing urban island effect.

01:08:22.000 --> 01:08:46.000
Referred to. Heat, Trapped trees, mitigate climate change, permeable surfaces, absorb water during storm and flooding prevent flooding open space filters ring leading to study one study, linking open space to reduction in several diseases in in summary open space is good for communities health stability

01:08:46.000 --> 01:08:50.000
beauty, quality of life, and it also good for the bottom line.

01:08:50.000 --> 01:08:51.000
Quote promoting a better quality of life, or our family should never come at the expensive economic growth.

01:08:51.000 --> 01:09:21.000
Yeah.

01:09:26.000 --> 01:09:31.000
yes, my name is Beverly Picar. I've been a resident here for 38 years.

01:09:31.000 --> 01:09:37.000
I'm really concerned about the traffic, the pollution that the traffic is going to be causing here.

01:09:37.000 --> 01:09:50.000
Oh, plus the amount of people who will be added, How is that gonna affect our our police and fire plus The water situation?

01:09:50.000 --> 01:10:00.000
Our governor, saying that we have to cut back. We're in a drought. We've been under drop for so many years now, and yet you're building all these new houses.

01:10:00.000 --> 01:10:15.000
Where is this water going to come from? The golf course does not use regular water, that they have their own and it's it's like we claimed water so that we would be adding all these houses, and they're gonna be using all the waters work where we're supposed

01:10:15.000 --> 01:10:18.000
to be conserving and not watering our long zoom.

01:10:18.000 --> 01:10:24.000
Whatever. I'm just really concerned about how all these houses are gonna affect plus the traffic.

01:10:24.000 --> 01:10:49.000
I came home. Oh, westbound on polema and from grand it it was backed up from Grand to Copley, which is a half a mile, just waiting for just waiting for them to get the through the signal on Grand and it's it's just I don't even know what to

01:10:49.000 --> 01:11:00.000
say, I'm just frustrated, and and so many things here, plus if there's an emergency like a fire, how are we gonna get another 700 cars out of here out of this neighborhood?

01:11:00.000 --> 01:11:12.000
As it is, I know that when the come on a freeway is backed up they use Collima, and there's been a time where I couldn't even get out of my street because the the The traffic.

01:11:12.000 --> 01:11:22.000
Was backed. So I just think that's it's not a good idea at any in any way.

01:11:22.000 --> 01:11:23.000

We need our open space. We need our are green, We need our our wildlife.

01:11:23.000 --> 01:11:24.000
next speaker, Beverly Pecorn, State your name for the regular.

01:11:24.000 --> 01:11:25.000
You have 3 min

01:11:25.000 --> 01:11:42.000
Thank you.

01:11:42.000 --> 01:11:52.000
Yes, okay, yes. My name is Wanda Ewing

01:11:52.000 --> 01:11:59.000
The proposed depending on 76 acres of royal vista, will have a substantial adverse effect on the acreage.

01:11:59.000 --> 01:12:08.000
Now, zoned as open space. The draft er our content should address the following biological resources.

01:12:08.000 --> 01:12:14.000
The golf course is a tree-filled green space that is, a wildlife habitat, and quarter to the 20 hills.

01:12:14.000 --> 01:12:22.000
Significant ecological area for many animals, I have observed Blue heron, coyotes, possums, cotton.

01:12:22.000 --> 01:12:30.000
Tell rabbits, raccoons, foxes, skunks, frogs, great horned owls, and barn owls on the property.

01:12:30.000 --> 01:12:39.000
There are populations of Canada geese that appear in September and October, migrating from Alaska and the North.

01:12:39.000 --> 01:12:43.000
They are dependent on the golf course, lakes, feeding and wintering.

01:12:43.000 --> 01:13:02.000
Here. Rv. Development drain the 2 lakes. 3 weeks ago the landowners have intentionally altered the environment, so that biologists studying the land during the Eir draft will not determine an accurate account of the migratory birds living here which includes the protected

01:13:02.000 --> 01:13:21.000
swallows, hydrology. The open space is a watershed with streams and lakes, currently 76 acres of rainwater, and lake surface water permeates the open space

filtering down into the 20 basin aquifer developing the land with streets and

01:13:21.000 --> 01:13:27.000
housing housing units will not allow water to penetrate the soil, and will deplete the aquifer.

01:13:27.000 --> 01:13:49.000
Over time, especially during the drought. Also the golf course floods dream periods of ring wildfire, the lakes fed by the aquifer, are also a water screen for la and orange county fire department air tankers, fighting wildfire wildfires The la county fire department stated the golf

01:13:49.000 --> 01:13:57.000
course. Open space was a location for community members to gather during emergencies, aesthetics.

01:13:57.000 --> 01:14:04.000
The proposed project does not conform to the surrounding neighborhood, Averages of 10,000 square foot lots.

01:14:04.000 --> 01:14:09.000
The view shed of the San Gabriel Mountains will be altered by the project.

01:14:09.000 --> 01:14:18.000
The nighttime illumination of street lights and house lighting, and the daytime glare of project windows into my yard will alter the quality of life.

01:14:18.000 --> 01:14:36.000
I've experienced for 43 years in this residence we we are currently in the sixth mass extinction on earth, due to excess excessively human activity, and we have lost 3 billion birds in North America in the past 50 years I care deeply for the health and fate of our environment

01:14:36.000 --> 01:14:43.000
which indigenous people understand is tied to the health and fate of ourselves and future generations.

01:14:43.000 --> 01:15:00.000
For those reasons, accountable study of the environmental effects in crucial before paving over more open space.

01:15:00.000 --> 01:15:10.000
Hello! My name is renewing. California is home to more species of plants and animals than any other state, and we are now experiencing local extinctions.

01:15:10.000 --> 01:15:24.000
La's increasingly fragile ecosystem is threatened by real estate interests and speculation, development, ecosystem, degradation from disturbance, pollution, and overdensification lessons The viability, of ecosystem processes, and

01:15:24.000 --> 01:15:29.000
biodiversity. This development will cut off wildlife, habitat connectivity.

01:15:29.000 --> 01:15:36.000
We need to protect Roland Heights last remaining sizable open space in order to preserve local biodiversity.

01:15:36.000 --> 01:15:42.000
We live in one of the highest densified locations in the nation, more density equals more crime.

01:15:42.000 --> 01:15:48.000
A Qmd. Identifies our area as a sensitive receptor zone, which means the air quality is hazardous.

01:15:48.000 --> 01:15:54.000
Our community is at a heightened risk of poor health, such as black lung disease from vehicle pollutants.

01:15:54.000 --> 01:16:07.000
We are one mile from the 57 60 freeway Junction, which is the most congested interchange in California, as well as the city of industry's goods Transit Corridor urban sprawl continues to jeopardize endangered and threatened

01:16:07.000 --> 01:16:23.000
species, and others are being fast tracked to extinction, Reckless developments are causing irreversible damage to our fragile ecosystem The expansion of non-transit oriented development increases the reliance on private auto transportation further increasing air

01:16:23.000 --> 01:16:48.000
pollutants, The addition of duplexes and triplexes to the project will add to the number of cars in this area.

01:16:48.000 --> 01:16:53.000
Hello! My name is Susan Trout, and I would like to address Wildfires.

01:16:53.000 --> 01:17:00.000
As you know, we live in a very high fire, hazard, severity zone.

01:17:00.000 --> 01:17:06.000
We have a golf course that provides defensible space and lakes for air tankers.

01:17:06.000 --> 01:17:13.000
We will lose that, and we will add 360 more residential units.

01:17:13.000 --> 01:17:31.000
That is not a standalone development. Once that happens, the rest of the golf course is going to be sold for rather residential development, because we heard at one of the hearings an attorney for those owners who, said if this gets rezoned

they would like the same consideration.

01:17:31.000 --> 01:17:44.000
For their property, therefore increasing this beyond 360 residential units, we will need more funding for Fire Department, sheriff and emergency services.

01:17:44.000 --> 01:17:45.000
We also need not have a local hospital in the area. I saw that maps that were not included in the Nop, and I am concerned as I heard, other speakers, The new development is going to empty into only 2 streets Walnut drive South and Kalima If You're familiar with our area we

01:17:45.000 --> 01:17:46.000
Thank you. Next Speaker. Susan Trouts, please set your name for the record.

01:17:46.000 --> 01:18:16.000
You have 3 min

01:18:26.000 --> 01:18:43.000
good evening. My name is James Chu. My concern is that the increase hasn't proposed by the developer will cause. Exit significant strain on the existing area utility system The developers looking at 200 single family homes 88 multi family units and 72 condominium

01:18:43.000 --> 01:18:50.000
units We're looking at additional 2 to 3,000 residents packed into a small, densely populated area just this past summer.

01:18:50.000 --> 01:18:53.000
We've experienced power outages, rolling blackouts.

01:18:53.000 --> 01:19:00.000
Time restrictions on when to end, when not to use our electricity at home, and not to mention this, the severe water restrictions.

01:19:00.000 --> 01:19:25.000
Imagine adding that many more people to an R ready strain utility system.

01:19:25.000 --> 01:19:34.000
okay. Be low. You know My, you know. Thank you for all the other speakers that've been addressing all the impacts.

01:19:34.000 --> 01:19:41.000
But I think, as we stated, that a static definitely is impacted because there's nothing that can replace an open space.

01:19:41.000 --> 01:19:48.000
What we can see is concrete. No matter, they are changing street lighting, changing the curbside.

01:19:48.000 --> 01:19:55.000
All those things were not able to replace an open space for aesthetic purpose.

01:19:55.000 --> 01:20:01.000
Same thing for the agricultural and forestry. There's nothing that can you know when you are listing.

01:20:01.000 --> 01:20:06.000
When Mr. Ladley was a listing all the potential significant impacts.

01:20:06.000 --> 01:20:16.000
Everything will be significantly impact from aesthetic agricultural forestry, air, quality, biological resources, energy.

01:20:16.000 --> 01:20:21.000
All those will be significantly impacted at all. The pre speakers has been already listed.

01:20:21.000 --> 01:20:27.000
We have been addressing about the noise, and particularly like the first speaker that was mentioned about Lyman.

01:20:27.000 --> 01:20:33.000
I think one of the things that is for the year I have to look at is the amount of accidents that happen in lemon.

01:20:33.000 --> 01:20:47.000
It happens, so frequent at that lemon exit, it is very dangerous that when I have to turn, I have to think about my son making that turn to the freeway is so dangerous It's like a deadly turn you're taking your risk.

01:20:47.000 --> 01:21:00.000
And so I think that one also need to be put into the yeah are to look at if we are looking so, the way of exiting this potential project is to be in lemon And fairway.

01:21:00.000 --> 01:21:04.000
And another thing that I really want to address is about the community.

01:21:04.000 --> 01:21:08.000
the whole developer that is, sending the information for us.

01:21:08.000 --> 01:21:19.000
For this meeting, because we were not notified, and seems like that they continue to strengthen communication from the past with 1,000 feet.

01:21:19.000 --> 01:21:39.000
To now be 500 feet. I don't see the hearing or the meeting, for the environment is allowing us to exercise our basic rights, to address the environment when we're not being notified, and you've county, and you the supervisor le county supervisor

janice Hahn is here, or listening

01:21:39.000 --> 01:22:00.000
to this I want to say which Hood Department is to be monitoring to making sure the developer are allowing us to exercise our basic rights, to address the environmental concern when we are not being notified, the area is 76 acres and the only notify people with 500 feet that coin to

01:22:00.000 --> 01:22:09.000
the question, and I think that should also be listed in the yeah ei are as to what basis that the developer has to justify them, notify.

01:22:09.000 --> 01:22:29.000
Only people within 500 feet The radius of this whole area is 76 acres, and how can they justify that notification?

01:22:29.000 --> 01:22:30.000
Thank you. Next Speaker Roy Humphreys. Yeah.

01:22:30.000 --> 01:22:37.000
Thank you.

01:22:37.000 --> 01:22:56.000
Okay, Can you hear me? Can you hear me? Oh, okay, My name's Roy Hamfred, and something, though the the persons need to understand that these law so forth came down from Sacramento and your governor saying Hey not all all counties, all cities and must comply with

01:22:56.000 --> 01:23:08.000
with the development of housing for our population, and this is only part of it, and we, hearing a lot about you know the Nimby situation where are you going to put the housing?

01:23:08.000 --> 01:23:12.000
Anywhere you're going to have like impact nowhere, no matter where you put it.

01:23:12.000 --> 01:23:28.000
And if I were these people over by the golf course, I'd be on the doing the same thing, of, and I've seen all of their comments, and so forth on the roll heights buzz etc. and I Do understand their position How it's for the greater good and we must

01:23:28.000 --> 01:23:46.000
comply to provide for our population, and being a sanctuary state, Hey, we get to all portions of it, and that is kind of selfish not to provide for our population and as to the environmental if it doesn't matter where you put this take and put it anywhere you want it's gonna

01:23:46.000 --> 01:23:52.000
have essentially the same situation. So it's time to grow up.

01:23:52.000 --> 01:24:17.000
And the Fs up to the needs of the entirety of our society and community, and another thing that the kill switch on this is the water, as I understand that some recent information from Sacramento the governor has got on his table about no new development in State of California period because of the water situation and the Federal government, so

01:24:17.000 --> 01:24:23.000
far is typing up all of this stuff. So if you want a a kill switch for this project, it's on.

01:24:23.000 --> 01:24:32.000
It's in the water, and all that, because I I have a feeling from listening to the developer that they're gonna do everything they can to do this project right so forth.

01:24:32.000 --> 01:25:01.000
And the other thing is, the word is Diamond Bar is gonna annex you once this thing goes through, so lots of good things to think about there.

01:25:01.000 --> 01:25:04.000
Yes. Can you hear me

01:25:04.000 --> 01:25:11.000
The former speakers have all spoken very well, and they've covered almost every single thing.

01:25:11.000 --> 01:25:40.000
I've thought for the last 50 years, as I've watched my state turn into an over developed desert when I was a boy, this was all sage brush and California live oak everything that is green that you see here was he imported and watered by stevening water from the

01:25:40.000 --> 01:25:49.000
river, draining our aquifers. Central California has gone down 35 feet in my lifetime.

01:25:49.000 --> 01:26:03.000
I'm sitting down. We have to stop. This unmitigated development of every single green space left in the State for our children.

01:26:03.000 --> 01:26:06.000
And our grandchildren, all of our posterity.

01:26:06.000 --> 01:26:13.000
There simply must be an end to it. Watch mine to happen here.

01:26:13.000 --> 01:26:21.000
1 point. It has not been addressed, in my opinion, is, you really believe that

every family only has 2 cars.

01:26:21.000 --> 01:26:25.000
Wake up and look in your neighborhood. Right across the street from me.

01:26:25.000 --> 01:26:37.000
There's a man woman with 4 little children. They have 7 cards, The other end of my call is that gave us 6 cards farther up the street.

01:26:37.000 --> 01:26:44.000
Near one day, They've got 8 cards, so how many cars are really going to be in this development?

01:26:44.000 --> 01:26:49.000
If you know what cars do. The fire Prior speakers have spoke well on that.

01:26:49.000 --> 01:26:54.000
We've got too many cards, and they're not alike.

01:26:54.000 --> 01:26:56.000
I don't know if that's any better, either.

01:26:56.000 --> 01:27:03.000
But anyway, I've spoke on this before. When they tried to destroy this flow.

01:27:03.000 --> 01:27:10.000
Of course, a few years ago, and we managed to stop within, because it's the wrong thing to do.

01:27:10.000 --> 01:27:20.000
And if our leaders in county government can't see that they need to be replaced, and that includes you, Mister Arlington.

01:27:20.000 --> 01:27:29.000
If you can't see the damage you will be doing to this neighborhood, not just this neighborhood.

01:27:29.000 --> 01:27:51.000
The rest of California. We've got to stop developers because developers are only there for the money, and then when they've got their money, they're gone.

01:27:51.000 --> 01:28:09.000
good evening. My name is Eric Cheng, speaking mostly to the traffic issues, I used to live in Devon Bar, moved to Baltimore, but still go to the area, recently in the calendar screen with that population densities it's the Highest pollution pollution.

01:28:09.000 --> 01:28:12.000
Burden is the traffic, and that's Leo out.

01:28:12.000 --> 01:28:18.000
The additional residents would be coming into the area. Many people on this already.

01:28:18.000 --> 01:28:34.000
The second thing I want to talk about is just the park access Right, of course, isn't listed as a open space as its private land but if you get a chance to walk around the community, I've played golf there before you go like anytime, after 6 or 7 pm you could

01:28:34.000 --> 01:28:44.000
you'll know that it's used by the community for walking and for other purposes as well, and it's just just gonna be interested to see on the report.

01:28:44.000 --> 01:28:50.000
No parks are going to be developed with the additional 360 units.

01:28:50.000 --> 01:29:10.000
What does that look like in terms of open space for people to exercise, and specifically part access in relation to part density?

01:29:10.000 --> 01:29:13.000
Hi! My name is Shelley Gentry. I live in Diamond Bar.

01:29:13.000 --> 01:29:19.000
My house bags directly to the golf course. I want to talk about safety there.

01:29:19.000 --> 01:29:26.000
First of all, let me say to the person that said that Diamond Bar wants to annex this development.

01:29:26.000 --> 01:29:34.000
I suggest that they talk to the City council of Diamond Bar because I've talked to each and every one of them, and that has never been suggested.

01:29:34.000 --> 01:29:37.000
So rumor should not be spread. Second of all, I live.

01:29:37.000 --> 01:29:43.000
My house backs directly to the golf course, and is fully open at the level of the golf course.

01:29:43.000 --> 01:29:50.000
They want to put a 5 to 12 year old plate area right in front of my backyard.

01:29:50.000 --> 01:29:57.000
That I can reach out and touch from my fence this in these walking trails, will have the same problem.

01:29:57.000 --> 01:30:06.000

What it's going to do is drive people into these neighborhoods in mass, and these people can now view the backs of people's homes.

01:30:06.000 --> 01:30:18.000
People's homes will be unsecure. This already this area already has the highest crime area in the in Diamond Bar, and these people are going to be able to access the rear of people's homes.

01:30:18.000 --> 01:30:32.000
These people people will no longer feel safe. They'll no longer have able to secure their property, and they're gonna have the entire general public trapseing through the backs of their homes that we're designing to look over open space.

01:30:32.000 --> 01:30:43.000
So they're very open. They're not. They're not covered with fences and and backyards like normal, environmental preparations of of tract.

01:30:43.000 --> 01:30:46.000
Are And you're and then the walking trailer.

01:30:46.000 --> 01:30:52.000
They're really just buffer zones between old and new construction and it's a marketing gimmick to say their trails.

01:30:52.000 --> 01:30:55.000
But again they're going to drag people through people's backyards.

01:30:55.000 --> 01:31:05.000
It's very, very unsafe for for these people that are living there, especially people like me, that are at that golf course level.

01:31:05.000 --> 01:31:10.000
Some of the might. Neighbors only have a 15 to 20 foot setback on their backyards.

01:31:10.000 --> 01:31:13.000
That's how close their houses to the golf course.

01:31:13.000 --> 01:31:28.000
What happens to them. You put up a fence in front of their house, you've ruined it, and all these homes any home that is near any of these parks are going to be devalued, and if they also think that the traffic is going to be handled by fair.

01:31:28.000 --> 01:31:38.000
Way and Clement, they're wrong, because once you build on Walnut drive, you're gonna drive traffic up to my street, which is, which is cowboy, which is also a light.

01:31:38.000 --> 01:31:55.000
And then that's that is a residential area already on a shortcut for the ways app And you're gonna drive traffic heavy traffic through my neighborhood, and that's

never been accounted for because They seem to think fair way and Kalima is going to be able to handle the traffic which

01:31:55.000 --> 01:31:58.000
it won't. And the situation at Lemon let's keep in mind.

01:31:58.000 --> 01:32:02.000
There's also a middle school in the area, and the traffic is ridiculous.

01:32:02.000 --> 01:32:03.000
You can't get anywhere between Tweet 2, 30, and 5, 30, especially near that freeway entrance on lemon.

01:32:03.000 --> 01:32:04.000
Thank you. Next Speaker Shelley Gentry, you have 3 min, and state your name for the record

01:32:04.000 --> 01:32:18.000
Thank you. Our next speaker. It's lean, that cool.

01:32:18.000 --> 01:32:24.000
Linda call I would like to address the grading of 3.6 million cubic yards of soil.

01:32:24.000 --> 01:32:40.000
This project, wind, tail. This comment is for the La County Health Department and California State Health Department total grading per the nop has now increased from 2 point, one nearly 2, point, 1 8 million to 3.6 million cubic yards.

01:32:40.000 --> 01:32:52.000
I don't know what happened, but it seems like there's a significant increase I'm concerned with the large quantity of soil movement in the how it will affect the resident living near the golf course.

01:32:52.000 --> 01:32:58.000
To give you an idea. 3.6, 2 million, cubic yards is about a 1,000 Olympic size.

01:32:58.000 --> 01:33:01.000
Swimming pool of soil that needs to be moved.

01:33:01.000 --> 01:33:08.000
It is estimated that it will take between 4 to 8 months to excavate, depending on the size of the hauling trucks.

01:33:08.000 --> 01:33:20.000
As a result of this major movement of soil, I'm extremely concerned that valley fever a fungal infection which attacks the respiratory track and can stay in your system for years, will affect many.

01:33:20.000 --> 01:33:26.000
Of the residents. About 5 years ago, some homes were built a quarter mile from the

proposed site.

01:33:26.000 --> 01:33:47.000
Those homes doing the hillside excavation some of my neighbor contracted valley fever as a result of the excavation given the close proximity to the current, side, it's very possible the valley fever fungal sport are also present in the golf course soil currently There are no

01:33:47.000 --> 01:33:59.000
soil testing that can be performed To determine whether the spoil the spores are in the soil prior to excavation we will, only know once the excavation. Starts.

01:33:59.000 --> 01:34:16.000
What are the mitigation portal calls? Should the county decide to approve the project with the county, provide forfeit full face, respirator, or hipaa filters to surrounding residents during the excavation how long will the excavation last will we be able to go out and take walks or

01:34:16.000 --> 01:34:23.000
be confirmed confined to our homes for many months will we be able to open windows to let the brief in?

01:34:23.000 --> 01:34:28.000
Or do we have to share a window? What about the residents with asthma?

01:34:28.000 --> 01:34:35.000
Walnut Valley Senior Living facility sits on the west side of the golf course about Point, 4 miles from the Development.

01:34:35.000 --> 01:34:42.000
This 125 bed assistant living facility, so resident in their eighties and nineties.

01:34:42.000 --> 01:34:52.000
Many residents have medical conditions underlying medical conditions which increase the risk of contracting valley fever.

01:34:52.000 --> 01:34:57.000
Valley fever. Can affect people of any age, but is most common in adults.

01:34:57.000 --> 01:35:15.000
H. 60 or older, acute valley fever can be fatal. The duty and care of La County to protect the health and welfare of the residents, If this is known that there are possible valley fever spores present the county needs to proceed with extreme caution so the health and welfare of its

01:35:15.000 --> 01:35:16.000
residents on that compromise at the expense of building new homes.

01:35:16.000 --> 01:35:17.000
You have 3 min and set your name for the record

01:35:17.000 --> 01:35:31.000
Thank you. Our next speaker and last speaker is Michelle Capell.

01:35:31.000 --> 01:35:34.000
Hello! Michelle Kopel, I am a resident.

01:35:34.000 --> 01:35:47.000
That also lives direct on the golf course On fairlyance drive, we purchase this house a little over 2 years ago, from my parents, who resided here for 30 years.

01:35:47.000 --> 01:35:53.000
Prior we purchased this house with 2 small children. We have 2 and a half year old twins.

01:35:53.000 --> 01:36:04.000
We also have an older daughter, as well as a dog, and in purchasing this home we you know, and anticipated to be here for a long term.

01:36:04.000 --> 01:36:24.000
It was a great community. Amazing schools, you know, great neighborhoods and neighbors, and very shortly after moving in, we received this information, and really just to echo everyone's concerns, especially for those of us that are living directly on the golf course, there's a really big worry as parents and as

01:36:24.000 --> 01:36:35.000
residents for the safety concerns. We don't purchase this house to have people directly behind us quote unquote walking spaces behind us, or trails.

01:36:35.000 --> 01:36:42.000
we all know the impact. It's going to have environmentally, But I think also in terms of quality of life for our children.

01:36:42.000 --> 01:36:50.000
Quality of life for our families, the ability to feel safe in our backyards, and to have a sense of privacy.

01:36:50.000 --> 01:37:00.000
of course, the value of our homes are going to be significantly impacted with this, and I understand that that that doesn't make a difference to you.

01:37:00.000 --> 01:37:04.000
All the aren't here, but we are living here. This is our home.

01:37:04.000 --> 01:37:11.000
This is a place in which we are planning to raise children and create a community, and to have this.

01:37:11.000 --> 01:37:26.000
You know money, Grab, come in, is really really unsettling, and I appreciate that,

or I hope that you could appreciate that as a community, we Really, are pulling together because This is our this is our livelihood.

01:37:26.000 --> 01:37:56.000
This is our quality of life, and to have that jeopardize is a really it's a really unsettling feeling every night, So I appreciate that you are giving us some time to hear us. Hopefully.

01:38:06.000 --> 01:38:13.000
Okay, thank you so much. And I think it's already been stated that we will be having a second in person.

01:38:13.000 --> 01:38:25.000
Scoping meeting, and that in person scoping meeting will be held on December sixth, 2022, at 6 Pm. But the role in Heights community.

01:38:25.000 --> 01:38:32.000
Center So if you know anyone who did not have a chance to join the scoping meeting, we would welcome them them to join that scoping meeting.

01:38:32.000 --> 01:38:38.000
The presentation will be very similar to the one you just saw, in fact, mostly identical.

01:38:38.000 --> 01:38:43.000
So it might not be worth your time to attend though you're all welcome to attend, if you would like.

01:38:43.000 --> 01:38:47.000
And just to respond to one of the comments from a speaker.

01:38:47.000 --> 01:38:51.000
The notices for the scoping meeting will go out to a radius of a 1,000 feet.

01:38:51.000 --> 01:38:52.000
So thank you for your input. On that that part of our noticing procedure, and with that I would like to thank everyone for their to participation, and we'll we'll end the scoping meeting here, thank you So much.

01:38:52.000 --> 01:39:02.000
Yes, yes.

01:39:02.000 --> 01:39:12.000
And have a good night.

01:39:12.000 --> 01:39:32.000
Thank you.Thanks you. Bye bye