AGENDA
ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF ROLLING HILLS
7:30 AM
TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2019
MEET AT 49 EASTFIELD DRIVE

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

4. FIELD TRIPS

A. ZONING CASE NO. 959 Request for a Conditional Use Permit to convert an existing 689 square foot stable, to a mixed-use structure which includes a 450 square foot recreation room and a 239 square foot storage space, located at 49 Eastfield Drive (Lot 33-EF) Rolling Hills, CA, (Craig & Cindy Waldman).

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
1. Motion to continue discussion to regular Planning Commission meeting in the evening on May 21, 2019.

B. ZONING CASE NO. 955. Request for a Site Plan Review for a new 6,374 square foot residence with 1,360 square foot porch, 756 square foot attached garage, 934 square foot basement, 1,643 square foot swimming pool & spa and grading of 5,600 cubic yards, total cut and fill; a Conditional Use Permit for a 452 square foot stable and 575 square foot corral, and Variances to exceed the maximum permitted lot disturbance and for a retaining wall located in the side yard setback at 1 Poppy Trail, (Lot 90-B2-RH) Rolling Hills, CA, (Yeh).

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
1. Motion to continue discussion to regular Planning Commission meeting in the evening on May 21, 2019.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Documents pertaining to an agenda item received after the posting of the agenda are available for review in the City Clerk's office or at the meeting at which the item will be considered.
All zoning case items have been determined to be categorically exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines unless otherwise stated.
TO: HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: YOLANTA SCHWARTZ, PLANNING DIRECTOR

APPLICATION NO. ZONING CASE NO. 959
SITE LOCATION: 49 EASTFIELD DRIVE (LOT 33-EF)
ZONING AND SIZE: RAS-1, 1.17 ACRES (EXCL. ROADWAY EASEMENT)
APPLICANT: CRAIG AND CINDY WALDMAN
REPRESENTATIVE: CHRISTIAN ROGGE
PUBLISHED: MAY 9, 2019

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Project
The applicant converted an existing 689 square foot stable to a mixed-use structure without proper approvals. The project also includes setting aside a 1,000 sq.ft. area for a future stable and corral.

Conditional Use Permit
The applicants request a Conditional Use Permit to legalize a conversion of an existing 689 square foot stable to a mixed-use structure which includes a 450 square foot recreation room and a 239 square foot storage space. There is also 211 square feet of covered porch.

Recommendation
It is recommended that the Planning Commission view the project in the field, open the public hearing, take brief public testimony and continue the meeting to the evening meeting of the Planning Commission or provide other direction to staff.

BACKGROUND

Zoning, Land Size and Existing Conditions
ZC NO. 959 49 Eastfield Mixed-Use Structure

1/9
The property is zoned RAS-1 and the gross lot area is 1.30 acres and 1.17 acres excluding the roadway easement. The net lot area for development purposes is 0.97 acres or 42,295 square feet.

**Driveway and Motor Court**
There is no change proposed in vehicular access to the mixed-use structure.

**Past Approval for the Property**
In March 2012 an administrative approval was granted to construct a 971 square foot addition with 1,196 square foot basement and for a major remodel of the residence, where most of the walls were to be demolished, as well as to relocate and change the shape of the existing swimming pool, which is not to exceed 756 square feet. The house remodel, addition and basement was completed and the residence is now 3,261 square feet with 1,196 square foot basement, 2 separate garages of 948 square feet total and a pool and spa of 756 square feet. In 2013, a Conditional Use Permit for a stable was approved, which was also completed.

**MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE**

**Grading and Stabilization**
There is no new construction proposed so no grading is included in the CUP proposal.

**Disturbance**
The lot was graded in the past and the disturbed area is 71.6%. The applicants propose to stay within the previously disturbed area when designating a stable/corral set aside area.

**Height**
The height of the mixed-use structure will remain unchanged from the previously constructed stable height.

**Drainage**
The previously approved drainage and erosion control plans are not proposed to change.

**Lot Coverage**
The existing structural coverage of 15.4% (20% max. permitted) and total lot coverage of 30.13% (35% max. permitted) are only changing based on the added stable set aside area of 450 square feet. The proposed structural coverage is 16.5% (20% max. permitted) and total lot coverage is proposed to be 31.17% (35% max. permitted).

**Walls**
No walls are included in the proposed project.
Stable and Corral Set Aside
The applicants propose to set aside a 1,000 sq.ft. area for a future stable and corral in an area north of the mixed-use structure. Access to the future stable corral is available through the existing access pathways. The stable and corral set aside area is located within the previously disturbed corral area.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TABLE
A Conditional Use Permit is required for the mixed-use structure.

Mixed-Use Structure Requirements
Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, mixed-use structures are allowed uses with a Conditional Use Permit and the following regulations apply:

Definition: "Mixed use structure" means a structure detached from the primary building and used or designed to be used for a garage or for two or more of the following uses: garage, keeping of horses or other permitted animals, storage of equestrian, agricultural and general household goods, recreational purposes, an office, a study or other uses. Two or more of the same uses within the structure are not permitted. If any of the uses include keeping of horses or other permitted animals, no portion of the structure may contain a guest-house or sleeping quarters for humans.

Conditions: Mixed Use Structures. A mixed use structure, as defined by this title, shall be subject to the following conditions:
   a. Mixed use structures shall not be located in the front yard or any setback;
   b. That portion of the structure intended to be used for other than a garage use, shall not exceed eight hundred square feet in size;
   c. Vehicular access to the garage or mixed use structure shall not occur within an easement or within twenty-five feet of the side or rear lot line;
   d. If a portion of the structure is designed or intended to be used for a garage, that portion shall be separated by an interior common wall from the portion of the structure used as a stable, barn, office, study, recreational use or other use. The interior common wall shall be constructed in the same manner as found in attached townhouse construction. No access from the interior of the portion used for a garage to the interior of the portion used for the other use shall be permitted;
   e. If a portion of the structure is intended to be used as a stable, that portion of the structure, in addition to meeting the requirements of this subsection shall be subject to the requirements of Chapter 17.18 of this title.
f. If a portion of the structure is intended to be used as a garage, there shall be no sleeping quarters, occupancy, kitchen or kitchenette facilities, but a sanitary facility including a sink and toilet maybe permitted. The remainder of the structure and its uses shall comply with the provisions of this section for each individual use.

g. A loft area may be constructed only over the stable portion of the mixed use structure, subject to the requirements of Chapter 17.18 of this title.

h. Where the garage, stable or any other use that is specified on the approved plan is converted to another use, or if the proportions of any approved use is changed without required approvals, the permit granting the mixed use structure may be revoked, pursuant to Chapter 17.58, and the structure shall be removed at the cost of the property owner;

i. If any conditions of the permit are violated, or if any law, statute or ordinance is violated, the permit may be revoked and the privileges granted by the permit shall lapse, provided that the property owner has been given written notice to cease such violation and has failed to do so for a period of thirty days, and further provided that the owner has been given an opportunity for a hearing.

The proposed structure meets the above conditions and will be so stipulated in the Resolution, if the project is approved and no variance applies.

Utility Lines / Septic Tank
All utility lines have already been placed underground. There are no anticipated changed to the septic tank.

General
In describing the application the applicants’ agent states, in part, that the proposed mixed-use structure is an exchange of the existing stable to a recreational [and storage] room and is consistent with current building allowances.

Rolling Hills Community Association Review
Rolling Hills Community Association may review this project at a later date.

Planning Commission Responsibilities
When reviewing a development application, the Planning Commission must consider whether the proposed project meets the criteria for a Conditional Use Permit, as attached below.
Environmental Review
The project has been determined to be categorically exempt (Class 3) pursuant to Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

### Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE PLAN REVIEW</th>
<th>PREVIOUS PROJECT-APPROVED</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA-S- 1 ZONE SETBACKS</td>
<td>ADDITION AND MAJOR REMODEL STABLE/CORRAL</td>
<td>MIXED USE STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front: 50 ft. from front roadway easement line</td>
<td>Residence 3,261 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Residence 3,261 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side: 20 ft. from property line</td>
<td>Garage/w service area 948 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Garage/w service area 948 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear: 50 ft. from rear property line</td>
<td>Stable 689 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Mixed-Use Struct 689 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURES (Site Plan Review required for new structures or when size of residence increases by more than 999 s.f. in a 36-month period &amp; grading; CUP for Mixed-Use Structure)</td>
<td>Service yard 96 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Service yard 96 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable porches 211 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Mixed-Use porches 211 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool/spa 756 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Pool/spa 756 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pool eqpm. 32 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Pool eqpm. 32 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basement 1,196 sq.ft.</td>
<td>Basement 1,196 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 6,506 sq.ft.</td>
<td>TOTAL 6,956 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL LOT COVERAGE (20% maximum)</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>16.5% (with stable set aside)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LOT COVERAGE (35% maximum)</td>
<td>30.13%</td>
<td>31.17% (with stable set aside)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING PADS (30% guideline)</td>
<td>Res. Pad 29.4%</td>
<td>31.5% (with stable set aside)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADING Site Plan Review required if</td>
<td>716 c.y. cut and fill (existing)</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTURBED AREA (40% maximum; any existing or proposed graded areas. Re-grading of previously graded areas is not counted)</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABLE (min. 450 SQ.FT. &amp; 550 SQ.FT. CORRAL)</td>
<td>689 sq.ft.</td>
<td>450 sq.ft. Future - set aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STABLE ACCESS</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROADWAY ACCESS</td>
<td>Existing driveway approach; widened drwy</td>
<td>Existing driveway approach; widened drwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEWS</td>
<td>Planning Commission condition</td>
<td>Planning Commission review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANTS AND ANIMALS</td>
<td>Planning Commission condition</td>
<td>Planning Commission review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

17.42.050  Basis for approval or denial of conditional use permit.

The Commission (and Council on appeal), in acting to approve a conditional use permit application, may impose conditions as are reasonably necessary to ensure the project is consistent with the General Plan, compatible with surrounding land use, and meets the provisions and intent of this title. In making such a determination, the hearing body shall find that the proposed use is in general accord with the following principles and standards:

A. That the proposed conditional use is consistent with the General Plan;
B. That the nature, condition and development of adjacent uses, buildings and structures have been considered, and that the use will not adversely affect or be materially detrimental to these adjacent uses, building or structures;
C. That the site for the proposed conditional use is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the use and buildings proposed;
D. That the proposed conditional use complies with all applicable development standards of the zone district;
E. That the proposed use is consistent with the portions of the Los Angeles County Hazardous Waste Management Plan relating to siting and siting criteria for hazardous waste facilities;
F. That the proposed conditional use observes the spirit and intent of this title.
TO: HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: YOLANTA SCHWARTZ, PLANNING DIRECTOR

APPLICATION NO: ZONING CASE NO. 955
SITE LOCATION: 1 POPPY TRAIL (LOT 90 B2-RH)
ZONING AND SIZE: RAS-2, 5.5 ACRES (GROSS)
APPLICANT: ROGER YEH
REPRESENTATIVE: JOSEPH SPIERER, JOSEPH SPIERER ARCHITECTS
TAVISHA ALES, BOLTON ENGINEERING
PUBLISHED: JANUARY 3, 2019; APRIL 4, 2019; MAY 9, 2019

ATTACHMENTS: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission at their April 16, 2019 meeting opened the public hearing on this matter and scheduled a field trip to the property on May 21, 2019. It is recommended that the Planning Commission review the project in the field, take brief testimony and continue the meeting to the evening meeting of the Planning Commission at 6:30PM on May 21, 2019.

The Project
The project entails the construction of a new residence with a basement, garage, covered porch, stable with corral, retaining walls, new swimming pool and other outdoor amenities.

Zoning and Land Size
The property is zoned RAS-2 and the gross lot area is 5.5 acres. The net lot area of the lot is 204,383 square feet or 4.69 acres. The lot is vacant but has a graded, previously created building pad as well as a 15’ wide driveway leading to the building pad. Poppy Trail Road traverses the lot and the Gerojeff Trail is also located on the lot. Access is...
taken over the adjacent lot, at 0 Poppy Trail. The area across Poppy Trail (to the east of the road) has been designated as an easement to the RHCA as well as a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). There are bridle trails leading to/from Hesse's Gap riding ring through this portion of the lot. SEA cannot be disturbed, as it has been identified as having biological resources. Following the remediation and the entitlements, the SEA was so noted on the Final Parcel Map and recorded.

**Past Property Approval**
In 2005, an active landslide took place on what was, at the time, 1 Poppy Trail. The roadway easement (Poppy Trail) was covered by dirt from the slide and a series of remediation steps were taken to stabilize the land and reconstruct Poppy Trail. As a result of that stabilization, two vacant lots were formed, 1 Poppy Trail and the adjacent property, 0 Poppy Trail.

At the conclusion of remediation of the landslide, the City approved a number of elements on the lot that would allow for future development, including a subdivision into two lots, determination of setbacks, variances for greater than permitted disturbance for both lots (55% on subject lot and 65% on 0 Poppy Trail lot), a set of slopes steeper than 2:1 grade, the driveway aprons, the set aside area for stables and corrals, utility line placement, slopes greater than 30 feet in height, walls located in setbacks, walls higher than five feet tall, landscaping on slopes, grading and export of dirt. To create the two lots, lot line adjustments between several parcels in the vicinity were processed, as well as a subdivision, zoning map and a zone change.

In 2017 approval was granted for the development of a residence with appurtenant facilities on the adjacent, 0 Poppy Trail.

**Site Plan Review**
The applicant requests a Site Plan Review for a new 6,374 square foot residence with 756 square foot attached garage and 934 square foot basement, a 1,643 square foot swimming pool & spa, a retaining wall ranging in height from 6" curb to 5' along the north western limits of the building pad, a portion of which is in the side setback, and overall grading of 5,600 cubic yards. Also proposed are several outdoor amenities, such as a BBQ, service yard and water feature. 520 cubic yards of dirt is proposed to be exported from the basement and pool excavation.

**Conditional Use Permit**
A Conditional Use Permit is requested for a new 452 square foot stable and 575 square foot corral.

**Variances**
A Variance is requested for approximately 160' of the retaining wall to encroach between 1-foot to 2.5 feet into the side setback. The Building Code requires certain distance from structures to an ascending slope. In order to comply, the applicants propose to slightly enlarge the building pad, by 860 square feet, to create a larger yard
area between the house and the slope, to construct an up to 5' high retaining wall into
the setback and to exceed the lot disturbance to 69.6%.

During the remediation of the landslide, the lot was graded and slopes reconstructed
and at that time a variance for disturbance of the lot was granted of 55%, (40% max.
permitted). According to new evaluation of the disturbed area of the lot by the Civil
Engineer, calculated specifically for this application, the disturbance of the lot is 69.6%,
and is greater than the variance of 55% granted in 2010. Therefore, a new variance is
required for the 69.6% disturbance.

(See more detail on the disturbance under the Disturbance description below).

**Driveway and Motor Court**
The applicants propose to widen the existing driveway to 20' and size of the motor
court to meet Fire Department requirements. The slope of the driveway is 7% or less for
the first twenty feet and never greater than 17% grade at any point. The Traffic
Commission previously reviewed and recommended approval of the driveway apron.
The City Council approved the driveway apron at the time the lot was subdivided on
October 4, 2010.

**MUNICIPAL CODE COMPLIANCE**

**Grading and Stabilization**
Due to the engineering of the lot and surrounding slope, there are limitations to grading
on the slope of the property. The only proposed improvement near the engineered
slope is the widening of the driveway, and pushing the building pad out a few feet.
Overall grading will include 2,800 cubic yards cut and 2,800 cubic yards fill, 1,500 cubic
yards over excavation, and 2,000 cubic yards re-compaction. The total grading for the
site is proposed to be 5,600 cubic yards with 520 cubic yards of dirt to be exported from
the site from the pool and basement excavation.

**Disturbance**
As reported in the variance section, existing disturbance of the lot is 69.6%. This
percentage is based on an updated survey conducted by the project engineer. There will
be no additional disturbance as a result of the proposed project. All development is
being constructed within a previously disturbed area. While reviewing the
development proposed on 0 Poppy Trail in 2017, it became apparent that it is necessary
to amend the previously prepared and adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND)
for the landslide remediation project, (of a landslide that occurred in 2005 at this
location), to reflect the correct disturbance on both lots. The original MND prepared for
the landslide remediation project was undertaken by the previous owners (CJPIA).
Prior to the remediation of the landslide it was reported that the projected lot
disturbance would be 65% on the lot that became 0 Poppy Trail and 55% on the lot
currently under consideration, which is 1 Poppy Trail, whereas a current survey of the
property show disturbance at 69.6%, including for the stable and corral. In 2017 staff

ZC No. 955 1 Poppy Trail
prepared an addendum to the MND explaining the discrepancy in reporting of the
disturbed area. It was determined that all of the areas of the lot where grading or
remediation took place were reviewed by geotechnical, soils and civil engineer
consultants prior to any grading being implemented, and is substantiated by the
date technical reports that are on file at City Hall, including a final analysis for the as
remediated project. The lower percent reported in the original project application
for the landslide remediation was a numerical error provided by the Civil Engineer. The
amended MND was adopted by the Planning Commission on August 15, 2017 and is
included with this report.

Height
The height of the highest ridgeline for the residence is proposed to be 18.25 feet, and it
varies between 12’, 15’ and the 18.25’. The highest ridgeline of the stable is proposed to
be 12.25 feet. The basement is proposed to be 9 feet deep.

Drainage
The existing condition of the site includes an extensive swale system with outlets into
the natural drainage course and weep holes in the retaining walls. The run-off is
directed away from the building pad. The new swales to be constructed behind the wall
along the limit of the building pad, will collect water from above the project site and
direct it away from the building pad.

The remediation of the landslide was previously subject to the Storm Water Pollution
Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which included stormwater management for the grading of
the driveway and building pad. This application is subject to the City’s Low Impact
Development (LID) ordinance requirements for retention of water on site and
biofiltration, and the City’s Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance where the
applicants must implement low water usage planting, comply with a water budget and
prescribed irrigation devices and certify compliance. The previously landscaped slopes
and walls must remain and be maintained in good condition. All of these requirements
will be reviewed at the plan check review process and monitored during construction.

Lot Coverage
The net lot area of the lot is 204,383 square feet. The proposed overall total (structural
and flatwork) coverage on the lot (with exclusions) is 27,979 square feet or 13.7% in
conformance with the lot coverage limitations, (w/out exclusions 13.73%), (35% max.).
The proposed structural net lot coverage (with exclusions) is 10,746 square feet or 5.25%
in conformance with the lot coverage limitations, (w/out exclusions- 5.28%), (20%
max.). The building pad has been graded and is 23,750 square feet. The applicant
proposes to enlarge it by 860 square feet to 24,610 sq.ft. Building coverage on this pad is
proposed at 43.7%, which includes the stable, (30% guideline).

Walls
There are several existing walls on the subject property. These walls were used to
stabilize the lot and have previously been approved as part of the remediation of the
landslide in 2010. This includes some walls higher than 5 feet and/or located within setback areas.

The proposed project includes one, approximately 340’ long retaining wall, ranging from a 6” curb to 5’ in height along the northwestern limits of the building pad, portion of which encroaches between 1’ to 2.5’ into the side setback. A 55’ long wall not to exceed 3’ is also proposed along a portion of the back wall, at the northwestern end of the residence. The walls will average out to 2½ feet in height. A drainage swale will be constructed behind the wall to collect run-off from the slope and divert it around the building pad.

**Stable Access**

Stable access is proposed for both vehicles and horses off the main driveway. Since Georgeff Trail is located on the property, access to the trails is very convenient.

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT SUMMARIES**

A Conditional Use Permit is required for the stable pursuant to Section 17.18.060. The proposed stable will be 452 square feet with a 575 square foot corral.

Pursuant to the zoning code requirements the following is applicable to this request:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not less than 6’ wide roughened access; if greater than 1,000 sq.ft. stable access to comply with Fire Dept. requirements.</td>
<td>Proposed 20’ wide vehicular access off driveway and over 6’ horse access from easement bridal trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable, corral not to be located on slopes greater than 4:1</td>
<td>Located on area with a slope no greater than 4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in front yard or side or front setback. May be located up to 25’ in rear setback.</td>
<td>Stable and corral comply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. 35’ from any residential structure</td>
<td>Complies with requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building to be designed for rural and agricultural uses only, but may include storage of vehicles and household items</td>
<td>Building is proposed to look like a stable and be used for a stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size to include the entire footprint including loft, if any, as measured from the exterior walls</td>
<td>452 square foot stable with no loft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of 60% of the size of the structure shall be maintained for agricultural uses</td>
<td>Agricultural spaces include one stall, and is 327 sq.ft. or 72.3% of the size of the structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of 40% of the size of the structure, but not to exceed 800 s.f. may be maintained for a tack room</td>
<td>Tack room is 125 sq.ft. 27.6% of the structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack room may have sanitary and kitchenette amenities</td>
<td>Not proposed at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tack room may have glazed openings</td>
<td>No window proposed in tack room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry doors to agricultural space to be min. 4’ wide &amp; 8’ high; appearance of a stable door</td>
<td>To comply- to be reviewed by the Architectural Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loft is permitted</td>
<td>No loft proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loft plate height may not exceed 7’</td>
<td>No loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior area of stables may not be paved</td>
<td>Unpaved corral adjacent to the stable and a short pervious access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corral shall be fenced</td>
<td>Proposed fenced corral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access not to exceed 25%</td>
<td>Access complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corral to be contiguous to stable. Planning Commission may determine the size of a coral based on the size of the stable</td>
<td>Corral to be contiguous to stable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial uses or sleeping is not allowed</td>
<td>Applicant is not proposing any commercial uses or sleeping in the stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utility Lines / Septic Tank**

It will be a requirement that utility lines to all of the proposed structures be placed underground. Much of this infrastructure was already provided for during the landslide remediation and stub outs for the utilities are in the ground.

The previous remediation of the site also requires that any future development of a residence include a percolation test. This is to accommodate the septic tank. The applicant has conducted this test and has indicated on the plans a septic tank location consistent with the results of the test.

**Additional Environmental Review**

As stated earlier, the project review was continued from the January 2019 meeting to allow staff to determine if the proposed project may be subject to a new review of one of the components of CEQA, the Biological Resources, because it may no longer be covered by the mitigated negative declaration document used in the landslide remediation on the site. Therefore, additional time was required to evaluate this issue.

A portion of the property is designated as a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). This means that biological resources were identified in the area and it needs to remain undisturbed. Prior to the landslide remediation the impact of grading and disturbance of the property was analyzed in the CEQA document prepared at the time. The proposed new development is consistent with that analysis. That SEA was identified by the Environmental consultant that was hired prior to remediation of the lot to study the biological resources and is recorded with the Final Parcel Map.

During the review of this project staff came across information that there may be an adjacent ecologically sensitive area located in the area of the proposed widening of the driveway. Normally a single family development with appurtenant structures is exempt from CEQA (14 CCR Section 15303). To process the application the City needed to analyze whether an exception to that exemption applies because of the new information.
Based on the City's evaluation we found that the project is exempt and that there is no
evidence to suggest that an exception to the exemption would apply. The MND
prepared for the remediation project concluded that the project would not have a
significant adverse effect on the environment. The biological resources section analyzed
the following: five vegetation communities, including the urban/developed, disturbed
habitat, southern mixed chaparral, non-native grassland, and southern willow scrub;
two sensitive habitats, including the southern mixed chaparral and southern willow
scrub; twenty-five sensitive plant species; and sixteen sensitive animal species, and only
found the presence of a few sensitive resources (southern mixed chaparral, southern
willow scrub, as well as riparian area) on the east side of Poppy Trail, and was
designated as an ESA. (See attached the Biological Resources section of the CEQA
documents prepared for the remediation.)

In addition, the City sought out the opinion of a biologist to compare the conclusions in
the former MND with the new County SEA to see whether the former MND covered
the same environmental sensitivities as in the County SEA. The biologist concluded that
there are no sensitive biological resources within the proposed project footprint, and
therefore no significant impacts would result from the project implementation. The
biologist also found that the area currently in question was already developed or was in
a disturbed condition as a result of the landslide and that no sensitive biological
resources were located in the area currently proposed for development at the time the
MND was prepared in 2010, (see attached biologist’s opinion.)

Environmental Determination
The project has been determined to be categorically exempt pursuant to the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Class 3, Section 15303 New Construction.
Earlier approved elements and anticipated development activities for the subject
property were previously reviewed and mitigations are covered by a Mitigated
Negative Declaration adopted in October 2010, and as corrected in 2017.

Rolling Hills Community Association Review
Rolling Hills Community Association will review this project at a later date.

Planning Commission Responsibilities
When reviewing a development application, the Planning Commission must consider
whether the proposed project meets the findings for a Site Plan Review, Conditional
Use Permit, and Variances as seen below.

NEARBY PROPERTIES
(For information only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>House size in sq.ft. (built/add or remodel)</th>
<th>Lot Area (gross acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Poppy Trail</td>
<td>Approved 4,859*</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Poppy Trail</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Poppy Trail</td>
<td>3,598*</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Site Plan Review</th>
<th>Proposed Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Portuguese Bend Road</td>
<td>5,136*</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Portuguese Bend Road</td>
<td>8,661</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Saddleback Road</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Poppy Trail</td>
<td>Proposed 6,374</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The above do not include garages, basements and other accessory structures.

**SOURCES:** Assessor's records * City records

### Project Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Plan Review</th>
<th>Proposed Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RA-S-2 ZONE SETBACKS</strong></td>
<td>NEW RESIDENCE, GARAGE, POOL and STABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front: 50 ft. from front easement line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side: 35 ft. from property line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear: 50 ft. from rear easement line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Residence 6,374 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>Garage 756 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool and spa</td>
<td>Pool and spa 1,643 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Equipment</td>
<td>Pool Equipment 41 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Stable 452 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service yard</td>
<td>Service yard 96 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Porches</td>
<td>Covered Porches 1,360 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor firepit</td>
<td>Outdoor firepit 25 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor BBQ</td>
<td>Outdoor BBQ 53 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water feature</td>
<td>Water feature 9 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement</td>
<td>Basement 934 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>TOTAL 10,809 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRUCTURAL LOT COVERAGE** (20% maximum)

| STRUCTURAL LOT COVERAGE (20% maximum) (20% maximum) | 10,746 sq.ft. or 5.25% (with deductions) (5.28% no deductions) |

**TOTAL LOT COVERAGE** (35% maximum)

| TOTAL LOT COVERAGE (35% maximum)                     | 27,979 sq.ft. or 13.69% (with deductions) 13.7% - no deductions |

**BUILDING PADS (30% guideline)**

| BUILDING PADS (30% guideline)                        | 43.7% residence pad coverage (with deductions). It includes stable |

**GRADING**

Site Plan Review required if excavation and/or fill or combination thereof that is more than 3 feet in depth and covers more than 2,000 sq.ft; must be balanced on site.

| GRADING                                               | 2,800cy cut and 2,800 cy fill, for a total of 5,600 cy. 520 cy to be exported from excavation of basement and pool |

**DISTURBED AREA** (40% maximum; any graded building pad area, any remedial grading (temporary disturbance), any graded slopes and building pad areas, and

| DISTURBED AREA                                        | 69.6% Variance previously granted for 55% |
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any nongraded area where impervious surfaces exist.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STABLE (min. 450 SQ.FT. &amp; 550 SQ.FT. CORRAL)</td>
<td>452 s.f Stable 575 s.f. Corral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROADWAY ACCESS</td>
<td>Off bridal trail and driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEWS</td>
<td>Planning Commission review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANTS AND ANIMALS</td>
<td>Planning Commission review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITE PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA

17.46.010 Purpose.

The site plan review process is established to provide discretionary review of certain development projects in the City for the purposes of ensuring that the proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan; incorporates environmentally and aesthetically sensitive grading practices; preserves existing mature vegetation; is compatible and consistent with the scale, massing and development pattern in the immediate project vicinity; and otherwise preserves and protects the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Rolling Hills.

17.46.050 Required findings.

A. The Commission shall be required to make findings in acting to approve, conditionally approve, or deny a site plan review application.

B. No project which requires site plan review approval shall be approved by the Commission, or by the City Council on appeal, unless the following findings can be made:

1. The project complies with and is consistent with the goals and policies of the general plan and all requirements of the zoning ordinance;

2. The project substantially preserves the natural and undeveloped state of the lot by minimizing building coverage. Lot coverage requirements are regarded as maximums, and the actual amount of lot coverage permitted depends upon the existing buildable area of the lot;

3. The project is harmonious in scale and mass with the site, the natural terrain and surrounding residences;

4. The project preserves and integrates into the site design, to the greatest extent possible, existing topographic features of the site, including surrounding native vegetation, mature trees, drainage courses and land forms (such as hillside and knolls);

5. Grading has been designed to follow natural contours of the site and to minimize the amount of grading required to create the building area;

6. Grading will not modify existing drainage channels nor redirect drainage flow, unless such flow is redirected into an existing drainage course;

7. The project preserves surrounding native vegetation and mature trees and supplements these elements with drought-tolerant landscaping which is compatible with and enhances the rural character of the community, and landscaping provides a buffer or transition area between private and public areas;

8. The project is sensitive and not detrimental to the convenient and safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles; and

9. The project conforms to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

17.42.050 Basis for approval or denial of conditional use permit.

The Commission (and Council on appeal), in acting to approve a conditional use permit application, may impose conditions as are reasonably necessary to ensure the project is consistent with the General Plan, compatible with surrounding land use, and meets the provisions and intent of this title. In making such a determination, the hearing body shall find that the proposed use is in general accord with the following principles and standards:

A. That the proposed conditional use is consistent with the General Plan;
B. That the nature, condition and development of adjacent uses, buildings and structures have been considered, and that the use will not adversely affect or be materially detrimental to these adjacent uses, building or structures;
C. That the site for the proposed conditional use is of adequate size and shape to accommodate the use and buildings proposed;
D. That the proposed conditional use complies with all applicable development standards of the zone district;
E. That the proposed use is consistent with the portions of the Los Angeles County Hazardous Waste Management Plan relating to siting and siting criteria for hazardous waste facilities;
F. That the proposed conditional use observes the spirit and intent of this title.

CRITERIA FOR VARIANCES

17.38.050 Required findings. In granting a variance, the Commission (and Council on appeal) must make the following findings:

A. That there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same vicinity and zone;
B. That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights possessed by other properties in the same vicinity and zone but which is denied the property in question;
C. That the granting of such variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity;
D. That in granting the variance, the spirit and intent of this title will be observed;
E. That the variance does not grant special privilege to the applicant;
F. That the variance is consistent with the portions of the County of Los Angeles Hazardous Waste Management Plan relating to siting and siting criteria for hazardous waste facilities; and
G. That the variance request is consistent with the general plan of the City of Rolling Hills.

SOURCE: City of Rolling Hills Zoning Ordinance
**Applicant Statement/Justification**

Regarding compatibility to the zone and variance for the wall, the applicant states the following:

"In order for the site to maintain H/2 ratio surrounding the residence, we are in need of placing retaining walls in setback. The retaining walls in setback would only be visible to owner and not adjacent properties. The area in need of additional retaining walls in setback have a higher slope than most of site. The variance is necessary for the preservation of the site for the property and neighboring properties. The retaining walls in setback will not be visible.

The retaining walls in setback will not be materially detrimental to the vicinity. They are located in the back of the site behind the residence. Retaining walls will match adjacent wall styles and below HOA height restrictions.

The variance would be consistent with the portions of the County of LA Hazardous Waste Management Plan for the siting criteria for hazardous waste facilities. All requirements would be met and maintained.

The variance request would be consistent with the general plan of the City of Rolling Hills and would meet all requirements."

Regarding the overall development of a new residence and appurtenant structures on a vacant lot, the applicant states in part as follows:

The project is compatible and fits with the surrounding sites of neighboring houses. It is located at the most feasible location to maximize drainage courses, land forms and vegetation. No impact from grading will result as the lot was previously graded. The development is minimal in regards to lot coverage. The project is harmonious in scale and mass with the site and adjacent properties. The rear setback encroachment is due to necessity of a retaining wall and a swale required to maintain the slope. The wall would only be visible from the residence and not adjacent properties.

Regarding the CUP for the stable and corral, the applicant states in part: Stables and corrals are a requirement of the City and this project is consistent with the General Plan. The project site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the stable and corral.
13 February 2019

Yolanta Schwartz
Planning Director
City of Rolling Hills
2 Portuguese Bend Road
Rolling Hills, CA 90274

Re: Poppy Trail Project, City of Rolling Hills

Dear Yolanta,

At your request I have reviewed documentation that you have provided regarding the County of Los Angeles designation of a portion of the property in question as being within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), and the impact of that designation on a proposed single-family residence with associated driveway improvements.

You will recall that I worked on the Poppy Trail Landslide Remediation Project from 2010 through 2012. In your files you have my Biological Resources Technical Report, which analyzed conditions on the site prior to the remediation activities and discussed impacts to sensitive biological resources. Attached is the figure from the report showing the existing vegetation communities prior to the remediation activities. Please note that the areas currently in question were either already developed or were in a disturbed condition as a result of the landslide (an Act of God). Note that no sensitive biological resources were located in the area currently proposed for development and improvement. Also attached is a 2012 Google Earth image of the site, showing the entire area that was cleared pursuant to the landslide remediation.

Because no biological resources of any kind occur or have occurred in the area where the currently proposed improvements are planned, the SEA designation must have been an error. Certainly, the George F. Canyon and riparian area on the east side of Poppy Trail are sensitive habitat, but those areas were not and will not be disturbed.

Given the vast areas mapped throughout Los Angeles County as SEAs, it is not surprising that the boundaries of these areas can sometimes be vague. Many of the areas were derived from hand-drawn maps from the 1970s, which were later digitized. Most of the SEAs have never actually been surveyed providing precise boundaries. Boundaries shown on the County maps can easily be off, sometimes by hundreds of feet or more.

Furthermore, the areas to be improved meet none of the six SEA designation criteria, as described in Appendix E - Conservation and Natural Resources Element Resources (pages 85 and 86) of the Los Angeles County General Plan.
Given that there are no sensitive biological resources within the proposed project footprint, it is difficult to imagine any way that significant impacts would result from project implementation.

If you have any questions at all, please call me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

William T. Everett, PhD, FN, FRGS
Figure 9. Biological Resources (Vegetation) Map of the project site. All areas not specifically defined are Urban/Developed.
Satellite image of the project site in 2012, showing the complete absence of vegetation (of any kind) from the project site.
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POPPY TRAIL ROAD LANDSLIDE REMEDIATION PROJECT

SUMMARY

The Poppy Trail Road Landslide Remediation project is multi-faceted effort to remediate a landslide that occurred in 2005. In addition to removing and replacing the landslide mass, the project includes road repair, lot line adjustments, and creation of an additional parcel. Upon project implementation, the site will contain two legal parcels totaling 10.16 acres (gross).

The project site is located on Poppy Trail Road in the City of Rolling Hills, on the Palos Verdes Peninsula in Los Angeles County.

Five vegetation communities occur on-site: Urban / Developed, Disturbed Habitat, Southern Mixed Chaparral, Non-Native Grassland, and Southern Willow Scrub.

Habitat Assessments were conducted on-site for California Gnatcatchers and Palos Verdes Blue Butterflies. No sensitive species were detected or are considered likely to occur.

The project will result in the loss on-site of 0.16 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral. This loss is not deemed significant. An area of Southern Willow Scrub (wetland) on the site will not be impacted and will be protected from future disturbance by designation by the City as an Environmentally Protected Area.

All impacts of the project are below a level of significant pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. No mitigation is required.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to document the biological resources identified as present or potentially present on the project site; identify potential biological resource impacts resulting from the proposed project; and recommend measures to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate significant impacts consistent with federal, state, and local rules and regulations including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

BACKGROUND

On March 5 2005, a landslide occurred in the City of Rolling Hills. The landslide originated on property located at 1 Poppy Trail Road (the "Sheen property") and terminated just below the roadway easement for Poppy Trail Road. The landslide buried a portion of Poppy Trail Road, which is the sole means of ingress and egress for nine residential lots. The entire project area is located within the City of Rolling Hills, and Poppy Trail Road is located on land owned mostly by the City of Rolling Hills.

Immediately following the landslide, the City and the Rolling Hills Community Association undertook various emergency measures including winterization of the landslide mass, construction of a temporary access road at the toe of the landslide, and construction of a temporary debris wall along Poppy Trail Road (Photograph 1). Over the ensuing months, various legal actions were initiated among and between parties that were impacted by the landslide. The disputes were ultimately resolved through a Settlement Agreement that was approved in April 2010. Among the Agreement conditions is a requirement calling for a subdivision map creating two parcels where a single parcel now exists. Remediation of the lands and improvements that were impacted by this landslide will be incorporated into the subdivision map and associated discretionary actions including a lot line adjustment, a grading plan, a zone change, and site plan review and variances.
PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The project site and all project elements are located on Poppy Trail Road in the City of Rolling Hills (Figures 1 and 2). The site is dominated by a steep, east-facing slope. It is this slope that slipped during the landslide. The site is situated between 720 and 925 feet above sea level. The approximate USGS coordinates of the site are 33°46'N, 118°21'W (Torrance 7.5 minute series quadrangle, Figure 3). The upper portions of the site contain an existing residence (now abandoned), and associated improvements such as a tennis court and riding stables. The lower portions of the site contain much of the landslide mass, the emergency post-slide alignment of Poppy Trail Road, a small area of natural and naturalized vegetation, and a deeply incised drainage with an intermittent blue line stream flowing in its bottom. The drainage contains dense riparian associated vegetation.

The site is bordered on the northwest and west by Portuguese Bend Road and a single family residence, respectively. To the south is a large undeveloped parcel containing native vegetation. To the southeast, across Poppy Trail Road, is single family residence. To the east and northeast, across Poppy Trail Road, is a large City-owned parcel containing a riding arena, picnic facilities, and undeveloped land.

Central elements of the proposed project are to fully remediate the area of the landslide (removing the slumped soil and replacing it as an engineered fill), to create two residential lots for future sale, to reconstruct Poppy Trail Road to full standards in the location of the temporary road, to reconstruct the existing bridle pathway along Poppy Trail Road and create a new bridle trail on a structural terrace. Discretionary actions to be taken include:

Subdivision: Two parcels will be created through the remediation and grading plans. Parcel 1 will have a net area of 2.68 acres and Parcel 2 net area of 4.76 acres. Total project area encompasses 7.44 acres (net).

Lot Line Adjustment: The two new parcels will be comprised in part of land that was the original Sheen property. However, to facilitate optimum layout and design, and in accordance with elements of the Settlement Agreement, lot lines will be adjusted including the incorporation of limited acreage from two surrounding parcels. One of the donor parcels is owned by the City of Rolling Hills and includes 3.99 acres of land on and around the Poppy Trail Road alignment beginning about 150 feet south of Portuguese Bend Road and ending just short of the curve at the Willow Creek trailhead. The second donor parcel is owned by Saridakis Construction Inc. and includes 1.17 acres contained in a triangular parcel that abuts the City-owned property and extends north of the remaining Saridakis Construction Inc. acreage. The lot line adjustment has multiple purposes; (a) the City seeks to divest ownership of that portion of the lot where the Poppy Trail Road right of way is located, consistent with city policy; (b) transfer of the Saridakis Construction, Inc. parcel will facilitate resolution of financial repercussions sustained by that owner as a result of the landslide; (c) transfer of both parcels will facilitate implementation of a Settlement Agreement provision that calls for the creation of two or three parcels to replace the existing Sheen property; and (d) sale of the parcels will enable the California Joint Powers Insurance Authority (the Project Applicant) to recover a portion of the costs incurred in this remediation project.

This report and analysis is limited to the footprint of the existing parcel and those portions of the contiguous two donor parcels that will be incorporated into the new parcels.

Additional details regarding the required zoning changes and site plan review and variances can be found in the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project. These details are not germane to analysis of biological impacts.
SURVEY METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

Prior to the initial visit, I reviewed variety of sources to ascertain the potential and possible occurrence of sensitive species at the project site. I conducted records searches for the USGS quadrangle and surrounding quads of the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) On-Line Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. Any sensitive species known to occur in the vicinity were given special attention, and available natural history information was reviewed. Seasonal occurrence patterns (e.g., annual plants, migratory birds) were factored into survey plans in the event that site visits are made during time periods when certain species are not present or conspicuous. Information sources include the Jepson Manual (1993), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Recovery Plans for Threatened/Endangered Species, and numerous other references, publications, and on-line resources. Typically, 15-20 field guides to various taxa are taken into the field for quick reference if necessary.

A list of sensitive species with potential to occur at the site was also reviewed prior to field work. All species requiring directed or focused protocol surveys were noted and given special attention.

In the field, potentially sensitive plants species not readily identified in situ were photographed and/or collected for identification via keys or other methods.

To assess the biological resources of the project location, I visited the site on 17 June and 7 July 2010. During both visits I was able to examine the entire project site and adjacent areas. The first visit lasted from 1115 to 1400, the second from 1100 to 1530. Conditions for observation during both visits were excellent, with temperatures in the low 70s to mid 80s, no cloud cover, and light winds. Observations on-site were recorded as they were made, and form the basis of this report and the Biological Resources Map. Animals were identified using scat, tracks, burrows, vocalizations, or by direct observation with the aid of 10X42 Leica binoculars. Vegetation mapping was conducted in accordance with vegetation community definitions as described in Holland (1986). In addition, vegetation mapping on-site was aided by the use of a digital satellite photograph. I took photographs of the site during the visits (Appendix C). It should be noted that all vegetation community mapping is verified on the ground to the greatest degree possible in the absence of a systematic land survey.

During site visit, all habitats were assessed for their suitability for occupation by any sensitive species with potential to occur.

RESULTS

Botany

Five vegetation communities occur on-site: Urban / Developed, Disturbed Habitat, Southern Mixed Chaparral, Non-Native Grassland, and Southern Willow Scrub. A complete floral species list compiled from the site survey is provided in Appendix A.

---
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Vegetation Communities (See Biological Resources Map)

Urban / Developed (Holland Code 12000) - 2.70 Acres

The area incorporated into this category includes most of the Sheen parcel (Figure 6) and contiguous ornamental landscaped areas. Poppy Trail Road is also included.

Disturbed Habitat (Holland Code 11300) - 5.67 Acres

The footprint of the landslide area is classified as Disturbed. Since the landslide, this area has been heavily invaded by several noxious species of weeds, including castor bean Ricinus communis, tree tobacco Nicotiana glauca, and sweet fennel Foeniculum vulgare (Photograph 2). Also included is an area between Poppy Trail Road and the northern site boundary (Photographs 5 and 6). This area is frequently mowed for fire abatement purposes.

Southern Mixed Chaparral (Holland Code 37120) - 0.68 Acres

This vegetation community is limited to a small area in the southeast corner of the project site (Photograph 3). It is dominated by several dense, tall stands of toyon Heteromeles arbutifolia and lemonade berry Rhus integrifolia plants. Associated plant species include California bush sunflower Encelia californica, arroyo lupine Lupinus succulentus, ashy-leaf buckwheat Eriogonum cinerium, purple sage Salvia leucophylla, and Cliff Malacothrix Malacothrix saxatilis.

Non-Native Grassland (Holland Code 42200) - 0.48 Acres

Another small area in the southeast corner of the site contains this habitat type (Photograph 3). Typical invasive weedy grasses and forbs dominate, including species from the genera Avena, Brassica, Bromus, and Hordeum.

Southern Willow Scrub (Holland Code 63320) - 0.63 Acres

The area designated as being within a wetland on the Biological Resources Map contains this habitat type (Photographs 7, 8, and 9). Willows Salix sp., Mexican elderberry Sambucus mexicana, poison oak Toxicodendron diversilobum, wild cucumber Marah macrocarpus, California blackberry Rubus ursinus, and stinging nettle Urtica dioica ssp. holosericea dominate. The drainage contains both U.S. Army and California Department of Fish and Game jurisdictional wetlands. This area will be protected by City designation as an Environmentally Protected Area, which will prohibit any grading, clearing or development. This habitat type will not be impacted by project implementation.

Zoology

Wildlife recorded during the surveys include common and expected species for the habitats that occur on-site. A total of 14 species of birds, one species of mammal, and one species of reptiles were recorded during the site surveys. A complete list of animals detected on-site is provided in Appendix B. Additional common wildlife species likely occur on the site.
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Sensitive Resources

Sensitive plants or animals are defined here as species of rare, threatened, or endangered status, or depleted or declining species according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), or California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Sensitive habitats include those which are considered rare in the region, or support sensitive plants or animals.

Sensitive Habitats

Southern Mixed Chaparral and Southern Willow Scrub are considered sensitive habitats. Significant impacts to these habitat types requires mitigation to reduce impacts to below a level of significant. In addition, impacts to wetlands or non-wetland Waters of the United States, as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Department of Fish and Game (Section 404 of the Clean Water Act 33 U.S.C. 1344 and Section 1600 et seq of the California Fish and Game Code, respectively) require permits and/or a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

As noted above, the survey was conducted with special attention to looking for habitats that are considered sensitive according to the USFWS, CDFG, CNPS, that are listed on the CDFG’s Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) record for the Torrance 7.5 minute quadrangle. The site lacks the appropriate habitat to support most sensitive species.

Sensitive Plants

The following sensitive plant species were evaluated for their potential to occur on the project site and/or specifically looked for during the site survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aphanisma</td>
<td>Aphanisma blitoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura marsh milk-vetch</td>
<td>Astragalus pycnostachyus var. lanosissimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal dunes milk-vetch</td>
<td>Astragalus tener var. titi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South coast saltscale</td>
<td>Atriplex pacifica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish’s brittlescale</td>
<td>Atriplex parishii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson’s saltscale</td>
<td>Atriplex serenana var. davidsonii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt’s pincushion</td>
<td>Chaenactis glabriuscula var. orcuttiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt marsh bird’s-beak</td>
<td>Cordylandthus maritimus ssp. maritimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach spectaclepod</td>
<td>Dithyrea maritima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulter’s goldfields</td>
<td>Lasthenia glabrata ssp. coulteri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Catalina Island desert thorn</td>
<td>Lycium brevipes var. hassei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading navarretia</td>
<td>Navarretia fossalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California orcutt grass</td>
<td>Orcuttia californica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballona cinquefoil</td>
<td>Potentilla multituga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis’ evening-primrose</td>
<td>Camissonia lewisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon’s pentachaeta</td>
<td>Pentachaeta lyonii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island green dudleya</td>
<td>Dudleya virens ssp. insularis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalina crossosoma</td>
<td>Crossosoma californicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern tarplant</td>
<td>Centromadia [=Hemizonia] parryi ssp. australis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal barley</td>
<td>Hordeum intercedens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino aster</td>
<td>Symphyotrichum defoliatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary seablite</td>
<td>Suaeda esteroa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast woolly-heads</td>
<td>Nemacaulis denudata var. denudata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Species</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand's star phacelia</td>
<td>Phacelia stellaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley spineflower</td>
<td>Chorizanthe parryi var. fernandina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of these species were observed during the site survey or are considered likely to occur because there is no suitable habitat within the project area or the project area is outside of their known range. No other sensitive plant species were detected or are considered likely to occur.

Sensitive Wildlife

The following sensitive animal species were evaluated for their potential to occur on the project site and/or specifically looked for during the site survey:

**Reptiles**
- Coast horned lizard: Phrynosoma coronatum

**Mammals**
- South coast marsh vole: Microtus californicus stephensi
- Pocketed free-tailed bat: Nyctinomops femorosaccus
- Big free-tailed bat: Nyctinomops macrotis
- Pacific pocket mouse: Perognathus longimembris pacificus
- Southern California saltmarsh shrew: Sorex ornatus salicornicus
- American badger: Taxidea taxus

**Birds**
- Burrowing owl: Athene cunicularia
- California black rail: Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus
- California least tern: Sternula antillarum browni
- Western snowy plover: Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus
- Southwestern willow flycatcher: Empidonax traillii extimus
- Belding's savannah sparrow: Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi
- Tricolored blackbird: Agelaius tricolor

None of these species were observed during the site survey or are considered likely to occur because there is no suitable habitat within the project area or the project area is outside of their known range.

Two sensitive animal species are known to occur near the project site, and are given specials consideration here.

**Coastal California Gnatcatcher**
*Polioptila californica*

The California Gnatcatcher is a federal threatened species, a state species of concern, and is a "target species" of the NCCP process. This species is a non-migratory resident whose range covers the coastal plains and foothills of Southern California and northern Baja California. It was formerly widespread in coastal lowlands below about 2,000 feet elevation and typically occurs in or near Coastal sage Scrub. The California Gnatcatcher is seriously declining due to loss of habitat. Between 85% and 90% of this species' habitat has been lost to urban or agricultural development. It is almost extirpated from Ventura, San Bernadino, and Los Angeles counties. The population is estimated to be just under 5000 pairs.
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California Gnatcatchers require Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) habitat, with a significant vegetative component of California sagebrush *Artemisia californica*. On the project site there is no CSS, only a small area of dense Southern Mixed Chaparral dominated by dense, mature toyon and lemonade berry plants. The nearest habitat potentially suitable for this species is located approximately 1/3 mile north and south of the project site. Given the lack of suitable habitat on or adjacent to the project site, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys should not be necessary and are not recommended.

**Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly**

*Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis*

[The following status, distribution, and habitat information is excerpted from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2008 5-Year Review for this species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA)].

The Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly was listed as Endangered under the ESA in 1980. Historically, the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly occurred throughout the Palos Verdes peninsula in Los Angeles County, California. When the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly was recognized as a distinct subspecies in the 1970’s, its range and distribution were already reduced by grazing, agriculture, and residential and urban development. The type locality (where the subspecies was first collected and identified) on the Alta Vista Terrace was developed for residential use in 1978, and the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly population was extirpated from the location. By the early 1980’s, Palos Verdes Blue Butterflies were found at only 10 locations, and none were observed between 1983 and 1993, leading to the conclusion that the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly was likely extinct. However, they were discovered in 1994 on the Defense Fuel Support Facility, San Pedro. The only area currently known to be consistently occupied by the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly includes the Defense Fuel Support Facility and the former Palos Verdes Navy housing area. The Navy committed to conserving the species within both areas.

In 1994, a captive rearing program was established from the population at the Defense Fuel Support Facility. The butterflies have been successfully reared in captivity every year since the program was established, and in 2007 a secondary rearing facility was established at Moorpark College, Moorpark, California. While the success of the captive breeding program varied since its inception, the establishment of the secondary rearing facility and improved rearing procedures made 2007 the most successful year on record with over 4,000 Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly pupae (resting stage “cocoons”) produced in captivity. In March 2008, a reintroduction effort was initiated on the Palos Verdes Peninsula.

Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly pupae from the Defense Fuel Support Facility captive rearing program were introduced to the 28.5 acre Linden H. Chandler Preserve (Chandler Preserve) in the City of Rolling Hills Estates following habitat restoration efforts in 2000.

Palos Verdes blue butterflies require suitable larval host plants for oviposition and larval development. Coast locoweed *Astragalus trichopodus lonchus* was once thought to be the exclusive larval host plant for the species. However, larvae are now known to feed also on deerweed *Lotus scoparius*. Both of these host plants are naturally distributed within disturbed patches in coastal sage scrub communities throughout the Palos Verdes peninsula. Both plant species invade cleared areas following disturbance. Palos Verdes Blue Butterflies require some minimum number of larval host plants and nectar resources to successfully exploit a habitat patch over extended periods.
During the site survey no locoweed or deerweed plants were observed. There is no Coastal Sage Scrub on or adjacent to the project site. Consequently the site is not suitable for occupation by the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly.

To be certain of this conclusion on 7 July 2010 I was accompanied to the site by David K. Faulkner, a renown Southern California Entomologist and expert on rare and sensitive butterfly species. He evaluated the site and also concluded is it not suitable for the species.

The nearest known sites for the species are the Chandler Preserve (~ one mile northwest) and the ocean side of the peninsula, over one mile to the south.

The project will have no impacts on the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly.

Wildlife Movement Corridors and Nursery Sites

A wildlife corridor can be defined as a linear landscape feature allowing animal movement between two larger patches of habitat. Connections between extensive areas of open space are integral to maintain regional biodiversity and population viability. In the absence of corridors, habitats become isolated islands surrounded by development. Fragmented habitats support significantly lower numbers of species and increase the likelihood of local extinction for select species when they are restricted to small isolated areas of habitat. Areas that serve as wildlife movement corridors are considered biologically sensitive.

Wildlife corridors can be defined in two categories: regional wildlife corridors and local corridors. Regional corridors link large sections of undeveloped land and serve to maintain genetic diversity among wide-ranging populations. Local corridors permit movement between smaller patches of habitat. These linkages effectively allow a series of small, connected patches to function as a larger block of habitat and perhaps result in the occurrence of higher species diversity or numbers of individuals than would otherwise occur in isolation. Target species for wildlife corridor assessment typically include species such as bobcat, mountain lion, and mule deer.

To assess the function and value of a particular site as a wildlife corridor, it is necessary to determine what areas of larger habitats it connects, and to examine the quality of the corridor as it passes through a variety of settings. High quality corridors connect extensive areas of native habitat, and are not degraded to the point where free movement of wildlife is significantly constrained. Typically, high quality corridors consist of an unbroken stretch of undisturbed native habitat.

The only feature of the project site that could be considered a minor local wildlife corridor is the drainage that runs along the eastern site boundary. This drainage will not be impacted by project implementation, and will be protected by special designation by the City of Rolling Hills. As such, no significant impacts to wildlife movement corridors are anticipated.

Native Wildlife Nursery Sites, which are considered sensitive resources that require protection, are defined as “sites where wildlife concentrate for hatching and/or raising young, such as rookeries, spawning areas, and bat colonies”. Features such as individual raptor or woodrat nests do not constitute places where wildlife concentrate, thus they do not meet this definition and are therefore not considered Native Wildlife Nursery Sites. Nesting raptors will be protected by seasonal construction limitations or directed surveys. No Native Wildlife Nursery Sites occur on the site or will be impacted by project implementation.
POPPOY TRAIL ROAD LANDSLIDE REMEDIATION PROJECT

WETLANDS SURVEY

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers USACE frequently requires that formal or informal wetland delineations be conducted under guidelines set forth in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual. The USACE defines a wetland as “an area... inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions.” Typically, USACE wetlands are characterized by the presence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology.

In addition to regulating jurisdictional wetlands, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) requires authorization for discharges of dredged or fill material into Waters of the United States. For non-tidal Waters of the U.S. the extent of jurisdiction is defined as the Ordinary High Water Mark, which is defined as: “the line on the shore established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical characteristics such as a clear, natural lines impressed on the bank, shelving, changes in the character of soil, destruction of terrestrial vegetation or presence of litter and debris.”

Thus, an area determined to be a non-wetland may still be under USACE jurisdiction if certain criteria are met. To aid in identifying characteristics of Waters of the U.S., the USACE has prepared guidelines (USACE 2001) and a matrix detailing potential Waters of the U.S. based on apparent flow regimes, geomorphic features, and surface flow indicators. In addition, determination that a wetland or water body is a Waters of the United States also requires that the area in question is subject to interstate commerce. These criteria were considered as they apply to the project site.

California Department of Fish and Game Wetlands

Typically, the extent of CDFG wetlands is determined by the limits of riparian vegetation as it extends from a stream, creek, river, pond, lake, or other water feature.

The only jurisdictional wetland (USACE & CDFG) that was identified during the survey of the project site is contained within the incised drainage that straddles the eastern site boundary line. The extent of wetland is shown as Southern Willow Scrub on the project Biological Resources Map.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

In addition to CEQA and City policy, the project could be subject to analysis under the state and federal Endangered Species acts, if listed species occurred on the site or were considered likely to occur. Because no such species occur, no endangered species regulations apply.

Impacts to wetland habitats could require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Certification from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and a Streambed Alteration Agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game. Because there will be no impacts to wetland habitats, no wetland permitting will be required for project implementation.

PROJECT IMPACTS

Direct Impacts

Impacts associated with the project include the unavoidable loss on-site of 0.16 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral. A tabulation of habitats on the project site is presented in Table 1.

---
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Table 1. Existing, impacted, and preserved habitat on the project site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANT COMMUNITY</th>
<th>ACREAGE ON-SITE</th>
<th>ACREAGE IMPACTED ON-SITE</th>
<th>ACREAGE IMPACTED OFF-SITE</th>
<th>ACREAGE PRESERVED ON-SITE</th>
<th>TOTAL MITIGATION REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URBAN / DEVELOPED</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTURBED HABITAT</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN MIXED CHAPARRAL</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NATIVE GRASSLAND</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN WILLOW SCRUB</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Impacts

There is the potential for indirect impacts to occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project. The areas where indirect impacts have the potential to occur could extend from the construction or development areas into sensitive habitat due to such activities as excessive landscape irrigation, vegetation trampling outside developed areas, and introduction of non-native species (e.g., Argentine ants, cats, non-native invasive plant species). These indirect impacts are referred to as "edge effects." There is the potential for indirect impacts on animals as a result of an increase in noise, dust, and light during permitted activities and from vehicle use. These indirect impacts are considered unavoidable due to the nature of the project, existing uses on-site, and existing surrounding land uses.

Indirect impacts from edge effects are considered adverse, but not significant, because the area where activities will take place is isolated and existing edge effects are already impacting the site. Additional effects, if any, would be incremental and less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts consider the potential regional effects of a project and how a project may affect an ecosystem or one of its sensitive components beyond the project limits and on a regional scale. Section 15064 of the State CEQA Guidelines governs the determination of significant environmental impacts caused by a project. The evaluation of a project’s cumulative impacts is discussed in Section 15064(h) of the CEQA Guidelines. Cumulative impacts must be discussed when project impacts, although individually limited, may be cumulatively considerable. "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects affecting the same resource (CEQA Guidelines §15064(h)(1)). The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects
alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project’s incremental effects are cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines §15064 (h)(4)).

If significant impacts were identified, the project would have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. Other effects that would be considered cumulatively considerable would include substantial reduction the habitat of a fish or wildlife species that cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or significantly reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal species. None of these effects apply to the project. The project will not result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Direct impacts occur when biological resources are altered or destroyed during the course of, or as a result of, project implementation. Examples of such impacts include removal or grading of vegetation, filling wetland habitats, or severing or physically restricting the width of wildlife corridors. Other direct impacts may include loss of foraging or nesting habitat and loss of individual species as a result of habitat clearing. Indirect impacts may include elevated levels of noise or lighting, change in surface water hydrology within a floodplain, and increased erosion or sedimentation. These types of indirect impacts can affect vegetation communities or their potential use by sensitive species. Permanent impacts may result in irreversible damage to biological resources. Temporary impacts are interim changes in the local environment due to construction and would not extend beyond project-associated construction, including revegetation of temporarily disturbed areas adjacent to native habitats.

The California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines define “significant effect on the environment” as a “substantial, or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment.” The CEQA Guidelines further indicate that there may be a significant effect on biological resources if the project will:

A. Substantially affect an endangered, rare or threatened species of animal or plant or the habitat of the species.

B. Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species to the extent that it adversely affects the population dynamics of the species.

C. Substantially diminish habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.

No impacts to Special Status Wildlife Species are anticipated. The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species to the extent that it adversely affects the population dynamics of the species nor will it substantially diminish habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.

The area of Southern Mixed Chaparral loss on the site is so small that it does not result in significant impacts to sensitive resources.

MITIGATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As proposed, the project will result in the loss on-site of 0.16 acres of Southern Mixed Chaparral. However, no mitigation is required for this loss because it is deemed too minimal to constitute a significant impact.
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I recommend that to avoid any inadvertent impacts to sensitive biological resources:

1. A qualified biologist shall review the final grading plans, access routes and staging areas, monitor all aspects of construction and conduct an on-site training session with construction personnel prior to any site disturbance. This training will educate personnel regarding the sensitivity of on-site and adjacent habitats.

2. During grading and slope remediation, the wetland area adjacent to Poppy Trail Road be fenced with orange construction (snow) fencing, and the signage be provided that states “ENVIRONMENTALLY PROTECTED AREA. ABSOLUTELY NO ACCESS”.

3. In order to prevent any adverse impacts to any on or off-site resources, it is recommended that adequate measures (Best Management Practices) be taken during construction to prevent runoff from entering the adjacent parcels. This includes silt fencing, straw wattles and sandbags along the top of the drainage that parallels Poppy Trail Road. No fill material shall be placed into this area. These measures should be sufficient to help reduce any possible indirect impacts of the proposed project to a level well below significant.

The project as proposed is deemed not to have significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.
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FIGURES (see following pages)
Figure 1. Location of project site in regional context (Palos Verdes Peninsula).

Figure 2. Detail location map of project site.
Figure 3. Topographical map showing project site location. Taken from USGS Torrance 7.5 minute series quadrangle.
Figure 4. Vicinity satellite photograph of site.
Figure 5. Close-up satellite photograph of the entire project site footprint.
Figure 6. Close-up satellite photograph of initial (Sheen) parcel.
Figure 7. Area (bounded in yellow) to be added by lot line adjustment from contiguous “donor” parcels.
Figure 8. Two parcels that will be created by project implementation.
Figure 9. Biological Resources (Vegetation) Map of the project site. All areas not specifically defined are Urban/Developed.
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## PLANT SPECIES OBSERVED ON THE PROJECT SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dicotyledoneae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacardiaceae - Sumac Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhus integrifolia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lemonade Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Toxicodendron diversilobum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poison Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiaceae (Umbelliferae) - Carrot Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Foeniculum vulgare</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweet Fennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocynaceae [Asclepiadaceae] - Dogbane [Milkweed] Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Asclepias fascicularis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow-leaf Milkweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae (Compositae) - Sunflower Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Artemisia californica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Sagebrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baccharis pilularis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coyote Brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cirsium sp.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Encelia californica</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Bush Sunflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Malacothrix saxatilis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cliff Malacothrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sonchus asper</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prickly Sow Thistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassicaceae (Cruciferae) - Mustard Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brassica nigra</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Mustard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Raphanus sativus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wild Radish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprifoliaceae - Honeysuckle Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sambucus mexicana</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican Elderberry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chenopodiaceae - Goosefoot Family

_Atriplex semibaccata_  
_Chenopodium sp._  
_Chenopodium californicum_  
_Salsola tragus_  

Australian Saltbush  
Pigweed  
California Pigweed  
Russian Thistle

Convolvulaceae - Morning Glory Family

_Calystegia macrostegia_  

Morning-glory

Cucurbitaceae - Gourd Family

_Marah macrocarpus_  

Wild Cucumber

Euphorbiaceae - Spurge Family

_Chamaesyce albobrarinata_  
_Ricinus communis_  

Rattlesnake Weed  
Castor Bean

Fabaceae (Leguminosae) - Pea Family

_Lupinus succulentus_  
_Melilotus alba_  
_Melilotus sp._  
_Vicia villosa_  

Arroyo Lupine  
White Sweet-clover  
Sweet-clover  
Common Vetch

Geraniaceae - Geranium Family

_Erodium cicutarium_  

Red-stem Filaree

Hydrophyllaceae - Waterleaf Family

_Phacelia sp._  
_Phacelia parryi_  

California Blue Bells  
Parry Phacelia

Lamiaceae (Labiateae) - Mint Family

_Marrubium vulgare_  
_Salvia apiana_  
_Salvia mellifera_  
_Salvia leucophylla_  

Hore-hound  
White Sage  
Black Sage  
Purple Sage

Malvaceae - Mallow Family

_Malva parviflora_  
_Malva sylvestris_  

Cheeseweed  
High Mallow
Papaveraceae - Poppy Family

*Eschscholzia californica*  
California Poppy

Polygonaceae - Buckwheat Family

*Eriogonum cinerium*  
Ashy-leaf Buckwheat

Rosaceae - Rose Family

*Heteromeles arbutifolia*  
*Rubus ursinus*  
Toyon  
California Blackberry

Salicaceae - Willow Family

*Salix lasiolepis*  
Arroyo Willow

Scrophulariaceae - Figwort Family

*Mimulus aurantiacus*  
*Scrophularia californica*  
*var. floribunda*  
Red Bush Monkey-flower  
Coast Figwort, Bee Plant

Solanaceae - Nightshade Family

*Nicotiana glauca*  
*Solanum* sp.  
*Solanum americanum*  
*Solanum xanti*  
Tree Tobacco  
Nightshade  
White Nightshade  
Purple Nightshade

Urticaceae - Nettle Family

*Urtica dioica ssp. holosericea*  
Stinging Nettle

Monocotyledoneae

Poaceae (Gramineae) - Grass Family

*Avena* sp.  
*Avena barbata*  
*Bromus carinatus*  
*Bromus diandrus*  
*Bromus hordeaceus*  
*Bromus madritensis*  
*ssp. rubens*  
*Leymus condensatus*  
*Pennisetum setaceum*  
Wild Oats  
Slender Wild Oat  
California Brome  
Ripgut Grass  
Soft Chess  
Red Brome  
Giant Wild Rye  
Fountain Grass
APPENDIX B

WILDLIFE SPECIES OBSERVED OR DETECTED ON THE PROJECT SITE

BIRDS

Mourning Dove
Anna’s Hummingbird
Allen’s Hummingbird
Western Scrub-Jay
American Crow
Common Raven
Bushtit
Northern Mockingbird
Spotted Towhee
California Towhee
Song Sparrow
Lesser Goldfinch
Black-headed Grosbeak
House Finch

Zenaida macroura
Calypte anna
Selasphorus sasin
Aphelocoma californica
Corvus brachyrhynchos
Corvus corax
Psaltriparus minimus
Mimus polyglottos
Pipilo maculatus
Pipilo crissalis
Melospiza melodia
Carduelis psaltria
Pheucticus melanocephalus
Carpodacus mexicanus

MAMMALS

California Ground Squirrel
Spermophilus beecheyi

Observed

AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES

Western Fence Lizard
Sceloporus occidentalis

Observed
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PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE PROJECT SITE
PHOTOGRAPH INDEX

Yellow arrows and numbers indicate the locations and directions from which the following photographs were taken:
Photograph 1. View of the central portion of the project site. The landslide area is covered in green matting. Poppy Trail Road is in the foreground.

Photograph 2. View of the landslide area with recent invasive weed growth.
Photograph 3. View of the southeast corner of the site. The areas of Southern Mixed Chaparral and Non-Native Grassland are on the left.

Photograph 4. The alignment of Poppy Trail Road with temporary retaining wall. Southern Willow Scrub is on the left.
Photograph 5. The area of Disturbed Habitat on the north side of Poppy Trail Road.

Photograph 6. The area of Disturbed Habitat on the north side of Poppy Trail Road.
Photograph 7. Photograph looking down to drainage area containing Southern Willow Scrub.

Photograph 8. Area containing Southern Willow Scrub.
Photograph 9. Reconstructed road, retaining wall, and Southern Willow Scrub.
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Bill holds a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Master Bird Banding Permit (#22378) with Endangered Species Authorization, and California Gnatcatcher Survey Authorization Permit # TE-788036. He received his Masters Degree from the University of San Diego in 1991, and completed a Post-Graduate Program at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government in 1997.

Bill served as a member of the Conservation and Research Committee of the Zoological Society of San Diego since the committee was first established. In 1990, he founded the Endangered Species Recovery Council (www.esrc.org), an international organization of scientists and conservationists dedicated to finding solutions to the problem of species extinctions. He continues as President of the organization.

In May 2002 Bill was honored in New York as a first recipient of the Explorers Club “Champions of Wildlife” award.
William T. Everett is a research, consulting, and conservation biologist with more than 35 years experience in the San Diego environment and around the world. He has logged more than 14,000 hours of field work, all detailed with field notes. In the 1970’s Bill apprenticed in the study of chaparral ecology under Frank Gander, the retired but renown premier California botanist of the 1930s and 40s. Although his specialty is ornithology, Bill has a long-standing interest in all endangered species management and conservation issues. As President then Conservation Chairman of the San Diego Chapter of the Audubon Society in the late 1970s, he gained a keen understanding of the conservation challenges facing a growing Southern California. He subsequently became one of the first Biological Consultants certified by the County of San Diego in the 1980s. Bill is a Fellow of the National Association of Environmental Professionals (NAEP) and subscribes to the NAEP Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice for Environmental Professionals.

Bill Everett has published numerous scientific articles and conducted research in Southern California, Alaska, Antarctica, Baja California, South America, and throughout the tropical Pacific Ocean. In 1977, in recognition of his accomplishments, he was appointed as a Research Associate of the Department of Birds and Mammals of the San Diego Natural History Museum, a position he holds to this day. In 1990 he was elected as a Research Fellow of the Zoological Society of San Diego, and in 1988 was appointed as the Senior Conservation Biologist of the Western Foundation of Vertebrate Zoology. The Royal Geographic Society of London elected Bill as a Fellow in 1996, following his election as a Fellow of the Explorers Club in 1990.
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