

**Appendix 3**

**Comments and Responses and Planning Commission and City  
Council Input Concerning the Plan**

---

## Comments and Responses

---

Both public meetings and public hearings have been held concerning the design of the streetscape and recommended traffic mitigation improvements for this corridor. These meetings were preceded by more than a year of community meetings and study sessions with local neighborhood Homeowners Associations. In addition, several hearings have been held regarding this Addendum and environmental review Conditions of Approval. Copies of minutes of the Planning Commission review of this document are contained in **Appendix 2**.

Other than comments made by the City Council at a hearing on the Plan held on April 23, 1997, the only other comments received on this document were sent to the City by the County of Los Angeles Public Works Department. Formal responses to these comments are provided on the pages following this introduction.

**County of Los Angeles  
Department of Public Works**

Page 1

The first three paragraphs of this comment are recitals of goals common to the City and County. Paragraph three raises the concern that some of the planned improvements may reduce through capacity along the Corridor in the future.

**Response:** The City is equally concerned about the operation of intersections and the ability of the proposed lane sections to accommodate cumulative traffic volumes. However, this corridor is an important scenic resource and also serves as a neighborhood street in a part of the community. Therefore, any improvement of the corridor must recognize these attributes and plan for their retention and enhancement. No specific critique of the ultimate planned capacity is provided in the comment letter and no specific suggestions to revise intersection designs or lane configurations are provided so it is difficult to constructively respond to this rather general comment. The City will continue to monitor the operation of through capacity and intersection performance in the future which may result in the need to modify some of the existing plans for the Corridor. The City also intends to be attentive to buildout and growth in the corridor, the primary factors which may increase traffic capacity demands in the future.

**County of Los Angeles  
Department of Public Works**

Page 2

With all due respect, the City realizes the importance of this Corridor as a secondary passage through the Santa Monica Mountains; however, to design the Corridor to be primarily available for emergency conditions related to the closure of Highway 101 and the connection of the valley and coastal areas of the region would not be sensible or warranted. However, the City is interested in participating cooperatively in any long term emergency response planning, including transportation related responses, to disaster conditions.

Serious consideration of the potential for a four through lane design for the entire corridor would be premature for several reasons. First, as the comment concedes, the proposed section widths are adequate (if not ideal) to handle the level of traffic anticipated. Second, the City will monitor the adequacy of the existing sections in relation to capacity. Third, any consideration of "extra-capacity widening" at this time would merely encourage the inducement of unwanted growth and increased residential density. Finally, considerable right-of-way is needed to implement even a lesser width solution in several parts of the corridor. Full four lane widening is beyond the capacity of the City to implement even if a defensible argument could be made that such an improvement should be seriously considered at this time.

The City appreciates the opportunity to respond to your concerns.

## Response to Council Comments

Members of the City Council expressed concerns regarding:

- (1) *sufficiency of geologic review prior to construction of various improvements, particularly retaining walls;*
- (2) *light and glare issues related to modified street lighting; and*
- (3) *traffic capacity problems generally and the design of specific improvements at various locations.*

Responses are provided to each of these concerns.

### Geologic Review

Based on the level of review available to the City at this time, the proposed retaining wall designs along portions of the Corridor appear to be technically feasible. However, further geologic testing (including soil borings and calculation of the ability of the soil to support required structures, etc.) will be necessary to determine the full feasibility (and cost effectiveness) of retaining wall construction. Conditions of Approval have been developed to ensure that careful and detailed geologic review prior to construction within any segment of the Corridor. Because it is very likely the City Council will be implementing nearly all portions of this Corridor Plan through Capital Improvement Programs or grants, the Council will have an opportunity to review future detailed design, construction, and geologic monitoring plans. Please refer to the Conditions of Approval for the Corridor Plan for detailed language concerning future implementing geologic review.

### Light and Glare

Similarly, implementation of any future lighting program along the Corridor will require subsequent review by Council. A mitigation measure has been required that will enable Council review of detailed photometric plans for any construction within the Corridor. This measure should provide an adequate opportunity for the Council to review, comment upon, and modify any future lighting plans.

## Traffic Capacity Problems

Based on available information, the Corridor Plan represents a good faith attempt to balance neighborhood circulation needs with through capacity demands. While specific design solutions at every intersection may not be universally acceptable to community members, the basic traffic improvement goals of the plan are reasonable and sensitive to community concerns. To ensure that the City monitors the continuing evolution of community interests concerning traffic in this corridor, a mitigation measure has been recommended which requires the City's Traffic and Transportation Manager to monitor the success of implemented traffic planning solutions and to make recommendations to Council to amend the plan as needed in the future.



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE  
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331  
Telephone: (626) 458-5100

RECEIVED

JUL 17 1997

CITY OF CALABASAS

LARRY W. STONE, Director

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
P.O. BOX 1460  
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

IN REPLY PLEASE  
REFER TO FILE: P-3

July 10, 1997

Mr. Steven K. Harris  
Planning Director  
City of Calabasas  
26135 Mureau Road  
Calabasas, CA 91372

Dear Mr. Harris:

**MULHOLLAND HIGHWAY MASTER PLAN**  
**OLD TOPANGA CANYON ROAD TO MULHOLLAND DRIVE**

Thank you for providing a copy of your city's proposed Mulholland Highway Master Plan for our review.

Mulholland Highway has long been recognized by the County as a gateway from Los Angeles' urban area to the Santa Monica Mountains. The scenic qualities of Mulholland Highway and its importance in providing passage to the various assets of the Santa Monica Mountains are very much a consideration in the planning policies of the County's Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains Area Plan.

The County's circulation policies for the Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains intend to protect and enhance the environmental and visual qualities of the area, minimize disruption to local communities, and at the same time attend to the mobility needs of the region. Mulholland Highway's designation as a Parkway on the County Highway Plan reflects the County's desire to maintain the scenic qualities of the roadway while recognizing the need to accommodate traffic demands of the area.

The Mulholland Highway Plan indicates that the intent of the study "is to reduce the dominance of the automobile on the Highway and increase the natural and pedestrian environment". That intent is consistent with your City's General Plan-Transportation Policy A.1 which states: "In balancing competing objectives, promote avoiding significant, adverse impacts to sensitive environmental features and residents' quality of life, as higher priorities than moving automobiles." Our Department is concerned about the adequacy of the roadway improvements proposed in the study. If constructed as proposed, Mulholland Highway may not be able to accommodate future traffic demands, resulting in congestion that may adversely impact sensitive environmental features and quality of life in the Calabasas area.

Mr. Steven K. Harris  
July 10, 1997  
Page 2

Mulholland Highway is the only continuous east-west arterial highway in the Santa Monica Mountains area. There are few alternate routes for local and commuter traffic dependent on this highway. In the event of a breakdown of the Ventura Freeway, Mulholland Highway is the closest route that could provide relief from traffic gridlock.

Based on our Ventura Corridor traffic model, between the project limits, one traffic lane in each direction along Mulholland Highway is marginally adequate for buildout traffic volumes. West of Old Topanga Canyon Road, two traffic lanes in each direction will be needed for the buildout scenario. The Mulholland Highway Master Plan proposes two traffic lanes throughout the length of Mulholland Highway under consideration except at the east end where four lanes are recommended.

Based on expected traffic demand at buildout of the area and the lack of alternative east-west routes in the region, it is important to preserve the possibility of widening the highway to four lanes in the future. Your City's current proposal would preclude adding traffic lanes to Mulholland Highway.

We recommend that your City's final Mulholland Highway Master Plan allows for the protection of sufficient right of way to accommodate two traffic lanes in each direction along Mulholland Highway.

If you have any questions regarding our recommendation, please contact Mr. Hubert Seto of my staff at (626) 458-4349.

Very truly yours,

HARRY W. STONE  
Director of Public Works

  
CARL L. BLUM  
Deputy Director

HS:nr  
311

cc: Mr. Charles Cate  
City Manager-City of Calabasas