Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Richard J. Bruckner
Director

DATE: May 12, 2011

TO: Pat Modugno, Chair
Esther L. Valadez, Vice Chair
David W. Louie, Commissioner
Harold V. Helsley, Commissioner
Curt Pedersen, Commissioner

FROM: Samuel Z. Dea, Supervising Regional Planner
Special Projects Section

SUBJECT: AGENDA ITEM NO. 5
PROJECT NO. 04-181-(5)
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61105
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200500080
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 200500081
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 200500043
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 200500032
PARKING PERMIT NO. 200500011
SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW NO. 201000001

The following additional information is provided for your Commission's review:

- **Final EIR Errata**: An errata was issued regarding the Final EIR in response to a letter received from Castaic Lake Water Agency (attached). The errata includes the following revisions:
  a) A revision to the response to the Castaic Lake Water Agency letter (Letter C17 - Attached) dated January 13, 2011 (see Correction 1 attached);
  b) A revision to the Executive Summary Table, mitigation measure MV 4.8-1 (see Correction 2 attached);
  c) A revision to Draft EIR Section 4.8, Water Service, mitigation measure MV 4.8-1 (see Correction 3 attached); and
  d) A revision to the Mission Village Mitigation Monitoring Plan, mitigation measure MV 4.8-1 (see Correction 4 attached).
- **Revised California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") finding MV 4.8-1**: As a result of the changes in the Final EIR mentioned above, CEQA finding MV 4.8-1 (page 153 of original document) was revised as follows:

  Existing –
  MV 4.8-1: *Upon* the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.

Revised –
MV 4.8-1: *Prior to* the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.

- **Revised Project Findings**: Minor changes were made to the project findings which were limited to editorial refinements and localized modifications to the language that add clarity to the document. The findings with track changes to the content of the document and clean copies of the documents are included for the Commission's convenience.

- **Revised Project Conditions from Fire Department**: The revised conditions from Fire are attached and reflect a change in the number of public fire hydrants required for the project, from 224 to 217. The revised report is attached for the Commission's convenience.

- **Revised Project Conditions from Department of Public Works**: The revised conditions from Public Works are attached and reflect a change in Road Condition No. 60 (page 9 of original document) as follows:

  Existing –
  Road Condition No. 60: Prior to final map approval, pay the fees established by the Board of Supervisors for the Magic Mountain/Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District in effect at the time of recordation.

  Revised –
  Road Condition No. 60: Prior to final map approval, pay the fees *or satisfy fee payment as outlined in the* District Formation established by the Board of Supervisors for the Magic Mountain/Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District in effect at the time of recordation.

- **Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105 and Exhibit Map (Exhibit A)**: Reduced size copies of the revised vesting tentative tract map and exhibit map, dated December 15, 2010, are attached for your Commission's convenience.

- Staff has received one phone call on May 9, 2011 from a local resident expressing concerns regarding the scale of the project and environmental impacts.

If you have any questions please contact Carolina Blengini of my staff at (213) 974-1522 or by e-mail at cblengini@planning.lacounty.gov. Department office hours are Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Department is closed on Fridays.

ATTACHMENTS
A. Castaic Lake Water Agency Letter, dated January 13, 2011
B. Final EIR Errata (Corrections 1 through 4)
C. Revised Project Findings
D. Revised Project Conditions from Fire Department
E. Revised Project Conditions from Department of Public Works
F. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105, dated 12/15/10 - Reduced size copy
G. Exhibit Map (Exhibit A), dated 12/15/10 – Reduced Size copy

SZD:CSB

Letter No. C17

JAN 2 0 2011

CASTAIC LAKE WATER AGENCY

January 13, 2011

Ms. Carolina Blengini
County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning
Special Projects Section
320 West Temple Street, Room 1340
Los Angeles, California 90012

Re: Castaic Lake Water Agency Comments on the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report (SCH No 2005051143)

Dear Ms. Blengini:

The Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) is the provider of imported water to the Santa Clarita Valley. The CLWA service area covers the proposed project site and all of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area in which the proposed project is located. CLWA has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and submits the following comments:

1

WATER SERVICE IMPACTS (Section 4.8 Section 9.C. Additional Mitigation Measures Proposed by this EIR)

On page 4.8-151 the DEIR contains the following mitigation (emphasis added):

> Implementation of the above Specific Plan mitigation measures as part of the Mission Village project would mitigate impacts to water resources to less than significant levels. As a result, no additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR are required or necessary, because the Mission Village project does not result in any significant water-related impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures. However, at the request of CLWA, the following mitigation measure has been added to the EIR:
>
> MV 4.8-1 Upon the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.

2

The project will use local groundwater and recycled water from CLWA as a source of annual supply. The project's potable and recycled water systems will be connected to the CLWA potable and recycled water systems. The other users of these supplies in the CLWA service area have paid for their share of costs by paying Facility Capacity Fees.

3

BOARD OF DIRECTOR
PRESIDENT
THOMAS P. CAMPBELL
VICE PRESIDENT
WILLIAM C. COOPER
E.G. "JERRY" GLADBACH
DEAN D. EFSTATHIOU
WILLIAM PECSI
PETER KAVOUNAS
EDWARD A. COLLEY
JACQUELYN H. McMILLAN
R. J. KELLY
B. J. ATKINS
KEITH ABERCROMBIE

GENERAL MANAGER
DAN MASNADA

GENERAL COUNSEL
McCORMICK, KIDMAN & BEHRENS, LLP

SECRETARY
APRIL JACOBS

"A PUBLIC AGENCY PROVIDING RELIABLE, QUALITY WATER AT A REASONABLE COST TO THE SANTA CLARITA VALLEY"
27234 BOUQUET CANYON ROAD • SANTA CLARITA, CALIFORNIA 91350-2173 • 661 297-1600 FAX 661 297-1611
website address: www.clwa.org

The project is also a part of the potable water system for the entire Specific Plan which relies upon imported Nickel water to satisfy the potable water demands of the Specific Plan area including the Mission Village Project. Nickel water will need to be conveyed through CLWA facilities and treated at CLWA treatment plants. 4

The failure of the Project to pay Facility Connection fees to the CLWA could result in the underfunding of imported and recycled water infrastructure within the CLWA service area. Avoidance of paying the Project's fair share of infrastructure costs could result in the inability of CLWA to cover capital and operations costs and thereby compromise CLWA's ability to serve potable water service area wide and to meet the recycled water supply goals of the Urban Water Management Plan.

Therefore, Mitigation Measure MV 4.8-1 is not just requested by CLWA, but required by CEQA in order to incorporate the mitigation measure into the Project and to include it in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) for the Project. Both need to specifically state that the CLWA Facility Capacity Fees will be paid by the developers of the Project prior to the issuance of building permits. Only with the payment of these fees from the developer to CLWA will the project's direct and cumulative impacts to water supplies be reduced to less than significant. 5

The DEIR should be modified to confirm that the mitigation measure is needed for the reasons set forth above. In addition, the DEIR should be revised to clarify that the mitigation measure will be adopted should the County approve the proposed Project and that the measure will be incorporated into the MMP so that the measure is fully enforceable. Finally, CLWA requests that proposed responses to CLWA's comments be provided prior to certification of the Final EIR, so that CLWA can ensure that the modifications have been implemented as requested.

CLWA appreciates the efforts of the County and looks forward to responses to the concerns raised. If you have any questions, please contact Jeff Ford, Principal Water Resources Planner, at (661) 513-1281, or by e-mail at jford@clwa.org.

Sincerely,

Dan Masnada
General Manager

cc: CLWA Board of Directors
Steve Zimmer, Newhall Land
Russ Behrens, McCormack, Kidman and Behrens

ERRATA

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT for MISSION VILLAGE

SCH No. 2005051143

County Project No. 04-181
Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105
SEA Conditional Use Permit No. RCUP200500080
Oak Tree Permit No. ROAK200500032

Oak Tree Permit No. T200500043
Conditional Use Permit RCUP200500081
(Off-Site Improvements)
Parking Permit RPKT20050001

Volume I

Section 1.0 – 3.0

Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

May 10, 2011

The following pages of the Mission Village Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) represent information corrected subsequent to the circulation of the Final EIR on May 5, 2011. Corrections are shown in double-underline and strikeout format. Corrected pages consist of:

1. A revision to the response to Letter C17. Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), dated January 13, 2011 (See Response 4);
2. A revision to the Executive Summary Table, mitigation measure MV 4.8-1;
3. A revision to Draft EIR Section 4.8, Water Service, mitigation measure MV 4.8-1; and
4. A revision to the Mission Village Mitigation Monitoring Plan, mitigation measure MV 4.8-1.

Letter No. C17 **Letter from Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), dated January 13, 2011**

Responses 1

The County acknowledges Castaic Lake Water Agency's (CLWA) role in the provision of imported water to the Santa Clarita Valley. The County further acknowledges that the CLWA service area covers the Mission Village proposed project and all of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan area in which the proposed project is located. The County appreciates CLWA's review of the Draft EIR for the Mission Village project and receipt of CLWA's comments.

Responses 2

This comment quotes from the Draft EIR, at page 4.8-151. The quoted text is taken from Section 4.8, Water Service, of the Draft EIR. In response to CLWA's comment, the quoted text has been revised for clarification purposes. The revised text, found in the Revised EIR Pages of the Final EIR, is as follows:

> "~~Implementation of t~~ The above Specific Plan mitigation measures are ~~as~~ part of the Mission Village project by virtue of the County's approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003), and would mitigate impacts to water resources to less-than-significant levels. The above Specific Plan mitigation measures also will be incorporated into the County's Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Mission Village project as applicable. Nonetheless, to ensure that the Mission Village project impacts to water resources remain less than significant, the following mitigation measure was included in the Draft EIR; such mitigation also will be included in the County's Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Mission Village project to ensure enforcement of the measure: ~~As a result, no additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR are required or necessary, because the Mission Village project does not result in any significant water related impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures. However, at the request of CLWA, the following mitigation measure has been added to the EIR:~~
>
> MV 4.8-1 Prior to~~Upon~~ the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures."

The above clarifications are intended to acknowledge the importance of the Mission Village project's requirement to pay facility capacity fees to CLWA to ensure the fair-share funding of water infrastructure within the CLWA service area.

Response 3

The County notes the information provided by CLWA with respect to its supplies and facility capacity fees. The County appreciates CLWA's comments and the comments will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

Response 4

While the Mission Village proposed project is part of the potable water system for the entire Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the project does not rely on Nickel water to satisfy its potable water demands. As reported in the Newhall Ranch Revised Additional Analysis, Section 2.5, Water Resources (Volume VIII, May 2003), the Nickel water would only be needed on the Specific Plan site in years when the Newhall agricultural water has been fully used, which is estimated to occur after approximately the 21st year of project construction. However, the County acknowledges that the Nickel water would need to be conveyed *via* the State Water Project (SWP) system through point of delivery agreements involving CLWA and conveyed and treated through CLWA facilities to the Valencia Water Company water system. Recycled water from CLWA would also be supplied to the Mission Village Project.

Response 5

The County notes the information provided by CLWA with respect to its supplies and facility capacity fees. The County appreciates CLWA's comments and the comments will be made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed project.

In addition, the County agrees with CLWA that Mitigation Measure MV 4.8-1 is required by CEQA to ensure that the Mission Village project impacts to water resources remain less than significant. Should the County approve the Mission Village proposed project, then Mitigation Measure MV 4.8-1 would be adopted by the County and incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the project in order to ensure that the mitigation measure is fully enforceable.

Lastly, the County will comply with CLWA's request that the County's responses to CLWA's comments be provided prior to certification of the Mission Village Final EIR.

Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.8 WATER SERVICE (CONTINUED)		
	SP 4.11-21 (continued) would begin upon approval of the first subdivision map and be provided annually to the RWQCB and County for the purpose of monitoring water quality impacts of the Specific Plan over time. If the sampling data results in the identification of significant new or additional water quality impacts resulting from the Specific Plan, which were not previously known or identified, additional mitigation shall be required at the subdivision map level. (*This measure is not applicable until subdivision map approval for the Mission Village project.*)	
	SP 4.11-22 Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision. (*Consistent with this measure, the applicant of the Mission Village project has provided the County with this documentation. As a condition of approval of the Mission Village tract map, the applicant will provide proof to the County that the agricultural land in the County proposed to be retired from irrigated production, in fact, has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the Mission Village subdivision.*)	
	MV 4.8-1 Prior to~~Upon~~ the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.	

Specific Plan, including the identification of appropriate candidate land areas for recharge. The report shall be subject to approval by the Department of Public Works (DPW) and other applicable regulatory agencies, as determined by DPW. (The referenced report has been completed and included in **Appendix 4.8**.)

c. Additional Mitigation Measures Proposed by this EIR

~~Implementation of t~~The above Specific Plan mitigation measures are ~~as~~ part of the Mission Village project by virtue of the County's approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003), and would mitigate impacts to water resources to less-than-significant levels. The above Specific Plan mitigation measures also will be incorporated into the County's Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Mission Village project as applicable. Nonetheless, to ensure that the Mission Village project impacts to water resources remain less than significant, the following mitigation measure was included in the Draft EIR; such mitigation also will be included in the County's Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the Mission Village project to ensure enforcement of the measure: ~~As a result, no additional mitigation measures beyond those identified in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Program EIR are required or necessary, because the Mission Village project does not result in any significant water-related impacts after implementation of the above mitigation measures. However, at the request of CLWA, the following mitigation measure has been added to the EIR:~~

MV 4.8-1 Prior to~~Upon~~ the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.

10. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

a. Project Impacts

With implementation of the Specific Plan mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in or contribute to any significant unavoidable impacts on Santa Clarita Valley water resources. No further mitigation measures are required.

b. Cumulative Impacts

Because the proposed project is relying on local independent water supplies (i.e., local groundwater and recycled water from local water reclamation plants), the proposed Mission Village project does not result in or contribute to any significant unavoidable cumulative impacts on Santa Clarita Valley water supplies. Therefore, as stated above, cumulative mitigation measures are not required.

ERRATA

CORRECTION 4

SP 4.11-22 Beginning with the filing of the first subdivision map allowing construction on the Specific Plan site and with the filing of each subsequent subdivision map allowing construction, the Specific Plan applicant, or its designee, shall provide documentation to the County of Los Angeles identifying the specific portion(s) of irrigated farmland in the County of Los Angeles proposed to be retired from irrigated production to make agricultural water available to serve the subdivision. As a condition of subdivision approval, the applicant or its designee, shall provide proof to the County that the agricultural land has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the subdivision. (*Consistent with this measure, the applicant of the Mission Village project has provided the County with this documentation. As a condition of approval of the Mission Village tract map, the applicant will provide proof to the County that the agricultural land in the County proposed to be retired from irrigated production, in fact, has been retired prior to issuance of building permits for the Mission Village subdivision .*)	Applicant	Receipt of written report from applicant	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Concurrent with Submittal of Application for Tentative Tract Maps which permit construction.
MV 4.8-1 Prior to~~Upon~~ the issuance of building permits associated with each subdivision map allowing construction within the Mission Village site, the applicant shall pay Facility Capacity Fees to the Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA) in accordance with CLWA policies and procedures.	Applicant	Receipt of documentation from applicant	1. LACDRP 2. LACDRP 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit
4.9 WASTEWATER DISPOSAL			
SP 4.12-1 The Specific Plan shall reserve a site of sufficient size to accommodate a water reclamation plant to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*This measure has been implemented by the Board of Supervisors' approval in May 2003, of the Newhall Ranch WRP within the boundary of the Specific Plan.*)	Applicant	Specific Plan Review 	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Final Approval of Specific Plan
SP 4.12-2 A 5.8 to 6.9 mgd water reclamation plant shall be constructed on the Specific Plan site, pursuant to County, State, and Federal design standards, to serve the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. (*This measure will be implemented pursuant to the project-level analysis already completed for the Newhall Ranch WRP in the certified Newhall Ranch Specific Plan EIR .*)	WRP Applicant	Review of WRP Construction Plans	1. County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (CSDLAC) 2. CSDLAC 3. Prior to Demand for First Phase or WRP Capacity
SP 4.12-3 The Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan shall be implemented pursuant to County, State, and Federal design standards. (*The proposed Mission Village sewer system would implement the previously adopted Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan relative to the Mission Village portion of the Specific Plan .*)	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Review of Tentative Map	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Approval of Tentative Maps
SP 4.12-4 Prior to recordation of each subdivision permitting construction, the applicant of each subdivision shall obtain a letter from the new County sanitation district stating that treatment capacity will be adequate for that subdivision. (*This mitigation measure, as it applies to Mission Village, will be implemented concurrent with project development .*)	Applicant	Review Final Subdivision Map	1. CSDLAC 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Each Final Subdivision Map
SP 4.12-5 All facilities of the sanitary sewer system will be designed and constructed for maintenance by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and/or the new County sanitation district or similar entity in accordance with their manuals, criteria, and requirements. (*This mitigation measure, as it applies to Mission Village, will be implemented concurrent with project development.*)	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Review Final Subdivision Plans	1. CSDLAC, LACDPW 2. CSDLAC, LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Each Final Subdivision Map

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61105 MISSION VILLAGE (A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). VTTM No. 61105, dated December 15, 2010, submitted by Newhall Land and Ffarming Company ("subdivider") proposes a mixed-use community that is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and

dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

~~Along with the development of VTTM No. 61105, as revised,~~ The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

6. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

7. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance ~~Determination No~~Review No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an

average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

    Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

DRAFT

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

17. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

    (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

    (b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

    (c) 143 open space lots;

    (d) 2 public park (active) lots;

    (e) 4 private recreation lots;

    (f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

    (g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

    (h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

    (i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

18. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

19. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

20. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

21. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to

the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage <u>on a particular lot</u> ~~among lots~~ may be allowed if ~~it~~ <u>such increase</u> does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

22. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

23. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

24. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

25. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories:

Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology~~, Biota~~, Traffic/Access~~, Noise~~, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant~~,~~ and unavoidable ~~and/or cumulative~~ impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(a~~b~~) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(~~b~~d) Air Quality;
(~~c~~e) Solid Waste Services; and
(~~d~~f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally e~~E~~ach of these significant and unavoidable impact categories~~,~~ with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

26. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. ~~On~~ At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

27. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

28. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of SCOPE, who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

DRAFT

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

29. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the

increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

30. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

31. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

32. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

33. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally

proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

34. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

35. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

36. As part of the project, Commerce Center Drive and Magic Mountain Parkway will be extended to provide regional access to and from the project site to SR-126 and I-5, respectively. The Commerce Center Drive extension serves as the primary north/south access through Mission Village and it connects to SR-126 by new interchange improvements. Magic Mountain Parkway is the primary east/west access through the project and it connects to The Old Road. Westridge Parkway provides a secondary connection to the south of the project site. The Magic Mountain Parkway extension proceeds westerly from its existing terminus at The Old Road for a distance of approximately 5,000 feet before intersecting with the project site. The extension of Commerce Center Drive proceeds southerly from its current terminus at SR-126, over the Santa Clara River, into the project site, and includes construction of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge. The bridge will span the width of the Santa Clara River, equating to a roadway segment of approximately 1,300 feet in length and 120 to 129 feet in width. The internal circulation plan provides a system of arterials, residential and commercial collectors, residential public streets, and private drives.

37. Private driveway lots within the development will provide internal access in single-family and multi-family neighborhoods, including in the Village Center, which is the mixed-use center of the community.

38. Of the 35182 single-family lots, four are designed as flag lots (Lot Nos. 564, 57548, 49, 297 and 298, as shown on the VTTM No. 061105 and Exhibit Map dated December 15, 2010). Due to grading requirements, these four lots cannot comply with the frontage width required by the county for a standard lot. However, the lot is of adequate size to accommodate a residence and comply with all other required development standards.

39. Traffic calming features are incorporated into the local street system, including curb extensions and chokers, which narrow the road to promote slowing down traffic mid-block and at intersections.

40. Access as depicted on the tentative map will be adequate for all lots and for the deployment of fire fighting and other emergency service vehicles because all roads are improved pursuant to applicable Fire and Public Works standards.

41. Mission Village comprises active and passive open space/recreation areas, and preservation open space areas. Active open space areas within the project site include space for recreational activities in two public parks (community park and neighborhood park) a private park, called Village Green, located in the Village Center, and two private recreation centers.

    A total of 352 acres of open space area, distributed among 139 lots, are depicted throughout the Tentative Map and function as connection buffer between development planning areas, trails and utility easements.

    The Project includes 212.6 acres of River Corridor dedication and a total of 85.8 acres of Spineflower Preserve which are natural open space areas within the project site dedicated to preservation.

42. The Mission Village project includes approximately 693 acres of open/ recreation space, as depicted on the revised VTTM No. 61105, consisting of 85.8-acres of spineflower preserves (lots 46, 468, 470, 500-01), 26.8 acres of parks (lots 469, 612), a 2.9-acre private park (Village Green) (lot 527), 11.8 acres of recreation/recreation centers (lots 178, 424, 526), 275.9 acres of open space (lots 35-45, 614-15, 611, 603, 471-75, 487-95, 498-99, 449, 451-52, 440, 435-37, 428-31, 425, 408-10, 414-22, 391-95, 353, 354-56, 362, 365-66, 617-20, 266-73, 360, 363-64, 146-50, 156), 212.6 acres of open space (River) (lots 605-08), 27.5 acres of open space (River Adjacent) (lots 367, 609), 18.4 acres of open space (LDZ [Landscape Development Zone]) (lots 151, 159, 160, 377-79, 382-83, 426, 438, 444, 446, 453-54, 460-67, 476-79, 502-507, 541-49), 16.1 acres of open space (Lion Canyon) (lots 358-59), and 14.6 acres of open space (Arroyo Walk)(lots 152-55, 531-32).

43. The Mission Village project also includes a dedicated location for a fire station (lot 448), which will serve the surrounding community.

44. The applicant has requested phasing of final map recordation. Multiple final maps will be permitted. The phasing depicted on the tentative tract map may be changed subject to submittal of a revised phasing map and a written request to staff. The phasing depicted on the tentative tract map may be changed subject to

the Amended Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

45. The project preserves and enhances sensitive habitat, and includes significant open space and recreational components. Approximately 693 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are designated for open space and recreation uses. This includes 85.8-acres in three spineflower preserves that will be established in the northeasterly portions of the site. For recreational purposes, three park lots and two recreation centers lots are depicted within the subdivision. Two of the parks would be public, one a 21.6-acre Community Park and the other a 5.2-acre Neighborhood Park; both would include improvements and serve both active and passive uses. The subdivision also includes the 2.9-acre Village Green, which is a private park located in the Village Center designed to provide opportunities for both passive and active recreation, as well as an area for community functions, such as a farmers market.

46. According to Section 2.3.2 of the Specific Plan, the Low Residential land use designation shall have the average lot size of no less than 1.0 acre in size within any proposed subdivision map. Residential development lots 279-351 within the Low Density ("L") designation averaged one acre in size on previous tentative map submittals. However, in the view of staff, it is in the best interests of the project, and consistent with the Specific Plan, that the natural open space portions of these residential lots be located outside the residential lots and within the fully-protected designated open space lots, as indicated on the revised VTTM dated December 15, 2010. However these open space lots remain within the Low Density land use designation and are included in the calculation of average lot size for this land use category.

47. Second units are proposed on 73 lots in the Low Density Residential ("L") land use designation, shown as Lots 279-351 on VTTM No. 61105. The second units will provide a more affordable housing alternative for caretakers, extended family, senior residents, and other renting households.

48. Conceptual plans for development of the recreational facilities have been provided. Minor changes to the park design are subject to approval of a revised park plan by the Department of Regional Planning and parks and Recreation. Any park project shall be substantially consistent with underlying approvals.

49. Three private recreation/recreation center lots are depicted on VTTM No. 61105. The recreation areas will be fenced and maintained by a homeowners association, with parking provided both off street and on street. These lots will provide recreational amenities for the Mission Village community.

50. The site is physically suitable for the type of development and the density being proposed because the property has adequate building sites to be developed in accordance with the grading ordinance; has access to County-maintained streets; will be served by sanitary sewers; will be provided with water supplies and distribution facilities with sufficient capacity to meet anticipated domestic and fire protection needs; and has all flood hazards and geologic hazards mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Public Works.

51. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause serious public healthy problems because sewage disposal, storm drainage, fire protection, and geological and soils factors are addressed in the conditions of approval.

52. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantial or avoidable injury to fish and wildlife or their habitat as appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Plan/conditions of approval.

53. The discharge of sewage from this land division into the public sewer system will not violate the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to Division 7 (Commencing with Section 13000) of the California Water Code.

54. The division and development of the subject property in the manner set forth on this vesting tentative tract map will not unreasonably interfere with the free and complete exercise of public entity and/or public utility rights-of-way and/or easements within the tentative tract map since the design and development, as set forth in the conditions of the project and on the tentative map, provide adequate protection for any such rights-of-way and easements.

55. The design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities therein since the lots are of sufficient size so as to permit orientation of structures in an east-west alignment for southern exposure or to take advantage of shade or prevailing breezes.

56. The housing and employment needs of the region were considered and balanced against the public service needs of local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources when the project was determined to be consistent with the General Plan and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

57. The Mission Village tract map has been submitted as a "vesting" tentative tract map. As such, it is subject to the provisions of Chapter 21.38 of the Los Angeles County Code, Vesting Tentative Map.

DRAFT

58. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is a comprehensive document that guides the development of the Newhall Ranch property. The document sets forth a comprehensive set of plans, development regulations, design guidelines, and implementation programs designed to produce a project consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan and Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The applicant has provided a booklet, titled "Mission Village Planning Notebook" (Notebook), which provides the detailed exhibits and tables that update the Specific Plan within the Mission Village subdivision boundary, and identify goals and objectives within the Specific Plan that these project features achieve. Mission Village is consistent with the following aspects of the Specific Plan:

Affordable Housing: The Specific Plan requires affordable housing, with a total of 2,200 affordable units located throughout the Specific Plan area (Specific Plan Section 3.10). The applicant submitted the Newhall Affordable Housing Implementation Plan to the County which was approved by the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission in June 25, 2010. The Affordable Housing Implementation Plan states that Mission Village shall develop up to 300 affordable homes within the project site.

Circulation: The circulation plan proposed for Mission Village is a refinement of the Newhall Ranch Master Circulation Plan approved as part of the Specific Plan and it is consistent with the designation, location and dimensions of the highways and collector roads depicted in the Specific Plan. Private Drives are designed to conform to the final design criteria approved in the Westside Communities Private Drives and Traffic Calming Manual.

Transit: The Specific Plan contemplated two bus pull-in areas within areas located within Mission Village. The proposed project depicts three bus stops and a bus transfer station. The proposed locations of the transfer station and bus stops are a refinement of the location in the Specific Plan to accommodate final circulation design of the project, and are consistent with the intent of the Specific Plan to provide convenient access to public transit within the Mission Village project area.

Trails: The Master Plan of Trails in the Specific Plan is general in nature, and provides general locations for trails within the project area. The Tentative Map provides more detailed information regarding the location of trails within the Mission Village project area. The location of the trails depicted on the Tentative Map is consistent with the Specific Plan. However the applicant is requesting an adjustment in the required 12-foot wide trail section to 8-foot wide trails for the community trails, local trails and pathways. The four feet reduction will provide additional landscaping along the trail, reduce the trail's paved area and increase permeable area around the trails to comply with Low Impact Development Standards. The intent of the trails is to provide pedestrian and bicycles use and

the reduction of the width of the trail will not compromise the intended use. Therefore, the proposed 8-foot wide trails are consistent with the Specific Plan.

Spineflower Preserve: The Specific Plan Land Use Plan depicts a 20.3 acre Specific Plan conservation easement within Mission Village. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing easement to approximately 85 acres in an effort to provide connectivity to permanent open space, preserve known spineflower populations and establish a Spineflower Preserve. The proposed expansion of the Spineflower Preserve area is consistent with the Specific Plan because it provide for additional protection of sensitive resources in keeping with the policies in the Specific Plan to protect such resources.

Drainage and Water Quality Plan: The Conceptual Backbone Drainage Plan of the Specific Plan sets forth the framework by which drainage and flood protection to the site will be provided. A primary goal of the plan was to provide drainage and flood protection while preserving the Santa Clara River as a resource. The Mission Village Drainage and Water Quality Plan is consistent with the Specific Plan, which included conceptual drainage plans that reflects innovative methodologies to meet NPDES requirements, and reflects a comprehensive system of flood control and detention basins to maintain water quality standards.

Water Plan: The Conceptual Backbone Water Plan was designed in the Specific Plan for the Mission Village portion of the overall project with water main and reclaimed water lines to be located along Commerce Center Drive, Magic Mountain Parkway, Westridge Parkway, and "A" Street. The Potable and Reclaimed Water Plan follows the Conceptual Backbone Water Plan and depicts in greater detail, the infrastructure lines to serve the Mission Village project. While the precise routing of water lines for the delivery system delineated by Mission Village Water Plan differ to some extent from the Conceptual Plan set forth in the Specific Plan, this routing flexibility falls within the prescribed Substantial Conformance parameters set in the Specific Plan Implementation Section 5.2.2b(a).

Sewer Plan: The Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan of the Specific Plan set forth a system for sewage collection witch included connection to a water reclamation plant, a collection system with pump stations, and both gravity and force mains. A detailed Sewer Plan was prepared for Mission Village that provides further refinement to the location of sewer main lines and while the precise routing of sewer lines for the delivery system differ to some extent from the Conceptual Plan set forth in the Specific Plan, this routing flexibility falls within the prescribed Substantial Conformance parameters set in the Specific Plan Implementation Section 5.2.2b(a).

Land Use Plan: The Mission Village project is proposed within the Mesas Village area identified in the Specific Plan. Land Uses depicted within the project boundary are Low Density Residential, Low-Medium Density Residential,

DRAFT

Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Commercial, Mixed Use, Open Space and River Corridor. Flexibility was built into the Specific Plan to allow for adjustments, transfers and conversions of use, boundaries, square footage, etc. (Specific Plan Section 5.2-5, page 5-14), within certain parameters. The Mesas Village is divided into Planning Areas, as Mission Village only covers 71 percent of the Mesas Village area, some planning areas do not pertain to Mission Village even though they are within Mesas Village. Although Mesas Village is entitled to a maximum of 7,716 dwelling units and 2,232,000 square feet of building space, Mission Village is only entitled to a maximum of 5,465 dwelling units and 1,948,500 which corresponds to the Planning Areas within the Mission Village Tentative Map boundary.

The applicable regulations include:

- The total number of dwelling units in the Mesas Village shall not exceed 5,465 total dwelling units.

  Mission Village represents approximately 71 percent of the total Mesas Village area. Currently, there is no other residential development proposed in the Mesas Village area. Mission Village proposes 4,055 dwelling units. Therefore, this regulation has been met.

- The total maximum building square footage for the Mission Village project shall not exceed the total maximum building square footage set forth in the Annotated Land Use Plan Statistical Summary for the Specific Plan area.

  The Annotated Land Use Plan Statistical Summary determines that the maximum building square footage allowed by the Specific Plan for this area is 1,948,500 square feet. Mission Village proposes 1,555,100 building square feet. Therefore, this regulation has been met.

- No planning area may change in total acreage by more than 20 percent.

  Mission Village is proposing changes to the acreage of most of the planning areas, however, none of the changes exceed 20 percent. Therefore, this regulation has been met.

Each land Use designation contains several Planning Areas. The table below shows a summary of the changes between the Project and the Mesas Village (Specific Plan) in total acreage, number of dwelling units and non-residential square footage. Detailed information about the changes per Planning Area is available in a table format on page 53 and 65 of the Notebook, with exhibits on pages 51 and 52.

Land Use	Area comparison to Specific Plan	Dwelling Units Comaprison to Specific Plan	Planned Non-Residential Square footage comparison to Specific Plan	Maximum Non-Residnetial Square Footage comparison to Specific Plan
Low	4.9% increase	-8	n/a	
Low-Medium	3.8% decrease	-235	n/a	
Medium	3.6% decrease	-129	N/a	
High	19.4% increase	-41	n/a	
Mixed Use	4.0% increase	-640	212,000	-372,000
Commercial	18.5% decrease	n/a	24,100	-20,900
Open Area	1.7% decrease	n/a	n/a	n/a
River Corridor	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a

The table above show that Low-Medium and Medium Residential land use designations decreased in area and in number of dwelling units while Low and High Residential land use designations increased in area but still decreased the number of dwelling units. The Mixed Use designation increased four percent in area, decreased the number of dwelling units but increased the commercial square footage. Even though the commercial square footage was increased in the Mixed Use and Commercial land use designations, the commercial square footage is still under the maximum allowed for commercial area within those categories as permitted by the Specific Plan. These changes are due to project refinement which results in changes in the number of housing units, square footage of non-residential space and area dedicated to each use.

The elementary school as well as the Community and Neighborhood Parks are part of land use overlays, and are 'flexible' as to their final location within the Specific Plan. The land use overlay adjustments are permitted pursuant to Section 5.2-5 of the Specific Plan with respect to size, quantity and location of public service facilities such as parks and schools. As part of the overlay uses depicted in the Specific Plan, Mission Village is proposing an elementary school, a fire station and a library as land use overlays.

59. Based on the record before it, the Commission finds the proposed subdivision and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the land use plan, affordable housing, circulation, transit, trails, infrastructure allocation, non-residential square footage allocations, residential dwelling unit allocations, spineflower preserve and land use.

60. Mitigation measures, which have been incorporated into the project and included in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, are listed in the Executive Summary of the Final EIR, and include mitigation measures originally prescribed within the Specific Plan EIR.

61. The Commission finds substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the project outweigh its unavoidable significant effects on visual quality, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources.

62. The Mission Village project is subject to California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code.

63. Approval of this subdivision is conditioned on the subdivider's compliance with the attached conditions of approval, as well as the conditions of approval for CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001.

64. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

65. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. ~~RCUP~~200500080 (SEA), CUP No. ~~RCUP~~200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. ~~RPKT~~200500011, and Substantial Conformance ~~Determination~~ Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

2. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

3. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

4. Approves Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105 (dated December 15, 2010), subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission, including recommendations of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee.

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. RCUP200500080 (SEA)
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project approvals, the applicant is requesting approval of a project-level Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") CUP No. RCUP200500080 to provide the County with the regulatory framework to implement Mission Village development within the approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary in a manner that is consistent with both the adopted Specific Plan and previously approved program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5). Specifically, the proposed Mission Village project-level improvements within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary include the Commerce Center Drive Bridge, neighborhood park, access roads, and easements, grading, trails, water quality basins, bank stabilization, water and sewer utility crossings, utility corridor, storm drain outlets, and potential riparian mitigation sites.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational

facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on-site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, is a related request that proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

DRAFT

The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

6. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

7. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

    In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended

Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biota
- Cultural/Paleontological Resources
- Education
- Environmental Safety
- Fire Protection Services
- Floodplain Modifications
- Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
- Global Climate Change
- Hydrology
- Library Services
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Parks and Recreation
- Sheriff Services
- Solid Waste Disposal
- Traffic/Access
- Utilities
- Visual Qualities
- Wastewater Disposal
- Water Quality
- Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology~~, Biota~~, Traffic/Access~~, Noise~~, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and~~,~~ unavoidable ~~and/or cumulative~~ impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(~~b~~d) Air Quality;
(~~c~~e) Solid Waste Services; and
(~~d~~f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally e~~E~~ach of these significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010, to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant

presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of Santa Clarita Organization for Planning The Environment ("SCOPE"), who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total

of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to

212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of

357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

35. In approving this grant, the Commission finds as follow:

    a. The proposed development would be consistent with the adopted General Plan and Area Plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site.

    b. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan's adjusted SEA 23 boundary removed a limited amount of acreage for development from the existing SEA; however, the SEA was determined to nonetheless remain in a viable and largely natural condition, particularly when taking into account major factors influencing the realization of applicable General Plan objectives, including competing priorities between resource preservation and other General Plan policies and objectives.

    c. The proposed development was determined to conform with the General Plan's SEA "design compatibility criteria," in that:

        (i) The development was designed to be highly compatible with biotic resources present in the existing SEA 23, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

        (ii) The development was designed to maintain waterbodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state within the existing SEA 23;

        (iii) The development was designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in a natural and undisturbed state within the existing SEA 23;

(iv) The development retained sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resources within the existing SEA 23 from the proposed development;

(v) The development provided fences or walls where necessary to buffer important habitat within the existing SEA 23 from proposed development; and

(vi) The development located and designed roads and utilities serving the development so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths within the existing SEA 23.

d. The approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan was found to be sensitive to, and compatible with, the biotic resources of the existing SEA 23;

e. The proposed development at the proposed locations within the existing SEA 23 would not:

(i) Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area;

(ii) Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or

(iii) Jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

f. The proposed site was adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features to be located in the approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary in order to integrate said uses with the uses in the surrounding areas.

g. The site was adequately served:

(i) By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and

(ii) By other public or private service facilities as are required.

36. Development of project-related improvements within the Mission Village tract map site would permanently impact approximately 21.6 acres within SEA 23, and an additional approximate 18.3 acres within SEA 23 would be impacted as part of the off-site development.

DRAFT

37. A CUP is required to authorize project-related improvements within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, pursuant to the requirements of the Specific Plan. A CUP for development within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary is required to ensure consistency with the previously approved program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5), which, in the previous approval, the Board found to be consistent with applicable requirements for development within an SEA.

38. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan and program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5), the project-related improvements within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary include: (a) Commerce Center Drive Bridge, including a portion of Commerce Center Drive; (b) river trail; (c) access roads and public utility easements; (e) utilities (including storm drain outlets, water quality basins, sanitary sewer, water, cable, gas, fiber optics, etc.); (f) bank stabilization; (g) neighborhood park; and (h) grading.

39. With approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and CUP No. 94-087-(5), the Board approved the general alignment for Commerce Center Drive Bridge in order to minimize impacts to sensitive habitat and species within SEA 23, and to minimize major access points to SR-126. The Board found the bridge crossing to be essential for a functional circulation system to serve the Specific Plan area and the region, and to advance many of the County's goals and policies related to transportation, land use, and other issues of public interest. The bridge crossing was found to comply with the County's engineering requirements, and to be strategically located and designed to provide maximum transportation effectiveness, while minimizing impacts to critical resources, habitat areas, and animal movement paths in riparian corridor areas. Commerce Center Drive Bridge would connect the existing north terminus of Commerce Center Drive at SR-126 with the proposed southern extension of Commerce Center Drive and would serve central portions of Newhall Ranch. The bridge would span the width of the Santa Clara River, equating to a roadway segment of approximately 1,300 feet in length and 120 to 129 feet in width.

40. Consistent with previously approved SEA CUP No. 94-087 (5), the Mission Village project bank stabilization is consistent with the following objectives that were developed to balance the environment and flood control issues presented by the Santa Clara River, as required by the County General Plan. These objectives are as follows:

    (i) The flood corridor must allow for the passage of Los Angeles County Capital Flood flows without the permanent removal of natural vegetation (except at bridge crossings);

(ii) The bank of the river will generally be outside of the "waters of the United States" as defined by federal laws and regulations, and as determined by the delineation completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") in August 1993;

(iii) Where the Corps delineation width is insufficient to contain the Capital Flood flow, the flood corridor will be widened by an amount sufficient to carry the Capital Flood flow, and the flood corridor will be widened by an amount sufficient to carry the Capital Flood flow without the necessity of permanently removing vegetation or significantly increasing velocity;

(iv) Where development is proposed within the existing Los Angeles County 50-year Capital Floodplain, the land where development is to occur will be elevated in conformance with Los Angeles County policies to remove it from the Floodplain; and

(v) Bank stabilization will occur only where necessary to protect against erosion.

41. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails, and paseos. Portion of the Regional River Trail is located with the SEA on the north side of the Santa Clara River, at the northern portion of Mission Village. This trail is part of the Trails Plan approved as part of Specific Plan and will be constructed within the bank stabilization area and not disturbing additional area.

42. Riparian mitigation sites will be located within the SEA boundary within the Mission Village project site. The riparian mitigation sites are necessary to maintain the riparian areas and enhancement to the rived corridor. These mitigation sites are subject to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) review and approval.

43. Utilities planned to serve the Mission Village project include water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics and recycled water lines.

DRAFT

44. The Mission Village project would include one of the Specific Plan Neighborhood Parks on the project site. The park would contain approximately 5 acres of usable parkland, approximately 2.2 acres of which would be located within the SEA.

45. The approval of the components of Mission Village that are located within the SMA/SEA 23 is consistent with the requirements of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County General Plan, and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.

46. The Mission Village project is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the set aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. The development of Mission Village within portions of SEA 23 will result in the vast majority of SEA 23 left in a natural state and it is designed to be highly compatible with biological resources and consistent with the provisions of the Specific Plan and CUP 94-087-(5).

Development proposed for Mission Village is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The Specific Plan's Land Use Plan depicted five villages, and the Mission Village project is a portion of the Mesas Village, as shown on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan. Previously approved CUP 94-087-(5) describes the future Specific Plan components authorized for development within the SEA, which includes the following components within Mission Village: (a) Commerce Center Drive Bridge; (b) Commerce Center Drive; (c) River trail; (d) Access roads and public utility easements; (e) Utilities: storm drain outlets, utilities within the proposed utility corridor, and utilities within Commerce Center Drive Bridge; (f) Bank stabilization; (g) Water Quality basins and associated features; (h) Park; and (i) Grading.

There are a total of 1,261.8 acres within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105. Of that amount, 237.5 of those acres are within SEA 23. Approximately 21.5 acres of the 237.5 acres will be permanently impacted by project development. The project includes additional areas outside the boundaries of the tentative map where the associated off-site improvements are proposed. Of those off-site areas, approximately 18.4 acres within SEA 23 will be permanently impacted by development of the project. Thus, the vast majority of SEA 23 will be left in a natural state, highly compatible with the biological resources present and consistent with the provisions of the Specific Plan and CUP 94-087-(5).

47. The development of Mission Village within portions of SEA 23 would maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state, consistent with the approved Specific Plan and CUP 94-087-(5). As contemplated by the approved Specific Plan, Commerce Center Drive Bridge will require the placement of abutments and piers in the river area; the effect of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge crossing was assessed in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan

Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.3, Floodplain Modifications and appropriate mitigation was required. The EIR prepared for Mission Village includes additional environmental analysis of the bridge abutments and piers relative to the river corridor.

Also as contemplated by the approved Specific Plan, the Mission Village development will include bank stabilization, but only where necessary to protect development from erosion. Bank stabilization is proposed to be buried in all areas except at outlet structures, access ramps, and bridge abutments where it is expected that grouted rock or reinforced concrete will be required to meet Department of Public Works standards. Limited impacts to the Santa Clara River will occur as a result of these improvements.

48. The Mission Village project is designed so that wildlife movement corridors (migratory paths) are left in an undisturbed and natural state. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, animal migratory paths within the SEA 23 will be left mostly undisturbed, with limited exception at the Commerce Center Drive Bridge abutment and pier locations. Other proposed development within SEA 23 (river trail, storm drain outlets, utility lines, Commerce Center Drive Bridge, bank stabilization, park, and water quality basins) will have a de minimis impact on migratory pathways, and the riparian mitigation areas will provide beneficial cover for migratory animals. Additionally, the increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009), which results in 85.8 acres of preserves, will provide enhanced connectivity to open space.

49. The Mission Village project retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resource areas from the development. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, Mission Village will retain sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open space areas to complement SEA 23. The Specific Plan requires a minimum 100-foot buffer adjacent to the Santa Clara River between the top of the bank stabilization and development within the Residential Low Medium, Residential Medium, Mixed Use, and Business Park uses, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Director; uses within the buffer area are limited to public infrastructure, abutments, trails and parks. Consistent with the Specific Plan, Mission Village residential and commercial development will be set back from the Santa Clara River resources by a distance ranging between 220 feet and 970 feet. Only necessary infrastructure (i.e., water quality basins, bridge abutments, storm drain outlets, and channel stabilization) will be constructed within the setback areas.

The Mission Village tract map includes the installation of bank protection at the Commerce Center Drive Bridge, along the water quality basin at San Jose Flats (an existing agricultural field), and at the mouth of Lion Canyon to protect

proposed drainage facilities. The bank protection at the water quality basin location is to protect the water quality basin and would be located down slope from the neighborhood park; the closest residential use to the bank protection is approximately 400 feet away with approximately 120 feet of vertical separation. The proposed bank protection at Lion Canyon is to protect the water quality and drainage improvements at the mouth of Lion Canyon; the closest residential use to the bank protection is approximately 250 feet away with a 120 foot vertical separation.

The remaining development areas of the tract map are set back from the riparian sensitive habitat horizontally at least?? ~~(since the SP requires a min of 100 feet, shouldn't this say that it will be at least that?)~~ 100 feet and, in some cases, up to 800 feet. In addition, due to the topographic nature of the site, vertical separations up to 160 feet will occur, further protecting sensitive habitat along SEA 23.

The off-site development proposed as part of the Mission Village project located near or within SEA 23 is for public infrastructure use and no residential or commercial development associated with Mission Village is proposed near these infrastructure improvements. Furthermore, where appropriate, the vegetation within portions of the setback or buffer zone may be restored and/or enhanced to increase habitat values when compared to existing conditions.

50. Where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, the Mission Village development will implement several buffer measures to protect significant habitat within SEA 23. Implementation of the measures described in the Specific Plan will be implemented by conditions of approval imposed through the subdivision approval process, including the EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program. In order to preclude access into the SEA from the residential areas, the rear yards of all residential lots within the vicinity of the SEA will be required to be fenced. In addition, the trails near the SEA will include post and cable fencing with signs prohibiting access to the area. Furthermore, other mitigation measures and conditions of approval will be adopted to ensure the protection of sensitive biotic resources within the SEA 23 (e.g., shielding of illumination).

51. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, Mission Village's roads and utilities have been designed and located so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths. The vast majority of roadways and utilities serving Mission Village are removed far to the south of SEA 23 and, as a result, will have no impact on SEA 23. The number and location of the bridge crossings were established by the Specific Plan in part to minimize impacts on SEA 23 and other sensitive resources. As part of the Mission Village development, the Commerce Center Drive Bridge crossing will be implemented; however, all other

roads within the Mission Village development are either internal to the project or extend to the west and east far from SEA 23.

52. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

53. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. The proposed use with the attached conditions and restrictions are consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan;

B. With the attached conditions and restrictions, the requested use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety and general welfare;

DRAFT

C. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features to occur within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area;

D. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private facilities as are required; and,

E. The proposed project and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the density, goals, and policies of the General Plan and Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including SEAs, in that:

i. The requested development is designed to be compatible with the biotic resources present including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

ii. The requested development is designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses and their tributaries in a natural state;

iii. The requested development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in an undisturbed and natural state;

iv. The requested development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open space to buffer critical resource areas for said requested development and is compatible with the natural biotic, cultural, scenic, and open space resources of the area;

v. Where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development;

vi. Roads and utilities serving the proposed development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths; and

vii. Approval of the proposed development within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, to include project-related improvements, is based on the project's ability to mitigate public safety, design and/or environmental considerations, as provided in the Zoning Ordinance, the General Plan, and Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

The information contained in the Final EIR, and the materials submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearings substantiate the required findings for an SEA conditional use permit as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Sections

22.56.090 and 22.56.215, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certified that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project, and

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 200500080 (SEA), subject to the attached conditions.

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200500081
(DEVELOPMENT OF 73 SECOND UNITS, A CONTINUED CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY, WATER TANKS AND PROJECT-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE, AND RELATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE GRADING)
SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW NO. 201000001
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project approvals, the applicant is requesting approval of CUP No. 200500081 to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, and water tanks; and Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment

of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width). ~~VTTM No. 61105, dated December 15, 2010, submitted by Newhall Land and farming Company ("subdivider") proposes a mixed-use community that is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

~~Along with the development of VTTM No. 61105, as revised,~~ The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on-site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

~~5. CUP No. 200500081 is a request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.~~

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, is a related request that proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

   (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

~~6.~~ The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. ~~Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight feet width).~~

~~7.~~6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

~~8.~~7. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

~~9.~~8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit

encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

~~10.~~9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site ~~and reciprocal~~ parking for lots within the Village Center.

~~11.~~10. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

~~12.~~11. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

~~13.~~12. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

~~14.~~13. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

DRAFT

~~15.~~14. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

~~16.~~ The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

15.

~~17. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:~~

~~(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);~~

~~(b) 11 mixed use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;~~

~~(c) 143 open space lots;~~

~~(d) 2 public park (active) lots;~~

~~(e) 4 private recreation lots;~~

~~(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;~~

~~(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;~~

~~(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and~~

DRAFT

~~(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).~~

~~The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~

~~18.~~16. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

~~19.~~17. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

~~20.~~18. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

~~21.~~19. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

DRAFT

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage ~~among lots~~on a particular lot may be allowed if ~~it~~ such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be

reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

~~22.~~20. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River, about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

~~23.~~21. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

~~24.~~ In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

22.

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

DRAFT

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

~~25.~~23. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology~~, Biota~~, Traffic/Access~~, Noise~~, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and, unavoidable ~~and/or cumulative~~ impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(~~b~~a) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(~~b~~d) Air Quality
(~~c~~e) Solid Waste Services; and
(~~d~~f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally e~~E~~ach of these significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~26.~~24. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. ~~On~~ At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

~~27.~~25. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

DRAFT

~~28.~~26. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment ("SCOPE"), who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

~~29.~~27. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the

amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would

increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

~~30.~~28. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

~~31.~~29. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

~~32.~~30. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

~~33.~~31. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

~~34.~~32. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

~~35.~~33. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

~~36.~~ The adopted Specific Plan contains provisions addressing CUPs. The purpose of the CUP procedure is to provide a mechanism to permit, on a case-by-case basis, uses ~~which~~ that may be appropriate in certain land use designations. Specific Plan Section 5.2.3, Conditional Use Permit Process, provides that the CUP procedure for the Specific Plan is set forth in Los Angeles County Code Title 22, Chapter 22.56, Part 1, in effect as of the date the Specific Plan is adopted. A "conditional use," as defined by the County, means a use which, because of characteristics peculiar to it, or because of size, technological process or type of equipment, or because of its location with reference to surroundings, street or highway width, traffic generation or other demands on public services, requires special consideration relative to placement at specific locations in the land use designation(s) where classified, to ensure proper integration with other existing or permitted uses in the same designation.

~~37. CUP No. 200500081 authorizes development of the following: (i) 73 second dwelling units on Lots 279-35; (ii) continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units on Lot 528; (iii) on-site and off-site project infrastructure and related on-site and off-site project grading totaling approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of~~

DRAFT

~~earthwork (28.9 cubic yards of cut and 28.9 cubic yards of fill). On-site project grading would be conducted in connection with construction of the project infrastructure and utilities authorized by this permit. Off-site grading would be conducted in connection with construction of the extensions of Westridge Parkway and Commerce Center Drive, and the off-site improvements and infrastructure authorized by this permit, including the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, a utility corridor, a water quality basin, debris basins, an electrical substation, water tanks, and miscellaneous drainage improvements outside the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105.~~

34.

~~38. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).~~

Second Units and Continued Care Retirement Community

~~39.~~35. Second units are proposed on 73 lots in Planning Area TM-14 in the Low Density Residential ("L") land use designation, shown as Lots 279-351 on VTTM No. 61105. These lots average one acre in size when included with the open space lots within the Low land use designation. According to the Specific Plan (Table 5.4-1), 122 second dwelling units are allowed with a CUP in Planning Area TM-14. The provision of second dwelling units in Mission Village will provide additional affordable housing opportunities, while maintaining the character of a single-family neighborhood. The second units will provide a more affordable housing alternative for caretakers, extended family, senior residents, and other renting households.

~~40.~~36. The proposed second units will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons

located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare. The 73 proposed second units will provide a more affordable housing alternative for caretakers, extended family, senior residents, and other renting households. The second units could not be sold separately from the primary residence, nor may the underlying residential lot be subdivided without additional approvals or modifications to the project. The second units would be required to comply with the same development requirements as the primary residence and, therefore, will integrate with the primary residence on the property and will be designed to adhere to the maximum size authorized by the Specific Plan. Additionally, the second units will be limited to a maximum living area of 800 square feet and will be regulated to meet main building setbacks, standard height limits, and other applicable requirements. The 73 proposed second units are consistent with the maximum of 122 second units authorized by the Specific Plan within the "L" land use designation of The Mesas, as shown in Table 5.4-1 of the Specific Plan.

Because the second units would be required to comply with the same development requirements as the primary residence and must integrate with the primary residence, and because the units could not be sold separately from the primary residence, the second units would not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of the property of other persons located in the vicinity, nor would they constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

~~41.~~37. The lots proposed for the second units are adequate in size and shape to accommodate the second units to integrate them with the uses in the surrounding area. The building pad for each lot where a second unit is proposed is adequate in size and shape and the specific location of future buildings will be reviewed prior to issuance of building permits. Second units will comply with all required development standards. Pursuant to Specific Plan Section 3.9(2)(b), second units are limited to a maximum living area of 800 square feet and are regulated to meet main building setbacks, standard height limits, lot coverage, floor area ratio, and other applicable requirements. VTTM No. 61105 has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee and conditions of approval will be established prior to approval. The proposed project will be developed in conformance with all applicable County Codes including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, and Building Code.

~~42.~~38. The sites for the second units are adequately served by streets of sufficient width and improved to carry the quantity of traffic that would be generated, and by other public or private service facilities as required. The Mobility Plan (Section 2.4) of the Specific Plan provides for a hierarchy of highways and streets that will provide a safe and efficient circulation system for Mission Village, as well as its

neighboring communities. The residential communities will be directly served by a roadway system consisting of public streets and private streets and drives. The 73 second units, proposed on lots 279-351, will be served by a series of private streets and drives of 40' to 60' in width, more than-adequate to carry the traffic generated. The highway and street widths and standards have been reviewed by County staff to ensure compatibility with applicable access criteria, and the project has been conditioned to comply with the approved traffic study, which was completed using the methodology and standards specified by County staff and utilizing the County approved Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model. The traffic study for the project has been incorporated into the EIR and the project will be required to conform to all conditions of approval for VTTM No. 61105, as well as all mitigation measures adopted by the County. Any other public facilities which are necessary to serve the proposed second units will be incorporated as required.

~~43.~~ The Continued Care Retirement Community ("CCRC") would consist of 351 residential units within VTTM No. 61105 Lot 528 According to the Specific Plan Permitted Use Matrix (Table 3.4-2), A CCRC (care facilities, Residential - 7 or more persons) is allowed with a CUP in the Mixed-Use land use category. The CCRC would be located within the mixed use Village Center portion of the project. The Exhibit Map for VTTM No. 61105, which provides a conceptual design for the CCRC notes that the CCRC may consist of 3 ~~&~~ and 4-story buildings with a mix of units designated for independent living and assisted living. The CCRC units may be made available on a for-sale or rental basis.

39.

~~44.~~40. The proposed CCRC will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare. The CCRC is a proposed residential senior community designed to provide its residents with the opportunity for "aging in place" within a familiar community. The CCRC is anticipated to contain a mixture of independent units, assisted living units, and other supportive living opportunities, thereby providing a variety of living options to its residents. The CCRC will be developed in conformance with all applicable County and Specific Plan development guidelines and standards. The CCRC will not be materially detrimental to the property of others in the vicinity as it has been designed and integrated as part of the mixed use Village Center neighborhood. The CCRC will provide residential options for aging residents in a well designed facility with necessary amenities and services.

~~45.~~41. The lots proposed for the CCRC are adequate in size and shape to accommodate the CCRC in a manner that integrates it with the uses in the

surrounding area. VTTM No. 61105 Lot 528 is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed CCRC facility as depicted on the tentative map, and it has been designed to integrate into the Village Center area of the Mission Village community. The VTTM No. 61105 Exhibit Map depicts a conceptual CCRC, including driveways throughout the development to accommodate the required amount of parking, which has been established based on the parking standards for senior citizen housing development found in the County Code. The Specific Plan does not contain parking standards for this specific use.

VTTM No. 61105 has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee and recommended conditions of approval have been reviewed and considered by the Commission prior to approval. Any future changes in the design of the CCRC relative to VTTM No. 61105, if necessary, will be reviewed by staff through either the Revised Exhibit A or Exhibit Map procedure. If the project applicant is not able to reach agreement with a builder/operator for development of the CCRC, the applicant may seek to modify the CCRC tract map site to a multi-family development, with a maximum of 351 dwelling units. Such a proposal would require that the applicant show that the site can accommodate the applicable development standards, including parking requirements, for the residential units.

46.42. The site for the CCRC is adequately served by streets of sufficient width and improved to carry the quantity of traffic that would be generated, and by other public or private service facilities as required. The Mission Village circulation plan includes a hierarchy of streets to serve its proposed neighborhoods. The CCRC is located adjacent to Commerce Center Drive and will be served by driveways from proposed streets and private drives with right-of-way widths of 64 feet to 84 feet. The street widths and standards have been reviewed by County staff to ensure compatibility with applicable access criteria, and the project will be conditioned to comply with the approved traffic study. All other public facilities necessary to serve the proposed CCRC will be provided as required by the project's conditions of approval, including compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted as part of the project approvals.

47.43. The project's location, size, design and operating characteristics have given consideration to harmony in scale, bulk, coverage, and density; the availability of public utilities, services and facilities; the generation of traffic and the capacity and physical character of surrounding and proposed streets; and the suitability of the site for the type and intensity of use or development proposed.

44. The applicant has demonstrated the suitability of the subject property for the proposed uses. Establishment of the proposed uses at the designated locations is in conformity with good zoning practice. Compliance with the conditions of

DRAFT

approval will ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and consistency with all applicable Specific Plan policies.

Water Tanks and On-Site Infrastructure

~~48.~~45. VTTM No. 61105 depicts the proposed infrastructure necessary to develop Mission Village. This infrastructure includes ~~roadways; a sanitary sewer system, including~~ sewer pump stations; ~~a water system, including~~ water tanks and booster pump stations~~; and other utilities typical to a mixed-use development~~. The proposed infrastructure is described in detail in the Mission Village EIR. Specific to the water tanks, two new water tanks, one 4 million gallons in size for potable water and the other a 3 million gallon tank for reclaimed water, are depicted on VTTM No. 61105, located partially within the boundaries of the tentative map and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and partially off-site within VTTM 61996. A third new water tank, 4 million gallons in size for potable water, will be located on an existing pad within the Westridge community. An existing off-site 3.3 million gallon potable water tank, the Round Mountain tank, will be converted to reclaimed water in conjunction with the development of Mission Village. Portion of the water tanks located outside of the Specific Plan area is zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture, 5-acre minimum lot size) within unincorporated County territory. Therefore, these tanks are subject to the regulations of such zone and pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Section 22.24.150, water tank is a use subject to a Conditional Use Permit.

~~49.~~46. The water tanks and infrastructure at the proposed locations will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. The on-site project infrastructure would be typical of infrastructure serving mixed-use developments of this scale and nature in the region. The proposed utilities will connect to existing facilities to provide for an integrated infrastructure system serving existing and future residents. Accessory features associated with the utility systems, such as sewer pump stations, will allow for proper functioning of the system. A fully operational utility system will ~~affect~~ benefit the residents in the surrounding area in a positive manner. Additionally, certain infrastructure components would provide benefits to persons residing or working in the surrounding area, such as the roadway infrastructure, which would facilitate travel in the project vicinity. Specific to the water tanks, the potable water tanks proposed to be developed with the Mission Village project will service residents with safe, quality drinking water. The reclaimed water tanks will significantly contribute to water conservation by offering treated water for irrigation and other approved uses.

~~50.~~47. The water tanks and infrastructure at the proposed locations will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons

located in the vicinity of the site. The development of necessary utilities on the project site will provide a benefit to both future residents of Mission Village, as well as other persons located in the vicinity of the project site. As to the water tanks, the water tank sites depicted on VTTM No. 61105 have been strategically selected to consider a natural elevation that would provide adequate water service in an efficient manner, as well as minimize any possible negative aesthetic impact on the community. The proposed potable water tank to be located within Westridge will be placed on a graded pad with previously established plumbing infrastructure, adjacent to existing water tanks. The existing tank location has been operating with no detrimental effect on surrounding properties. Similarly, the existing Round Mountain tank has been operating with no detrimental effect on surrounding properties.

52. The water tanks and infrastructure at the proposed locations will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed infrastructure, including water tanks, would provide the future residents of Mission Village with necessary utilities and would benefit the project and surrounding vicinity as well. Additionally, VTTM No. 61105 has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, and conditions of approval have been established for the subdivision, which have been reviewed and considered by the Commission. The County's Department of Public Works, Department of Health Services, and Fire Department will ensure the infrastructure improvements are designed so that there will be no danger to public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed project also will be developed in conformance with all applicable County Codes including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, and Building Code. The EIR for the project includes mitigation measures relating to development standards and the project is conditioned to comply with those mitigation measures.

~~51.~~53. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features in order to integrate the water tanks and infrastructure with the uses in the surrounding area. The project infrastructure has been designed in compliance with the development standards of the Specific Plan, applicable provisions of Title 22, and other applicable County Codes and Regulations. The specific lots designated for the proposed water tanks are adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features. The lots for the tanks that would be located partially within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105 and the Specific Plan, and partially off-site within VTTM 61996, will require grading activities, as indicated on the tentative map. The water tank site is designed to be shielded from view by a landscaped berm to provide for visual integration with the surrounding area. The proposed tank to be located within Westridge would be adjacent to existing water tanks and, therefore, would be

visually integrated into the surrounding area, as is the existing Round Mountain tank.

~~52.~~49. The proposed site would be adequately served by streets and highways, and other necessary public service facilities. As depicted on VTTM No. 61105, Mission Village will be a fully functioning community providing all necessary infrastructure including roadways, utilities and other required public and private facilities. A hierarchy of public and private streets and drives is proposed to provide internal circulation, as well as connection to the surrounding community. Highway and street widths and standards have been reviewed by the County's Subdivision Committee and conditions of approval requiring construction to applicable standards are part of the project approval. Public utilities include a sanitary sewer system, a water system for the provision of both potable and reclaimed water, electricity, gas, telephone and cable television. These utilities have been designed to adequately serve the project and to allow for integration with future neighborhoods. Conditions to ensure proper development of the required utility services are incorporated into the project approval.

On-Site Grading

50. Pursuant to 22.56.210 of the County Code, grading projects that exceed 100,000 cubic yards of grading require a CUP. The project encompasses a maximum of approximately 54 million cubic yards of grading (27 million cubic yards of cut and 27.4 cubic yards of fill) is proposed for on-site, which includes infrastructure grading for a sanitary sewer system and pump stations, potable and reclaimed water systems, and drainage improvements. The 54 million cubic yards of grading associated with VTTM No. 61105 also includes approximately 186,000 cubic yards of cut and 945,000 cubic yards of fill grading for off site grading portion of the following improvements which are partially inside and partially outside VTTM No. 61105: extension of Westridge Parkway (32,390 cubic yards of cut and 232,390 cubic yards of fill) and Commerce Center Drive (31,900 cubic yards of cut and 288,270 cubic yards of fill), water tanks (55,380 cubic yards of cut and 130,030 cubic yards of fill), water quality basin (18,900 cubic yards of cut and 63,635 cubic yards of fill), two debris basins (23,970 cubic yards of cut and 100,425 cubic yards of fill), Lion Canyon drainage improvements and miscellaneous grading necessary to tie to existing grades (55,955 cubic yards of cut and 130,395 cubic yards of fill.)

~~53.~~51. Grading operations at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. As a result of the location of the project site, there are few nearby occupied properties that would be directly affected by project grading. Any potential adverse effects of the grading operations would be minimized through

compliance with restrictions imposed through the mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR, the attached conditions of approval, and the Los Angeles County Grading Code and Building Code, as each relates to traffic control, noise impacts and dust management.

~~54.~~52. Grading operations at the proposed location will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. The proposed grading operations would be conducted in compliance with the approved Specific Plan Conceptual Grading Plan, which identified appropriate areas for grading activities, and in compliance with Specific Plan Section 4.8, which contains Design Guidelines for Grading and Hillside Management to ensure that any adverse effects of grading on other properties in the vicinity would not be materially detrimental. In addition, Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001, which has been reviewed and considered concurrently, describes the proposed project's compliance with Los Angeles County Hillside Development Guidelines, the preservation of views, and the preservation of significant features, which demonstrates that the proposed grading operations would not be materially detrimental to the enjoyment or valuation of surrounding property.

~~55.~~53. Grading operations at the proposed location would not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed grading operations would be conducted in compliance with the approved Specific Plan Conceptual Grading Plan, which identified appropriate areas of grading activities. In addition, grading operations will be conducted in compliance with all applicable County requirements to ensure that grading will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

~~56.~~54. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features in order to integrate the requested uses with the uses in the surrounding area. VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying Exhibit Map provide detailed information that demonstrates compliance with the requirements of the Specific Plan and County Code Title 22, as applicable, relative to the accommodation of all project development features. The proposed grading operations are consistent with these requirements. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the grading plan will be reviewed to ensure it is in compliance with the approved tentative map and that all required development standards for the proposed lots can be met.

~~57.~~55. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets to carry the kind and quantity of traffic grading activities would generate, and by public service facilities as required. The Mission Village project site is served by existing public

roadways, which provide access to the property. Grading equipment will be able to access the property from existing public streets; there will be no need for off-site transport of graded materials through the use of public streets. In addition, project grading will allow for the construction of roadways and public and private service facilities to serve the proposed project site.

Off-Site Grading and Infrastructure

56. Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Section 22.56.210, off-site grading projects require a CUP. The project includes grading outside the boundaries of the VTTM No. 61105 and outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan as part of the project. In addition to the 54.4 million cubic yards (27 million cubic yards of cut and 27.4 million cubic yards of fill) of on-site grading, 1.9 million cubic yards of grading (1.9 million cubic yards of cut and 1.9 million cubic yards of fill) is required for the proposed off-site infrastructure improvements including the Magic Mountain Parkway extension, utility corridor, and the larger of the two Southern California Edison substation alternative sites.

~~58.~~57. As shown on VTTM No. 61105, Commerce Center Drive will extend through the Mission Village community and connect to Magic Mountain Parkway. Westridge Parkway will extend northerly to Magic Mountain Parkway, and Magic Mountain Parkway will be extended from its existing terminus westward to and through the project site. Portions of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway would extend beyond the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105 and would require off-site grading of approximately 900,000 cubic yards of cut and 500,000 cubic yards of fill; 400,000 cubic yardscys would be transported from the off-site location for use within the Mission Village site. The northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive also will require some offsite grading. The proposed extensions will be consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Circulation Plan, the Mission Village Circulation Plan, and the goals and objectives of the Los Angeles County Highway Plan.

~~59.~~58. The proposed grading operations associated with construction of the two water tanks (potable and reclaimed) will be located partially within the boundaries of the Mission Village tract map along the southerly boundary, and partially off-site to the south within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61996, outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~60.~~59. The proposed water quality basin would be located directly north of the Mission Village tract map site, just south of the Santa Clara River and west of the Six Flags Magic Mountain parking lot, on an approximately 2.5-acre lot under Newhall Land ownership. The water quality basin would serve to improve the water quality of urban run-off.

~~61.~~60. Two off-site debris basins are proposed to be constructed along the southerly tract boundary within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61996. The debris basins would serve to improve the water quality of urban run-off.

~~62.~~61. An electrical substation may be necessary to serve the area and two possible locations are proposed, both of which comply with all applicable requirements. The first alternative site is located almost entirely within the Portrero Valley portion of the Specific Plan, with a portion encroaching into the Legacy Village project (VTTM No. 061996). A total of 158,000 cubic yards of cut and 45,000 cubic yards of fill would be necessary if this location is chosen. The second alternative site is located easterly of the first and is partially within the Portrero Valley portion of the Specific Plan and partially within the Legacy Village project site, outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Proposed grading for this alternative would be 372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill. The excess dirt under either alternative would be placed in the existing agricultural fields in Potrero Valley.

~~63.~~62. Facilities for the transmission of utilities to serve the Mission Village project would be located partially in an off-site utility corridor, which will include utility infrastructure to serve the Mission Village project and, ultimately, future Newhall Ranch development. The corridor utilities will include a gravity sewer and pressure sewer force main, and pipelines for potable water, recycled water, agricultural water, electrical power, telephone, cable television, and natural gas. The utility corridor alignment generally runs east/west along SR-126 to the I-5, where the alignment turns to the south. Grading for the proposed utility corridor would be a balanced operation and totals 618,000 cubic yards of cut and 618,000 cubic yards of fill.

~~64.~~63. Development of Mission Village will involve stabilization of the Lion Canyon drainage, which will involve the construction of drainage treatment improvements, including grade stabilization measures to maintain sediment equilibrium and protect the channel bed and banks from hydromodification impacts. Some of these drainage treatment improvements may involve grading and construction of improvements outside the tract boundary. In addition, a limited amount of off-site grading also will be conducted along the tract boundary edges in order to tie into natural grades.

~~65.~~64. The requested uses and activities at the proposed locations will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. The off-site grading that will be necessary for the construction of utility and roadway improvements will allow for development of a fully functional community, which will benefit the future residents of Mission Village, as

well as residents and visitors to the surrounding area. The extensions of Magic Mountain Parkway, Commerce Center Drive, and Westridge Parkway will provide improved circulation and access. Potable and reclaimed water tanks will serve the Mission Village project and Newhall Ranch property in the vicinity. The water quality basin will address urban run-off into the Santa Clara River from both the project and existing development, and will allow for maintenance of a natural ecosystem along the river corridor. The utility corridor and electrical substation will serve the Mission Village project and Newhall Ranch, as well as providing regional benefits.

The requested uses and activities at the proposed locations would not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. The proposed grading and associated improvements would be located primarily on the property of the project applicant. There are no residential uses located in close proximity to the proposed grading with the exception of the residents located to the south in the Westridge development. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Final EIR, in combination with the conditions of approval issued in conjunction with this permit, will mitigate any potential adverse effects on persons or property in the vicinity. Grading operations will be temporary in nature and are not expected to be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property in the vicinity.

~~66.~~65. The requested uses and activities at the proposed locations will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed grading operations will be conducted in conformance with all applicable County Codes and the recommendations and design requirements of the project's geotechnical report. Appropriate mitigation measures to address potential impacts relating to aesthetics, noise, air quality (fugitive dust), re-compaction and stabilization have been imposed to ensure the activities do not endanger public health, safety, or welfare.

~~67.~~66. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features in order to integrate the requested uses and activities with the uses in the surrounding area. The proposed off-site grading will allow for construction of the proposed improvements on lots of adequate size and shape to accommodate any development features that are required. All conditions of approval or mitigation measures that include standards for fencing, landscaping, or other development features will be complied with as required.

~~68.~~67. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use

DRAFT

would generate. Grading operations associated with the off-site improvements would not negatively impact existing highways or streets. The proposed grading sites are located either partly within the proposed Mission Village project site or directly adjacent to the project site so off-site roadways will not be impacted by any export. Wherever possible, grading operations are proposed to balance individually. For the electrical substation, each alternative will require export to a nearby disposal site that would be reached without traveling on existing streets or highways. Grading associated with the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway will require that 400,000 cubic yards of material be exported from the grading site to the Mission Village site with no need to travel on existing streets or highways.

~~69.~~68. The proposed site is adequately served by other public or private service facilities as are required. During grading, all necessary service facilities will be available to facilitate necessary operations and compliance with applicable mitigation measures. If County regulations or mitigation measures require the provision of temporary public services, they will be provided, as needed.

~~70.~~ Approval of this CUP is conditioned on the applicant's compliance with the attached conditions of approval, as well as the conditions of approval for VTTM No. 61105.

69.

~~71. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.~~

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW

~~72.~~70. The adopted Specific Plan contains "substantial conformance" provisions. The purpose of the substantial conformance provisions is to determine whether proposed developments or uses substantially comply with the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan and other applicable Los Angeles County ordinances that do not conflict with the Specific Plan. The applicant seeks substantial conformance determinations as to the following: (i) grading in areas with an average slope of 25% percent or greater conforms with the Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines contained in Specific Plan Chapter 4.8, 1a-1h; (ii) pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2 (13), modifications to certain setback requirements in the Village Center substantially conform with Specific Plan Table 3.4-1 (Site Development Standards); and, (iii) pursuant to

Specific Plan Section 5.2.2 (9), adjustments to the proposed project's trail widths from 12 feet to 8 feet.

~~73.~~71. Specific Plan Section 5.2.2.d, General Findings Applicable to all Requests, provides that a request for a Substantial Conformance determination shall be based on the following findings: (a) the subject activity substantially conforms with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances that do not conflict with the Specific Plan; (b) the subject activity will not adversely affect public health and safety; and (c) the subject activity will not adversely affect adjacent property.

Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines

~~74.~~72. To develop the Mission Village project site as permitted by the Specific Plan, the project proposes a maximum of approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of earthwork onsite (within tract map) and offsite, which will be balanced within the overall Mission Village project area (28.9 cubic yards of cut and 28.9 cubic yards of fill). Approximately 54 million cubic yards of grading (27 million cubic yards of cut and 27.4 million cubic yards of fill) is proposed for the tract map site, which includes infrastructure grading for a sanitary sewer system and pump stations, potable and reclaimed water systems, and drainage improvements. An additional approximate 1.9 million cubic yards of grading is proposed in connection with development of the proposed off-site infrastructure improvements, including the Magic Mountain Parkway extension, utility corridor, and the larger of the two SCE substation alternative sites. Grading for the off-site improvements will be authorized by CUP 200500081.

~~75.~~73. Specific Plan Section 2.7, Hillside Preservation and Grading Plan, was prepared in accordance with Los Angeles County Performance Review Criteria for Hillside Management and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area General Plan goals and objectives relevant to grading. Specific Plan Section 4.8 establishes guidelines for grading and hillside management within the Specific Plan area, including Mission Village. These guidelines were prepared in accordance with the County of Los Angeles General Plan, the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, and the Hillside Design Guidelines established by the County Department of Regional Planning (December 1987). These guidelines were designed to achieve the goals of the Specific Plan and assure development that is safe, aesthetic, and cost effective.

~~76.~~74. Specific Plan Section 5.2.2.b(16) provides that for subdivisions having an average slope of 25%~~—~~percent or greater in those areas to be graded, a determination as to conformance with the Grading and Hillside Management

Guidelines in Specific Plan Section 4.8 is necessary. Mission Village has an average slope greater than 25%~~.~~percent.

~~77.~~75. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (a), provides that Los Angeles County hillside development guidelines should be followed in hillside areas in order to minimize grading impacts. Mission Village has been designed and will be developed in conformance with the County's current hillside development guidelines, which can minimize grading impacts, as well as all applicable County Codes including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, Building Code, and Fire Code. Additionally, the project will comply with all mitigation measures contained in the Mission Village EIR Mitigation Monitoring Plan adopted by this Commission, including, but not limited to, those mitigation measures specific to potential geotechnical and soil resources related impacts. Furthermore, all conditions and comments provided by the Department of Public Works ("Public Works") relating to the review of grading and geotechnical reports has been incorporated into CUP No. 200500081.

~~78.~~76. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (b), provides that significant ridges, knolls, and rock outcroppings will be respected in the site design and incorporated as features where feasible. While the proposed project grading would alter the hillside profile, where feasible the project site design respects significant ridges, knolls, and rock outcroppings. Significant landforms in the project vicinity identified in the Specific Plan include the bluffs on the south side of the Santa Clara River. Consistent with the grading and hillside management guidelines, Mission Village was designed specifically to preserve the bluff area along the south side of the river, in conformance with the Specific Plan. Additionally, while the Specific Plan identified distinctive elevated features within the Specific Plan development areas, including Sawtooth Ridge near Long/Adobe Canyon, Ayers Rock in Potrero Canyon, and numerous distinctive ridges within the Santa Susana Mountains, these features are located in the westerly portions of Newhall Ranch, are not located within the Mission Village project site, and, therefore, would not be adversely affected by development of the proposed project.

~~79.~~77. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (c), provides that contour grading should be employed where feasible to lessen the visual impact of large slopes and long major uniform slopes should be avoided. Where feasible, contour grading will be employed in the development of the project to lessen the visual impact of slope modification. The Mission Village project is designed to minimize large and long uniform slopes. The bluffs along the Santa Clara River would be preserved to lessen the grading and visual impacts from SR 126. Larger manufactured slopes have been designed with

curvilinear, scalloping contours with transitional gradients such as the slopes between Planning Areas A7 and A8. The larger slope near the southerly Commerce Center Drive bridge abutment would be contoured although the contour would be at a gradient that is less than the surrounding natural slopes due to engineering constraints. The slopes along Magic Mountain Parkway are relatively low in height (40-50 feet) when compared to other slopes on the site, although they would be long due to the need to follow the road.

~~80.~~78. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (d), provides that the removal of oak trees should be avoided to the maximum extent feasible and grading to the edge of driplines should be minimized. The proposed project will avoid impacts to oak tress to the maximum extent feasible and will minimize grading to the edge of the tree dripline. Two Oak Tree Permits, Permit Nos. 200500032 and 2005000043 are requested in connection with development of the project. Of the 564 oak trees located within the boundaries of the project site and within 200 feet of the proposed grading line, the majority of the trees will be unaffected by the project as 154 trees will be removed and 52 will be encroached upon. Grading associated with the easterly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, as well as grading for on-site development and necessary infrastructure, has been designed to allow for preservation of the majority of oak trees. For each tree that is removed, a minimum of two (for non-heritage trees) or ten (for heritage trees) 15-gallon replacement trees will be planted, resulting in a greater number of oak trees on site than presently exists.

~~81.~~79. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (e), provides that grading should emphasize and accentuate scenic vistas and natural landforms. The grading plan will follow the natural contour lines and preserve natural scenic vistas and landforms where feasible. Consistent with the grading and hillside management guidelines of the Specific Plan, Mission Village was designed specifically to preserve the bluff area along the south side of the river. In addition, Mission Village recreates a small canyon with grading associated with the Arroyo Park (lots 151-155). The residential and commercial developments are designed to be situated so as to accentuate scenic vistas and natural landforms such as the river bluffs along the southisde of the river.

~~82.~~80. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (f), provides that slopes requiring special erosion control or fuel modification prevention should be designed for ease of maintenance. Development areas subject to erosion control measures and fuel modification requirements have been designed to ensure ease of maintenance. Access to open space lots where maintenance is required is depicted on VTTM No. 61105 so that future homeowner's associations, landscape maintenance or other groups responsible

for maintenance of common areas can easily accept maintenance responsibilities.

~~83.~~81. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (g), provides that special attention should be given to arrangement of landscape materials as means of creating a natural, hillside appearance. Special attention will be given to the arrangement of landscape materials to help maintain and create a natural, hillside appearance. The project applicant will prepare landscape plans that are compliant with the County's Drought Tolerant Ordinance. In addition, numerous natural landscape features will be left intact such as the spineflower preserve, Santa Clara River, and the adjacent river bluffs.

~~84.~~82. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (h), provides that graded slopes should be planted and stabilized in compliance with County-approved landscape, irrigation, and maintenance requirements. Grading operations will include adequate erosion control, including landscaping and stabilization, to ensure that the site is developed in compliance with applicable County landscape, irrigation, and maintenance requirements. The project applicant will work with the departments of Fire, Public Works, Regional Planning, and Parks and Recreation to establish appropriate landscaping materials to comply with regulations covering erosion control planting, reduction of the threat of fire in high hazard areas, compliance with drought tolerant landscaping provisions, and maintenance responsibilities.

~~85.~~83. The Mission Village project has been reviewed by staff to ensure its design is in compliance with the Specific Plan, specifically with Section 4.8, Grading and Hillside Management Design Guidelines, and applicable Los Angeles County ordinances.

~~86.~~84. Project grading will be conducted in compliance with all applicable County requirements to ensure geotechnical stability and conformance with erosion control regulations, and to ensure that the proposed Mission Village project will not adversely affect the health and safety of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. Project grading will allow for the development of necessary infrastructure to benefit the health and safety of residents of Mission Village and future surrounding neighborhoods.

~~87.~~85. The development of Mission Village, including the grading necessary to construct the project, implements a portion of the Specific Plan, as approved by the Board of Supervisors, and will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site. Upon the completion of Mission Village, the development will be compatible with

surrounding residential neighborhoods, and will enhance the economic value of these properties as a result of the project improvements.

Setbacks

~~88.~~86. As described in the EIR, Mission Village includes a Village Center, which is a pedestrian oriented area that will include residential uses (apartments and condominiums) integrated with commercial uses that will include both retail and office space. The Village Center also will include the library, village green, community recreation center, a proposed continued care retirement community and a transit center. These uses will be linked together through a series of sidewalks, trails and paseos that connect the Village Center to the rest of Mission Village.

~~89.~~87. The Village Center will contain the following Specific Plan land use designations: Mixed Use (MU), High Residential (H), Medium Residential (M), and Commercial (C). The Development Standards for these land uses, including the required setbacks, are found in Specific Plan Table 3.4-1. While the Specific Plan provides for variation and flexibility in these land uses, the urban setting envisioned for the residential dwellings and commercial uses within the Village Center would be difficult to implement based on the Specific Plan setback requirements. Though a zero side yard lot configuration is permitted within certain land use designations, only the Mixed-Use (MU) designation permits zero front yards, with restrictions, limiting the potential to create a truly urban environment. Allowing greater flexibility in the setback requirements will ensure a design consistent with a pedestrian-oriented community.

~~90.~~88. Pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(13), modifications of the development standards contained on Table 3.4-1 are allowed provided findings for a determination that the modification is in substantial conformance with the provisions of the Specific Plan can be made. The reduction of setbacks of specific Mixed-Use, Commercial, High Residential, and Medium Residential designated lots within the Village Center (lots 508-515, 517-526, 528-530, and 621 on the approved tentative map) is consistent with the intent of the Village Center to be a pedestrian oriented area with buildings that are closer to the street. Limitations to the setback reductions are described in the Front Setback Modification provision (Section 3.6.1) of the Mission Village Planning Notebook ("Notebook") dated May 2011. The modified setbacks vary from a minimum of zero up to ten feet depending on the type of building frontage. The provisions in the Notebook will ensure that the building frontage on the streets of the Village Center are developed in manner that reflects a master planned pedestrian oriented Village Center.

DRAFT

In addition, footnote 12 on Table 3.4-1 for lots within the Mixed Use and Commercial designations details a 20-foot minimum side and rear yard setback requirement when building is adjacent to a different land use designation or a public road. However, the side and rear yard minimum setback (0-feet) for the lots within the Mixed Use and Commercial designations within the Village Center are in conformance when directly adjacent to landscape development zone (LDZ) and/or private drive lots and/or similar or compatible uses.

~~91.~~89. The Specific Plan provides for 20-foot minimum side and rear yard setbacks for Commercial and Mixed Use designated lots when a building is adjacent to a different land use designation or a public road. The purpose of the setback is to provide a buffer between two potentially incompatible uses. However, this requirement would impede the development goal of an urban pedestrian-oriented community. As depicted on the VTTM No. 61105 Exhibit Map, the rear or side yard for the lots in the Commercial and Mixed Use designated areas are adjacent to either a private drive or a 20-24 foot LDZ lot. Therefore, these uses are not adjacent to a public road or a potentially incompatible land use designation. Additionally, the private drive and LDZ lot would serve as a buffer, eliminating the need for the setback. Therefore, the zero-foot setback for lots adjacent to a private drive or a 20-24 foot landscape development zone lot would meet the intent of the Specific Plan.

~~92.~~90. Pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(h), a request for modification of the development standards such as the setback requirements contained in Table 3.4-1 may be approved where the Section 5.2 General Findings can be made, and such modification meets all applicable building, fire, and subdivision codes, and would be architecturally compatible with existing buildings in the surrounding neighborhood.

~~93.~~91. The modified setbacks substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and County ordinances. The setbacks will not be significantly different from those provided in Specific Plan Table 3.4-1. The requested interpretation is a refinement and further clarification of those standards. This request also is consistent with a similar interpretation approved by the Commission relative to the Newhall Ranch Landmark Village project.

~~94.~~92. The modified setbacks will not adversely affect public health, and safety. The modified setbacks within the Village Center will encourage greater flexibility in the design of this higher density commercial area to allow for a more vibrant and pedestrian oriented urban environment.

~~95.~~93. The modified setbacks within the Mission Village project will not adversely affect adjacent properties. The project site currently is undeveloped. The buildings with

the proposed 0' setbacks are located within the Village Center, which is designed as an urban, higher density neighborhood. Nearby uses will be complimentary and include multi-family housing developments, a library, a proposed continuing care retirement community, and a transit center.

~~96.~~94. The modified setbacks meet all applicable building, fire, and subdivision codes, as the Mission Village project will be developed in conformance with all applicable County Codes, including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, Building Code, and Fire Code. Additionally, the Mission Village project has been thoroughly reviewed by County staff and this Commission. The Mission Village EIR has been prepared to County standards, and includes measures to mitigate project impacts.

~~97.~~95. The modified setbacks will allow for architecturally compatible buildings in the surrounding neighborhood. Proposed buildings will be similar in character to others nearby.

~~98.~~96. The Mission Village project site is currently comprised of undeveloped land with no existing buildings.

Trail Widths

~~99.~~97. With the Specific Plan, the Board adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian and bicycle trails. When built out, Mission Village would include Regional River Trails, Community Trails, Local Trails and Pathways as part of a network of unified bicycle and pedestrian routes in landscaped parkways that provide access to the different neighborhoods and Villages that make up the proposed project and the larger Specific Plan area. The illustrated Trail Sections contained in the Specific Plan for the Community Trails, Local Trails, and Pathways depict a twelve-foot wide bicycle/pedestrian trail within a twenty to twenty-four foot wide recreation lot. (See Trail Section B2 of Exhibit 2.4-7 and Trail Sections C & D of Exhibit 2.4-8 of the Specific Plan.)

~~100.~~98. Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(9) provides for adjustments to the Master Trails Plan and any of the trail sections if the adjustment is in substantial conformance with the Specific Plan. The project applicant requests that the Specific Plan twelve-foot wide trail widths (Community Trails, Local Trails, and Pathways) be adjusted to eight-foot wide. The twenty to twenty-four foot wide

recreation lot will not be reduced in size. The reduction of 4 feet in trail width would allow for four additional feet of landscaping and pervious materials.

~~101.~~99. The proposed reduced width is appropriate for the three types of trails, the function of which is to allow for comfortable and safe recreational bicycle and pedestrian use of the routes. An eight-foot wide trail would be sufficient in size to accommodate pedestrians and the recreational use of bicycles. The adjusted trails and pathways will exceed Caltrans' minimum requirement for five-foot wide Class II bicycle facilities, Los Angeles County's minimum of four-foot wide sidewalks, and the American Disability Association's minimum requirement of five-foot wide sidewalks. In addition to the trail system, there will be a dedicated Class II bicycle lane provided on portions of the Magic Mountain Parkway and Commerce Center Drive extensions. The adjusted eight foot trails will achieve the goal of contributing to an extensive network of trails and pathways that will connect residents within Mission Village and beyond its boundaries, and also will provide safe and attractive transportation alternatives for pedestrians and bicyclists.

~~102.~~100. The adjusted trail widths substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances. The adjustments to the trail sections of the Community Trails, Local Trails, and Pathways is in compliance with Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(9) and Los Angeles County ordinances which do not conflict with the Specific Plan.

~~103.~~101. The adjusted trail widths will not adversely affect public health and safety. The adjustment will continue to allow for bicyclists and pedestrians to comfortably and safely share the routes. Additionally, reducing the width of the trails and pathways will increase the adjacent landscaping, which will assist in reducing impacts to water quality, and provide a more vibrant and attractive network of trails.

102. The proposed adjustment to the trails and pathways will not adversely affect adjacent property. The recreation lots will maintain the 20-24 foot width established by the Specific Plan and, but will provide additional landscape area therefore, will provide adequate buffer area.

~~104.~~103. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as

well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

~~105.~~104. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

For Conditional Use Permit no. 200500081

A. The proposed uses and activities, with the attached conditions and restrictions, are consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan;

B. With the attached conditions and restrictions, the requested uses and activities at the proposed locations will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety and general welfare;

C. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features prescribed in Title 22 of the County Code, or as otherwise required, in order to integrate such uses with the uses in the surrounding area; and

D. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private facilities as are required.

DRAFT

The information contained in the Final EIR, and the materials submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearings substantiate the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Section 22.56.090, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

For Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001

A. Development of Mission Village will substantially conform with the Specific Plan Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines in that:

i. Los Angeles County hillside development guidelines will be followed relative to development in hillside areas in order to minimize grading impacts;

ii. Significant ridges, knolls, and rock outcroppings will be respected in the site design and incorporated as features where feasible;

iii. Contour grading will be employed where feasible to lessen the visual impact of large slopes and long major uniform slopes will be avoided;

iv. The removal of oak trees will be avoided to the maximum extent feasible and grading to the edge of driplines will be minimized;

v. Project grading will emphasize and accentuate scenic vistas and natural landforms;

vi. Slopes requiring special erosion control or fuel modification prevention will be designed for ease of maintenance;

vii. Special attention will be given to the arrangement of landscape materials as a means of creating a natural, hillside appearance;

viii. Graded slopes will be planted and stabilized in compliance with County-approved landscape, irrigation, and maintenance requirements;

ix. Project grading substantially conforms with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances that do not conflict with the Specific Plan;

x. Project grading will not adversely affect public health and safety; and,

xi. Project grading will not adversely affect adjacent property.

DRAFT

B. Development of Mission Village will substantially conform with the Specific Plan setback requirements in that:

i. The modified setbacks meet all applicable building, fire, and subdivision codes;

ii. The modified setbacks will allow for architecturally compatible buildings in the surrounding neighborhood;

iii. The modified setbacks substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and County ordinances;

iv. The modified setbacks will not adversely affect public health, and safety; and

v. The modified setbacks will not adversely affect adjacent properties.

C. Development of Mission Village will substantially conform with the Specific Plan trail width requirements in that:

i. The adjusted trail widths substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances which do not conflict with the Specific Plan;

ii. The adjusted trail widths will not adversely affect public health and safety; and,

iii. The adjusted trail widths will not adversely affect adjacent property.

The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a substantial conformance determination, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Reporting procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance

Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgement of the Commission; and

2. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 200500081, subject to the attached conditions.

6. Approves Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001, subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PARKING PERMIT NO. 200500011
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). ~~VTTM No. 61105, dated December 15, 2010, submitted by Newhall Land and farming Company ("subdivider") proposes a mixed-use community that is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~ As part of the Mission Village project, the applicant is requesting approval of a parking permit to authorize off-site and reciprocal (interchangeable) parking for lots within the Village Center area of Mission Village.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable

and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

~~Along with the development of VTTM No. 61105, as revised,~~ The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. ~~Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center area of Mission Village, and to reserve the right to provide less than the required parking through submittal at a future date of a joint-use or shared parking plan pursuant to the Specific Plan.~~ VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site

plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~5.~~6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

~~6.~~7. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

~~7.~~8. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

~~8.~~9. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

~~9.~~10. Substantial Conformance ~~Determination~~ Review No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight feet width).

~~10.~~11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

~~11.~~12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

~~12.~~13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

~~13.~~14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

~~14.~~15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

DRAFT

~~15.~~16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~16. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:~~

~~17. (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);~~

~~18. (b) 11 mixed use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;~~

~~19. (c) 143 open space lots;~~

~~20. (d) 2 public park (active) lots;~~

~~21. (e) 4 private recreation lots;~~

~~22. (f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;~~

~~23. (g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;~~

~~24. (h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and~~

~~25. (i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).~~

~~26. The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~

~~18.~~17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

~~19.~~18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system

DRAFT

of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

~~29.~~19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

~~21.~~20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums

rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage ~~among lots~~ on a particular lot may be allowed if itsuch increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

~~22.~~21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

~~23.~~22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

~~24.~~23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources	Mineral Resources
Air Quality	Noise
Biota	Parks and Recreation
Cultural/Paleontological Resources	Sheriff Services
Education	Solid Waste Disposal
Environmental Safety	Traffic/Access
Fire Protection Services	Utilities
Floodplain Modifications	Visual Qualities
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources	Wastewater Disposal
Global Climate Change	Water Quality
Hydrology	Water Service
Library Services	

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

~~34.~~24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, ~~Biota,~~ Traffic/Access, ~~Noise,~~ Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and~~,~~ unavoidable ~~and/or cumulative~~ impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(~~a~~b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(~~b~~d) Air Quality;
(~~c~~e) Solid Waste Services; and

DRAFT

(~~d~~f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally e~~E~~ach of these significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~26.~~25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. ~~On~~ At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

~~27.~~26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

~~28.~~27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

DRAFT

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

~~29.~~28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease).

DRAFT

The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.

- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

~~39.~~29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

~~40.~~30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

DRAFT

~~41.~~31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

~~42.~~32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

~~34.~~33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of

the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

~~35.~~34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

~~36.~~35. As described in the EIR, Mission Village includes a Village Center, which is a pedestrian-oriented area that will include residential uses (apartments and condominiums) integrated with commercial uses that will include both retail and office space. The Village Center also will include the library, village green, community recreation center, and a proposed continued care retirement community. These uses will be linked together through a series of sidewalks, trails and paseos that connect the Village Center to the rest of Mission Village.

~~37.~~36. The project has been designed to provide the number of parking spaces required by the Specific Plan based on the conceptual uses proposed. The VTTM No. 61105 Site Plan - Exhibit Map provides information as to the number and location of parking spaces for these uses. Within the Village Center specifically, parking is provided on-site on the lots where a particular use is proposed, or off-site on adjacent private drives or nearby lots. Thus, although Mission Village will provide adequate parking consistent with the requirements of the Specific Plan to serve all proposed uses, not all required parking within the Village Center will be located on the same lot as the use it is intended to serve. Pursuant to applicable County Code and Specific Plan provisions, if required parking is provided off-site, a parking permit is required.

~~38.~~37. Specific Plan Section 3.7, Parking Regulations, governs motor vehicle parking within the Specific Plan area. Except as otherwise specified in the Specific Plan, parking requirements for the Specific Plan Area shall be in accordance with Los Angeles County Planning and Zoning Code ("Zoning Code") Section 22.52.1000. Under Zoning Code Section 22.52.1083, every use shall provide the required number of parking spaces on the same lot or parcel of land on which the use is located unless expressly allowed otherwise by a parking permit approved pursuant to Part 7 of Chapter 22.56. Zoning Code Section 22.56.100 sets forth the facts to be substantiated in support of issuance of a parking permit. The applicant requests a parking permit to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for Village Center lots 508 (Mixed-Use/Commercial), 509 (Commercial), 510 (Commercial), 511 (Mixed-Use - Residential/Commercial), 526 (Recreation Center), 527 (Village Green - Private Park) and 529 (Mixed-Use/Commercial). This permit is not requesting reduction of parking but reciprocal parking which intends to allow parking spaces to be used by different lots.

~~39.~~38. The project has been designed to provide the number of parking spaces required by the Specific Plan based on the conceptual uses proposed; this permit does not seek to reduce that number. -Within the Village Center specifically, parking is

provided on-site, on the lots where a particular use is proposed, or off-site on adjacent private drives or nearby lots. The following table depicts the subject lots, use type, required number of parking spaces, and the location and number of the off-site parking spaces:

Lot	Use	Specific Plan Required Parking	On Site Parking Provided	Off-site Parking Provided	Location of Off-Site Parking
508	Mixed-Use Commercial	899 spaces	880 spaces	19 spaces	19 on-street parallel spaces on "FF" Private Drive.
509 & 510	Mixed-Use Commercial	418 spaces	107 spaces	311 spaces	4 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 24 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive and 11 on-street spaces on "FF" Private Drive. 272 spaces located in parking structure (PS-2) on lot 509
511	3 & 4 Story Condominium and commercial	680 spaces	577 spaces	103 spaces	56 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 24 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive, 23 on-street spaces on "II" Private Drive
526	Recreation Center	63 spaces	32 spaces	68 spaces	24 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 18 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive, 26 on-street spaces on "II" Private Drive
527	Village Green – Private Park	6 spaces	0 spaces	6 spaces	6 on-street spaces on "II" Private Drive
529	Mixed-Use Commercial	374 spaces	84 spaces	290 spaces	5 on-street spaces on "DD"

DRAFT

					Private Drive, 75 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive, 210 spaces in parking structure (PS-2) on lot 509

~~40.~~39. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots is not expected to result in conflicts. Although not located on ~~adjacent or nearby lots or private drives~~the same lot as the use the parking will serve, the parking facilities will be located on adjacent or nearby lots convenient to the use they are intended to serve and will be designed in compliance with the requirements of the Specific Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as applicable. Even though the parking spaces will not be assigned to specific uses or lots, it is likely that visitors or users will park in close proximity to their destination. Specific parking areas for employees may be designated in the future through CC&Rs.~~As off-site parking will be located in a convenient location, it is unlikely that visitor or employees would park in unauthorized areas surrounding the property as there will be sufficient parking to accommodate them in closer proximity.~~

~~41.~~40. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots will provide the required parking consistent with the mixed-use, town center nature of the Village Center area. The number of spaces provided meets the Specific Plan parking requirements.

~~42.~~41. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots will not result in traffic congestion or unauthorized use of parking developed to serve surrounding property. The Village Center is a pedestrian oriented, mixed-use area that is linked to the rest of Mission Village via sidewalks, paseos and trails, where it is likely that residents will be able to limit use of their vehicles. As this area also will include community serving uses — the recreation center, Village Green (private park) and library, a resident or visitor can park once and access services and uses located within walking distance.

~~43.~~42. The Mission Village site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the requested parking arrangements. As depicted on the VTTM No. 61105 Site Plan - Exhibit Map, each lot has been designed to be adequate in size to meet the development standards required by the Specific Plan. Required yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features can be accommodated. Parking lots and structures have been designed to comply with parking space sizing requirements and parking lot design standards.

DRAFT

44.43. In the future, a use may be proposed in a location where the nature of the use makes it appropriate to authorize approval of a joint-use or shared parking plan under which a reduction in the aggregate total of required parking spaces for uses would be permitted. At this time it is ~~impossible~~ not possible to determine precisely how such a shared parking arrangement would work as the specific uses have not been established. ~~This parking permit reserves the right of the project applicant to submit for approval, at such time as the specific uses are determined,~~ In the future the applicant may apply for a Joint-Use or Shared Parking Plan pursuant to the provisions of Specific Plan Section 3.7, Parking Regulations~~.~~, which may allow a~~A~~ reduction in the aggregate total of required parking spaces for individual permitted uses ~~shall be permitted (for either joint-use or shared parking)~~ upon approval by the Planning Director.

45.44. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

DRAFT

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That there will be no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52 of the Los Angeles County Code or the Specific Plan because of the use characteristics of the proposed uses, as outlined in the off-site and reciprocal parking analysis prepared for the project;

B. That off-site facilities will provide the required parking for the uses because such off-site facilities are controlled through ownership by the owner of the use for which the site serves and are conveniently accessible to the main use;

C. That the requested parking permit at the location proposed will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking, or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding property; and

D. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in Title 22 and the Specific Plan.

E. That the applicant has met the burden of proof set forth in Section 22.56.1020; and

F. That no written protest to the proposed parking permit has been received within 14 calendar days following the date on the notice sent by the director pursuant to Section 22.56.1050

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a Coastal Development Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.2410, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.090 of the Zoning Ordinance, for a Variance as set forth in Section 22.56.290 of the Zoning Ordinance, and for a Parking Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.1020 of the Zoning Ordinance.

~~A. The project does not seek a reduction in the number of parking spaces required by the Specific Plan and has been designed to provide the required number of spaces based on the conceptual uses proposed;~~

~~B. The off-site facilities and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots is not expected to result in conflicts or any inconvenience to those seeking available parking spaces;~~

~~C. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots will provide the required parking in convenient locations consistent with the mixed-use, town center nature of the Village Center area;~~

~~D. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots will not result in traffic congestion or unauthorized use of parking developed to serve surrounding property; and~~

~~E. The Mission Village site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the requested parking arrangements.~~

~~The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a parking permit, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Title 22, Chapter 22.56, Part 7 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), including, but not limited to, Section 22.56.1020.~~

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and

2. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Parking Permit No. 200500011, subject to the attached conditions.

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 200500032
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). ~~VTTM No. 61105, dated December 15, 2010, submitted by Newhall Land and farming Company ("subdivider") proposes a mixed-use community that is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~ As part of the Mission Village project, the applicant is requesting approval of OTP No. 200500032 to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and

infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

~~Along with the development of VTTM No. 61105, as revised,~~ The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. ~~Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.~~ VTTM No. 61105, as revised, is a related request to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

~~5.~~ The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

7. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

8. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

DRAFT

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

DRAFT

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~17. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:~~

~~(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);~~

~~(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;~~

~~(c) 143 open space lots;~~

~~(d) 2 public park (active) lots;~~

~~(e) 4 private recreation lots;~~

~~(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;~~

~~(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;~~

~~(h) 14 utility related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations), and~~

~~(i) 43 transportation related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).~~

~~The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~

~~18.~~17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

~~19.~~18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system

DRAFT

of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

~~20.~~19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

~~21.~~20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums

rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage ~~among lots~~ on a particular lot may be allowed if it such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

~~22.~~21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

~~23.~~22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

~~24.~~23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources	Mineral Resources
Air Quality	Noise
Biota	Parks and Recreation
Cultural/Paleontological Resources	Sheriff Services
Education	Solid Waste Disposal
Environmental Safety	Traffic/Access
Fire Protection Services	Utilities
Floodplain Modifications	Visual Qualities
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources	Wastewater Disposal
Global Climate Change	Water Quality
Hydrology	Water Service
Library Services	

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

~~25.~~24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology~~, Biota~~, Traffic/Access~~, Noise~~, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant~~,~~ and unavoidable ~~and/or cumulative~~ impacts in:

(a) Biota
(a~~b~~) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(~~b~~d) Air Quality
(c~~c~~e) Solid Waste Services; and

(~~d~~f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally e~~E~~ach of these significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~26.~~25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010, to November 21, 2010. ~~On~~ At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

~~27.~~26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

~~28.~~27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of SCOPE, who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day

public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

~~29.~~28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 858 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.

DRAFT

- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

~~30.~~29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

~~31.~~30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

~~32.~~31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a

letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

~~33.~~32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

~~34.~~33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

DRAFT

~~35.~~34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

~~36.~~35. In conjunction with the EIR and OTP process, the applicant has submitted an oak tree report prepared by a certified arborist that identifies 63 oak trees, including 3 heritage oaks, located in the area of the Magic Mountain Parkway extension within the Mission Village project site, regulated by the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The identified trees include those oak trees located within 200 feet of the proposed grading limits and excludes those located within the project site though outside the Magic Mountain Parkway extension area. (Impacts to oak trees located within the project site but outside the Magic Mountain Parkway extension area are addressed separately in Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043.) The arborist's report was prepared by Impact Sciences, Inc., and is dated December 2006, as revised November 26, 2007, March 2010, August 2010, and December 23, 2010.

36. Development of the project would result in the removal of 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees), and the encroachment into the protected zones of 2 additional oak trees (~~0~~ neither of which are heritage trees).

37. Development of Mission Village, including construction of the Magic Mountain Parkway extension, will not endanger the health of the remaining trees located on the property since these trees are located outside of the area that will be disturbed for the construction of the road. Additionally, protective fencing not less than four feet in height will be placed at the limits of the protective zone of any individual oak tree or dense stand of oak trees within 200 feet of the grading limits for the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and will be inspected by the forester and/or fire warden to ensure full protection of the health of the remaining trees located on the property. After the completion of the development and the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, the trees will continue to exist without being disturbed.

38. The removal of the 11 oak trees and the encroachment into the protected zone of the 2 oak trees will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposed project incorporates drainage and water quality plans which are designed to protect development, manage drainage and control pollutant run-off. The features of these plans are intended to blend into the community as an extension of the landscaping. All drainage entering and originating within the project area will be collected and controlled by the constructed drainage system to ensure no increase in site erosion. Additionally, surface water flows associated with construction of the easterly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway will be controlled through drainage controls approved by the Department of Public Works.

~~37.~~39. The removal and encroachment of the referenced oak trees is necessary due to design criteria and existing improvements, which limit the alignment of the proposed roadway, which is a County designated Master Plan highway. The continued existence of the oak trees at their present location presents significant obstacles to the planned improvements. Furthermore, to retain the oak trees on the subject property would prevent the construction of a County designated Master Plan highway; an alternative route would be cost prohibitive and fail to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The configuration of the extension of Magic Mountain parkway was determined based on a number of factors including feasible engineering design, traffic needs and topography, and to meet these standards, removals and encroachments on the oak trees were necessary.

40. The removal of the 11 oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of the 2 oak trees will not be contrary to or be in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the oak tree permit procedure. The removal of the oak trees is necessary to facilitate the development of portions of the project described above, and the applicant will mitigate the removal of the trees by planting a total of 46 trees in an area determined to be suitable for the oaks. Therefore, the oak resources are protected, while allowing the development to commence as proposed.

~~38.~~41. The Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, has reviewed the oak tree report and determined that the document is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition, and species of the oak trees on the site. The County Forester has recommended approval of the requested removals and encroachments, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement trees to be provided at a ratio of 2:1 for each tree removed and 10:1 for each Heritage oak tree removed, for a total of 46 mitigation trees.

~~39.~~42. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were

posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

40.43. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. Construction of the proposed land use will be accomplished without endangering the health of any remaining trees on the property that are subject to Part 16 of Chapter 22.56 of the Los Angeles County Code;

B. The removal of the 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees) will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated;

CB. Removal of 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees) and the encroachment into the protected zone of 2 additional oak trees ~~into the protected zone~~ is necessary ~~for the fruition of the development~~ as continued existence at their present locations frustrates the planned improvement or proposed use of the property to such an extent that placement of the trees precludes the reasonable and efficient use of such property for a use otherwise authorized and the oak trees proposed for removal interfere with highways both within and outside the subject property, and no reasonable alternative to such interference exists other than removal of the trees; and~~The continued existence of the oak trees at their present location presents significant obstacles to the planned improvements. Furthermore, to retain the oak trees on the subject property would prevent the construction of a County designated Master Plan highway; an alternative route would be cost prohibitive and fail to achieve the objectives of the proposed project.~~

~~C. The removal of the 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees) will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and~~

D. The removal of the oak trees will not be contrary to or in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the Oak Tree Permit procedures of the County.

The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for an oak tree permit, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Title 22, Part 16 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), including, but not limited to, Section 22.56.2100.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

2. ~~Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and~~

23. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project;

34. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

45. Approves Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 200500043
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). ~~VTTM No. 61105, dated December 15, 2010, submitted by Newhall Land and farming Company ("subdivider") proposes a mixed-use community that is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~ As part of the Mission Village project, the applicant is requesting approval of OTP No. 200500043 to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce

Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

~~Along with the development of VTTM No. 61105, as revised,~~The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. ~~OTP No. 200500043 is a request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.~~VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~5.~~

6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

7. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

DRAFT

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

DRAFT

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~17. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:~~

~~(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);~~

~~(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;~~

~~(c) 143 open space lots;~~

~~(d) 2 public park (active) lots;~~

~~(e) 4 private recreation lots;~~

~~(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;~~

~~(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;~~

~~(h) 14 utility related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and~~

~~(i) 43 transportation related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).~~

~~The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.~~

~~18.~~17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

~~19.~~18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system

DRAFT

of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

~~20.~~19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

~~21.~~20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums

rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage ~~among lots~~on a particular lot may be allowed if ~~it~~ such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

~~22.~~21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

~~23.~~22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

~~24.~~23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources	Mineral Resources
Air Quality	Noise
Biota	Parks and Recreation
Cultural/Paleontological Resources	Sheriff Services
Education	Solid Waste Disposal
Environmental Safety	Traffic/Access
Fire Protection Services	Utilities
Floodplain Modifications	Visual Qualities
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources	Wastewater Disposal
Global Climate Change	Water Quality
Hydrology	Water Service
Library Services	

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

~~25.~~24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology~~, Biota~~, Traffic/Access~~, Noise~~, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant~~,~~ and unavoidable ~~and/or cumulative~~ impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(a~~b~~) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(b~~d~~) Air Quality
(c~~e~~) Solid Waste Services; and

(~~d~~f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally e~~E~~ach of these significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

~~26.~~25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. ~~On~~ At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

~~27.~~26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

~~28.~~27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of SCOPE, who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day

public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

~~29.~~28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.

- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

~~30.~~29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

~~31.~~30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

~~32.~~31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a

letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

~~33.~~32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

~~34.~~33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

DRAFT

~~35.~~34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

~~36.~~35. In conjunction with the EIR and OTP process, the applicant has submitted an oak tree report prepared by a certified arborist that identifies 501 on-site oak trees, including 29 heritage oaks, located within the Mission Village project site and associated offsite improvements, regulated by the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The identified trees include those oak trees located within 200 feet of the proposed grading limits and excludes those located within the area of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway. The arborist's report was prepared by Impact Sciences, Inc., and is dated December 2006, as revised November 26, 2007, March 2010, and December 23, 2010. (Impacts to oak trees located within the area of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway are addressed separately in Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032.)

36. Development of the project would result in the removal of 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees), and the encroachment into the protected zones of 50 additional oak trees (including 2 heritage trees). (Six of the 143 oak trees to be removed also are included within the Oak Tree Permit (OTP00-196) for Landmark Village.)

37. Development of Mission Village will not endanger the health of the remaining trees located on the property since these trees are located outside of the area that will be disturbed for the construction of the project. Additionally, protective fencing not less than four feet in height will be placed at the limits of the protective zone of any individual oak tree or dense stand of oak trees within 200 feet of the grading limits and will be inspected by the forester and/or fire warden to ensure full protection of the health of the remaining trees located on the property. After the completion of the development, the trees will continue to exist without being disturbed.

38. The removal of the 143 oak trees and the encroachment into the protected zones of the 50 oak trees will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposed project incorporates drainage and water quality plans which are designed to protect development, manage drainage and control pollutant run-off. The features of these plans are intended to blend into the community as an extension of the landscaping. All drainage entering and originating within the project area will be collected and controlled by the constructed drainage system to ensure no increase in site erosion. Additionally, surface water flows associated with construction of the easterly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway will be controlled through drainage controls approved by the Department of Public Works.

~~37.~~39. The removal and encroachment of the referenced oak trees is necessary due to site constraints such as topography and drainage, to enable project grading and the construction of proposed roads, water quality or debris basins, and other related and necessary improvements. The oak trees proposed for removal are located in areas of the property where their continued existence would preclude the development of the property in an efficient manner. Natural resources, including oak trees, were evaluated in the preparation of a development plan which limited the impacts to such resources while allowing for development authorized by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The proposed project clusters development to avoid impacts to on-site resources such as spineflower, the Santa Clara River and other areas with oak trees. However, the project site contains steep topography and requires extensive grading to create a viable community. Grading is required for geotechnical stability, access and site balance and results in the removal of 143 oak trees, and encroachment into the protected zone of an additional 50 oak trees.

~~38.~~40. The Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, has reviewed the oak tree report and determined that the document is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition, and species of the oak trees on the site. The County Forester has recommended approval of the requested removals and encroachments, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement trees to be provided at a ratio of 2:1 for each tree removed and 10:1 for each Heritage oak tree removed, for a total of 350 mitigation trees.

~~39.~~41. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

~~40.~~42. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. Construction of the proposed land use will be accomplished without endangering the health of any remaining trees on the property that are subject to Part 16 of Chapter 22.56 of the Los Angeles County Code;.

B. The removal of the 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees) will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated;

C~~B~~. Removal of 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees) and the encroachment into the protected zone of 50 additional oak trees (including 2 heritage trees) is necessary as continued existence at their present locations frustrates the planned improvement or proposed use of the property to such an extent that alternative development plans cannot achieve the same permitted density and efficient use since the project site contains steep topography and requires extensive grading to create a viable community; and.~~into the protected zone is necessary for the fruition of the development. The continued existence of the oak trees at their present location presents significant obstacles to the planned improvements. Furthermore, to retain the oak trees on the subject property would prevent the allowed density and prove to be cost prohibitive to achieve the objectives of the proposed project.~~

~~C. The removal of the 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees) will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and~~

D. The removal of the oak trees will not be contrary to or in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the Oak Tree Permit procedures of the County.

The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for an oak tree permit, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Title 22, Part 16 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), including, but not limited to, Section 22.56.2100.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

2. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project;

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 61105 MISSION VILLAGE (A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). VTTM No. 61105, dated December 15, 2010, submitted by Newhall Land and Farming Company ("subdivider") proposes a mixed-use community that is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and

dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

6. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

7. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center

lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

    Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR," October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the

project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land with the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

17. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

    (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

    (b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

    (c) 143 open space lots;

    (d) 2 public park (active) lots;

    (e) 4 private recreation lots;

    (f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

    (g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

    (h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

    (i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

    The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site

plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

18. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

19. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

20. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

    In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

21. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

    Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process

pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

22. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to

agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

23. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

24. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

25. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, Traffic/Access, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education,

Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(d) Air Quality;
(e) Solid Waste Services; and
(f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally each of the significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

26. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

27. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

28. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of SCOPE, who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-

site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

29. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

30. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

31. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

32. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

33. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that

there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

34. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

35. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

36. As part of the project, Commerce Center Drive and Magic Mountain Parkway will be extended to provide regional access to and from the project site to SR-126 and I-5, respectively. The Commerce Center Drive extension serves as the primary north/south access through Mission Village and it connects to SR-126 by new interchange improvements. Magic Mountain Parkway is the primary east/west access through the project and it connects to The Old Road. Westridge Parkway provides a secondary connection to the south of the project site. The Magic Mountain Parkway extension proceeds westerly from its existing terminus at The Old Road for a distance of approximately 5,000 feet before intersecting with the project site. The extension of Commerce Center Drive proceeds southerly from its current terminus at SR-126, over the Santa Clara River, into the project site, and includes construction of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge. The bridge will span the width of the Santa Clara River, equating to a roadway segment of approximately 1,300 feet in length and 120 to 129 feet in width. The internal circulation plan provides a system of arterials, residential and commercial collectors, residential public streets, and private drives.

37. Private driveway lots within the development will provide internal access in single-family and multi-family neighborhoods, including in the Village Center, which is the mixed-use center of the community.

38. Of the 351 single-family lots, four are designed as flag lots (Lot Nos. 564, 575, 297 and 298, as shown on the VTTM No. 061105 and Exhibit Map dated December 15, 2010). Due to grading requirements, these four lots cannot comply with the frontage width required by the county for a standard lot. However, the lot is of adequate size to accommodate a residence and comply with all other required development standards.

39. Traffic calming features are incorporated into the local street system, including curb extensions and chokers, which narrow the road to promote slowing down traffic mid-block and at intersections.

DRAFT

40. Access as depicted on the tentative map will be adequate for all lots and for the deployment of fire fighting and other emergency service vehicles because all roads are improved pursuant to applicable Fire and Public Works standards.

41. Mission Village comprises active and passive open space/recreation areas, and preservation open space areas. Active open space areas within the project site include space for recreational activities in two public parks (community park and neighborhood park) a private park, called Village Green, located in the Village Center, and two private recreation centers.

A total of 352 acres of open space area, distributed among 139 lots, are depicted throughout the Tentative Map and function as connection buffer between development planning areas, trails and utility easements.

The Project includes 212.6 acres of River Corridor dedication and a total of 85.8 acres of Spineflower Preserve which are natural open space areas within the project site dedicated to preservation.

42. The Mission Village project includes approximately 693 acres of open/ recreation space, as depicted on the revised VTTM No. 61105, consisting of 85.8-acres of spineflower preserves (lots 46, 468, 470, 500-01), 26.8 acres of parks (lots 469, 612), a 2.9-acre private park (Village Green) (lot 527), 11.8 acres of recreation/recreation centers (lots 178, 424, 526), 275.9 acres of open space (lots 35-45, 614-15, 611, 603, 471-75, 487-95, 498-99, 449, 451-52, 440, 435-37, 428-31, 425, 408-10, 414-22, 391-95, 353, 354-56, 362, 365-66, 617-20, 266-73, 360, 363-64, 146-50, 156), 212.6 acres of open space (River) (lots 605-08), 27.5 acres of open space (River Adjacent) (lots 367, 609), 18.4 acres of open space (LDZ [Landscape Development Zone]) (lots 151, 159, 160, 377-79, 382-83, 426, 438, 444, 446, 453-54, 460-67, 476-79, 502-507, 541-49), 16.1 acres of open space (Lion Canyon) (lots 358-59), and 14.6 acres of open space (Arroyo Walk)(lots 152-55, 531-32).

43. The Mission Village project also includes a dedicated location for a fire station (lot 448), which will serve the surrounding community.

44. The applicant has requested phasing of final map recordation. Multiple final maps will be permitted. The phasing depicted on the tentative tract map may be changed subject to submittal of a revised phasing map and a written request to staff. The phasing depicted on the tentative tract map may be changed subject to the Amended Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

45. The project preserves and enhances sensitive habitat, and includes significant open space and recreational components. Approximately 693 acres of VTTM

No. 61105 are designated for open space and recreation uses. This includes 85.8-acres in three spineflower preserves that will be established in the northeasterly portions of the site. For recreational purposes, three park lots and two recreation centers lots are depicted within the subdivision. Two of the parks would be public, one a 21.6-acre Community Park and the other a 5.2-acre Neighborhood Park; both would include improvements and serve both active and passive uses. The subdivision also includes the 2.9-acre Village Green, which is a private park located in the Village Center designed to provide opportunities for both passive and active recreation, as well as an area for community functions, such as a farmers market.

46. According to Section 2.3.2 of the Specific Plan, the Low Residential land use designation shall have the average lot size of no less than 1.0 acre in size within any proposed subdivision map. Residential development lots 279-351 within the Low Density ("L") designation averaged one acre in size on previous tentative map submittals. However, in the view of staff, it is in the best interests of the project, and consistent with the Specific Plan, that the natural open space portions of these residential lots be located outside the residential lots and within the fully-protected designated open space lots, as indicated on the revised VTTM dated December 15, 2010. However these open space lots remain within the Low Density land use designation and are included in the calculation of average lot size for this land use category.

47. Second units are proposed on 73 lots in the Low Density Residential ("L") land use designation, shown as Lots 279-351 on VTTM No. 61105. The second units will provide a more affordable housing alternative for caretakers, extended family, senior residents, and other renting households.

48. Conceptual plans for development of the recreational facilities have been provided. Minor changes to the park design are subject to approval of a revised park plan by the Department of Regional Planning and parks and Recreation. Any park project shall be substantially consistent with underlying approvals.

49. Three private recreation/recreation center lots are depicted on VTTM No. 61105. The recreation areas will be fenced and maintained by a homeowners association, with parking provided both off street and on street. These lots will provide recreational amenities for the Mission Village community.

50. The site is physically suitable for the type of development and the density being proposed because the property has adequate building sites to be developed in accordance with the grading ordinance; has access to County-maintained streets; will be served by sanitary sewers; will be provided with water supplies and distribution facilities with sufficient capacity to meet anticipated domestic and

fire protection needs; and has all flood hazards and geologic hazards mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Public Works.

51. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause serious public healthy problems because sewage disposal, storm drainage, fire protection, and geological and soils factors are addressed in the conditions of approval.

52. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantial or avoidable injury to fish and wildlife or their habitat as appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring Plan/conditions of approval.

53. The discharge of sewage from this land division into the public sewer system will not violate the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to Division 7 (Commencing with Section 13000) of the California Water Code.

54. The division and development of the subject property in the manner set forth on this vesting tentative tract map will not unreasonably interfere with the free and complete exercise of public entity and/or public utility rights-of-way and/or easements within the tentative tract map since the design and development, as set forth in the conditions of the project and on the tentative map, provide adequate protection for any such rights-of-way and easements.

55. The design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities therein since the lots are of sufficient size so as to permit orientation of structures in an east-west alignment for southern exposure or to take advantage of shade or prevailing breezes.

56. The housing and employment needs of the region were considered and balanced against the public service needs of local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources when the project was determined to be consistent with the General Plan and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

57. The Mission Village tract map has been submitted as a "vesting" tentative tract map. As such, it is subject to the provisions of Chapter 21.38 of the Los Angeles County Code, Vesting Tentative Map.

58. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan is a comprehensive document that guides the development of the Newhall Ranch property. The document sets forth a comprehensive set of plans, development regulations, design guidelines, and implementation programs designed to produce a project consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan and

Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The applicant has provided a booklet, titled "Mission Village Planning Notebook" (Notebook), which provides the detailed exhibits and tables that update the Specific Plan within the Mission Village subdivision boundary, and identify goals and objectives within the Specific Plan that these project features achieve. Mission Village is consistent with the following aspects of the Specific Plan:

Affordable Housing: The Specific Plan requires affordable housing, with a total of 2,200 affordable units located throughout the Specific Plan area (Specific Plan Section 3.10). The applicant submitted the Newhall Affordable Housing Implementation Plan to the County which was approved by the Los Angeles County Community Development Commission in June 25, 2010. The Affordable Housing Implementation Plan states that Mission Village shall develop up to 300 affordable homes within the project site.

Circulation: The circulation plan proposed for Mission Village is a refinement of the Newhall Ranch Master Circulation Plan approved as part of the Specific Plan and it is consistent with the designation, location and dimensions of the highways and collector roads depicted in the Specific Plan. Private Drives are designed to conform to the final design criteria approved in the Westside Communities Private Drives and Traffic Calming Manual.

Transit: The Specific Plan contemplated two bus pull-in areas within areas located within Mission Village. The proposed project depicts three bus stops and a bus transfer station. The proposed locations of the transfer station and bus stops are a refinement of the location in the Specific Plan to accommodate final circulation design of the project, and are consistent with the intent of the Specific Plan to provide convenient access to public transit within the Mission Village project area.

Trails: The Master Plan of Trails in the Specific Plan is general in nature, and provides general locations for trails within the project area. The Tentative Map provides more detailed information regarding the location of trails within the Mission Village project area. The location of the trails depicted on the Tentative Map is consistent with the Specific Plan. However the applicant is requesting an adjustment in the required 12-foot wide trail section to 8-foot wide trails for the community trails, local trails and pathways. The four feet reduction will provide additional landscaping along the trail, reduce the trail's paved area and increase permeable area around the trails to comply with Low Impact Development Standards. The intent of the trails is to provide pedestrian and bicycles use and the reduction of the width of the trail will not compromise the intended use. Therefore, the proposed 8-foot wide trails are consistent with the Specific Plan.

Spineflower Preserve: The Specific Plan Land Use Plan depicts a 20.3 acre Specific Plan conservation easement within Mission Village. The applicant is proposing to expand the existing easement to approximately 85 acres in an effort

to provide connectivity to permanent open space, preserve known spineflower populations and establish a Spineflower Preserve. The proposed expansion of the Spineflower Preserve area is consistent with the Specific Plan because it provide for additional protection of sensitive resources in keeping with the policies in the Specific Plan to protect such resources.

Drainage and Water Quality Plan: The Conceptual Backbone Drainage Plan of the Specific Plan sets forth the framework by which drainage and flood protection to the site will be provided. A primary goal of the plan was to provide drainage and flood protection while preserving the Santa Clara River as a resource. The Mission Village Drainage and Water Quality Plan is consistent with the Specific Plan, which included conceptual drainage plans that reflects innovative methodologies to meet NPDES requirements, and reflects a comprehensive system of flood control and detention basins to maintain water quality standards.

Water Plan: The Conceptual Backbone Water Plan was designed in the Specific Plan for the Mission Village portion of the overall project with water main and reclaimed water lines to be located along Commerce Center Drive, Magic Mountain Parkway, Westridge Parkway, and "A" Street. The Potable and Reclaimed Water Plan follows the Conceptual Backbone Water Plan and depicts in greater detail, the infrastructure lines to serve the Mission Village project. While the precise routing of water lines for the delivery system delineated by Mission Village Water Plan differ to some extent from the Conceptual Plan set forth in the Specific Plan, this routing flexibility falls within the prescribed Substantial Conformance parameters set in the Specific Plan Implementation Section 5.2.2b(a).

Sewer Plan: The Conceptual Backbone Sewer Plan of the Specific Plan set forth a system for sewage collection witch included connection to a water reclamation plant, a collection system with pump stations, and both gravity and force mains. A detailed Sewer Plan was prepared for Mission Village that provides further refinement to the location of sewer main lines and while the precise routing of sewer lines for the delivery system differ to some extent from the Conceptual Plan set forth in the Specific Plan, this routing flexibility falls within the prescribed Substantial Conformance parameters set in the Specific Plan Implementation Section 5.2.2b(a).

Land Use Plan: The Mission Village project is proposed within the Mesas Village area identified in the Specific Plan. Land Uses depicted within the project boundary are Low Density Residential, Low-Medium Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Commercial, Mixed Use, Open Space and River Corridor. Flexibility was built into the Specific Plan to allow for adjustments, transfers and conversions of use, boundaries, square footage, etc. (Specific Plan Section 5.2-5, page 5-14), within certain parameters. The Mesas Village is divided into Planning Areas, as Mission Village only covers 71 percent of the Mesas Village area, some planning areas do not pertain to

Mission Village even though they are within Mesas Village. Although Mesas Village is entitled to a maximum of 7,716 dwelling units and 2,232,000 square feet of building space, Mission Village is only entitled to a maximum of 5,465 dwelling units and 1,948,500 which corresponds to the Planning Areas within the Mission Village Tentative Map boundary.

The applicable regulations include:

- The total number of dwelling units in the Mesas Village shall not exceed 5,465 total dwelling units.

  Mission Village represents approximately 71 percent of the total Mesas Village area. Currently, there is no other residential development proposed in the Mesas Village area. Mission Village proposes 4,055 dwelling units. Therefore, this regulation has been met.

- The total maximum building square footage for the Mission Village project shall not exceed the total maximum building square footage set forth in the Annotated Land Use Plan Statistical Summary for the Specific Plan area.

  The Annotated Land Use Plan Statistical Summary determines that the maximum building square footage allowed by the Specific Plan for this area is 1,948,500 square feet. Mission Village proposes 1,555,100 building square feet. Therefore, this regulation has been met.

- No planning area may change in total acreage by more than 20 percent.

  Mission Village is proposing changes to the acreage of most of the planning areas, however, none of the changes exceed 20 percent. Therefore, this regulation has been met.

Each land Use designation contains several Planning Areas. The table below shows a summary of the changes between the Project and the Mesas Village (Specific Plan) in total acreage, number of dwelling units and non-residential square footage. Detailed information about the changes per Planning Area is available in a table format on page 53 and 65 of the Notebook, with exhibits on pages 51 and 52.

Land Use	Area comparison to Specific Plan	Dwelling Units Comaprison to Specific Plan	Planned Non-Residential Square footage comparison to Specific Plan	Maximum Non-Residnetial Square Footage comparison to Specific Plan
Low	4.9% increase	-8	n/a	
Low-Medium	3.8% decrease	-235	n/a	

DRAFT

Medium	3.6% decrease	-129	N/a	
High	19.4% increase	-41	n/a	
Mixed Use	4.0% increase	-640	212,000	-372,000
Commercial	18.5% decrease	n/a	24,100	-20,900
Open Area	1.7% decrease	n/a	n/a	n/a
River Corridor	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a

The table above show that Low-Medium and Medium Residential land use designations decreased in area and in number of dwelling units while Low and High Residential land use designations increased in area but still decreased the number of dwelling units. The Mixed Use designation increased four percent in area, decreased the number of dwelling units but increased the commercial square footage. Even though the commercial square footage was increased in the Mixed Use and Commercial land use designations, the commercial square footage is still under the maximum allowed for commercial area within those categories as permitted by the Specific Plan. These changes are due to project refinement which results in changes in the number of housing units, square footage of non-residential space and area dedicated to each use.

The elementary school as well as the Community and Neighborhood Parks are part of land use overlays, and are 'flexible' as to their final location within the Specific Plan. The land use overlay adjustments are permitted pursuant to Section 5.2-5 of the Specific Plan with respect to size, quantity and location of public service facilities such as parks and schools. As part of the overlay uses depicted in the Specific Plan, Mission Village is proposing an elementary school, a fire station and a library as land use overlays.

59. Based on the record before it, the Commission finds the proposed subdivision and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the land use plan, affordable housing, circulation, transit, trails, infrastructure allocation, non-residential square footage allocations, residential dwelling unit allocations, spineflower preserve and land use.

60. Mitigation measures, which have been incorporated into the project and included in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, are listed in the Executive Summary of the Final EIR, and include mitigation measures originally prescribed within the Specific Plan EIR.

DRAFT

61. The Commission finds substantial benefits resulting from implementation of the project outweigh its unavoidable significant effects on visual quality, air quality, solid waste services, and agricultural resources.

62. The Mission Village project is subject to California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code.

63. Approval of this subdivision is conditioned on the subdivider's compliance with the attached conditions of approval, as well as the conditions of approval for CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001.

64. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

65. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

2. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

3. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

4. Approves Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105 (dated December 15, 2010), subject to the attached conditions established by the Commission, including recommendations of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. RCUP200500080 (SEA)
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project approvals, the applicant is requesting approval of a project-level Significant Ecological Area ("SEA") CUP No. RCUP200500080 to provide the County with the regulatory framework to implement Mission Village development within the approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary in a manner that is consistent with both the adopted Specific Plan and previously approved program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5). Specifically, the proposed Mission Village project-level improvements within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary include the Commerce Center Drive Bridge, neighborhood park, access roads, and easements, grading, trails, water quality basins, bank stabilization, water and sewer utility crossings, utility corridor, storm drain outlets, and potential riparian mitigation sites.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational

DRAFT

facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on-site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, is a related request that proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

(a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

(b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

(c) 143 open space lots;

(d) 2 public park (active) lots;

(e) 4 private recreation lots;

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

6. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

7. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

DRAFT

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

    In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended

Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, Traffic/Access, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(d) Air Quality;
(e) Solid Waste Services; and
(f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally each of the significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010, to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented

by a representative of Santa Clarita Organization for Planning The Environment ("SCOPE"), who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units);

the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to

212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of

357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

35. In approving this grant, the Commission finds as follow:

    a. The proposed development would be consistent with the adopted General Plan and Area Plan for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan site.

    b. The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan's adjusted SEA 23 boundary removed a limited amount of acreage for development from the existing SEA; however, the SEA was determined to nonetheless remain in a viable and largely natural condition, particularly when taking into account major factors influencing the realization of applicable General Plan objectives, including competing priorities between resource preservation and other General Plan policies and objectives.

    c. The proposed development was determined to conform with the General Plan's SEA "design compatibility criteria," in that:

        (i) The development was designed to be highly compatible with biotic resources present in the existing SEA 23, including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

        (ii) The development was designed to maintain waterbodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state within the existing SEA 23;

        (iii) The development was designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in a natural and undisturbed state within the existing SEA 23;

(iv) The development retained sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resources within the existing SEA 23 from the proposed development;

(v) The development provided fences or walls where necessary to buffer important habitat within the existing SEA 23 from proposed development; and

(vi) The development located and designed roads and utilities serving the development so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas, or migratory paths within the existing SEA 23.

d. The approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan was found to be sensitive to, and compatible with, the biotic resources of the existing SEA 23;

e. The proposed development at the proposed locations within the existing SEA 23 would not:

(i) Adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area;

(ii) Be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or

(iii) Jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

f. The proposed site was adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features to be located in the approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary in order to integrate said uses with the uses in the surrounding areas.

g. The site was adequately served:

(i) By highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate; and

(ii) By other public or private service facilities as are required.

36. Development of project-related improvements within the Mission Village tract map site would permanently impact approximately 21.6 acres within SEA 23, and an additional approximate 18.3 acres within SEA 23 would be impacted as part of the off-site development.

DRAFT

37. A CUP is required to authorize project-related improvements within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, pursuant to the requirements of the Specific Plan. A CUP for development within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary is required to ensure consistency with the previously approved program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5), which, in the previous approval, the Board found to be consistent with applicable requirements for development within an SEA.

38. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan and program-level SEA CUP No. 94-087-(5), the project-related improvements within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 boundary include: (a) Commerce Center Drive Bridge, including a portion of Commerce Center Drive; (b) river trail; (c) access roads and public utility easements; (e) utilities (including storm drain outlets, water quality basins, sanitary sewer, water, cable, gas, fiber optics, etc.); (f) bank stabilization; (g) neighborhood park; and (h) grading.

39. With approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and CUP No. 94-087-(5), the Board approved the general alignment for Commerce Center Drive Bridge in order to minimize impacts to sensitive habitat and species within SEA 23, and to minimize major access points to SR-126. The Board found the bridge crossing to be essential for a functional circulation system to serve the Specific Plan area and the region, and to advance many of the County's goals and policies related to transportation, land use, and other issues of public interest. The bridge crossing was found to comply with the County's engineering requirements, and to be strategically located and designed to provide maximum transportation effectiveness, while minimizing impacts to critical resources, habitat areas, and animal movement paths in riparian corridor areas. Commerce Center Drive Bridge would connect the existing north terminus of Commerce Center Drive at SR-126 with the proposed southern extension of Commerce Center Drive and would serve central portions of Newhall Ranch. The bridge would span the width of the Santa Clara River, equating to a roadway segment of approximately 1,300 feet in length and 120 to 129 feet in width.

40. Consistent with previously approved SEA CUP No. 94-087 (5), the Mission Village project bank stabilization is consistent with the following objectives that were developed to balance the environment and flood control issues presented by the Santa Clara River, as required by the County General Plan. These objectives are as follows:

    (i) The flood corridor must allow for the passage of Los Angeles County Capital Flood flows without the permanent removal of natural vegetation (except at bridge crossings);

(ii) The bank of the river will generally be outside of the "waters of the United States" as defined by federal laws and regulations, and as determined by the delineation completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("Corps") in August 1993;

(iii) Where the Corps delineation width is insufficient to contain the Capital Flood flow, the flood corridor will be widened by an amount sufficient to carry the Capital Flood flow, and the flood corridor will be widened by an amount sufficient to carry the Capital Flood flow without the necessity of permanently removing vegetation or significantly increasing velocity;

(iv) Where development is proposed within the existing Los Angeles County 50-year Capital Floodplain, the land where development is to occur will be elevated in conformance with Los Angeles County policies to remove it from the Floodplain; and

(v) Bank stabilization will occur only where necessary to protect against erosion.

41. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails, and paseos. Portion of the Regional River Trail is located with the SEA on the north side of the Santa Clara River, at the northern portion of Mission Village. This trail is part of the Trails Plan approved as part of Specific Plan and will be constructed within the bank stabilization area and not disturbing additional area.

42. Riparian mitigation sites will be located within the SEA boundary within the Mission Village project site. The riparian mitigation sites are necessary to maintain the riparian areas and enhancement to the rived corridor. These mitigation sites are subject to the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) review and approval.

43. Utilities planned to serve the Mission Village project include water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics and recycled water lines.

DRAFT

44. The Mission Village project would include one of the Specific Plan Neighborhood Parks on the project site. The park would contain approximately 5 acres of usable parkland, approximately 2.2 acres of which would be located within the SEA.

45. The approval of the components of Mission Village that are located within the SMA/SEA 23 is consistent with the requirements of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the County General Plan, and the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan.

46. The Mission Village project is designed to be highly compatible with the biotic resources present, including the set aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas. The development of Mission Village within portions of SEA 23 will result in the vast majority of SEA 23 left in a natural state and it is designed to be highly compatible with biological resources and consistent with the provisions of the Specific Plan and CUP 94-087-(5).

Development proposed for Mission Village is consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The Specific Plan's Land Use Plan depicted five villages, and the Mission Village project is a portion of the Mesas Village, as shown on the Specific Plan Land Use Plan. Previously approved CUP 94-087-(5) describes the future Specific Plan components authorized for development within the SEA, which includes the following components within Mission Village: (a) Commerce Center Drive Bridge; (b) Commerce Center Drive; (c) River trail; (d) Access roads and public utility easements; (e) Utilities: storm drain outlets, utilities within the proposed utility corridor, and utilities within Commerce Center Drive Bridge; (f) Bank stabilization; (g) Water Quality basins and associated features; (h) Park; and (i) Grading.

There are a total of 1,261.8 acres within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105. Of that amount, 237.5 of those acres are within SEA 23. Approximately 21.5 acres of the 237.5 acres will be permanently impacted by project development. The project includes additional areas outside the boundaries of the tentative map where the associated off-site improvements are proposed. Of those off-site areas, approximately 18.4 acres within SEA 23 will be permanently impacted by development of the project. Thus, the vast majority of SEA 23 will be left in a natural state, highly compatible with the biological resources present and consistent with the provisions of the Specific Plan and CUP 94-087-(5).

47. The development of Mission Village within portions of SEA 23 would maintain water bodies, watercourses, and their tributaries in a natural state, consistent with the approved Specific Plan and CUP 94-087-(5). As contemplated by the approved Specific Plan, Commerce Center Drive Bridge will require the placement of abutments and piers in the river area; the effect of the Commerce Center Drive Bridge crossing was assessed in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan

Final Additional Analysis, Section 2.3, Floodplain Modifications and appropriate mitigation was required. The EIR prepared for Mission Village includes additional environmental analysis of the bridge abutments and piers relative to the river corridor.

Also as contemplated by the approved Specific Plan, the Mission Village development will include bank stabilization, but only where necessary to protect development from erosion. Bank stabilization is proposed to be buried in all areas except at outlet structures, access ramps, and bridge abutments where it is expected that grouted rock or reinforced concrete will be required to meet Department of Public Works standards. Limited impacts to the Santa Clara River will occur as a result of these improvements.

48. The Mission Village project is designed so that wildlife movement corridors (migratory paths) are left in an undisturbed and natural state. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, animal migratory paths within the SEA 23 will be left mostly undisturbed, with limited exception at the Commerce Center Drive Bridge abutment and pier locations. Other proposed development within SEA 23 (river trail, storm drain outlets, utility lines, Commerce Center Drive Bridge, bank stabilization, park, and water quality basins) will have a de minimis impact on migratory pathways, and the riparian mitigation areas will provide beneficial cover for migratory animals. Additionally, the increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009), which results in 85.8 acres of preserves, will provide enhanced connectivity to open space.

49. The Mission Village project retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open spaces to buffer critical resource areas from the development. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, Mission Village will retain sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open space areas to complement SEA 23. The Specific Plan requires a minimum 100-foot buffer adjacent to the Santa Clara River between the top of the bank stabilization and development within the Residential Low Medium, Residential Medium, Mixed Use, and Business Park uses, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Director; uses within the buffer area are limited to public infrastructure, abutments, trails and parks. Consistent with the Specific Plan, Mission Village residential and commercial development will be set back from the Santa Clara River resources by a distance ranging between 220 feet and 970 feet. Only necessary infrastructure (i.e., water quality basins, bridge abutments, storm drain outlets, and channel stabilization) will be constructed within the setback areas.

The Mission Village tract map includes the installation of bank protection at the Commerce Center Drive Bridge, along the water quality basin at San Jose Flats (an existing agricultural field), and at the mouth of Lion Canyon to protect

proposed drainage facilities. The bank protection at the water quality basin location is to protect the water quality basin and would be located down slope from the neighborhood park; the closest residential use to the bank protection is approximately 400 feet away with approximately 120 feet of vertical separation. The proposed bank protection at Lion Canyon is to protect the water quality and drainage improvements at the mouth of Lion Canyon; the closest residential use to the bank protection is approximately 250 feet away with a 120 foot vertical separation.

The remaining development areas of the tract map are set back from the riparian sensitive habitat horizontally at least 100 feet and, in some cases, up to 800 feet. In addition, due to the topographic nature of the site, vertical separations up to 160 feet will occur, further protecting sensitive habitat along SEA 23.

The off-site development proposed as part of the Mission Village project located near or within SEA 23 is for public infrastructure use and no residential or commercial development associated with Mission Village is proposed near these infrastructure improvements. Furthermore, where appropriate, the vegetation within portions of the setback or buffer zone may be restored and/or enhanced to increase habitat values when compared to existing conditions.

50. Where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, the Mission Village development will implement several buffer measures to protect significant habitat within SEA 23. Implementation of the measures described in the Specific Plan will be implemented by conditions of approval imposed through the subdivision approval process, including the EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program. In order to preclude access into the SEA from the residential areas, the rear yards of all residential lots within the vicinity of the SEA will be required to be fenced. In addition, the trails near the SEA will include post and cable fencing with signs prohibiting access to the area. Furthermore, other mitigation measures and conditions of approval will be adopted to ensure the protection of sensitive biotic resources within the SEA 23 (e.g., shielding of illumination).

51. Consistent with the approved Specific Plan, Mission Village's roads and utilities have been designed and located so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths. The vast majority of roadways and utilities serving Mission Village are removed far to the south of SEA 23 and, as a result, will have no impact on SEA 23. The number and location of the bridge crossings were established by the Specific Plan in part to minimize impacts on SEA 23 and other sensitive resources. As part of the Mission Village development, the Commerce Center Drive Bridge crossing will be implemented; however, all other roads within the Mission Village development are either internal to the project or extend to the west and east far from SEA 23.

DRAFT

52. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

53. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. The proposed use with the attached conditions and restrictions are consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan;

B. With the attached conditions and restrictions, the requested use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety and general welfare;

C. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features to occur within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 in order to integrate said use with the uses in the surrounding area;

DRAFT

D. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private facilities as are required; and,

E. The proposed project and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the density, goals, and policies of the General Plan and Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, including SEAs, in that:

i. The requested development is designed to be compatible with the biotic resources present including the setting aside of appropriate and sufficient undisturbed areas;

ii. The requested development is designed to maintain water bodies, watercourses and their tributaries in a natural state;

iii. The requested development is designed so that wildlife movement corridors are left in an undisturbed and natural state;

iv. The requested development retains sufficient natural vegetative cover and/or open space to buffer critical resource areas for said requested development and is compatible with the natural biotic, cultural, scenic, and open space resources of the area;

v. Where necessary, fences or walls are provided to buffer important habitat areas from development;

vi. Roads and utilities serving the proposed development are located and designed so as not to conflict with critical resources, habitat areas or migratory paths; and

vii. Approval of the proposed development within the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23, to include project-related improvements, is based on the project's ability to mitigate public safety, design and/or environmental considerations, as provided in the Zoning Ordinance, the General Plan, and Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

The information contained in the Final EIR, and the materials submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearings substantiate the required findings for an SEA conditional use permit as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Sections 22.56.090 and 22.56.215, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

DRAFT

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certified that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 200500080 (SEA), subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 200500081
(DEVELOPMENT OF 73 SECOND UNITS, A CONTINUED CARE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY, WATER TANKS AND PROJECT-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE, AND RELATED ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE GRADING)
SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW NO. 201000001
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project approvals, the applicant is requesting approval of CUP No. 200500081 to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, and water tanks; and Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-

foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width)..

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

   The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on-site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, is a related request that proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

   (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

   (b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

   (c) 143 open space lots;

   (d) 2 public park (active) lots;

   (e) 4 private recreation lots;

DRAFT

(f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

(g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

(h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

(i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

7. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site

project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

11. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

12. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

13. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

14. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

15. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of

Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

16. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

17. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

18. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

19. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to

the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

20. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

21. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

22. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

23. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission

Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, Traffic/Access, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(d) Air Quality
(e) Solid Waste Services; and
(f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally each of the significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

24. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

25. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

26. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the

Environment ("SCOPE"), who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

27. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total

of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8

DRAFT

acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

28. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

29. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

30. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

31. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the

development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

32. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

33. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

34. The adopted Specific Plan contains provisions addressing CUPs. The purpose of the CUP procedure is to provide a mechanism to permit, on a case-by-case basis, uses that may be appropriate in certain land use designations. Specific Plan Section 5.2.3, Conditional Use Permit Process, provides that the CUP procedure for the Specific Plan is set forth in Los Angeles County Code Title 22, Chapter 22.56, Part 1, in effect as of the date the Specific Plan is adopted. A "conditional use," as defined by the County, means a use which, because of characteristics peculiar to it, or because of size, technological process or type of equipment, or because of its location with reference to surroundings, street or highway width, traffic generation or other demands on public services, requires special consideration relative to placement at specific locations in the land use designation(s) where classified, to ensure proper integration with other existing or permitted uses in the same designation.

Second Units and Continued Care Retirement Community

35. Second units are proposed on 73 lots in Planning Area TM-14 in the Low Density Residential ("L") land use designation, shown as Lots 279-351 on VTTM No. 61105. These lots average one acre in size when included with the open space lots within the Low land use designation. According to the Specific Plan (Table 5.4-1), 122 second dwelling units are allowed with a CUP in Planning Area TM-14. The provision of second dwelling units in Mission Village will provide additional affordable housing opportunities, while maintaining the character of a

single-family neighborhood. The second units will provide a more affordable housing alternative for caretakers, extended family, senior residents, and other renting households.

36. The proposed second units will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare. The 73 proposed second units will provide a more affordable housing alternative for caretakers, extended family, senior residents, and other renting households. The second units could not be sold separately from the primary residence, nor may the underlying residential lot be subdivided without additional approvals or modifications to the project. The second units would be required to comply with the same development requirements as the primary residence and, therefore, will integrate with the primary residence on the property and will be designed to adhere to the maximum size authorized by the Specific Plan. Additionally, the second units will be limited to a maximum living area of 800 square feet and will be regulated to meet main building setbacks, standard height limits, and other applicable requirements. The 73 proposed second units are consistent with the maximum of 122 second units authorized by the Specific Plan within the "L" land use designation of The Mesas, as shown in Table 5.4-1 of the Specific Plan.

Because the second units would be required to comply with the same development requirements as the primary residence and must integrate with the primary residence, and because the units could not be sold separately from the primary residence, the second units would not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of the property of other persons located in the vicinity, nor would they constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

37. The lots proposed for the second units are adequate in size and shape to accommodate the second units to integrate them with the uses in the surrounding area. The building pad for each lot where a second unit is proposed is adequate in size and shape and the specific location of future buildings will be reviewed prior to issuance of building permits. Second units will comply with all required development standards. Pursuant to Specific Plan Section 3.9(2)(b), second units are limited to a maximum living area of 800 square feet and are regulated to meet main building setbacks, standard height limits, lot coverage, floor area ratio, and other applicable requirements. VTTM No. 61105 has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee and conditions of approval will be established prior to approval. The proposed project will be

DRAFT

developed in conformance with all applicable County Codes including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, and Building Code.

38. The sites for the second units are adequately served by streets of sufficient width and improved to carry the quantity of traffic that would be generated, and by other public or private service facilities as required. The Mobility Plan (Section 2.4) of the Specific Plan provides for a hierarchy of highways and streets that will provide a safe and efficient circulation system for Mission Village, as well as its neighboring communities. The residential communities will be directly served by a roadway system consisting of public streets and private streets and drives. The 73 second units, proposed on lots 279-351, will be served by a series of private streets and drives of 40' to 60' in width, more than-adequate to carry the traffic generated. The highway and street widths and standards have been reviewed by County staff to ensure compatibility with applicable access criteria, and the project has been conditioned to comply with the approved traffic study, which was completed using the methodology and standards specified by County staff and utilizing the County approved Santa Clarita Valley Consolidated Traffic Model. The traffic study for the project has been incorporated into the EIR and the project will be required to conform to all conditions of approval for VTTM No. 61105, as well as all mitigation measures adopted by the County. Any other public facilities which are necessary to serve the proposed second units will be incorporated as required.

39. The Continued Care Retirement Community ("CCRC") would consist of 351 residential units within VTTM No. 61105 Lot 528 According to the Specific Plan Permitted Use Matrix (Table 3.4-2), A CCRC (care facilities, Residential - 7 or more persons) is allowed with a CUP in the Mixed-Use land use category. The CCRC would be located within the mixed use Village Center portion of the project. The Exhibit Map for VTTM No. 61105, which provides a conceptual design for the CCRC, notes that the CCRC may consist of 3 and 4-story buildings with a mix of units designated for independent living and assisted living. The CCRC units may be made available on a for-sale or rental basis.

40. The proposed CCRC will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area; or be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site; or jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety, or general welfare. The CCRC is a proposed residential senior community designed to provide its residents with the opportunity for "aging in place" within a familiar community. The CCRC is anticipated to contain a mixture of independent units, assisted living units, and other supportive living opportunities, thereby providing a variety of living options to its residents. The CCRC will be developed in conformance with all applicable County and Specific Plan development guidelines and standards. The CCRC will

DRAFT

not be materially detrimental to the property of others in the vicinity as it has been designed and integrated as part of the mixed use Village Center neighborhood. The CCRC will provide residential options for aging residents in a well designed facility with necessary amenities and services.

41. The lots proposed for the CCRC are adequate in size and shape to accommodate the CCRC in a manner that integrates it with the uses in the surrounding area. VTTM No. 61105 Lot 528 is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the proposed CCRC facility as depicted on the tentative map, and it has been designed to integrate into the Village Center area of the Mission Village community. The VTTM No. 61105 Exhibit Map depicts a conceptual CCRC, including driveways throughout the development to accommodate the required amount of parking, which has been established based on the parking standards for senior citizen housing development found in the County Code. The Specific Plan does not contain parking standards for this specific use.

VTTM No. 61105 has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee and recommended conditions of approval have been reviewed and considered by the Commission prior to approval. Any future changes in the design of the CCRC relative to VTTM No. 61105, if necessary, will be reviewed by staff through either the Revised Exhibit A or Exhibit Map procedure. If the project applicant is not able to reach agreement with a builder/operator for development of the CCRC, the applicant may seek to modify the CCRC tract map site to a multi-family development, with a maximum of 351 dwelling units. Such a proposal would require that the applicant show that the site can accommodate the applicable development standards, including parking requirements, for the residential units.

42. The site for the CCRC is adequately served by streets of sufficient width and improved to carry the quantity of traffic that would be generated, and by other public or private service facilities as required. The Mission Village circulation plan includes a hierarchy of streets to serve its proposed neighborhoods. The CCRC is located adjacent to Commerce Center Drive and will be served by driveways from proposed streets and private drives with right-of-way widths of 64 feet to 84 feet. The street widths and standards have been reviewed by County staff to ensure compatibility with applicable access criteria, and the project will be conditioned to comply with the approved traffic study. All other public facilities necessary to serve the proposed CCRC will be provided as required by the project's conditions of approval, including compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted as part of the project approvals.

43. The project's location, size, design and operating characteristics have given consideration to harmony in scale, bulk, coverage, and density; the availability of

public utilities, services and facilities; the generation of traffic and the capacity and physical character of surrounding and proposed streets; and the suitability of the site for the type and intensity of use or development proposed.

44. The applicant has demonstrated the suitability of the subject property for the proposed uses. Establishment of the proposed uses at the designated locations is in conformity with good zoning practice. Compliance with the conditions of approval will ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and consistency with all applicable Specific Plan policies.

Water Tanks and On-Site Infrastructure

45. VTTM No. 61105 depicts the proposed infrastructure necessary to develop Mission Village. This infrastructure includes sewer pump stations; water tanks and booster pump stations. The proposed infrastructure is described in detail in the Mission Village EIR. Specific to the water tanks, two new water tanks, one 4 million gallons in size for potable water and the other a 3 million gallon tank for reclaimed water, are depicted on VTTM No. 61105, located partially within the boundaries of the tentative map and the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, and partially off-site within VTTM 61996. A third new water tank, 4 million gallons in size for potable water, will be located on an existing pad within the Westridge community. An existing off-site 3.3 million gallon potable water tank, the Round Mountain tank, will be converted to reclaimed water in conjunction with the development of Mission Village. Portion of the water tanks located outside of the Specific Plan area is zoned A-2-5 (Heavy Agriculture, 5-acre minimum lot size) within unincorporated County territory. Therefore, these tanks are subject to the regulations of such zone and pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Section 22.24.150 water tank is a use subject to a Conditional Use Permit.

46. The water tanks and infrastructure at the proposed locations will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. The on-site project infrastructure would be typical of infrastructure serving mixed-use developments of this scale and nature in the region. The proposed utilities will connect to existing facilities to provide for an integrated infrastructure system serving existing and future residents. Accessory features associated with the utility systems, such as sewer pump stations, will allow for proper functioning of the system. A fully operational utility system will benefit the residents in the surrounding area in a positive manner. Additionally, certain infrastructure components would provide benefits to persons residing or working in the surrounding area, such as the roadway infrastructure, which would facilitate travel in the project vicinity. Specific to the water tanks, the potable water tanks proposed to be developed with the Mission Village project will service residents with safe, quality drinking water. The reclaimed water tanks will

significantly contribute to water conservation by offering treated water for irrigation and other approved uses.

47. The water tanks and infrastructure at the proposed locations will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. The development of necessary utilities on the project site will provide a benefit to both future residents of Mission Village, as well as other persons located in the vicinity of the project site. As to the water tanks, the water tank sites depicted on VTTM No. 61105 have been strategically selected to consider a natural elevation that would provide adequate water service in an efficient manner, as well as minimize any possible negative aesthetic impact on the community. The proposed potable water tank to be located within Westridge will be placed on a graded pad with previously established plumbing infrastructure, adjacent to existing water tanks. The existing tank location has been operating with no detrimental effect on surrounding properties. Similarly, the existing Round Mountain tank has been operating with no detrimental effect on surrounding properties.

52. The water tanks and infrastructure at the proposed locations will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed infrastructure, including water tanks, would provide the future residents of Mission Village with necessary utilities and would benefit the project and surrounding vicinity as well. Additionally, VTTM No. 61105 has been reviewed by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, and conditions of approval have been established for the subdivision, which have been reviewed and considered by the Commission. The County's Department of Public Works, Department of Health Services, and Fire Department will ensure the infrastructure improvements are designed so that there will be no danger to public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed project also will be developed in conformance with all applicable County Codes including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, and Building Code. The EIR for the project includes mitigation measures relating to development standards and the project is conditioned to comply with those mitigation measures.

48. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features in order to integrate the water tanks and infrastructure with the uses in the surrounding area. The project infrastructure has been designed in compliance with the development standards of the Specific Plan, applicable provisions of Title 22, and other applicable County Codes and Regulations. The specific lots designated for the proposed water tanks are adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features. The lots for the tanks that would be located partially within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105 and the Specific Plan, and partially off-site within VTTM 61996, will require

grading activities, as indicated on the tentative map. The water tank site is designed to be shielded from view by a landscaped berm to provide for visual integration with the surrounding area. The proposed tank to be located within Westridge would be adjacent to existing water tanks and, therefore, would be visually integrated into the surrounding area, as is the existing Round Mountain tank.

49. The proposed site would be adequately served by streets and highways, and other necessary public service facilities. As depicted on VTTM No. 61105, Mission Village will be a fully functioning community providing all necessary infrastructure including roadways, utilities and other required public and private facilities. A hierarchy of public and private streets and drives is proposed to provide internal circulation, as well as connection to the surrounding community. Highway and street widths and standards have been reviewed by the County's Subdivision Committee and conditions of approval requiring construction to applicable standards are part of the project approval. Public utilities include a sanitary sewer system, a water system for the provision of both potable and reclaimed water, electricity, gas, telephone and cable television. These utilities have been designed to adequately serve the project and to allow for integration with future neighborhoods. Conditions to ensure proper development of the required utility services are incorporated into the project approval.

On-Site Grading

50. Pursuant to 22.56.210 of the County Code, grading projects that exceed 100,000 cubic yards of grading require a CUP. The project encompasses a maximum of approximately 54 million cubic yards of grading (27 million cubic yards of cut and 27.4 cubic yards of fill) is proposed for on-site, which includes infrastructure grading for a sanitary sewer system and pump stations, potable and reclaimed water systems, and drainage improvements. The 54 million cubic yards of grading associated with VTTM No. 61105 also includes approximately 186,000 cubic yards of cut and 945,000 cubic yards of fill grading for off site grading portion of the following improvements which are partially inside and partially outside VTTM No. 61105: extension of Westridge Parkway (32,390 cubic yards of cut and 232,390 cubic yards of fill) and Commerce Center Drive (31,900 cubic yards of cut and 288,270 cubic yards of fill), water tanks (55,380 cubic yards of cut and 130,030 cubic yards of fill), water quality basin (18,900 cubic yards of cut and 63,635 cubic yards of fill), two debris basins (23,970 cubic yards of cut and 100,425 cubic yards of fill), Lion Canyon drainage improvements and miscellaneous grading necessary to tie to existing grades (55,955 cubic yards of cut and 130,395 cubic yards of fill.)

DRAFT

51. Grading operations at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. As a result of the location of the project site, there are few nearby occupied properties that would be directly affected by project grading. Any potential adverse effects of the grading operations would be minimized through compliance with restrictions imposed through the mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR, the attached conditions of approval, and the Los Angeles County Grading Code and Building Code, as each relates to traffic control, noise impacts and dust management.

52. Grading operations at the proposed location will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. The proposed grading operations would be conducted in compliance with the approved Specific Plan Conceptual Grading Plan, which identified appropriate areas for grading activities, and in compliance with Specific Plan Section 4.8, which contains Design Guidelines for Grading and Hillside Management to ensure that any adverse effects of grading on other properties in the vicinity would not be materially detrimental. In addition, Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001, which has been reviewed and considered concurrently, describes the proposed project's compliance with Los Angeles County Hillside Development Guidelines, the preservation of views, and the preservation of significant features, which demonstrates that the proposed grading operations would not be materially detrimental to the enjoyment or valuation of surrounding property.

53. Grading operations at the proposed location would not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed grading operations would be conducted in compliance with the approved Specific Plan Conceptual Grading Plan, which identified appropriate areas of grading activities. In addition, grading operations will be conducted in compliance with all applicable County requirements to ensure that grading will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare.

54. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features in order to integrate the requested uses with the uses in the surrounding area. VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying Exhibit Map provide detailed information that demonstrates compliance with the requirements of the Specific Plan and County Code Title 22, as applicable, relative to the accommodation of all project development features. The proposed grading operations are consistent with these requirements. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the grading plan will be reviewed to ensure it is in compliance with the

DRAFT

approved tentative map and that all required development standards for the proposed lots can be met.

55. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets to carry the kind and quantity of traffic grading activities would generate, and by public service facilities as required. The Mission Village project site is served by existing public roadways, which provide access to the property. Grading equipment will be able to access the property from existing public streets; there will be no need for off-site transport of graded materials through the use of public streets. In addition, project grading will allow for the construction of roadways and public and private service facilities to serve the proposed project site.

Off-Site Grading and Infrastructure

56. Pursuant to Los Angeles County Code, Section 22.56.210, off-site grading projects require a CUP. The project includes grading outside the boundaries of the VTTM No. 61105 and outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan as part of the project. In addition to the 54.4 million cubic yards (27 million cubic yards of cut and 27.4 million cubic yards of fill) of on-site grading, 1.9 million cubic yards of grading (1.9 million cubic yards of cut and 1.9 million cubic yards of fill) is required for the proposed off-site infrastructure improvements including the Magic Mountain Parkway extension, utility corridor, and the larger of the two Southern California Edison substation alternative sites.

57. As shown on VTTM No. 61105, Commerce Center Drive will extend through the Mission Village community and connect to Magic Mountain Parkway. Westridge Parkway will extend northerly to Magic Mountain Parkway, and Magic Mountain Parkway will be extended from its existing terminus westward to and through the project site. Portions of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway would extend beyond the boundaries of VTTM No. 61105 and would require off-site grading of approximately 900,000 cubic yards of cut and 500,000 cubic yards of fill; 400,000 cubic yards would be transported from the off-site location for use within the Mission Village site. The northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive also will require some offsite grading. The proposed extensions will be consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Circulation Plan, the Mission Village Circulation Plan, and the goals and objectives of the Los Angeles County Highway Plan.

58. The proposed grading operations associated with construction of the two water tanks (potable and reclaimed) will be located partially within the boundaries of the Mission Village tract map along the southerly boundary, and partially off-site to the south within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61996, outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

59. The proposed water quality basin would be located directly north of the Mission Village tract map site, just south of the Santa Clara River and west of the Six Flags Magic Mountain parking lot, on an approximately 2.5-acre lot under Newhall Land ownership. The water quality basin would serve to improve the water quality of urban run-off.

60. Two off-site debris basins are proposed to be constructed along the southerly tract boundary within the boundaries of VTTM No. 61996. The debris basins would serve to improve the water quality of urban run-off.

61. An electrical substation may be necessary to serve the area and two possible locations are proposed, both of which comply with all applicable requirements. The first alternative site is located almost entirely within the Portrero Valley portion of the Specific Plan, with a portion encroaching into the Legacy Village project (VTTM No. 061996). A total of 158,000 cubic yards of cut and 45,000 cubic yards of fill would be necessary if this location is chosen. The second alternative site is located easterly of the first and is partially within the Portrero Valley portion of the Specific Plan and partially within the Legacy Village project site, outside the boundaries of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. Proposed grading for this alternative would be 372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill. The excess dirt under either alternative would be placed in the existing agricultural fields in Potrero Valley.

62. Facilities for the transmission of utilities to serve the Mission Village project would be located partially in an off-site utility corridor, which will include utility infrastructure to serve the Mission Village project and, ultimately, future Newhall Ranch development. The corridor utilities will include a gravity sewer and pressure sewer force main, and pipelines for potable water, recycled water, agricultural water, electrical power, telephone, cable television, and natural gas. The utility corridor alignment generally runs east/west along SR-126 to the I-5, where the alignment turns to the south. Grading for the proposed utility corridor would be a balanced operation and totals 618,000 cubic yards of cut and 618,000 cubic yards of fill.

63. Development of Mission Village will involve stabilization of the Lion Canyon drainage, which will involve the construction of drainage treatment improvements, including grade stabilization measures to maintain sediment equilibrium and protect the channel bed and banks from hydromodification impacts. Some of these drainage treatment improvements may involve grading and construction of improvements outside the tract boundary. In addition, a limited amount of off-site grading also will be conducted along the tract boundary edges in order to tie into natural grades.

64. The requested uses and activities at the proposed locations will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. The off-site grading that will be necessary for the construction of utility and roadway improvements will allow for development of a fully functional community, which will benefit the future residents of Mission Village, as well as residents and visitors to the surrounding area. The extensions of Magic Mountain Parkway, Commerce Center Drive, and Westridge Parkway will provide improved circulation and access. Potable and reclaimed water tanks will serve the Mission Village project and Newhall Ranch property in the vicinity. The water quality basin will address urban run-off into the Santa Clara River from both the project and existing development, and will allow for maintenance of a natural ecosystem along the river corridor. The utility corridor and electrical substation will serve the Mission Village project and Newhall Ranch, as well as providing regional benefits.

The requested uses and activities at the proposed locations would not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site. The proposed grading and associated improvements would be located primarily on the property of the project applicant. There are no residential uses located in close proximity to the proposed grading with the exception of the residents located to the south in the Westridge development. Mitigation measures adopted as part of the Final EIR, in combination with the conditions of approval issued in conjunction with this permit, will mitigate any potential adverse effects on persons or property in the vicinity. Grading operations will be temporary in nature and are not expected to be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property in the vicinity.

65. The requested uses and activities at the proposed locations will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed grading operations will be conducted in conformance with all applicable County Codes and the recommendations and design requirements of the project's geotechnical report. Appropriate mitigation measures to address potential impacts relating to aesthetics, noise, air quality (fugitive dust), re-compaction and stabilization have been imposed to ensure the activities do not endanger public health, safety, or welfare.

66. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the required development features in order to integrate the requested uses and activities with the uses in the surrounding area. The proposed off-site grading will allow for construction of the proposed improvements on lots of adequate size and shape to accommodate any development features that are required. All conditions of

approval or mitigation measures that include standards for fencing, landscaping, or other development features will be complied with as required.

67. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate. Grading operations associated with the off-site improvements would not negatively impact existing highways or streets. The proposed grading sites are located either partly within the proposed Mission Village project site or directly adjacent to the project site so off-site roadways will not be impacted by any export. Wherever possible, grading operations are proposed to balance individually. For the electrical substation, each alternative will require export to a nearby disposal site that would be reached without traveling on existing streets or highways. Grading associated with the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway will require that 400,000 cubic yards of material be exported from the grading site to the Mission Village site with no need to travel on existing streets or highways.

68. The proposed site is adequately served by other public or private service facilities as are required. During grading, all necessary service facilities will be available to facilitate necessary operations and compliance with applicable mitigation measures. If County regulations or mitigation measures require the provision of temporary public services, they will be provided, as needed.

69. Approval of this CUP is conditioned on the applicant's compliance with the attached conditions of approval, as well as the conditions of approval for VTTM No. 61105.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW

70. The adopted Specific Plan contains "substantial conformance" provisions. The purpose of the substantial conformance provisions is to determine whether proposed developments or uses substantially comply with the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan and other applicable Los Angeles County ordinances that do not conflict with the Specific Plan. The applicant seeks substantial conformance determinations as to the following: (i) grading in areas with an average slope of 25percent or greater conforms with the Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines contained in Specific Plan Chapter 4.8, 1a-1h; (ii) pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2 (13), modifications to certain setback requirements in the Village Center substantially conform with Specific Plan Table 3.4-1 (Site Development Standards); and, (iii) pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2 (9), adjustments to the proposed project's trail widths from 12 feet to 8 feet.

DRAFT

71. Specific Plan Section 5.2.2.d, General Findings Applicable to all Requests, provides that a request for a Substantial Conformance determination shall be based on the following findings: (a) the subject activity substantially conforms with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances that do not conflict with the Specific Plan; (b) the subject activity will not adversely affect public health and safety; and (c) the subject activity will not adversely affect adjacent property.

Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines

72. To develop the Mission Village project site as permitted by the Specific Plan, the project proposes a maximum of approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of earthwork onsite (within tract map) and offsite, which will be balanced within the overall Mission Village project area (28.9 cubic yards of cut and 28.9 cubic yards of fill). Approximately 54 million cubic yards of grading (27 million cubic yards of cut and 27.4 million cubic yards of fill) is proposed for the tract map site, which includes infrastructure grading for a sanitary sewer system and pump stations, potable and reclaimed water systems, and drainage improvements. An additional approximate 1.9 million cubic yards of grading is proposed in connection with development of the proposed off-site infrastructure improvements, including the Magic Mountain Parkway extension, utility corridor, and the larger of the two SCE substation alternative sites. Grading for the off-site improvements will be authorized by CUP 200500081.

73. Specific Plan Section 2.7 Hillside Preservation and Grading Plan, was prepared in accordance with Los Angeles County Performance Review Criteria for Hillside Management and is consistent with the County of Los Angeles General Plan and the Santa Clarita Valley Area General Plan goals and objectives relevant to grading. Specific Plan Section 4.8 establishes guidelines for grading and hillside management within the Specific Plan area, including Mission Village. These guidelines were prepared in accordance with the County of Los Angeles General Plan, the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, and the Hillside Design Guidelines established by the County Department of Regional Planning (December 1987). These guidelines were designed to achieve the goals of the Specific Plan and assure development that is safe, aesthetic, and cost effective.

74. Specific Plan Section 5.2.2.b(16) provides that for subdivisions having an average slope of 25percent or greater in those areas to be graded, a determination as to conformance with the Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines in Specific Plan Section 4.8 is necessary. Mission Village has an average slope greater than 25percent.

DRAFT

75. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (a), provides that Los Angeles County hillside development guidelines should be followed in hillside areas in order to minimize grading impacts. Mission Village has been designed and will be developed in conformance with the County's current hillside development guidelines, which can minimize grading impacts, as well as all applicable County Codes including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, Building Code, and Fire Code. Additionally, the project will comply with all mitigation measures contained in the Mission Village EIR Mitigation Monitoring Plan adopted by this Commission, including, but not limited to, those mitigation measures specific to potential geotechnical and soil resources related impacts. Furthermore, all conditions and comments provided by the Department of Public Works ("Public Works") relating to the review of grading and geotechnical reports has been incorporated into CUP No. 200500081.

76. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (b), provides that significant ridges, knolls, and rock outcroppings will be respected in the site design and incorporated as features where feasible. While the proposed project grading would alter the hillside profile, where feasible the project site design respects significant ridges, knolls, and rock outcroppings. Significant landforms in the project vicinity identified in the Specific Plan include the bluffs on the south side of the Santa Clara River. Consistent with the grading and hillside management guidelines, Mission Village was designed specifically to preserve the bluff area along the south side of the river, in conformance with the Specific Plan. Additionally, while the Specific Plan identified distinctive elevated features within the Specific Plan development areas, including Sawtooth Ridge near Long/Adobe Canyon, Ayers Rock in Potrero Canyon, and numerous distinctive ridges within the Santa Susana Mountains, these features are located in the westerly portions of Newhall Ranch, are not located within the Mission Village project site, and, therefore, would not be adversely affected by development of the proposed project.

77. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (c), provides that contour grading should be employed where feasible to lessen the visual impact of large slopes and long major uniform slopes should be avoided. Where feasible, contour grading will be employed in the development of the project to lessen the visual impact of slope modification. The Mission Village project is designed to minimize large and long uniform slopes. The bluffs along the Santa Clara River would be preserved to lessen the grading and visual impacts from SR 126. Larger manufactured slopes have been designed with curvilinear, scalloping contours with transitional gradients such as the slopes between Planning Areas A7 and A8. The larger slope near the southerly Commerce Center Drive bridge abutment would be contoured although the

contour would be at a gradient that is less than the surrounding natural slopes due to engineering constraints. The slopes along Magic Mountain Parkway are relatively low in height (40-50 feet) when compared to other slopes on the site, although they would be long due to the need to follow the road.

78. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (d), provides that the removal of oak trees should be avoided to the maximum extent feasible and grading to the edge of driplines should be minimized. The proposed project will avoid impacts to oak tress to the maximum extent feasible and will minimize grading to the edge of the tree dripline. Two Oak Tree Permits, Permit Nos. 200500032 and 2005000043 are requested in connection with development of the project. Of the 564 oak trees located within the boundaries of the project site and within 200 feet of the proposed grading line, the majority of the trees will be unaffected by the project as 154 trees will be removed and 52 will be encroached upon. Grading associated with the easterly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, as well as grading for on-site development and necessary infrastructure, has been designed to allow for preservation of the majority of oak trees. For each tree that is removed, a minimum of two (for non-heritage trees) or ten (for heritage trees) 15-gallon replacement trees will be planted, resulting in a greater number of oak trees on site than presently exists.

79. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (e), provides that grading should emphasize and accentuate scenic vistas and natural landforms. The grading plan will follow the natural contour lines and preserve natural scenic vistas and landforms where feasible. Consistent with the grading and hillside management guidelines of the Specific Plan, Mission Village was designed specifically to preserve the bluff area along the south side of the river. In addition, Mission Village recreates a small canyon with grading associated with the Arroyo Park (lots 151-155). The residential and commercial developments are designed to be situated so as to accentuate scenic vistas and natural landforms such as the river bluffs along the southisde of the river.

80. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (f), provides that slopes requiring special erosion control or fuel modification prevention should be designed for ease of maintenance. Development areas subject to erosion control measures and fuel modification requirements have been designed to ensure ease of maintenance. Access to open space lots where maintenance is required is depicted on VTTM No. 61105 so that future homeowner's associations, landscape maintenance or other groups responsible for maintenance of common areas can easily accept maintenance responsibilities.

DRAFT

81. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (g), provides that special attention should be given to arrangement of landscape materials as means of creating a natural, hillside appearance. Special attention will be given to the arrangement of landscape materials to help maintain and create a natural, hillside appearance. The project applicant will prepare landscape plans that are compliant with the County's Drought Tolerant Ordinance. In addition, numerous natural landscape features will be left intact such as the spineflower preserve, Santa Clara River, and the adjacent river bluffs.

82. Specific Plan Section 4.8 (1), Grading and Hillside Management, subsection (h), provides that graded slopes should be planted and stabilized in compliance with County-approved landscape, irrigation, and maintenance requirements. Grading operations will include adequate erosion control, including landscaping and stabilization, to ensure that the site is developed in compliance with applicable County landscape, irrigation, and maintenance requirements. The project applicant will work with the departments of Fire, Public Works, Regional Planning, and Parks and Recreation to establish appropriate landscaping materials to comply with regulations covering erosion control planting, reduction of the threat of fire in high hazard areas, compliance with drought tolerant landscaping provisions, and maintenance responsibilities.

83. The Mission Village project has been reviewed by staff to ensure its design is in compliance with the Specific Plan, specifically with Section 4.8, Grading and Hillside Management Design Guidelines, and applicable Los Angeles County ordinances.

84. Project grading will be conducted in compliance with all applicable County requirements to ensure geotechnical stability and conformance with erosion control regulations, and to ensure that the proposed Mission Village project will not adversely affect the health and safety of persons residing or working in the surrounding area. Project grading will allow for the development of necessary infrastructure to benefit the health and safety of residents of Mission Village and future surrounding neighborhoods.

85. The development of Mission Village, including the grading necessary to construct the project, implements a portion of the Specific Plan, as approved by the Board of Supervisors, and will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the project site. Upon the completion of Mission Village, the development will be compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods, and will enhance the economic value of these properties as a result of the project improvements.

DRAFT

Setbacks

86. As described in the EIR, Mission Village includes a Village Center, which is a pedestrian oriented area that will include residential uses (apartments and condominiums) integrated with commercial uses that will include both retail and office space. The Village Center also will include the library, village green, community recreation center, a proposed continued care retirement community and a transit center. These uses will be linked together through a series of sidewalks, trails and paseos that connect the Village Center to the rest of Mission Village.

87. The Village Center will contain the following Specific Plan land use designations: Mixed Use (MU), High Residential (H), Medium Residential (M), and Commercial (C). The Development Standards for these land uses, including the required setbacks, are found in Specific Plan Table 3.4-1. While the Specific Plan provides for variation and flexibility in these land uses, the urban setting envisioned for the residential dwellings and commercial uses within the Village Center would be difficult to implement based on the Specific Plan setback requirements. Though a zero side yard lot configuration is permitted within certain land use designations, only the Mixed-Use (MU) designation permits zero front yards, with restrictions, limiting the potential to create a truly urban environment. Allowing greater flexibility in the setback requirements will ensure a design consistent with a pedestrian-oriented community.

88. Pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(13), modifications of the development standards contained on Table 3.4-1 are allowed provided findings for a determination that the modification is in substantial conformance with the provisions of the Specific Plan can be made. The reduction of setbacks of specific Mixed-Use, Commercial, High Residential, and Medium Residential designated lots within the Village Center (lots 508-515, 517-526, 528-530, and 621 on the approved tentative map) is consistent with the intent of the Village Center to be a pedestrian oriented area with buildings that are closer to the street. Limitations to the setback reductions are described in the Front Setback Modification provision (Section 3.6.1) of the Mission Village Planning Notebook ("Notebook") dated May 2011. The modified setbacks vary from a minimum of zero up to ten feet depending on the type of building frontage. The provisions in the Notebook will ensure that the building frontage on the streets of the Village Center are developed in manner that reflects a master planned pedestrian oriented Village Center.

In addition, footnote 12 on Table 3.4-1 for lots within the Mixed Use and Commercial designations details a 20-foot minimum side and rear yard setback requirement when building is adjacent to a different land use designation or a

public road. However, the side and rear yard minimum setback (0-feet) for the lots within the Mixed Use and Commercial designations within the Village Center are in conformance when directly adjacent to landscape development zone (LDZ) and/or private drive lots and/or similar or compatible uses.

89. The Specific Plan provides for 20-foot minimum side and rear yard setbacks for Commercial and Mixed Use designated lots when a building is adjacent to a different land use designation or a public road. The purpose of the setback is to provide a buffer between two potentially incompatible uses. However, this requirement would impede the development goal of an urban pedestrian-oriented community. As depicted on the VTTM No. 61105 Exhibit Map, the rear or side yard for the lots in the Commercial and Mixed Use designated areas are adjacent to either a private drive or a 20-24 foot LDZ lot. Therefore, these uses are not adjacent to a public road or a potentially incompatible land use designation. Additionally, the private drive and LDZ lot would serve as a buffer, eliminating the need for the setback. Therefore, the zero-foot setback for lots adjacent to a private drive or a 20-24 foot landscape development zone lot would meet the intent of the Specific Plan.

90. Pursuant to Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(h), a request for modification of the development standards such as the setback requirements contained in Table 3.4-1 may be approved where the Section 5.2 General Findings can be made, and such modification meets all applicable building, fire, and subdivision codes, and would be architecturally compatible with existing buildings in the surrounding neighborhood.

91. The modified setbacks substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and County ordinances. The setbacks will not be significantly different from those provided in Specific Plan Table 3.4-1. The requested interpretation is a refinement and further clarification of those standards. This request also is consistent with a similar interpretation approved by the Commission relative to the Newhall Ranch Landmark Village project.

92. The modified setbacks will not adversely affect public health, and safety. The modified setbacks within the Village Center will encourage greater flexibility in the design of this higher density commercial area to allow for a more vibrant and pedestrian oriented urban environment.

93. The modified setbacks within the Mission Village project will not adversely affect adjacent properties. The project site currently is undeveloped. The buildings with the proposed 0' setbacks are located within the Village Center, which is designed as an urban, higher density neighborhood. Nearby uses will be complimentary

and include multi-family housing developments, a library, a proposed continuing care retirement community, and a transit center.

94. The modified setbacks meet all applicable building, fire, and subdivision codes, as the Mission Village project will be developed in conformance with all applicable County Codes, including, but not limited to, the Subdivision Code, Grading Code, Building Code, and Fire Code. Additionally, the Mission Village project has been thoroughly reviewed by County staff and this Commission. The Mission Village EIR has been prepared to County standards, and includes measures to mitigate project impacts.

95. The modified setbacks will allow for architecturally compatible buildings in the surrounding neighborhood. Proposed buildings will be similar in character to others nearby.

96. The Mission Village project site is currently comprised of undeveloped land with no existing buildings.

Trail Widths

97. With the Specific Plan, the Board adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian and bicycle trails. When built out, Mission Village would include Regional River Trails, Community Trails, Local Trails and Pathways as part of a network of unified bicycle and pedestrian routes in landscaped parkways that provide access to the different neighborhoods and Villages that make up the proposed project and the larger Specific Plan area. The illustrated Trail Sections contained in the Specific Plan for the Community Trails, Local Trails, and Pathways depict a twelve-foot wide bicycle/pedestrian trail within a twenty to twenty-four foot wide recreation lot. (See Trail Section B2 of Exhibit 2.4-7 and Trail Sections C & D of Exhibit 2.4-8 of the Specific Plan.)

98. Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(9) provides for adjustments to the Master Trails Plan and any of the trail sections if the adjustment is in substantial conformance with the Specific Plan. The project applicant requests that the Specific Plan twelve-foot wide trail widths (Community Trails, Local Trails, and Pathways) be adjusted to eight-foot wide. The twenty to twenty-four foot wide recreation lot will not be reduced in size. The reduction of 4 feet in trail width would allow for four additional feet of landscaping and pervious materials.

DRAFT

99. The proposed reduced width is appropriate for the three types of trails, the function of which is to allow for comfortable and safe recreational bicycle and pedestrian use of the routes. An eight-foot wide trail would be sufficient in size to accommodate pedestrians and the recreational use of bicycles. The adjusted trails and pathways will exceed Caltrans' minimum requirement for five-foot wide Class II bicycle facilities, Los Angeles County's minimum of four-foot wide sidewalks, and the American Disability Association's minimum requirement of five-foot wide sidewalks. In addition to the trail system, there will be a dedicated Class II bicycle lane provided on portions of the Magic Mountain Parkway and Commerce Center Drive extensions. The adjusted eight foot trails will achieve the goal of contributing to an extensive network of trails and pathways that will connect residents within Mission Village and beyond its boundaries, and also will provide safe and attractive transportation alternatives for pedestrians and bicyclists.

100. The adjusted trail widths substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances. The adjustments to the trail sections of the Community Trails, Local Trails, and Pathways is in compliance with Specific Plan Section 5.2.2(9) and Los Angeles County ordinances which do not conflict with the Specific Plan.

101. The adjusted trail widths will not adversely affect public health and safety. The adjustment will continue to allow for bicyclists and pedestrians to comfortably and safely share the routes. Additionally, reducing the width of the trails and pathways will increase the adjacent landscaping, which will assist in reducing impacts to water quality, and provide a more vibrant and attractive network of trails.

102. The proposed adjustment to the trails and pathways will not adversely affect adjacent property. The recreation lots will maintain the 20-24 foot width established by the Specific Plan and, but will provide additional landscape area therefore, will provide adequate buffer area.

103. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in

The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

104. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

For Conditional Use Permit no. 200500081

A. The proposed uses and activities, with the attached conditions and restrictions, are consistent with the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan;

B. With the attached conditions and restrictions, the requested uses and activities at the proposed locations will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort, or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment, or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger, or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety and general welfare;

C. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features prescribed in Title 22 of the County Code, or as otherwise required, in order to integrate such uses with the uses in the surrounding area; and

D. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private facilities as are required.

DRAFT

The information contained in the Final EIR, and the materials submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearings substantiate the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Section 22.56.090, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

For Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001

A. Development of Mission Village will substantially conform with the Specific Plan Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines in that:

i. Los Angeles County hillside development guidelines will be followed relative to development in hillside areas in order to minimize grading impacts;

ii. Significant ridges, knolls, and rock outcroppings will be respected in the site design and incorporated as features where feasible;

iii. Contour grading will be employed where feasible to lessen the visual impact of large slopes and long major uniform slopes will be avoided;

iv. The removal of oak trees will be avoided to the maximum extent feasible and grading to the edge of driplines will be minimized;

v. Project grading will emphasize and accentuate scenic vistas and natural landforms;

vi. Slopes requiring special erosion control or fuel modification prevention will be designed for ease of maintenance;

vii. Special attention will be given to the arrangement of landscape materials as a means of creating a natural, hillside appearance;

viii. Graded slopes will be planted and stabilized in compliance with County-approved landscape, irrigation, and maintenance requirements;

ix. Project grading substantially conforms with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances that do not conflict with the Specific Plan;

x. Project grading will not adversely affect public health and safety; and,

xi. Project grading will not adversely affect adjacent property.

DRAFT

B. Development of Mission Village will substantially conform with the Specific Plan setback requirements in that:

i. The modified setbacks meet all applicable building, fire, and subdivision codes;

ii. The modified setbacks will allow for architecturally compatible buildings in the surrounding neighborhood;

iii. The modified setbacks substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and County ordinances;

iv. The modified setbacks will not adversely affect public health, and safety; and

v. The modified setbacks will not adversely affect adjacent properties.

C. Development of Mission Village will substantially conform with the Specific Plan trail width requirements in that:

i. The adjusted trail widths substantially conform with all applicable provisions of the Specific Plan and Los Angeles County ordinances which do not conflict with the Specific Plan;

ii. The adjusted trail widths will not adversely affect public health and safety; and,

iii. The adjusted trail widths will not adversely affect adjacent property.

The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a substantial conformance determination, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Reporting procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance

DRAFT

Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgement of the Commission; and

2. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Conditional Use Permit No. 200500081, subject to the attached conditions.

6. Approves Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001, subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PARKING PERMIT NO. 200500011
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project, the applicant is requesting approval of a parking permit to authorize off-site and reciprocal (interchangeable) parking for lots within the Village Center area of Mission Village.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

   (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

   (b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

   (c) 143 open space lots;

   (d) 2 public park (active) lots;

   (e) 4 private recreation lots;

   (f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

   (g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

   (h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

   (i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

   The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

DRAFT

7. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

8. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

9. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

10. Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

    Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

DRAFT

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

    In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

    Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5

of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding

benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, Traffic/Access, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain

Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significant and unavoidable impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(d) Air Quality;
(e) Solid Waste Services; and
(f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally each of the significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full

improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that

there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

35. As described in the EIR, Mission Village includes a Village Center, which is a pedestrian-oriented area that will include residential uses (apartments and condominiums) integrated with commercial uses that will include both retail and office space. The Village Center also will include the library, village green, community recreation center, and a proposed continued care retirement community. These uses will be linked together through a series of sidewalks, trails and paseos that connect the Village Center to the rest of Mission Village.

36. The project has been designed to provide the number of parking spaces required by the Specific Plan based on the conceptual uses proposed. The VTTM No. 61105 Site Plan - Exhibit Map provides information as to the number and location of parking spaces for these uses. Within the Village Center specifically, parking is provided on-site on the lots where a particular use is proposed, or off-site on adjacent private drives or nearby lots. Thus, although Mission Village will provide adequate parking consistent with the requirements of the Specific Plan to serve all proposed uses, not all required parking within the Village Center will be located on the same lot as the use it is intended to serve. Pursuant to applicable County Code and Specific Plan provisions, if required parking is provided off-site, a parking permit is required.

37. Specific Plan Section 3.7, Parking Regulations, governs motor vehicle parking within the Specific Plan area. Except as otherwise specified in the Specific Plan, parking requirements for the Specific Plan Area shall be in accordance with Los Angeles County Planning and Zoning Code ("Zoning Code") Section 22.52.1000. Under Zoning Code Section 22.52.1083, every use shall provide the required number of parking spaces on the same lot or parcel of land on which the use is located unless expressly allowed otherwise by a parking permit approved pursuant to Part 7 of Chapter 22.56. Zoning Code Section 22.56.100 sets forth the facts to be substantiated in support of issuance of a parking permit. The applicant requests a parking permit to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for Village Center lots 508 (Mixed-Use/Commercial), 509 (Commercial), 510 (Commercial), 511 (Mixed-Use - Residential/Commercial), 526 (Recreation

Center), 527 (Village Green - Private Park) and 529 (Mixed-Use/Commercial). This permit is not requesting reduction of parking but reciprocal parking which intends to allow parking spaces to be used by different lots.

38. The project has been designed to provide the number of parking spaces required by the Specific Plan based on the conceptual uses proposed; this permit does not seek to reduce that number. Within the Village Center specifically, parking is provided on-site, on the lots where a particular use is proposed, or off-site on adjacent private drives or nearby lots. The following table depicts the subject lots, use type, required number of parking spaces, and the location and number of the off-site parking spaces:

Lot	Use	Specific Plan Required Parking	On Site Parking Provided	Off-site Parking Provided	Location of Off-Site Parking
508	Mixed-Use Commercial	899 spaces	880 spaces	19 spaces	19 on-street parallel spaces on "FF" Private Drive.
509 & 510	Mixed-Use Commercial	418 spaces	107 spaces	311 spaces	4 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 24 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive and 11 on-street spaces on "FF" Private Drive. 272 spaces located in parking structure (PS-2) on lot 509
511	3 & 4 Story Condominium and commercial	680 spaces	577 spaces	103 spaces	56 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 24 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive, 23 on-street spaces on "II" Private Drive
526	Recreation Center	63 spaces	32 spaces	68 spaces	24 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 18 on-street spaces on "EE" Private

DRAFT

					Drive, 26 on-street spaces on "II" Private Drive
527	Village Green – Private Park	6 spaces	0 spaces	6 spaces	6 on-street spaces on "II" Private Drive
529	Mixed-Use Commercial	374 spaces	84 spaces	290 spaces	5 on-street spaces on "DD" Private Drive, 75 on-street spaces on "EE" Private Drive, 210 spaces in parking structure (PS-2) on lot 509

39. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots is not expected to result in conflicts. Although not located on the same lot as the use the parking will serve, the parking facilities will be located on adjacent or nearby lots convenient to the use they are intended to serve and will be designed in compliance with the requirements of the Specific Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as applicable. Even though the parking spaces will not be assigned to specific uses or lots, it is likely that visitors or users will park in close proximity to their destination. Specific parking areas for employees may be designated in the future through CC&Rs.

40. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots will provide the required parking consistent with the mixed-use, town center nature of the Village Center area. The number of spaces provided meets the Specific Plan parking requirements.

41. The off-site and reciprocal parking on adjacent streets or in adjacent or nearby lots will not result in traffic congestion or unauthorized use of parking developed to serve surrounding property. The Village Center is a pedestrian oriented, mixed-use area that is linked to the rest of Mission Village via sidewalks, paseos and trails, where it is likely that residents will be able to limit use of their vehicles. As this area also will include community serving uses — the recreation center, Village Green (private park) and library, a resident or visitor can park once and access services and uses located within walking distance.

42. The Mission Village site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the requested parking arrangements. As depicted on the VTTM No. 61105 Site Plan - Exhibit Map, each lot has been designed to be adequate in size to meet the development standards required by the Specific Plan. Required yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features can be

accommodated. Parking lots and structures have been designed to comply with parking space sizing requirements and parking lot design standards.

43. In the future, a use may be proposed in a location where the nature of the use makes it appropriate to authorize approval of a joint-use or shared parking plan under which a reduction in the aggregate total of required parking spaces for uses would be permitted. At this time it is not possible to determine precisely how such a shared parking arrangement would work as the specific uses have not been established. In the future the applicant may apply for a Joint-Use or Shared Parking Plan pursuant to the provisions of Specific Plan Section 3.7, Parking Regulations, which may allow a reduction in the aggregate total of required parking spaces for individual permitted uses upon approval by the Planning Director.

44. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

DRAFT

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. That there will be no need for the number of parking spaces required by Part 11 of Chapter 22.52 of the Los Angeles County Code or the Specific Plan because of the use characteristics of the proposed uses, as outlined in the off-site and reciprocal parking analysis prepared for the project;

B. That off-site facilities will provide the required parking for the uses because such off-site facilities are controlled through ownership by the owner of the use for which the site serves and are conveniently accessible to the main use;

C. That the requested parking permit at the location proposed will not result in traffic congestion, excessive off-site parking, or unauthorized use of parking facilities developed to serve surrounding property; and

D. That the proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the yards, walls, fences, loading facilities, landscaping and other development features prescribed in Title 22 and the Specific Plan.

E. That the applicant has met the burden of proof set forth in Section 22.56.1020; and

F. That no written protest to the proposed parking permit has been received within 14 calendar days following the date on the notice sent by the director pursuant to Section 22.56.1050

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for a Coastal Development Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.2410, Title 22, of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), for a Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.090 of the Zoning Ordinance, for a Variance as set forth in Section 22.56.290 of the Zoning Ordinance, and for a Parking Permit as set forth in Section 22.56.1020 of the Zoning Ordinance.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and

DRAFT

2. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission; and

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project; and

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Parking Permit No. 200500011, subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 200500032
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project, the applicant is requesting approval of OTP No. 200500032 to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable

and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, is a related request to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

   (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

   (b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

   (c) 143 open space lots;

   (d) 2 public park (active) lots;

   (e) 4 private recreation lots;

   (f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

   (g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

   (h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

   (i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

   The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

DRAFT

6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

7. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

8. OTP No. 200500043 is a related request to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

DRAFT

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

    In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

    Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the

DRAFT

Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by

the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, Traffic/Access, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain

DRAFT

Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significantand unavoidable impacts in:

(a) Biota
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(d) Air Quality
(e) Solid Waste Services; and
(f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally each of the significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010, to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of SCOPE, who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway

and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

DRAFT

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

DRAFT

30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve, and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that

there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

35. In conjunction with the EIR and OTP process, the applicant has submitted an oak tree report prepared by a certified arborist that identifies 63 oak trees, including 3 heritage oaks, located in the area of the Magic Mountain Parkway extension within the Mission Village project site, regulated by the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The identified trees include those oak trees located within 200 feet of the proposed grading limits and excludes those located within the project site though outside the Magic Mountain Parkway extension area. (Impacts to oak trees located within the project site but outside the Magic Mountain Parkway extension area are addressed separately in Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043.) The arborist's report was prepared by Impact Sciences, Inc., and is dated December 2006, as revised November 26, 2007, March 2010, August 2010, and December 23, 2010.

36. Development of the project would result in the removal of 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees), and the encroachment into the protected zones of 2 additional oak trees (neither of which are heritage trees).

37. Development of Mission Village, including construction of the Magic Mountain Parkway extension, will not endanger the health of the remaining trees located on the property since these trees are located outside of the area that will be disturbed for the construction of the road. Additionally, protective fencing not less than four feet in height will be placed at the limits of the protective zone of any individual oak tree or dense stand of oak trees within 200 feet of the grading limits for the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway and will be inspected by the forester and/or fire warden to ensure full protection of the health of the remaining trees located on the property. After the completion of the development and the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, the trees will continue to exist without being disturbed.

38. The removal of the 11 oak trees and the encroachment into the protected zone of the 2 oak trees will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposed

DRAFT

project incorporates drainage and water quality plans which are designed to protect development, manage drainage and control pollutant run-off. The features of these plans are intended to blend into the community as an extension of the landscaping. All drainage entering and originating within the project area will be collected and controlled by the constructed drainage system to ensure no increase in site erosion. Additionally, surface water flows associated with construction of the easterly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway will be controlled through drainage controls approved by the Department of Public Works.

39. The removal and encroachment of the referenced oak trees is necessary due to design criteria and existing improvements, which limit the alignment of the proposed roadway, which is a County designated Master Plan highway. The continued existence of the oak trees at their present location presents significant obstacles to the planned improvements. Furthermore, to retain the oak trees on the subject property would prevent the construction of a County designated Master Plan highway; an alternative route would be cost prohibitive and fail to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The configuration of the extension of Magic Mountain parkway was determined based on a number of factors including feasible engineering design, traffic needs and topography, and to meet these standards, removals and encroachments on the oak trees were necessary.

40. The removal of the 11 oak trees and encroachment into the protected zone of the 2 oak trees will not be contrary to or be in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the oak tree permit procedure. The removal of the oak trees is necessary to facilitate the development of portions of the project described above, and the applicant will mitigate the removal of the trees by planting a total of 46 trees in an area determined to be suitable for the oaks. Therefore, the oak resources are protected, while allowing the development to commence as proposed.

41. The Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, has reviewed the oak tree report and determined that the document is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition, and species of the oak trees on the site. The County Forester has recommended approval of the requested removals and encroachments, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement trees to be provided at a ratio of 2:1 for each tree removed and 10:1 for each Heritage oak tree removed, for a total of 46 mitigation trees.

42. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328

DRAFT

notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map, and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

43. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. Construction of the proposed land use will be accomplished without endangering the health of any remaining trees on the property that are subject to Part 16 of Chapter 22.56 of the Los Angeles County Code;

B. The removal of the 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees) will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated;

C. Removal of 11 oak trees (including 3 heritage trees) and the encroachment into the protected zone of 2 additional oak trees is necessary as continued existence at their present locations frustrates the planned improvement or proposed use of the property to such an extent that placement of the trees precludes the reasonable and efficient use of such property for a use otherwise authorized and the oak trees proposed for removal interfere with highways both within and outside the subject property, and no reasonable alternative to such interference exists other than removal of the trees; and

DRAFT

D. The removal of the oak trees will not be contrary to or in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the Oak Tree Permit procedures of the County.

The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for an oak tree permit, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Title 22, Part 16 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), including, but not limited to, Section 22.56.2100.

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

2. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project;

3. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

4. Approves Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, subject to the attached conditions.

FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 200500043
MISSION VILLAGE
(A PORTION OF NEWHALL RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN)

1. On May 27, 2003, the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles ("County") approved the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan ("Specific Plan"), which authorized development of the approximately 11,999-acre property for 20,885 dwelling units with 423 second units; 629 acres of mixed-use development; 67 acres of commercial uses; 249 acres of community parks, 869 acres of other Open Areas, and 5,159 acres of open space within two approved Special Management Areas/Significant Ecological Areas ("SMA/SEA"); two fire stations; one public library; one electrical substation; reservation of five elementary schools, one junior high school and one high school sites; a 6.8-million gallon per day Newhall Ranch Water Reclamation Plant ("WRP"); and other associated community facilities, such as roads and bridges.

2. The County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map ("VTTM") No. 61105, Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") No. 200500080, CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit ("OTP") No. 200500032, OTP No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011 and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001 on November 10, 2010, March 16, 2011, and May 18, 2011.

3. The proposed project ("Mission Village") is located within the boundary of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and represents the second phase of development of the Specific Plan (following Landmark Village). As part of the Mission Village project, the applicant is requesting approval of OTP No. 200500043 to authorize the removal of 143 oak trees from the project site, including 8 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 50 oak trees.

4. The Mission Village project, as revised, creates a mixed-use community of 4,055 residential units (351 single-family units and 3,704 multi-family units); 1,555,100 square feet of mixed-use/commercial space; approximately 693 acres of open space, including 26.8 acres for public parks, 14.7 acres for private recreational facilities, and 85.8 acres in three spineflower preserves connected to open space; a 9.5-acre elementary school; 3.3-acre library; 1.5-acre fire station; and 1.2-acre bus transfer station. Mission Village also includes facilities and infrastructure to support the project, including roads (including the Commerce Center Drive Bridge), trails, drainage improvements, flood protection (including buried bank stabilization within and adjacent to the Santa Clara River), potable

DRAFT

and recycled water systems (including water tanks), sanitary sewer system and dry utility systems to be developed in compliance with the provisions of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan (May 27, 2003).

The Mission Village includes several off-site project-related improvements (i.e., improvements outside the tract boundary, a portion of which is also located outside of the Specific Plan boundary), including: utility corridor, Magic Mountain Parkway roadway extension and related improvements, a water quality basin, three water tanks (portions of 2 would be located on site), a Southern California Edison (SCE) electrical substation, and two debris basins. Additional off-site improvements include work associated with the Lion Canyon drainage, grading associated with construction of the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway and southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, and miscellaneous grading to tie proposed grades into natural grades.

5. VTTM No. 61105, as revised, proposes to subdivide the Mission Village tract map site into a total of 621 lots, including:

   (a) 351 single family lots, 36 multi-family lots, 5 apartment/condominium lots, 2 mixed use/residential (including 66,400 sq. ft. of commercial uses), and 1 continued care retirement lot, for the development of 4,055 residential dwelling units (351 single-family units, and 3,704 multi-family units);

   (b) 11 mixed-use commercial lots for the development of up to 1,555,100 square feet (including the 66,400 sq. ft. referenced above) of office, retail and service uses;

   (c) 143 open space lots;

   (d) 2 public park (active) lots;

   (e) 4 private recreation lots;

   (f) 5 spineflower preserve lots;

   (g) 4 public facility lots, including 1 school lot, 1 library lot, 1 fire station lot, and 1 bus transfer station lot;

   (h) 14 utility-related lots (including water quality basins, water tanks, and wastewater pump stations); and

   (i) 43 transportation-related lots (public, private, and bridge roadways).

   The Exhibit Map, which accompanies VTTM No. 61105, depicts conceptual site development plans. Revised site plans to depict changes to the conceptual site plan shall be subject to the provisions of Section 5.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

DRAFT

6. CUP No. 200500080 (SEA) is a related request to ensure that project-level improvements within the SEA are consistent with the Board's previously approved CUP No. 94-087 (SEA).

7. CUP No. 200500081 is a related request to authorize the development of 73 second dwelling units, continued care retirement community with 351 dwelling units, on-site and off-site grading associated with VTTM No. 061105, water tanks and on-site infrastructure.

8. Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032 is a related request to authorize the removal of 11 oak trees in connection with construction of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, including 3 heritage oaks. The request also is to permit encroachment within the protected zone, due to potential impacts from construction, of an additional 2 oak trees.

9. Parking Permit No. 200500011 is a related request to authorize off-site and reciprocal parking for lots within the Village Center.

10. Substantial Conformance Determination No. 201000001 is a related request made pursuant to Section 5.2.2 of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan for a determination that VTTM No. 61105 would substantially conform to the standards, regulations, and guidelines of the Specific Plan relative to the following: (a) Grading and Hillside Management Guidelines (determination of conformance with Specific Plan Section 4.8 for areas to be graded with an average slope of 25% or greater); (b) modification to setback standards (to allow specific Village Center lots to be designed with a minimum 0-foot front yard setback; and (c) modification to proposed trail widths (adjustment of 12-foot wide trail section to eight-feet width).

11. The Mission Village project site, consisting of 1,854.6 gross acres (or rounded to approximately 1,855 acres), is located south of the Santa Clara River and SR-126, east of the Ventura County boundary and west of Interstate 5 ("I-5"), within the northeast corner of the approved Newhall Ranch Specific Plan in the Newhall Zoned District. The project site is comprised of the Mission Village tract map, which is 1,261.8 acres in size, and the off-site project related improvements area, which is 592.8 acres in size.

    Approximately 39.1 acres of VTTM No. 61105 are located outside the Specific Plan boundaries. VTTM No. 61105 consists of parcels 11, 12, 13, 22 and a portion of parcel 14 of the previously recorded Parcel Map No. 24500-01 and a portion of the Rancho San Francisco. Approximately 338.9 acres of the off-site project-related improvements are located outside of the Specific Plan boundaries.

DRAFT

12. The Specific Plan is divided in five "villages," and Mission Village occupies approximately 70 percent of one of those villages, which are referred to as Mesas.

13. The property is irregular in shape with variable sloping terrain. It is unimproved, but currently is utilized for agricultural activity. The project site (including the tract map area and off-site improvements) contains sensitive biological resources and habitat types, including special-status species, all of which have been described and evaluated in the Mission Village Draft Environmental Impact Report ("Draft EIR;" October 2010) and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR;" May 2011). The Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site, is within the previously approved River Corridor SMA/SEA 23. Historically, the project site was used for agricultural activity and related storage. Portions of the project site also have been used for cattle grazing and oil and gas production.

14. Access to the Mission Village project site is provided by SR-126 along the north of the project site, the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway extension to the east, and Westridge Parkway to the south. The western portion of the project site is accessible via existing agricultural roads. Connections to the proposed roads within the project site will be provided by the southerly extension of Commerce Center Drive, the westerly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway, and the northerly extension of Westridge Parkway.

15. The project site is located immediately southeast of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River, which forms the northern boundary of the project site. The Travel Village Recreational Vehicle ("RV") Park, SR-126, and Valencia Commerce Center are off-site and further to the north. The eastern site boundary abuts Six Flags Magic Mountain Theme Park and undeveloped land. Further to the east are an existing water reclamation plant (Valencia WRP), a California Highway Patrol station, hotels, restaurants, and service stations. To the south, outside of Newhall Ranch, is undeveloped land within the existing community of Westridge further to the southeast and the proposed Legacy Village (formerly Stevenson Ranch Phase V) further to the south. Undeveloped land within Newhall Ranch exists to the west of the project site, within the proposed Landmark Village northwest of the confluence of Castaic Creek and the Santa Clara River.

16. The subject property is zoned primarily "Specific Plan" ("SP"), although the areas within the Rancho San Francisco currently are zoned A-2-5. The SP zoning of the property became effective on June 26, 2003, following the adoption of Ordinance No. 2003-0031Z, which established Zone Case No. 94-087-(5). The zone change was associated with the approval of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

DRAFT

17. Approximately 57.8 million cubic yards of grading are proposed in a balanced cut and fill operation (28.9 million cubic yards of cut and 28.9 million cubic yards of fill) which includes grading for on-site and off-site improvements. In addition, 479,000 cubic yards of grading (372,000 cubic yards of cut and 107,000 cubic yards of fill) are proposed for one of the two Southern California Edison substation alternate locations.

18. With the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Newhall Ranch Master Trails Plan, which encompasses a comprehensive system of trails throughout the Specific Plan area, and provides potential connection points to regional trail systems within the Santa Clarita Valley. The Mission Village Trails Plan implements the Specific Plan's objective of providing a hierarchy of trails with varying sizes and functionality, providing an extensive community trail system throughout the project site, including pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails, which would be linked to the Santa Clara Regional River Trail (off-site to the northwest) via the extension of other local trails and paseos.

19. Utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, gravity sewer, force main, irrigation, cable, gas, fiber optics, and recycled water lines, will be constructed and installed to serve the Mission Village project.

    In order to provide future residents with access to alternative modes of transportation, VTTM No. 61105 includes a 1.2-acre transit site for development of a bus transfer station in the Village Center area of Mission Village. Development of this site facilitates local bus service and provides connection points for express bus operation within the Mission Village area.

20. Project buildout currently is planned to occur over several years, with full buildout not expected until 2021. Since market conditions and consumer needs historically change over time, a certain amount of flexibility is necessary in the specific type of residential units that ultimately would be built in order to assure the best mix of residential housing to meet changing market demands. Similarly, as to commercial uses, it is difficult to forecast with a high degree of certainty over the extended duration of project buildout the specific type of office uses and tenant space requirements that will be in demand as each segment of the project is developed.

    Flexibility has been incorporated into the Specific Plan to respond to those changes in demand and economic marketplace. Section 5.2.2.e (Amendments to the Tentative Subdivision Maps) of the Specific Plan allows subsequent changes to the approved tentative map through an Amended Exhibit Map process pursuant to Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance. The Amended exhibit map shall be approved only if the map is determined by the Director to be in substantial conformance with the approved map. Section 5.2.5

DRAFT

of the Specific Plan (Adjustment/Transfer/Conversion Provisions) provides standards for dwelling unit transfers, as well as other types of adjustments, including residential and non-residential building square footage transfers and conversions.

Flexibility is allowed for lots 158, 161, 162, 361, 376, 380, 381, 384-387, 396 (fire access), 397-407, 411, 427, 434, 439, 442, 443, 445, 447, 480-484, 508-532, 621 and associated private drives CC, DD, EE, FF, II, JJ, KK, LL1, LL2, NN, OO, PP, SS, TT, YY, ZZ. The flexibility includes the ability to: build condominiums rather than apartments, and vice versa; build detached housing units rather than attached units; alter residential building type and location within a designated planning area; change the location of driveways, driveway widths, driveway alignments, driveway entries and change the private drive alignments and location; change lot configurations; and, change commercial building type and location within a planning area. However, this flexibility will be limited. The total dwelling unit count, and commercial square footage, as shown on VTTM No. 61105 and the accompanying site plan exhibit maps, set a maximum cap that cannot be exceeded without additional approvals or modifications to the project. That is, project buildout would not exceed 3,704 multi-family dwelling units and 1,555,100 total commercial square feet. In addition, the open space and recreational acreages shown on VTTM No. 61105 will not be reduced.

The increase in the number of units or square footage of commercial space in the lots mentioned above depends on the decrease in another lot. An increase in the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage on a particular lot may be allowed if such increase does not exceed 20 percent of the number of multi-family residential units and commercial square footage allowed for that lot as approved by VTTM No. 61105. The designated land use category in each lot shall not change (i.e. lots designated as Mixed-Use shall remain Mixed-Use, lots designated as Medium Residential shall remain Medium Residential, lots designated as Open Area shall remain Open Area.)

Therefore, the subsequent changes to the tentative map will be subject to Section 5.2.2.e and 5.2.5 of the Specific Plan, and consistent with the environmental analysis in the project EIR. The changes on the map will be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Committee through the Amended Exhibit Map process prescribed in Section 21.16.15 of the County Subdivision Ordinance.

21. A program-level EIR was certified with adoption of the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan, which found that there would be significant unavoidable impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, visual resources, air quality, and solid waste disposal. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the Board of Supervisors, which concluded that there were significant overriding

benefits with approval of the Specific Plan. Public benefits include preservation of nearly 1,000 acres of the Santa Clara River; about 4,200 acres of the High Country SMA/SEA 20; approximately 1,517 acres of the Salt Creek area and other Open Areas; preservation of the River Corridor SMA/SEA 23 to retain significant riparian vegetation and habitat; the development of over 50 miles of trails including portions of the Santa Clara River Trail; and provisions for improved parks, schools, fire stations, and 2,200 affordable homes.

22. There has been substantial outreach to the surrounding community regarding the Mission Village project. The applicant has presented the project on several occasions to the West Ranch Town Council and one occasion to the Castaic Area Town Council.

23. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Pub. Resources Code §§ 21000 *et seq.*), CEQA Guidelines § 15063, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the County prepared an Initial Study for the Mission Village project. The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects of the project on the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources
Air Quality
Biota
Cultural/Paleontological Resources
Education
Environmental Safety
Fire Protection Services
Floodplain Modifications
Geotechnical/ Soil Resources
Global Climate Change
Hydrology
Library Services
Mineral Resources
Noise
Parks and Recreation
Sheriff Services
Solid Waste Disposal
Traffic/Access
Utilities
Visual Qualities
Wastewater Disposal
Water Quality
Water Service

Therefore, a project-level environmental impact report ("EIR") was required.

24. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and County Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared for the Mission Village project. The Draft EIR concluded that potential impacts were found to be less than significant with mitigation in the following impact categories: Geotechnical and Soil Resources, Hydrology, Traffic/Access, Water Service, Wastewater Disposal, Sheriff Services, Fire Protection Services, Education, Parks and Recreation, Library Services, Utilities, Mineral Resources, Environmental Safety, Cultural/Paleontological Resources, Floodplain

Modifications, Water Quality, and Global Climate Change. The Draft EIR also concluded that the project will result in significantand unavoidable impacts in:

(a) Biota;
(b) Visual Qualities;
(c) Noise;
(d) Air Quality;
(e) Solid Waste Services; and
(f) Agricultural Resources.

The significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR are all within the scope of the impacts analyzed in the certified Program EIR for the Specific Plan. Additionally each of the significant and unavoidable impact categories, with the exception of noise, was previously identified and included in the Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the certified Program EIR for the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan.

25. The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days from October 8, 2010 to November 21, 2010. At the November 10, 2010 public hearing, the Commission extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (for a total of a 99-day public comment period.)

26. Comments and recommendations from County departments and other agencies consulted during the environmental review process include the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Transportation, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, and City of Santa Clarita. Other agencies and organizations that have provided correspondence include, among others, the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, County of Ventura, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Sierra Club, California Water Network, Center for Biological Diversity, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment ("SCOPE"), Tri-County Watchdogs, and Friends of the Santa Clara River.

27. The project was presented to the Commission at a public hearing held November 10, 2010. At the hearing, the Commission heard the staff report, the applicant presented testimony regarding the project, and public testimony was presented by a representative of SCOPE, who requested that the Draft EIR public review period be extended.

Staff added that the applicant needed to address outstanding issues with the Department of Public Works (Public Works) regarding the Tentative Map. The issues include that the applicant shall record an easement for the necessary off-site regional sewer improvement, and easement for the off-site grading and full improvements on the alignments of the extension of Magic Mountain Parkway

and Westridge Parkway; that the applicant shall obtain a will serve letter from the Sanitation District to use the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant while the Newhall Water Reclamation Plant is not operational; and that the applicant shall provide detailed information regarding an agreement with Caltrans for mitigation of impacts to the state freeway system.

After discussion, the Commission continued the item to March 16, 2011 and extended the public comment period for the EIR to January 4, 2011 (total 99-day public comment period) to allow interested parties additional time to review and provide comments on the project and its DEIR and to allow the applicant to address outstanding issues with Public Works and address the following topics: (i) whether the applicant's request to adjust Specific Plan trail widths from 12-feet to 8-feet is warranted; (ii) whether the applicant's request for a zero setback in the Village Center is justified; (iii) whether the project includes sufficient upland infiltration; and (iv) whether pile-driving activities can be replaced with a quieter method; (v) whether the applicant should mitigate oak tree impacts by in kind planting or mitigation fee; and (vi) whether the project should include a trail head.

The Commission also directed staff to provide additional information on the following topics: (i) improvements within the SEA and river buffer; and (ii) development transfer among Specific Plan implementation phases.

28. On December 15, 2010, the project applicant submitted a revised VTTM No. 61105 to County staff for review. The map was revised in response to the December 3, 2010 approval by the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG") of the Newhall Ranch Resource Management and Development Plan/Spineflower Conservation Plan ("RMDP/SCP"), which includes within its boundaries the area encompassed by VTTM No. 61105. As approved by CDFG, the RMDP/SCP designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve on the VTTM No. 61105 site; this represents an increase of approximately 20.2 acres over the amount of spineflower preserve acreage designated on prior VTTM No. 61105 (November 24, 2009). As a result of the increased spineflower acreage and the enhanced connectivity to open space, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, consistent with the approved RMDP/SCP. Specifically, as revised, VTTM No. 61105 includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (351 single-family dwellings and 3,704 multi-family units); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged from the prior map. Under the prior VTTM No. 61105 (dated November 24, 2009), the Mission Village unit count was 4,412 dwelling units. With the increased spineflower preserve/connectivity, the project was reduced in size by a total of 357 dwelling units.

In summary, the changes to the map are as follows:

DRAFT

- Residential Dwelling Units: The total number of residential dwelling units has decreased from 4,412 to 4,055, a decrease of 357 total units. The number of single-family units decreased by 31 units from 382 to 351 units and the number of multi-family units decreased by 326 units from 4,030 to 3,704 units.
- Development/Grading Footprint: The size of the development/grading footprint on the project site decreased by 21.6 acres (two percent decrease). The total amount of grading associated with the proposed project decreased by one million cubic yards, from 29.9 to 28.9 million cubic yards.
- Spineflower Preserves: The number of lots dedicated to San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves has increased from two lots to five lots. Total land area dedicated for preserves increased from 65.6 acres to 85.8 acres.
- Oak Trees: Oak tree surveys were completed for the Mission Village Tract Map site and related offsite improvements including the extension of the Magic Mountain Parkway from its present terminus west to Mission Village Tract Map site. When all these areas are considered, a total of 564 trees are protected by County Ordinance. Of that total, 154 trees would be removed, 52 trees would be encroached upon, and 358 trees would not be impacted. On just the Tract Map site, utility corridor and Edison substation sites, 501 trees are protected, 143 trees would be removed, 50 trees would be encroached upon, and 308 trees would not be impacted. On the Magic Mountain Extension site, 63 trees are protected, 11 trees would be removed, two trees would be encroached upon, and 50 trees would not be impacted. With the revised project, the total number of trees to be removed would decrease by four from 158 to 154 trees. The total number of trees to be encroached on would increase by one from 51 to 52 trees.
- Open Space: The total land area dedicated to open space-related land use categories, which includes public and private parks, San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves, river area, and graded and ungraded lots, would increase under the revised project from approximately 636 acres to 693 acres. This is an increase in open space of approximately 57 acres (or an increase of approximately nine percent). This increased open space area includes the additional spineflower preserves (approximately 20.2 acres) which are described above and, un-graded and graded open space (36.8 acres). While the amount of River area decreased by 4.4 acres, from 217.0 to 212.6 acres, this area (4.4 acres) is now within one of the new San Fernando Valley spineflower preserves.

29. On January 13, 2011, the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee held a public meeting to consider the applicant's proposed revisions to VTTM No. 61105. The Committee issued conditions of approval and cleared the map.

30. At the continued public hearing on March 16, 2011, no members of the public provided testimony. The Commission heard and granted the applicant's request that the public hearing be continued to provide the applicant with additional time to complete its responses to the Commission's request for additional information made at the November 10, 2010 hearing. The March 16, 2011, hearing was continued to May 18, 2011.

31. At the Commission's regularly-scheduled meeting held March 22, 2011, during the public comment portion of the meeting, a representative of SCOPE read a letter dated March 16, 2011, regarding the project's potential effect on chloride levels in the Santa Clara River.

32. In May 2011, the Mission Village Final EIR (May 2011) was completed in accordance with CEQA. The "Mission Village Final EIR" is comprised of the following: (a) Draft EIR (October 2010), Volumes I-XX; and (b) Final EIR (May 2011), Volumes I-VII (collectively, "Final EIR"). The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR, all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments, technical appendices to the Draft and Final EIR, revised Draft EIR pages, and other information. The Final EIR also includes additional and revised mitigation measures that reduce the previously identified significant and unavoidable noise and biota impacts to a less than significant level. Department staff sent the Final EIR to the Commission for review and made it available to state and local agencies, organizations, and other interested parties.

The Mission Village Draft EIR (October 2010) analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with development of 4,412 dwelling units (382 single-family dwellings and 4,030 multi-family units) and 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use/commercial development on the proposed project site. Included within the proposed project as described was a 65.6-acre spineflower preserve.

Subsequent to circulation of the Draft EIR, and as previously referenced, the CDFG approved the Newhall Ranch RMDP/SCP, which designates 85.8 acres of spineflower preserve and enhanced connectivity to open space, on the Mission Village project site, an increase of 20.2 acres over the amount designated in the Draft EIR. As a result of the increased spineflower acreage/connectivity, the development component of the proposed Mission Village project has been reduced in size, and now includes a total of 4,055 dwelling units (a reduction of 357 dwelling units compared to the original, proposed Mission Village project); the 1.55 million square feet of mixed-use commercial development is unchanged. The revised project is consistent with the Mission Village project originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, however, the reduction in density and increase in preserved area is an improvement over the original proposal. The Final EIR clarifies the revisions to the Mission Village project and confirms that

there are no new or increased impacts from the project revisions, but rather that the project revisions further lessen the significance of any potential impacts.

33. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan consistent with the conclusions and recommendations of the Mission Village Final EIR has been prepared. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan identifies in detail the manner in which compliance with the measures adopted to mitigate or avoid potential significant impacts of the project is ensured, and its requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for the project.

34. [Hold for May 18, 2011 continued public hearing proceedings.]

35. In conjunction with the EIR and OTP process, the applicant has submitted an oak tree report prepared by a certified arborist that identifies 501 on-site oak trees, including 29 heritage oaks, located within the Mission Village project site and associated offsite improvements, regulated by the County Oak Tree Ordinance. The identified trees include those oak trees located within 200 feet of the proposed grading limits and excludes those located within the area of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway. The arborist's report was prepared by Impact Sciences, Inc., and is dated December 2006, as revised November 26, 2007, March 2010, and December 23, 2010. (Impacts to oak trees located within the area of the off-site extension of Magic Mountain Parkway are addressed separately in Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032.)

36. Development of the project would result in the removal of 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees), and the encroachment into the protected zones of 50 additional oak trees (including 2 heritage trees). (Six of the 143 oak trees to be removed also are included within the Oak Tree Permit (OTP00-196) for Landmark Village.)

37. Development of Mission Village will not endanger the health of the remaining trees located on the property since these trees are located outside of the area that will be disturbed for the construction of the project. Additionally, protective fencing not less than four feet in height will be placed at the limits of the protective zone of any individual oak tree or dense stand of oak trees within 200 feet of the grading limits and will be inspected by the forester and/or fire warden to ensure full protection of the health of the remaining trees located on the property. After the completion of the development, the trees will continue to exist without being disturbed.

38. The removal of the 143 oak trees and the encroachment into the protected zones of the 50 oak trees will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposed project incorporates drainage and water quality plans which are

designed to protect development, manage drainage and control pollutant run-off. The features of these plans are intended to blend into the community as an extension of the landscaping. All drainage entering and originating within the project area will be collected and controlled by the constructed drainage system to ensure no increase in site erosion. Additionally, surface water flows associated with construction of the easterly extension of Magic Mountain Parkway will be controlled through drainage controls approved by the Department of Public Works.

39. The removal and encroachment of the referenced oak trees is necessary due to site constraints such as topography and drainage, to enable project grading and the construction of proposed roads, water quality or debris basins, and other related and necessary improvements. The oak trees proposed for removal are located in areas of the property where their continued existence would preclude the development of the property in an efficient manner. Natural resources, including oak trees, were evaluated in the preparation of a development plan which limited the impacts to such resources while allowing for development authorized by the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan. The proposed project clusters development to avoid impacts to on-site resources such as spineflower, the Santa Clara River and other areas with oak trees. However, the project site contains steep topography and requires extensive grading to create a viable community. Grading is required for geotechnical stability, access and site balance and results in the removal of 143 oak trees, and encroachment into the protected zone of an additional 50 oak trees.

40. The Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden, Forestry Division, has reviewed the oak tree report and determined that the document is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition, and species of the oak trees on the site. The County Forester has recommended approval of the requested removals and encroachments, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement trees to be provided at a ratio of 2:1 for each tree removed and 10:1 for each Heritage oak tree removed, for a total of 350 mitigation trees.

41. Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper and property posting. Additionally, the project was noticed and case materials were available on the County Department of Regional Planning website and at libraries located in the vicinity of the project site. Approximately 328 notices of public hearing and completion and availability of the DEIR were mailed to property owners within a 1,000-foot radius of the subject property as well as additional notices to those on the courtesy mailing list for projects in the Newhall and Castaic Canyon Zoned Districts. The public hearing notice was published in The Signal on October 6, 2010, and La Opinion on October 7, 2010. The Draft EIR and project materials, including a vesting tentative tract map, exhibit map,

DRAFT

and draft conditions, were available for review at the Newhall Library, Valencia Library, and Castaic Library beginning October 8, 2010. On October 7, 2010, three large public hearing notice boards, eight feet wide by four feet high, were posted on the subject property at the north end of Westridge Parkway, west end of Magic Mountain Parkway and south end of Commerce Center Drive (At Henry Mayo Drive).

42. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1328, Los Angeles, California 90012, and the offices of the County's EIR consultant, Impact Sciences, Inc., 803 Camarillo Road, Suite A, Camarillo, California 93012. The custodian of such documents is the Section Head of the Special Projects Section, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:

A. Construction of the proposed land use will be accomplished without endangering the health of any remaining trees on the property that are subject to Part 16 of Chapter 22.56 of the Los Angeles County Code;

B. The removal of the 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees) will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated;

C. Removal of 143 oak trees (including 8 heritage trees) and the encroachment into the protected zone of 50 additional oak trees (including 2 heritage trees) is necessary as continued existence at their present locations frustrates the planned improvement or proposed use of the property to such an extent that alternative development plans cannot achieve the same permitted density and efficient use since the project site contains steep topography and requires extensive grading to create a viable community; and.

D. The removal of the oak trees will not be contrary to or in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the Oak Tree Permit procedures of the County.

The information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for an oak tree permit, as set forth in the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan and Title 22, Part 16 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance), including, but not limited to, Section 22.56.2100.

DRAFT

THEREFORE, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines; certifies that the Commission has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and "CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project," CUP No. 200500080 (SEA), CUP No. 200500081, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500032, Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, Parking Permit No. 200500011, and Substantial Conformance Review No. 201000001; and certifies that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

2. Certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, and that the environmental documentation reflects the independent judgment of the Commission;

3. Determines that with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures discussed in the Final EIR and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, the Mission Village project's significant environmental effects are reduced to less-than-significant levels except for certain specified unavoidable effects, which have been reduced to an acceptable level and are outweighed by the benefits of the project as identified in the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project;

4. Certifies the Final EIR as adequate under CEQA, adopts the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Mission Village Project and Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and, pursuant to section 21081.6 of Public Resources Code, finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated herein by reference, is adequately designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation; and

5. Approves Oak Tree Permit No. 200500043, subject to the attached conditions.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT D

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision: TR 61105 Map Date December 15, 2010

C.U.P. _____ Vicinity 3056C

☐ **FIRE DEPARTMENT HOLD** on the tentative map shall remain until verification from the Los Angeles County Fire Dept. Planning Section is received, stating adequacy of service. Contact (323) 881–2404.

☒ Access shall comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code, which requires all weather access. All weather access may require paving.

☒ Fire Department access shall be extended to within 150 feet distance of any exterior portion of all structures.

☒ Where driveways extend further than 150 feet and are of single access design, turnarounds suitable for fire protection equipment use shall be provided and shown on the final map. Turnarounds shall be designed, constructed and maintained to insure their integrity for Fire Department use. Where topography dictates, turnarounds shall be provided for driveways that extend over 150 feet in length.

☒ The private driveways shall be indicated on the final map as "Private Driveway and Firelane" with the widths clearly depicted. Driveways shall be maintained in accordance with the Fire Code.

☒ Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants. All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction.

☒ This property is located within the area described by the Fire Department as "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" (formerly Fire Zone 4). A "Fuel Modification Plan" shall be submitted and approved prior to final map clearance. (Contact: Fuel Modification Unit, Fire Station #32, 605 North Angeleno Avenue, Azusa, CA 91702-2904, Phone (626) 969-5205 for details).

☒ Provide Fire Department or City approved street signs and building access numbers prior to occupancy.

☐ Additional fire protection systems shall be installed in lieu of suitable access and/or fire protection water.

☐ The final concept map, which has been submitted to this department for review, has fulfilled the conditions of approval recommended by this department for access only.

☐ These conditions must be secured by a C.U.P. and/or Covenant and Agreement approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department prior to final map clearance.

☐ The Fire Department has no additional requirements for this division of land.

Comments: **THE FIRE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT AS PRESENTLY SUBMITTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. (see additional page for details)**

By Inspector: Juan C. Padilla Date February 22, 2011

Land Development Unit – Fire Prevention Division – (323) 890-4243, Fax (323) 890-9783

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - UNICORPORATED

Subdivision No. TR 61105 Tentative Map Date December 15, 2010

Revised Report YES

☐ The County Forester and Fire Warden is prohibited from setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted. However, water requirements may be necessary at the time of building permit issuance.

☒ The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at the single family dwellings locations is **1250** gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 2 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 1 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.

☒ The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at the detach condos/duplex locations is **1500** gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 2 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 1 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.

☒ The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at the multi-family/commercial locations is **5000** gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of 5 hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. 3 Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.

☒ The required fire flow for private on-site hydrants is **2500** gallons per minute at 20 psi. Each private on-site hydrant must be capable of flowing **1250** gallons per minute at 20 psi with two hydrants flowing simultaneously, one of which must be the furthest from the public water source.

☒ Fire hydrant requirements are as follows:

Install 217 public fire hydrant(s).

Install ____ private on-site fire hydrant(s).

☒ All hydrants shall measure 6"x 4"x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal. All on-site hydrants shall be installed a minimum of 25' feet from a structure or protected by a two (2) hour rated firewall.
- ☒ Location: As per map on file with the office.
- ☒ Other location: ____

☒ All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted or bonded for prior to Final Map approval. Vehicular access shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.

☐ The County of Los Angeles Fire Department is not setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted.

☒ Additional water system requirements will be required when this land is further subdivided and/or during the building permit process.

☐ Hydrants and fire flows are adequate to meet current Fire Department requirements.

☐ Upgrade not necessary, if existing hydrant(s) meet(s) fire flow requirements. Submit original water availability form to our office.

Comments: **The required fire hydrants shall be installed and tested or bonded for prior to Final Map clearance. The required fire flow of 5000 gpm may be reduced at which time the final design plans are submitted to the Fire Department for review as architectural drawings or revised Exhibit A as the CUP process.**

All hydrants shall be installed in conformance with Title 20, County of Los Angeles Government Code and County of Los Angeles Fire Code, or appropriate city regulations. This shall include minimum six-inch diameter mains. Arrangements to meet these requirements must be made with the water purveyor serving the area.

By Inspector JuanC Padilla Date February 22, 2011

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

LAND DEVELOPMENT UNIT REQUIREMENTS
ADDITIONAL PAGE

Subdivision No: TR 61105 **Map Date:** December 15, 2010

TENTATIVE MAP – CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1 The proposed raised medians for Magic Mountain Parkway and all gated entrances on page 6 are missing. The medians shall be clearly depicted on all future road/street improvement plans and comply with the following condition of approval:
All raised center medians shall provide a break, a rolled curb, or curb depression at intervals determined by Public Works in consultation with the Fire Department. The location and distance between the median breaks will be determined by Public Works and the Fire Department during final road/street plan design. Road improvement plans must be forwarded to the Fire Department for review and approval prior to final Public Works approval for construction.

2 Flag lots shall provide a minimum paved unobstructed driveway width of 20', clear to the sky. This driveway shall provide a reciprocal access agreement if access is shared. Compliance is required prior to Final Map clearance.

3 The Fire Department's Planning Division has approved the fire station site for this project with the following conditions:
- Developer must enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Fire District that includes the operational date of the station prior to the issuance of any building permits.
- Developer to construct a minimum 13,500 square foot turnkey, fully operational fire station to the Fire District's specifications. The Developer is responsible for all on-site and off-site improvements the Fire District deems necessary for the operation of the station.
- Developer to equip the station with one pumper engine and one ladder truck to the Fire District's specifications.
- All other details to be clearly definced in the Agreement between the Developer and the District.

EXHIBIT MAP – CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

4 Fire lanes where parking is proposed shall comply with the following:
- driveway width of 34' will allow parking on one side
- driveway width of 36' will allow parking on both side

5 Buildings being served by a 26' wide Private Driveway and Fire Lane will have a height restriction not to exceed 35'. Buildings that are 35' in height or greater shall provide a minimum paved driveway width of 28'. Such driveway shall be parallel to one side of the building, preferably the longer side.

6 Divided Fire Department access shall not be less than 20ft in width, clear to the sky.

7 Clearly depict the Fire Department turnaround dimension on the final design plan. All proposed turnarounds shall be designed to accommodate the adequate Fire Department vehicle due to the size of the building and comply with the Fire Department access standards.

8 Provide a minimum No Parking clearance of 15' on each side of the required public/private fire hydrant, indicate compliance on the final design plan. The required amount of parking spaces shall be reviewed and approved by the Department of Regional Planning. Adequate signage and/or stripping shall be required prior to occupancy.

9 All proposed roundabout shall be reviewed and approved during the architectural plan review or during the CUP approval process.

10 Final access approval, including all proposed gates, for the proposed developments within the Exhibit Maps shall be further reviewed for compliance at which time the final design plans are submitted to the Fire Department for review as architectural drawings during the building permit process or revised Exhibit A as the CUP process.

11 Fire hydrants location for the proposed development within the Exhibit Maps will be determined at which time the final design plans are submitted to the Fire Department for review as architectural drawings during the building permit process or revised Exhibit A as the CUP process.

By Inspector: JuanC Padilla Date: February 22, 2011

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – SUBDIVISION
TRACT NO. 61105 (Rev.)

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 12-15-2010
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 12-15-2010

The following reports consisting of 31 pages are the recommendations of Public Works.

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Details and notes shown on the tentative map are not necessarily approved. Any details or notes which may be inconsistent with requirements of ordinances, general conditions of approval, or Department policies must be specifically approved in other conditions, or ordinance requirements are modified to those shown on the tentative map upon approval by the Advisory agency.

2. Easements are tentatively required, subject to review by the Director of Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

3. Easements shall not be granted or recorded within areas proposed to be granted, dedicated, or offered for dedication for public streets, highways, access rights, building restriction rights, or other easements until after the final map is filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office. If easements are granted after the date of tentative approval, a subordination must be executed by the easement holder prior to the filing of the final map.

4. In lieu of establishing the final specific locations of structures on each lot/parcel at this time, the owner, at the time of issuance of a grading or building permit, agrees to develop the property in conformance with the County Code and other appropriate ordinances such as the Building Code, Plumbing Code, Grading Ordinance, Highway Permit Ordinance, Mechanical Code, Zoning Ordinance, Undergrounding of Utilities Ordinance, Water Ordinance, Sanitary Sewer and Industrial Waste Ordinance, Electrical Code, and Fire Code. Improvements and other requirements may be imposed pursuant to such codes and ordinances.

5. All easements existing at the time of final map approval must be accounted for on the approved tentative map. This includes the location, owner, purpose, and recording reference for all existing easements. If an easement is blanket or indeterminate in nature, a statement to that effect must be shown on the tentative map in lieu of its location. If all easements have not been accounted for, submit a corrected tentative map to the Department of Regional Planning for approval.

6. Adjust, relocate, and/or eliminate lot lines, lots, streets, easements, grading, geotechnical protective devices, and/or physical improvements to comply with ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the County determined the application to be complete all to the satisfaction of Public Works.

7. Prior to final approval of the tract map submit a notarized affidavit to the Director of Public Works, signed by all owners of record at the time of filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office, stating that any proposed condominium building has not been constructed or that all buildings have not been occupied or rented and that said building will not be occupied or rented until after the filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

8. Place standard condominium/residential planned development/commercial planned development/Landscape Maintenance District notes on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works. The formation of the Landscape Maintenance District for all median and parkway landscaping must be approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

9. Place standard lease purpose only notes for the apartment lots on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

10. Furnish Public Works' Street Name Unit with a list of street names acceptable to the subdivider. These names must not be duplicated within a radius of 20 miles.

11. A Mapping & Property Management Division house numbering clearance is required prior to approval of the final map.

12. The boundaries of the unit final maps shall be designed to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Department of Regional Planning.

13. The first unit of this subdivision shall be filed as Tract No. 61105-01, the second unit, Tract No. 61105-02, and the last unit, Tract No. 61105.

14. If unit filing occurs, reserve reciprocal drainage, ingress/egress, sewer, water, utilities, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the private driveways and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

15. Label driveways and multiple access strips as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

16. Reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, sewer, water, utilities, right to grade, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the common private driveways to the satisfaction of Public Works.

17. Quitclaim or relocate easements running through proposed structures.

18. Show open space note and dedicate residential construction rights over the open space lots.

19. If possible, modify the boundaries of the open space lots or add additional open space lots to include the airspace easements for sight distance to the satisfaction of the Department of Regional Planning and Public Works.

20. A final tract map must be processed through the Director of Public Works prior to being filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

21. Prior to submitting the tract map to the Director of Public Works for examination pursuant to Section 66442 of the Government Code, obtain clearances from all affected Departments and Divisions, including a clearance from the Subdivision Mapping Section of the Land Development Division of Public Works for the following mapping items; mathematical accuracy; survey analysis; and correctness of certificates, signatures, etc.

22. A final guarantee will be required at the time of filing of the final map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

23. Within 30 days of the approval date of this land use entitlement or at the time of first plan check submittal, the applicant shall deposit the sum of $2,000 (Minor Land Divisions) or $5,000 (Major Land Divisions) with Public Works to defray the cost of verifying conditions of approval for the purpose of issuing final map clearances. This deposit will cover the actual cost of reviewing conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permits, Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Vesting Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Oak Tree Permits, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring Programs and Regulatory Permits from State and Federal Agencies (Fish and Game, USF&W, Army Corps, RWQCB, etc.) as they relate to the various plan check activities and improvement plan designs. In addition, this deposit will be used to conduct site field reviews and attend meetings requested by the applicant and/or his agents for the purpose of resolving technical issues on condition compliance as they relate to improvement plan design, engineering studies, highway alignment studies and tract/parcel map boundary, title and easement issues. When 80% of the deposit is expended, the applicant will be required to provide additional funds to restore the initial deposit. Remaining balances in the deposit account will be refunded upon final map recordation.

HCW JC

Prepared by John Chin Phone (626) 458-4910 Date 01-12-2011

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
WWW.LADPW.ORG

TRACT NO: 061105

TENTATIVE MAP DATE: 12/15/10
EXHIBIT MAP DATE: 12/15/10

STORM DRAIN SECTION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, PHONE: (626) 458-4921

Prior to Improvement Plans Approval:

1. Submit a hydrology study for review and approval and comply with the requirements of the Drainage Concept / Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) plan which was conceptually approved on 01/30/08 and 02/23/10 to the satisfaction of Public Works.

2. Notify the State Department of Fish and Game prior to commencement of work within any natural drainage course. Provide a copy of the 1605 Agreement upon processing the drainage plans. If non-jurisdiction is established by the Department of Fish and Game, submit a letter of non-jurisdiction to Public Works (Land Development Division).

3. Contact the State Water Resources Control Board to determine if a Notice of Intent (NOI) and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) are required to meet National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction requirements for this site.

4. Contact the Corps of Engineers to determine if a permit is required for any proposed work within the major watercourse. Provide a copy of the 404 Permit upon processing the drainage plans. If non-jurisdiction is established by the Corps of Engineers, submit a letter of non-jurisdiction to Public Works (Land Development Division).

5. A maintenance permit is required from the State Department of Fish and Game, the Corps of Engineers, and the State Water Resources Control Board to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

6. This site is located in Zone "A" per the Federal Flood Insurance Rate Map. Obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from FEMA to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

7. Obtain and record notarized drainage covenants, in a form approved by Public Works, from all impacted offsite property owners, as determined by Public Works. By acceptance of this condition, the applicant acknowledges and agrees that this condition does not require or otherwise involve the construction or installation of an offsite improvement, and that the offsite drainage covenants referenced above do not constitute an offsite easement, license, title or interest in favor of the County. Therefore, the applicant acknowledges and agrees that the provisions of Government Code Section 66462.5 do not apply to this condition and that the County shall have no duty or obligation to acquire by negotiation or by eminent domain any land or any interest in any land in connection with this condition.

8. Department of Public Works approval for location, span, and clearance for the proposed Commerce Center Bridge spanning Santa Clara River is required prior to grading plan approval. The Commerce Center Bridge and Embankment at the north side are under a different project by Caltrans and the County.

9. The sizing, design, and final locations of the proposed SUSMP mitigation shall be addressed in the hydrology study in compliance with the Newhall Ranch Stormwater Mitigation Plan to the satisfaction of Public Works. This may require a lot configuration change, a change in the number of lots, a revised drainage concept, a revised environmental document, and/or a revised tentative map.

10. The Locations and number of catch basins in streets will vary depending on final street grades and the final hydrology analysis to be approved by Department of Public Works.

11. The non-structural utility corridor embankment is not to be maintained by LACFCD. An agreement memorializing the maintenance responsibilities must be in place to the satisfaction of Public Works.

12. Comply with the requirements of "Newhall Ranch Santa Clara River HEC-RAS Modeling Report dated December 2005 (I-5 to Ventura County Line)", "Newhall Ranch-Santa Clara River Phase 1 Fluvial Study dated March 6, 2006" approved on 04/18/06 and the approval letter from Land Development Division of LACDPW, and "Newhall Ranch Phase II River Fluvial Study" approved on 11/25/08.

13. Portions of the County Adopted Floodway (maps 43-ML23, 43-ML24, 43-ML25, 43-ML26, and 43-ML27) must be revised and/or rescinded by the Board of Supervisors. The improvements within the existing river will result in relocating the floodplain and require revising the existing County Ordinanced Floodways. The improvements and resulting County Adopted Floodway revisions may be phased.

14. Per ratification of these conditions of approval, the Board recognizes that the County Adopted ML maps will be revised and/or rescinded and authorizes the Director of Public Works to revise and/or rescind all necessary maps.

15. Lots 358 and 359 - Lion Canyon contain a restored stream area. At the time of the approval of the vesting tentative tract map, the exact design of the restored stream area was not known. This restored stream area may contain a variety of drainage devices to convey, transmit, and stabilize storm flows and sediment. These devices may include rock and/or concrete step-pool structures, bio-stabilization, soil cement embankment and/or drop structures/grade control, turf reinforcement matting, culverts, rock and/or concrete check structures and grade control and drains. The restored stream design and implantation shall be in compliance with the Newhall Ranch Tributary Channel Design Guidelines, as approved on 7/9/2009 to the satisfaction of Public Works.

    Grading will also occur within this area to implement the appropriate drainage devices and for the creation of a geomorphic channel design. Grades shown on the tentative map may vary ± 20 feet. However, grading will not extend beyond the limits of the cross hatched area without the approval of Department of Regional Planning and Department of Public works.

Prior to Recordation of a Final Map or Parcel Map Waiver:

1. Submit plans of drainage facilities as required by hydrology study for design of drainage facilities to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

2. Show and dedicate to Flood Control District or to the County of Los Angeles easements and/or right of way on the final map to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

3. Show and label all natural drainage courses.

4. Dedicate to the County the right to restrict the erection of buildings in the flood hazard area.

5. An assessment district shall be formed to finance the future ongoing maintenance and capital replacement of all SUSMP devices/systems identified by the Department of Public Works. Unless sufficient funds have been collected prior to acceptance by Public works, the subdivider shall deposit the first year's total assessment based on the Public Works engineering report. This will fund the first year's maintenance after the facilities are accepted. The second and subsequent years' assessment will be collected through the property tax bill. This is required to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

6. If the County authorizes a Grant of Waiver, delineate the flood hazard area and/or place a flood hazard note on a plat which shall be attached to the waiver. This is required to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

Prior to Building Permit:

Prior to issuance of building permits, plans must be approved to: provide for the proper distribution of drainage and for contributory drainage from adjoining properties and eliminate the sheet overflow, ponding, and protect the lots from high velocity scouring action; comply with NPDES, SWMP, and SUSMP requirements.

Prior to Improvement Acceptance for Public Maintenance:

1. Portions of the County Adopted Floodway Map (maps 43-ML23, 43-ML24, 43-ML25, 43-ML26, and 43-ML27) must be rescinded and revised by the Board of Supervisors as proposed in the drainage concept approved on 01/30/08.

2. A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA must be obtained. Public Works, Watershed Management Division (626) 458-4322, should be contacted to obtain required procedures.

3. All maintenance permits of the regulatory agencies must be active at the time of acceptance.

Name Yong Guo Date 01/05/11 Phone (626) 458-4921
YONG GUO

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
GEOTECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION
GEOLOGIC REVIEW SHEET
900 So. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
TEL. (626) 458-4925

DISTRIBUTION
__ Geologist
__ Soils Engineer
1 GMED File
1 Subdivision

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 61105
SUBDIVIDER Newhall Land and Farming Co.
ENGINEER Psomas
GEOLOGIST & SOILS ENGINEER R.T. F & A

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 12/15/10 (Rev)
LOCATION Newhall Ranch

REPORT DATE 12/15/10, 4/29/10, 12/21/09, 10/14/09, 10/13/09

Additional Reports Reviewed Allan Seward: 7/20/04; Leighton & Assoc.:3/16/10 (offsite grading)

TENTATIVE MAP FEASIBILITY IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL FROM A GEOLOGIC STANDPOINT

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE FULFILLED:

1. The final map must be approved by the Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division (GMED) to assure that all geotechnical requirements have been properly depicted. For Final Map clearance guidelines refer to GS051.0 in the Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports (http://www.dpw.lacounty.gov/gmed/manual.pdf).

2. A grading plan must be geotechnically approved by the GMED prior to Final Map approval. The grading depicted on the plan must agree with the grading depicted on the tentative tract or parcel map and the conditions approved by the Planning Commission. If the subdivision is to be recorded prior to the completion and acceptance of grading, corrective geologic bonds may be required.

3. Prior to grading plan approval a detailed engineering geology and soils engineering report must be submitted that addresses the proposed grading. All recommendations of the geotechnical consultants must be incorporated into the plan (Refer to the Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports at http://www.dpw.lacounty.gov/gmed/manual.pdf).

4. All geologic hazards associated with this proposed development must be eliminated. Alternatively, the geologic hazards may be designated as restricted use areas (RUA), and their boundaries delineated on the Final Map. These RUAs must be approved by the GMED, and the subdivider must dedicate to the County the right to prohibit the erection of buildings or other structures within the restricted use areas (refer to GS063.0 in the manual for preparation of Geotechnical Reports*).

5. The Soils Engineering review dated 1/10/11 is attached.

Prepared by Reviewed by _____ Date 1/10/11
Charles Nestle

Please complete a Customer Service Survey at http://dpw.lacounty.gov/go/gmedsurvey

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
GEOTECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION

SOILS ENGINEERING REVIEW SHEET

Address: 900 S. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
Telephone: (626) 458-4925
Fax: (626) 458-4913

District Office 8.2
Job Number GMPH
Sheet 1 of 1

DISTRIBUTION:
___ Drainage
___ Grading
___ Geo/Soils Central File
___ District Engineer
___ Geologist
___ Soils Engineer
___ Engineer/Architect

Tentative Tract Map 61105
Location Castaic
Developer/Owner Newhall Land and Farming Company
Engineer/Architect Psomas
Soils Engineer R.T. Frankian & Associates (94-502-60)
Geologist Same as above

Review of:

Revised Tentative Tract Map Dated By Regional Planning 12/15/10
Soils Engineering and Geologic Report Dated 12/15/10, 4/29/10, 12/21/09, 10/13/09 (Change of Consultant), 6/13/05, 12/22/04, 7/22/04
Geology Report Dated 10/14/09
Soils Engineering and Geology report by Leighton and Associates Dated 3/16/10 (Offsite Grading – SCE substation)
Previous Review Sheet Dated 5/17/10

ACTION:

Tentative Map feasibility is recommended for approval.

REMARKS:

1. *At the grading plan review stage, provide information, analyses, and/or recommendations for the following:*
   a. *Soil parameters.* Provide additional shear strength test results of various materials required for additional stability analyses as indicated below.
   b. *Slope stability analyses.* Provide additional stability analyses for slopes based on a 40-scale to substantiate those proposed at 100-scale. Indicate the various shear strength parameters used in the analyses, in the appropriate segments of each failure plane. Show locations of the cross sections used in slope stability analyses on the geotechnical map. Recommend mitigation if factors of safety are below County minimum standards.
   c. *Debris flow hazards.* Provide recommendations at 40-scale as necessary.
   d. *Debris basins.* Provide slope stability analyses considering rapid drawdown condition for debris basins with slopes steeper than 3:1 gradient and designed with outlet structures, as necessary. Recommend mitigation if factors of safety is below the minimum standard.

NOTE TO THE PLAN CHECKER/BUILDING AND SAFETY DISTRICT ENGINEER:
A. THE ON-SITE SOILS ARE MODERATELY TO SEVERELY CORROSIVE TO FERROUS METALS.
B. THE ON-SITE SOILS HAVE A MEDIUM EXPANSION POTENTIAL.
C. PER THE PREVIOUS SOILS ENGINEER, DEWATERING SHALL BE PERFORMED FOR REMOVALS IN THE VICINITY OF BORINGS B-72E AND B-73E.
D. PER THE SOILS ENGINEER, LOTS 484, 19 AND 20, 300, 322 THRU 325 HAVE BEEN PLACED IN OPEN SPACE LOTS 487, 130, 367, 358, RESPECTIVELY.

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
YOSHIYA MORISAKU
No. 67587
Exp. 6/30/11
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Prepared by _____ Date 1/10/11
Yoshiya Morisaku

NOTICE: Public safety, relative to geotechnical subsurface exploration, shall be provided in accordance with current codes for excavations, inclusive of the Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 11.48, and the State of California, Title 8, Construction Safety Orders.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – GRADING
TRACT MAP NO. 61105 REV9

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 12-15-2010
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 12-15-2010

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO GRADING PLAN APPROVAL:

1. Notarized covenants shall be prepared and recorded by the applicant for any offsite impacts, as determined by Public Works. By acceptance of this condition, the applicant acknowledges and agrees that this condition does not require the construction or installation of an off-site improvement, and that the offsite covenants referenced above do not constitute an offsite easement, license, title or interest in favor of the County. Therefore, the applicant acknowledges and agrees that the provisions of Government Code Section 66462.5 do not apply to this condition and that the County shall have no duty or obligation to acquire by negotiation or by eminent domain any land or any interest in any land in connection with this condition. (Offsite work is shown on the tentative map, but not required for public improvements, and design changes during the improvement change may allow the offsite improvements or impacts to be omitted or mitigated, respectively)

2. Provide approval of:

   a. The latest drainage concept/hydrology/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP)/Low Impact Development (LID) plan (if applicable) by the Storm Drain and Hydrology Section of Land Development Division.

   b. The location/alignment and details/typical sections of any park/trail, as shown on the grading plan, to the satisfaction of the Department of Parks and Recreation.

   c. The grading plan by the Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division (GMED).

   d. Permits and/or letters of non-jurisdiction from all State and Federal Agencies, as applicable. These agencies may include, but may not be limited to the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board, State of California Department of Fish and Game, State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), and the Army Corps of Engineers.

   e. A Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from FEMA to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

   f. Identify all oak trees on the grading plan; use the same numbers as the oak tree report, and provide status (to remain, to be encroached, or to be removed) in concurrence with the arborist's oak tree report and oak tree permit.

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL MAP RECORDATION:

3. Submit a grading plan for approval. The grading plan must show and call out the following items, including but not limited to: construction of all drainage devices and details, paved driveways, elevation and drainage of all pads, SUSMP and LID devices (if applicable). Acknowledgement and/or approval from all easement holders may be required.

4. Construct curb, gutter, base, pavement, and sidewalk (if applicable) on all private drives to the satisfaction of Public Works. In addition, if applicable, construct additional sidewalk pop-outs in the vicinity of any above ground utilities to meet current American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works. All final design criteria (alignment, curvature, slopes, right-of-way widths) for private drives shall conform to the approved "Private Drives and Traffic Calming Design Guidelines Manual". All private drives shall be constructed per an approved grading plan to the satisfaction of Public Works.

5. A maintenance agreement or CC&Rs may be required for all privately maintained drainage devices, slopes, and other facilities.

MDE

Name David Esfandi Date 01/10/2011 Phone (626) 458-4921

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. If TR 61105 records before TR 53295, construct offsite street improvements on Magic Mountain Parkway from the easterly Tract boundary line to The Old Road to the satisfaction of Public Works. Interim improvements pertaining to the required width of Magic Mountain Parkway may be permitted upon further traffic analysis to the satisfaction of Public Works.

2. A minimum centerline curve length of 100 feet shall be maintained on all local streets and a minimum centerline curve radius of 100 feet on all cul-de-sac streets. Curves through intersections should be avoided when possible. If unavoidable, the alignment shall be adjusted so that the proposed BC and EC of the curve through the intersection are set back a minimum of 100 feet away from the BCR's of the intersection. Reversing curves of local streets need not exceed a radius of 1,500 feet and any curve need not exceed a radius of 3,000 feet.

3. Compound curves are preferred over broken-back curves. Broken-back curves must be separated by a minimum of 200 feet of tangent (1,000 feet for multi-lane highways or industrial collectors). If compound curves are used, the radius of the smaller curve shall not be less than two-thirds of the larger curve. The curve length of compound curves shall be adjusted to exceed a minimum curve length of 100 feet, when appropriate, in accordance with AASHTO guidelines.

4. The minimum centerline radius is 350 feet on all local streets with 64 feet of right of way and on all the streets where grades exceed 10 percent.

5. The central angles of the right of way radius returns shall not differ by more than 10 degrees on local streets.

6. Driveways will not be permitted within 25 feet upstream of any catch basins when street grades exceed six (6) percent.

7. Provide maximum 6% grade through the knuckles.

8. Provide a standard knuckle on "S" Street (as shown on the tentative map) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

9. Provide a different street name on the terminus leg of "S" Street (portion that lies west of the knuckle) if determined necessary by Public Works.

10. Provide minimum landing area of 100 feet for local collectors, 50 feet for local access roads, and 25 feet for cul-de-sacs at a maximum three (3) percent grade on all "tee" intersections.

11. The Commerce Center Drive bridge alignment and grade shall conform with the ultimate alignment and grade of the Commerce Center Drive/Henry Mayo/SR 126 interchange.

12. The centerline alignment of Magic Mountain Parkway and Commerce Center Drive shall conform to the approved Interdepartmental Engineering Committee (IEC) P-282 (PW) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

13. Dedicate variable width right of way on Magic Mountain Parkway, varying from 46 feet from centerline to 69 feet from centerline, to the satisfaction of Public Works.

14. Dedicate variable width right of way on Commerce Center Drive, varying from 56 feet from centerline to 73 feet from centerline, to the satisfaction of Public Works.

15. Dedicate right of way 43 feet from centerline on "GG" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

16. Dedicate right of way 42 feet from centerline on Westridge Parkway to the satisfaction of Public Works.

17. Dedicate right of way 39 feet from centerline on "MM" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

18. Dedicate right of way 33 feet from centerline on "QQ" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

19. Dedicate right of way 32 feet from centerline on "A" Street, "B" Street, "R" Street, "HH" Street" and, "RR" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works. Additional right of way dedication may be necessary on "A" Street between Commerce Center Drive and "EE" Private Drive to accommodate adequate curb/striping transitions. The additional required right of way shall be consistent with an approved detailed signing and striping plan.

20. Dedicate right of way 30 feet from centerline on "Q1" Street, "Q2" Street, and "Q3" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

21. Dedicate right of way 29 feet from centerline on "H" Street and "I" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

22. Make an offer of variable width private and future right of way on "S" Street, varying from 45 feet from centerline at the intersection of "R" Street to 29 feet from centerline at the intersection of "Z" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

23. Make an offer of variable width private and future right of way on "UU" Street, varying from 45 feet from centerline at the intersection of "R" Street to 32 feet from centerline at the intersection of "V" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

24. Make an offer of private and future right of way 45 feet from centerline on "K" Street, to the satisfaction of Public Works.

25. Make an offer of private and future right of way 30 feet from centerline on "C" Street, "D1" Street, "D2" Street, "E" Street, "L" Street (from "N" Street to "M" Street) and "N" Street (from "O" Street to "L" Street) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

26. Make an offer of private and future right of way 29 feet from centerline on"L" Street (south of "M" Street), "M" Street, "N" Street (west of "O" Street and east of "L" Street), "O" Street, "S" Street (north of "Z" Street), "T" Street, "U" Street, "V" Street, "W" Street, and "Z" Street (east and west of "S" Street) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

27. The design elements (alignment, curvature, slopes, easement widths) of the Private Drives "F", "G", "J", "P", "BB", "CC", "DD", "EE", "FF" "II","JJ","KK", "PP" "LL1", "LL2", "NN", "OO", "SS", "TT", "VV", "WW", "XX", "YY",and "ZZ" are not necessarily approved. Conform to the final design criteria (alignment, curvature, slopes, right-of-way widths) of the approved "Private Drives and Traffic Calming Design Guidelines Manual". All private drives shall be constructed per an approved grading plan to the satisfaction of Public Works.

28. Provide a minimum of 25 foot curb return radii at all intersections to the satisfaction of Public Works. Larger radius returns shall be provided at all highway intersections and other intersections where larger radii are warranted at the discretion of Public Works. The following intersections may require larger radii (than that shown on the tentative map or conceptual striping plan) to accommodate turning trucks: Magic Mountain Parkway at "EE" Private Drive, Commerce Center Drive at "A" Street, Commerce Center Drive at "DD" Private Drive. This list of intersections shall not serve as a comprehensive list as every intersection shall be constructed appropriately to provide adequate design features to the satisfaction of Public Works.

29. Dedicate adequate property line return radii at all intersections to adequately construct a curb ramp to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards and to the satisfaction of Public Works. At a minimum, the property line return radii shall be consistent with the necessary curb return radii and parkway widths that are deemed appropriate by Public Works. Additional right of way corner cut offs shall be dedicated at all signalized intersections and other locations where deemed appropriate by Public Works.

30. Reserve easements for ingress/egress purposes over any sidewalks or paseos constructed outside the public right of way to the satisfaction of Public Works.

31. Construct curb, gutter, base, pavement, and sidewalk on all public, and private and future streets to the satisfaction of Public Works. In addition, construct additional sidewalk pop-outs in the vicinity of any above ground utilities to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works.

32. Construct curb, gutter, base, pavement, and sidewalk (if applicable) on all private drives to the satisfaction of Public Works. In addition, if applicable, construct additional sidewalk pop-outs in the vicinity of any above ground utilities to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works. All final design criteria (alignment, curvature, slopes, right-of-way widths) for private drives shall conform to the approved "Private Drives and Traffic Calming Design Guidelines Manual". All private drives shall be constructed per an approved grading plan to the satisfaction of Public Works.

33. Construct a slough wall outside the street right of way when the height of the slope is greater than five feet above the sidewalk and the sidewalk is adjacent to the street right of way. The wall shall not impede any required line of sight. Slough wall is not required if there is a minimum of 3 feet wide flat area between the right of way and the toe of the slope provided there is appropriate drainage system to minimize the sloughing of the slope.

34. The site layout for the elementary school located on Lot 157 is not necessarily approved.

35. Permission is granted to reduce the centerline curve radius to 250 feet on "K" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works.

36. The driveway leading to lot 380 from "B" Street shall align with "K" Street to the satisfaction of Public Works unless an alternate driveway entrance location acceptable to Public Works is provided.

37. The driveway leading to lot 513 from "II" Private Drive shall align with "CC" Private Drive to the satisfaction of Public Works unless an alternate driveway entrance location acceptable to Public Works is provided.

38. Monument signs located on medians (within private drives or driveways to individual lots) shall not impede adequate line of sight to vehicles or pedestrians.

39. Provide adequate curb/striping transitions on "A" Street between Commerce Center Drive and "EE" Private Drive to the satisfaction of Public Works. Additional right of way dedication may be necessary to accommodate the necessary transitions. The additional right of way (if necessary) shall be consistent with an approved detailed signing and striping plan.

40. Provide adequate curb transitions on "DD" Private Drive where the private drive right of way transitions from 84 feet to 60 feet (located approximately 550 feet east of "HH" Street) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

41. All gated entries proposed for any commercial lots shall substantially conform to the typical gate details provided in the "Private Drives and Traffic Calming Design Guidelines Manual" to the satisfaction of Public Works. Provide additional stacking distance if determined to be necessary to the satisfaction of Public Works.

42. All emergency vehicle access gates shall remain closed at all times except during an emergency.

43. The gates located on the driveway serving the Park on Lot 469 shall remain open during business hours.

44. Provide intersection sight distance to the satisfaction of Public Works for a design speed of:

    (1) 65 mph (725 feet) on Commerce Center Drive from "A" Street (both directions) and from "GG" Street (easterly direction);

    (2) 40 mph (415 feet) on "A" Street from "R" Street (easterly direction) and from "CC" Street (both directions); on "B" Street from "C" Street (southerly direction);

    (3) 30 mph (310 feet) on "C" Street from "F" Private Drive (northerly direction), on "E" Street from "D1" Street (westerly direction); on "L" Street from "M" Street (northerly direction); on "N" Street from "L" Street (both directions); and on Q1 street from the driveway leading to the Elementary School on

Lot 157 (northerly direction).

(4) 25 mph (260 feet) on "L" Street from "M" Street (southerly direction); on "GG" Street from the driveway leading to Lot 483 (southerly direction);

Line of sight requirements for corner sight distance are not necessarily restricted to the above intersections. Additional line of sight for all other intersections and driveways shall be required if deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works. Line of sight shall be within right of way or dedicate airspace easements to the satisfaction of Public Works. Additional grading may be required.

45. Provide stopping sight distance where applicable along all public and private and future streets. Line of sight shall be within right of way or dedicated airspace easements to the satisfaction of Public Works. In areas where the intersection sight distance overlaps with the stopping sight distance, the more stringent of the two shall govern.

46. All line of sight easements shall be depicted on grading and landscaping plans to the satisfaction of Public Works.

47. Comply with the following street lighting requirements:

a. Provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring along the property frontage on all streets and highways to the satisfaction of Public Works. The operation and maintenance of the street lights on the private and future street shall be the responsibility of the Developer/Home Owners Association until such time as the street is accepted for maintenance by the County. Submit street lighting plans as soon as possible for review and approval to the Street Lighting Section of the Traffic and Lighting Division. For additional information, please contact the Street Lighting Section at (626) 300-4726.

b. The proposed development, or portions thereof, are not within an existing Lighting District. Annexation and assessment balloting are required. Upon tentative map approval, the applicant shall comply with conditions listed below in order for the Lighting District to pay for the future operation and maintenance of the street lights. The Board of Supervisors must approve the annexation and levy of assessment (should assessment balloting favor levy of assessment) prior to filing of the final subdivision maps for each area with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk.

(1) Request the Street Lighting Section to commence annexation and levy of assessment proceedings.

(2) Provide business/property owner's name(s), mailing address(es), site address, Assessor Parcel Number(s), and Parcel Boundaries in either Microstation or Auto CADD format of territory to be developed to the Street Lighting Section.

(3) Submit a map of the proposed development including any roadways conditioned for street lights that are outside the proposed project area to Street Lighting Section. Contact the Street Lighting Section for map requirements and with any questions at (626) 300-4726.

c. The annexation and assessment balloting process takes twelve months or more to complete once the above information is received and approved. Therefore, untimely compliance with the above will result in a delay in receiving approval of the street lighting plans or in filing the final subdivision map for recordation. Information on the annexation and the assessment balloting process can be obtained by contacting Street Lighting Section at (626) 300-4726.

d. For acceptance of street light transfer of billing, the area must be annexed into the Lighting District and all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, must be constructed according to Public Works approved plans. The contractor shall submit one complete set of "as-built" plans. Provided the above conditions are met, all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, have been energized, and the developer has requested a transfer of billing at least by January 1 of the previous year, the Lighting District can assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the street lights by July 1 of any given year. The transfer of billing could be delayed one or more years if the above conditions are not met.

48. The roadway median layouts (pocket lengths, widths, etc) shown in the plan view of the tentative map are not necessarily approved.

49. Conform to the approved conceptual signing and striping plan (approved on August 19, 2010) and submit detailed signing and striping plans (scale 1" = 40') for all multi-lane streets, private drives, and highways in the vicinity of this project and at any other offsite location if required to mitigate any traffic impact (per the attached letter from our Traffic and Lighting Division dated September 30, 2010 which supersedes their December 7, 2006 letter) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

It shall be noted that the conceptual striping plan approved on August 19, 2010 shows the existence of a cul-de-sac ("A" Street) east of Commerce Center Drive. This cul-de-sac was eliminated from the tentative map after approval of the conceptual striping plan and was replaced by a driveway (from Commerce Center Drive) to the park located on Lot 469. Striping at the park driveway / Commerce Center Drive intersection shall substantially conform to the general striping layout originally approved on the August 19, 2010 Conceptual Striping Plan to the satisfaction of Public Works.

50. Traffic Signal Plans (scale 1"=20') shall be required at any location where modification to the existing traffic signal has been deemed necessary and at locations where new traffic signals are to be installed (per the attached letter from our Traffic and Lighting Division dated September 30, 2010 which supersedes their December 7, 2006 letter) to the satisfaction of Public Works.

51. Provide adequate signal easements at the entrance to the Park located on Lot 469 to the satisfaction of Public Works.

52. Signing and striping plans, signal plans (where applicable), and cost estimates, are required for any segment of roadway or intersection identified in the approved traffic study as one for which the project is obligated to submit a pro-rata share payment. Should improvements to any segment of roadway or intersection as described above be included in a full mitigation Bridge and Major Thoroughfare (B&T) District, the project shall be exempt from submitting signing and striping, signal plans, and corresponding cost estimates for those improvements and shall only be responsible for paying the appropriate B&T District fees in effect at the time of final map recordation. If required, signing and striping plans, signal plans, and cost estimates may be conceptual in nature and shall be used solely as a tool to obtain a monetary value for the pro-rata share percentages identified in the approved traffic study. Approved cost estimates from Public Works must be obtained and the appropriate payments made prior to final map recordation.

53. Comply with the mitigation measures identified in the attached September 30, 2010 letter (which supersedes the December 7, 2006 letter) from our Traffic and Lighting Division to the satisfaction of Public Works. If a Bridge and Thoroughfare District is formed, and if signals identified in the study are included as facilities specifically identified for inclusion in that approved District, then the amount and eligibility for a credit against your District obligation may be given if approved by Public Works.

54. Plant street trees on all public and private and future streets to the satisfaction of Public Works.

55. Install postal delivery receptacles in groups to serve two or more residential units to the satisfaction of Public Works.

56. Underground all new and existing service lines and distribution lines that are less than 50 KV and new utility lines to the satisfaction of Public Works and Southern California Edison. Please contact Construction Division at (626) 458-3129 for new location of any above ground utility structure in the parkway.

57. Establish a landscape maintenance district, subject to the approval of Parks and Recreation, for the purpose of maintaining landscaped medians and parkways on all streets and highways to the satisfaction of Public Works.

58. Prior to recordation of the first unit map, subdivider must acquire all right-of-way easements and fee interests necessary for the Commerce Center Drive/Henry Mayo/SR 126 interchange project to the satisfaction of Public Works.

59. Prior to recordation of the first unit map, subdivider shall provide an executed agreement between the County of Los Angeles and the Newhall Land and Farming Company that defines their funding responsibilities for the Commerce Center Drive/Henry Mayo/SR 126 interchange project to the satisfaction of Public Works.

60. Prior to final map approval, pay the fees or satisfy fee payment as outlined in the District formation document established by the Board of Supervisors for the Magic Mountain/Westside Bridge and Major Thoroughfare Construction Fee District in effect at the time of recordation.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

GAIL FARBER, Director

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
http://dpw.lacounty.gov

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: T-4

September 30, 2010

Mr. Daryl Zerfass
Austin-Foust Associates, Inc.
2223 Wellington Avenue, Suite 300
Santa Ana, CA 92701-3161

Dear Mr. Zerfass:

MISSION VILLAGE
TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 61105
TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (AUGUST 17, 2010)
CASTAIC JUNCTION AREA

As requested, we have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed Mission Village project. The project site is generally located west of the Golden State (I-5) Freeway between State Route 126 to the north and Valencia Boulevard to the south in the unincorporated County of Los Angeles area of Castaic Junction.

We generally agree with the Traffic Impact Analysis that traffic signals shall be installed at the following intersections within the project site. The design and construction of the traffic signals shall be the sole responsibility of the project. The signals shall be in place to the satisfaction of Public Works. Detailed signing and striping plans and traffic signal plans shall be submitted to Public Works for review and approval.

- B Street at Magic Mountain Parkway
- A Street at Magic Mountain Parkway
- Commerce Center Drive at A Street
- KK Drive/HH Street at Magic Mountain Parkway
- II Drive at Magic Mountain Parkway
- Westridge Parkway at Magic Mountain Parkway
- Commerce Center Drive at Magic Mountain Parkway
- Commerce Center Drive at DD Drive
- Commerce Center Drive at GG Street
- Westridge Parkway at QQ Street (Fire Station Signal)

The following intersections may justify the installation of traffic signals due to the close proximity of the proposed elementary school. The applicant shall enter into a secured agreement/bond with Public Works to guarantee the installation of traffic signals when the traffic conditions warrant their installation. These intersections shall be monitored for the installation of the signals once the school is opened and every year thereafter for up to 5 years after the certificate of occupancy of the last residential unit of Mission Village (excluding age restricted/qualified residential units and residential units within the Saugus School District) is issued and the full planned occupancy of 900 students for the proposed school (or fewer students if official documentation from the Newhall School District shows no increase in student enrollment for five consecutive school years). The applicant or the current owner of the development shall submit an annual traffic signal warrant analysis to Public Works for review and approval. When traffic signals are warranted, the applicant or current owner of the development shall design the necessary striping and signal plans and construct the signals to the satisfaction of Public Works. Any security for the traffic signal construction submitted will be returned once the construction is completed to the satisfaction of Public Works or at the expiration of the above-mentioned monitoring program.

- A Street at B Street/CC Drive
- Q1 Street at A Street
- HH Street/R Street at A Street

In addition, the following intersection needs to be incorporated into the report with an acknowledgement that the traffic created by the project justifies the installation of a traffic signal. The project shall install a traffic signal at the following location after detailed signing and striping plans and traffic signal plans have been reviewed and approved by Public Works.

- Westridge Parkway at Old Rock Road

We generally agree with the Traffic Impact Analysis that the following off-site intersections will be significantly impacted by the proposed project. The implementation schedule for the required improvements listed below shall be consistent with the most current Public Works-approved Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis or, in the case of the Commerce Center Drive at State Route 126 location, with the threshold identified in Section 4.4 of the Traffic Impact Analysis if this threshold occurs before the one identified in the then-current Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis.

The Old Road at McBean Parkway

Stripe a third southbound through lane and a westbound right-turn lane

Commerce Center Drive at SR-126

Existing intersection shall be replaced by a grade separated interchange

We generally agree with the Traffic Impact Analysis that the cumulative traffic generated by the project and other related projects will significantly impact the off-site intersections listed in the tables referenced below. The project shall contribute its proportionate share of the cost for the mitigation measures identified in each table.

- Table 4-5: Off-Site Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts – 2021 Cumulative Conditions
- Table 4-9: Off-Site Mitigation Measures for Project Impacts – Build out 2035 Cumulative Conditions
- Table 4-11: Roadway Construction Stages
- Table 4-12: Intersection Improvements by Stage (County and Caltrans Locations)

Tables 4-5, 4-9, and 4-12 (and cross reference in some of these tables to Appendix J) state that the following intersections can be mitigated through the payment of a fair share towards the traffic impact. We recognize that Table 4-5, 4-9, and 4-12 depict the cumulative condition as distinguished from the project-specific condition. However, since the Traffic Impact Analysis indicates that the project alone plus ambient traffic will have a significant impact at the following two intersections, in addition to the cumulative impacts identified in the aforementioned tables, revisions to the tables are necessary to provide clarification.

- The Old Road at McBean Parkway
- Commerce Center Drive at State Route 126

Tables 4-12 and 4-13 also indicate several intersections (see enclosed annotated tables) that are located within the Valencia and Via Princessa Bridge and Thoroughfare Districts. The Traffic Impact Analysis indicates that no payment of Bridge and Thoroughfare District fees in those districts is required for the reasons stated in Section 4.2 of the Traffic Impact Analysis. The project applicant recently consulted with us on this matter and we concur with this approach. In addition, the project applicant is actively engaged in the formation efforts of the Westside Bridge and Thoroughfare

District that encompasses the area covered by the Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis. It is our requirement that this Westside Bridge and Thoroughfare District be formed prior to final recordation of the first map associated with the Mission Village project.

In addition to our technical review of the Traffic Impact Analysis, we have discussed the following conditions with the project applicant:

a) Acquisition of all necessary right of way, including reaching an agreement with the various utility companies (if any) that must carry out relocations in order to accommodate the work, for the construction by Public Works of the Commerce Center Drive at State Route 126 grade separated interchange shall be completed prior to final action by the Board of Supervisors on the Tentative Tract No. 61105 for the Mission Village project. Public Works will then be in a position to certify the right of way per Caltrans' procedures for federally funded projects.

b) The funding plan, which includes a cost sharing agreement between the County and the project applicant, for the construction of the Commerce Center Drive at State Route 126 grade separated interchange work must be in place prior to final recordation of the first map associated with the Mission Village project.

c) Our prior review of the Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis is dated May 15, 2007. As you know, the purpose of the Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis is to evaluate the timing of required improvements commensurate with the proposed phased land developments in the Westside Santa Clarita Valley area. An update to the Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis will allow us to make adjustments to the prior phasing assumptions based on current traffic conditions. Therefore, the update shall include actual traffic counts on newly constructed roadways and/or at intersections where traffic mitigation measures have been carried out. Consequently, our approval of an updated Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis is required prior to the final recordation of the first map associated with the Mission Village project. It is also our expectation that an annual report due January 30th of each year shall be submitted to Public Works for review and approval identifying the number and type of residential units and the square footage and type of nonresidential building permits issued during the prior year in Mission Village and any other development within the Westside Santa Clarita Valley area. The purpose of this annual report will be to track development progress against the development thresholds identified in the Traffic Impact Analysis and the then-current Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis. At a minimum, an update to the Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis is expected to occur at the following development thresholds:

1) 3,176 residential units and 13.17 million square feet nonresidential uses
2) 6,066 residential units and 14.87 million square feet nonresidential uses
3) 14,515 residential units and 16.00 million square feet nonresidential uses
4) 21,373 residential units and 17.65 million square feet nonresidential uses
5) 25,001 residential units and 19.78 million square feet nonresidential uses
6) 27,615 residential units and 22.08 million square feet nonresidential uses

In addition, the project also needs to reach an understanding with Caltrans for the phasing of proposed improvements on State Highway facilities. Therefore, the following mitigation is required.

> The applicant shall work cooperatively with Caltrans to determine and provide transportation mitigation needed on State Highway facilities. The applicant shall construct mitigation improvements or pay an equitable share for mitigation projects to the satisfaction of Caltrans. The applicant shall enter into a traffic mitigation agreement with Caltrans before or within 6 months of certification of the Environmental Impact Report.

If you have any questions regarding the review of the document, please contact Ms. Courtney Sweeney of our Traffic Studies Section at (626) 300-4777.

Very truly yours,

GAIL FARBER
Director of Public Works

WILLIAM J. WINTER
Assistant Deputy Director
Traffic and Lighting Division

CS:cn
P:\tlpub\WPFILES\FILES\STU\Courtney\EIR\EIR 10030 - TTM 61105 Mission Village Traffic Impact Analysis.v4.docx

Enc.

cc: Caltrans (Elmer Alvarez, James McCarthy)
Newhall Land and Farming (Corey Harpole)
Regional Planning (Paul McCarthy)

Table 4-12: Intersection Improvements by Stage (County and Caltrans Locations)

Stage	Intersection	Improvements	Project Traffic Share %
1	7. I-5 SB Ramps & SR-126	Stripe 4th WBT	14.3%
	9. The Old Road & I-5 SB Ramps (at Rye Canyon Road)	Relocate intersection north of the existing location. Provide 1 NBL (U-Turns only), 2 NBT, 2 NBR, 2 SBL, 3 SBT, 2 WBL, and 1 WBR	1.4%
	10. I-5 SB Ramps & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Add 2nd SBR, 3rd EBT, 2nd EBR, 2nd WBL, and 4th WBT (part of the Magic Mountain Interchange Phase 2 project)	19.7%
	11. I-5 NB Ramps & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Add shared NBL/NBR, 2nd EBL, 3rd EBT and convert 4th WBT to shared WBT/WBR (part of the Magic Mountain Interchange Phase 2 project)	17.6%
	25. The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road	Add 2nd & 3rd NBT, 2nd SBL, and 3rd SBT. Restripe 1st WBR to a shared WBL/WBR. Convert the northbound and westbound free-flow right-turn lanes to conventional right-turn lanes with overlap phasing.	7.1%
	26. The Old Road & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Add 2nd NBL, 3rd NBT, 1st NBR, 2nd SBL, 3rd SBT, 1st SBR, 2nd EBL, 3rd & 4th EBT, 2nd WBL, and 4th WBT	21.1%
	28. The Old Road & McBean Pkwy	Signal modification to add a northbound right-turn overlap phase.	27.0%
	80. Wolcott Way & SR-126	Add 1st NBL, 1st & 2nd NBR, 2nd SBL, 3rd EBT, 1st EBR, 2nd WBL, and 3rd WBT	6.4%
	81. Commerce Center Drive & Henry Mayo Drive	Add 1st EBL, 1st & 2nd EBT, and 1st WBT (part of SR-126 grade separation project)	49.3%
	94 (82/83). Commerce Center Drive & SR-126	Construct grade separation for Commerce Center Drive at SR-126 to include direct on- and off-ramps for WB SR-126, a loop on-ramp for SB Commerce Center Drive to EB SR-126, a direct on-ramp for NB Commerce Center Drive to EB SR-126, and a direct off-ramp for EB SR-126 to Commerce Center Drive	44.8%
	106. Commerce Center Drive & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Construct new intersection. Provide 2 SBL, 2 SBR, 2 EBL, 3 EBT, 3 WBT, and 1 WBR with right-of-way reserved for future conversion to a free-flow right-turn lane (part of the project to extend Magic Mountain Parkway to west of Commerce Center Drive)	53.9%
	107. Westridge Pkwy & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Construct new intersection. Provide 1 NBL, 1 NBT, 1 NBR, 1 SBL, 1 Shared SBT/SBR, 1 EBL, 2 EBT, 1 Shared EBT/EBR, 2 WBL, 2 WBT, and 1 WBR	66.9%
	110. Chiquito Canyon Road/Long Canyon Road & SR-126	Add 1st NBL, 1st & 2nd NBT, 1st & 2nd NBR, 2nd SBL, convert SBR to 1st SBT, add 2nd SBT, 1st EBR, and 1st & 2nd WBL (part of the project to construct Long Canyon Road south of SR-126)	3.7%
	118. Six Flags Entrance & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Add 1st SBR, 1st & 2nd EBL, 2nd, 3rd & 4th EBT, and 2nd, 3rd & 4th WBT (part of the project to extend Magic Mountain Parkway to west of Commerce Center Drive)	32.3%
2	28. The Old Road & McBean Pkwy	Restripe southbound approach to add a 2nd SBL, signal modification to provide right-turn overlap phasing for NBR	27.0%
	81. Commerce Center Drive & Henry Mayo Drive	Add 1st NBL, 1st, 2nd & 3rd NBT, 2nd SBL, 1st, 2nd & 3rd SBT, 1st EBR, 1st WBL, (part of the project to extend Commerce Center Drive south over the Santa Clara River)	49.3%
	104. Poe Pkwy & Valencia Blvd	Construct new intersection. Provide 1 NBL, 1 NBR, 2 EBT, 1 EBR, 1 WBL, and 2 WBT (part of the project to extend Poe Parkway to Valencia Boulevard)	1.1%
3	101. Long Canyon Road & Valencia Blvd	Construct new intersection. Provide 2 SBL and 1 free-flow WBR (part of the project to construct Valencia Boulevard between Long Canyon Road & Magic Mountain Parkway)	2.1%
	102. Magic Mountain Pkwy & Valencia Blvd (Newhall Ranch)	Construct new intersection. Provide 1 free-flow SBR, and 2 EBL (part of the project to construct Valencia Boulevard between Long Canyon Road & Magic Mountain Parkway)	7.0%

(Continued)

Table 4-12: Intersection Improvements by Stage (County and Caltrans Locations) (Cont'd)

Stage	Intersection	Improvements	Project Traffic Share %
4	25. The Old Road & Rye Canyon Road	Add 2nd & 3rd WBL	7.1%
	101. Long Canyon Road & Valencia Blvd	Add 1st NBT, 1st NBR, 1st SBT, and 1st WBL	2.1%
	102. Magic Mountain Pkwy & Valencia Blvd (Newhall Ranch)	Add 1st & 2nd NBL, 1st & 2nd NBT, 1st NBR, 1st & 2nd SBL, 1st & 2nd SBT, 1st & 2nd EBT, 1st EBR, 1st WBL, 1st & 2nd WBT, 1st WBR (part of the project to extend Valencia Boulevard west to Magic Mountain Parkway)	7.0%
5	12. I-5 SB Ramps & Valencia Blvd	Restripe 2nd WBR to a shared WBT/free-flow WBR	7.5%
	28. The Old Road & McBean Pkwy	Add 1st WBR	27.0%
	96. San Martinez Grande Canyon Road & SR-126	Add 1st SBL, and 1st WBR	4.7%
	101. Long Canyon Road & Valencia Blvd	Add 1st NBL, 1st SBR, 1st & 2nd EBL, 1st, 2nd & 3rd EBT, and 1st & 2nd WBT (part of the project to extend Valencia Boulevard west of Long Canyon Road)	2.1%
	103. Pico Canyon Road & Valencia Blvd	Construct new intersection. Provide 2 NBL, 1 NBR, 2 EBT, 1 EBR, 1 WBL, and 2 WBT (part of the project to extend Pico Canyon Road to Valencia Boulevard)	0.6%
	110. Chiquito Canyon Road/Long Canyon Road & SR-126	Add 2nd NBL, 3rd SBT, 1st SBR, 2nd EBL, 3rd & 4th EBT, and 3rd WBT	3.7%
6a	14. I-5 SB Ramps & McBean Pkwy	Add 2nd SBL	12.6%
	17. I-5 NB Ramps & Lyons Ave	Add 1st free-flow WBR	7.2%
6b	10. I-5 SB Ramps & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Re-stripe the shared SBL/SBT to a SBL and the 1st SBR to a shared SBL/SBT.	19.7%
	16. I-5 SB Loop Ramp & Pico Canyon Road	Restripe eastbound approach to add a 3rd EBT.	4.7%
	18. I-5 SB Ramps & Calgrove Blvd	Add 2nd EBT and 2nd WBT Via Princessa BRT	3.4%
	19. I-5 NB Ramps & Calgrove Blvd	Add 2nd EBT and 2nd WBT Via Princessa BRT	3.2%
	26. The Old Road & Magic Mountain Pkwy	Add 5th EBT and right-turn overlap signal phasing for SBR	21.1%
	29. The Old Road & Pico Canyon Road	Convert SBR to 2nd SBT	7.8%
	80. Wolcott & SR-126	Add 4th EBT, 4th WBT, and right-turn overlap signal phasing for NBR	6.4%
	96. San Martinez Grande Canyon Road & SR-126	Add 1st NBL, 1st NBT, 2nd SBL, 1st SBR, 1st EBR, and 1st WBL	4.7%

Regional Improvement

Source: Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis

NB = Northbound	NBL = NB Left-turn Lane	NBT = NB Through Lane	NBR = NB Right-turn Lane
SB = Southbound	SBL = SB Left-turn Lane	SBT = SB Through Lane	SBR = SB Right-turn Lane
EB = Eastbound	EBL = EB Left-turn Lane	EBT = EB Through Lane	EBR = EB Right-turn Lane
WB = Westbound	WBL = WB Left-turn Lane	WBT = WB Through Lane	WBR = WB Right-turn Lane

See Appendix J for Fair-Share Calculations

Table 4-13: Intersection Improvements by Stage (City Locations)

Stage	Intersection	Improvements	Project Traffic Share %
1	(45) McBean Pkwy & Magic Mountain	Add 4th NBT, 3rd EBT and 3rd WBT Valencia EBT	11.2%
	(48) McBean Pkwy & Newhall Ranch	Add 4th EBT and 4th WBT Valencia EBT	7.3%
	54. Orchard Village & Wiley Canyon	Add 1st NBR and 2nd SBL	2.2%
	55. Orchard Village & McBean Pkwy	Add 1st EBR	2.6%
	(57) Valencia Blvd & Magic Mountain	Add 1st NBR, 3rd EBT, 2nd WBL and convert WBR to 3rd WBT Valencia EBT	5.6%
	65. Bouquet Canyon Road & Soledad Canyon Road	Add 4th NBT	3.2%
	(66) Bouquet Canyon Road & Newhall Ranch Road	Add 2nd SBL, 3rd & 4th EBT and 4th WBT Valencia EBT	4.0%
4	55. Orchard Village & McBean	Add 1st SBL, shared SBL/SBT (part of the Henry Mayo Hospital Master Plan Phase 2 project)	2.6%
6a	30. Ave Stanford & Rye Canyon Rd	Add de-facto SBR	11.1%
	(33) Rye Canyon Rd/Copper Hill Rd & Newhall Ranch Road	Add 4th EBT Valencia EBT	6.0%
	(44) McBean Pkwy & Valencia Blvd	Add 4th WBT Valencia EBT	2.6%
	51. Wiley & Lyons	Convert EBR to 3rd EBT	4.9%
	54. Orchard Village & Wiley	Convert 2nd EBL to 3rd EBT	2.2%
6b	(53) Valley & Lyons	Convert WBR to 3rd WBT Via Princessa EBT	3.6%
	57. Valencia Blvd & Magic Mountain	Add 1st WBR	5.6%

Source: Westside Santa Clarita Valley Roadway Phasing Analysis

NB = Northbound	NBL = NB Left-turn Lane	NBT = NB Through Lane	NBR = NB Right-turn Lane
SB = Southbound	SBL = SB Left-turn Lane	SBT = SB Through Lane	SBR = SB Right-turn Lane
EB = Eastbound	EBL = EB Left-turn Lane	EBT = EB Through Lane	EBR = EB Right-turn Lane
WB = Westbound	WBL = WB Left-turn Lane	WBT = WB Through Lane	WBR = WB Right-turn Lane

See Appendix J for Fair-Share Calculations

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – SEWER
TRACT NO. 061105 (Rev.)

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 12-15-2010
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 12-15-2010

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

For information only:

1. The outlet(s) for the proposed local sewer system and any Sanitation District facilities for any unit map must be accepted for public use prior to recordation, otherwise the unit map in question must have approved and secured plans for the outlet system on file with Public Works and/or the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

2. A sewer area study for the proposed subdivision (PC11831AS, dated 2-25-2010) was reviewed and approved. No additional mitigation measures are required. The sewer area study shall be invalidated should there be an increase in the total number of dwelling units, an increase in the density, dwelling units occur on previously identified building restricted lots, a change in the proposed sewer alignment, an increase in the tributary sewershed, a change in the sewer collection points, or the adoption of a land use plan or a revision to the current plan. A revision to the approved sewer area study may be allowed at the discretion of the Director of Public Works. The approved sewer area study shall remain valid for two years after initial approval of the tentative map. After this period of time, an update of the area study shall be submitted by the applicant if determined to be warranted by Public Works.

Prior to recordation of a Final Map:

3. The necessary improvement plans for VTTM 61105 must be prepared in conformance with the approved Newhall Ranch Conceptual Sewer Master Plan PC 11812AS. If the system appurtenances and maintenance responsibilities shown on the improvement plans do not match those detailed in the approved Newhall Ranch Conceptual Sewer Master Plan PC 11812AS, the master plan must be revised and/or improvement plans modified to the satisfaction of Public Works.

4. The subdivider shall install and dedicate main line sewers and serve each building/lot with a separate house lateral or have approved and bonded sewer plans on file with Public Works for all facilities to be operated by the Consolidated Sewer Maintenance Districts.

5. Provide on-site easements to the satisfaction of Public Works.

6. The subdivider represents and warrants that subdivider has fee title to, or has acquired a sufficient interest in, all property necessary for the construction, operation and maintenance of the above-referenced main line sewers, including, but not limited to, irrevocable offers of dedication recorded in the County of Los Angeles Recorder's Office on December 14, 2010 as Numbers 1844254 and 1844255. Accordingly, the subdivider acknowledges and agrees (a) no condition of approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105 requires or otherwise involves the construction or installation of an offsite improvement within land that subdivider does not have sufficient title or interest to construct any such offsite improvement as referenced in Government Code Section 66462.5, (b) the provisions of Government Code Section 66462.5 are not applicable to the approval of this Vesting Tentative Tract Map, and (c) the County shall have no duty or obligation to acquire by negotiation or by eminent domain any land or interest in any land in connection with the conditions associated with this Vesting Tentative Tract Map approval. The subdivider further acknowledges that the County is relying on the foregoing representations and warranties of subdivider in approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105. Prior to the County's approval of any final map related to Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 61105, the subdivider shall convey, or cause to be conveyed to the Newhall Ranch Sanitation District and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County an easement, to the satisfaction of the Newhall County Sanitation District and the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County for the construction, operation and maintenance of the sewer.

7. The subdivider shall provide to the Public Works an annual status report throughout the construction phase of the project, until such time the new treatment plant is complete and operational, which reports the equivalent capacity units for this subdivision and the existing capacity units originating from the Newhall Ranch Specific Plan discharging into the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System.

8. Prior to recordation of the first unit map, the subdivider shall:

   a. provide documentation demonstrating satisfactory compliance with the provisions specified in the Agreement between County Sanitation Districts Nos. 26 and 32 of Los Angeles County and the Newhall Land and Farming Company Regarding a Plan for the Coordination of Wastewater Management Facilities Relating to The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Development, dated January 9, 2002, including documentation that the NRSD has become a party to both the Joint Administrative Agreement (JAA) and the modified Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System Agreement (SCVJSSA).

b. have approved regional sewer infrastructure plans on file with the Newhall Ranch Sanitation District or Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County and furnished a bond, letter of credit or other acceptable means of guarantee satisfactory to the Newhall Ranch Sanitation District or Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County for the sewer infrastructure system necessary to serve the subdivision.

9. Prior to obtaining the first Building Permit subdivider shall:

a. install and dedicate all required regional sewer infrastructure required for VTTM 61105 identified in the approved Newhall Ranch Conceptual Sewer Master Plan PC 11812AS. This infrastructure may exclude the Newhall Ranch WRP facility if its completion is not yet warranted per the Agreement between County Sanitation Districts Nos. 26 and 32 of Los Angeles County and the Newhall Land and Farming Company Regarding a Plan for the Coordination of Wastewater Management Facilities Relating to The Newhall Ranch Specific Plan Development, dated January 9, 2002 as determined by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION - WATER
TRACT NO. 61105 (Rev.)

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 12-15-2010
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 12-15-2010

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

Prior to recordation of a Final map:

1. A "Written Verification" and supporting documents from the water supplier to indicate the availability of a "Sufficient Water Supply" as required per Section 66473.7 of the Subdivision Map Act (SB 221) shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Department of Regional Planning and Public Works prior to filing any map.

2. A water system maintained by the water purveyor, with appurtenant facilities to serve all buildings/lots in the land division, must be provided. The system shall include fire hydrants of the type and location (both on-site and off-site) as determined by the Fire Department. The water mains shall be sized to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows.

3. There shall be filed with Public Works a statement from the water purveyor indicating that the water system will be operated by the purveyor, and that under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division, and that water service will be provided to each lot.

4. Easements shall be granted to the County, appropriate agency or entity for the purpose of ingress, egress, construction and maintenance of all infrastructures constructed for this land division to the satisfaction of Public Works.

5. Depict all line of sight easements on the landscaping and grading plans.

Prior to Building Permit By Building and Safety Division:

- Prior to obtaining a building permit from the Building and Safety Office, submit landscape and irrigation plans for each commercial/multi-family/open space lot in the land division, with landscape area greater than 2,500 square feet, in accordance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

Prepared by Julian Garcia Phone (626) 458-4921 Date 01-12-2011