

**CONFORMED COPY  
OF ORIGINAL FILED  
Los Angeles Superior Court**

**JUL 08 2013**

**John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk**

**By D. Salisbury**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**SCOPE (SANTA CLARITA ORGANIZATION )  
FOR PLANNING AND THE )  
ENVIRONMENT), FRIENDS OF THE SANTA )  
CLARA RIVER, HOMEOWNERS FOR )  
NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION, )**

Petitioners,

v.

**CITY OF SANTA CLARITA, SANTA )  
CLARITA CITY COUNCIL, et al., )**

Respondents.

**VISTA CANYON RANCH, LLC, et al. )**

Real Parties in Interest. )

Case No. BS 132487

Assigned for all purposes to:  
Honorable Allan J. Goodman

**JUDGMENT GRANTING PEREMPTORY  
WRIT OF MANDATE**

Original Petition Filed: June 10, 2011  
Amended Petition Filed: October 18, 2011

This matter came on regularly for hearing on January 10, 2013 and January 24, 2013, in Department WE-P of this Court, located at 1725 Main Street, Santa Monica, California. Dean Wallraff and Douglas P. Carstens appeared on behalf of SCOPE (Santa Clara Organization for Planning and the Environment), Friends of the Santa Clara River, and Homeowners for Neighborhood Preservation (collectively, Petitioners); Brian A. Pierik and Amy P. Hoyt appeared on behalf of the City of Santa Clarita and the Santa Clarita City Council; (collectively, Respondents); and Mark J.

1 Dillon and Danielle K. Morone appeared on behalf of Vista Canyon Ranch, LLC (Real Party in  
2 Interest).

3 The Court, having admitted into evidence the certified record of proceedings in this matter;  
4 having heard the arguments of counsel at trial; having reviewed the post-trial briefs filed; the matter  
5 having been submitted for decision; and having issued a final Statement of Decision, which directs  
6 that a judgment and peremptory writ of mandate issue in this matter,

7 IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

8 1. Judgment be and is entered in favor of Petitioners in this proceeding on the claims  
9 arising under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the reasons specified in the  
10 Court's Statement of Decision.

11 2. The Petition for Writ of Mandate is granted to vacate and set aside the approvals and  
12 the Environmental Impact Report for the Vista Canyon Project.

13 3. A Peremptory Writ of Mandate shall issue under seal of this Court, ordering  
14 Respondents to:

15 (a) set aside their approvals of the Vista Canyon Project, including approvals by the  
16 City of Santa Clarita of its Resolution 11-23 (approving Master Case 07-127 [General Plan  
17 Amendment 07-001A, Vista Canyon Specific Plan 07-001, Tentative Tract Map 69164,  
18 Conditional Use Permit 07-009, and Oak Tree Permit 07-019]); and of Ordinance No. 11-10  
19 (approving the Pre-Zone 07-001A for the Vista Canyon Project);

20 (b) set aside their approval of Resolution No. 11-25 as to the annexation of the Vista  
21 Canyon site into the City of Santa Clarita; provided, however, that nothing shall require the  
22 Los Angeles County Local Agency Formation Commission to act in any way; and

23 (c) set aside their approval of Resolution 11-21 certifying the Final Environmental  
24 Impact Report for the Vista Canyon Project.

25 4. The said Writ shall also enjoin Respondents and Real Party in Interest and their respective  
26 agents, officers, and employees, and all persons acting on the behalf of or in concert with any of them,  
27 from taking any action to implement the Vista Canyon Project that requires approval by the City of  
28

1 Santa Clarita under one of approvals ordered above to be set aside which may result in any change or  
2 alteration to the physical environment, unless and until Respondents have reconsidered their  
3 resolutions and ordinances orders to be set aside and until Respondents have certified an  
4 environmental impact report that complies with the California Environmental Quality Act by  
5 correcting the deficiencies identified in the Court's Statement of Decision; provided, further, that  
6 nothing herein or in the Writ issued shall preclude Respondents from applying for or securing funds to  
7 relocate a Metrolink station within the proposed boundaries of the said project.


8 5. The Court retains jurisdiction to oversee compliance with this Judgment and with the  
9 Peremptory Writ of Mandate issued.

10 6. Respondents shall file a Return to the Peremptory Writ of Mandate within sixty days of the  
11 date of its issuance, which Return shall state that Respondents have complied with the said writ, or  
12 that an appeal from this Judgment has been or will be filed. Any objections to the said Return shall be  
13 filed not later than the thirtieth day after the date of service of the Return.

14 7. Petitioners, as prevailing parties, are awarded attorneys fees in the amount of  
15 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ and costs in the amount of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: July 8, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Allan J. Goodman  
Judge of the Superior Court