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#### Abstract

PROPOSED Demolition of two (2) existing, one-story, multi-family residential structures and the construction PROJECT: of a new, 6,628 square-foot, small-lot subdivision with four (4) units with individual garages of 400 square feet each. The project includes approximately 1,309 square feet of hardscape and 941 square feet of porch/patio/breezeway/balcony space. This results in a total structure maximum of 9,430 square-feet (among four [4] units) and a maximum height of approximately 36 feet. The project is in the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Outer Corridor, is not subject to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance, and on an approximately 7,281 square-foot lot. The project does not propose removal of any protected trees. The project grading includes 331 cubic yards of cut, 403 cubic yards of fill, 0 cubic yards of export, and 72 cubic yards of import.


1. For Case No. VTT-74217-SL-1A, an appeal in part of the Director of Planning's Conditional Approval of a Project Permit Compliance with Design Review pursuant to Section 11.5.7 C. 6 and 16.50 respectively of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC for the Proposed Project).
2. For Case No. DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP-1A, An appeal in part of decision of the Deputy Advisory Agency's approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 74217-SL for a maximum of four (4) small lots in accordance with the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance No. 176,354, pursuant to L.A.M.C. Section 17.06,

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR CASE NO. DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP-1A:

1. Adopt the Findings;
2. Deny the appeals;
3. Sustain the entire Determination of the Director of Planning in approving a Project Permit Compliance with Design Review

## RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR CASE NO. VTT-74217SL-1A:

1. Adopt the Findings;
2. Deny the appeals;
3. Sustain the decision of the Deputy Advisory Agency in approving a Small Lot Subdivision.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning


Courtney Schoenwald, City Planner
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## PROJECT ANALYSIS

## PROJECT SUMMARY

On October 26, 2018, the Director of Planning approved with conditions a Project Permit Compliance Review (LAMC Section 11.5.7) and Design Review (Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan), and the Deputy Advisory Agency approved pursuant to the provisions of Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 17.15 and 12.22-C.27, and the State of California's Subdivision Map Act a Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. VTT-74217-SL, for the demolition of two (2) existing, one-story, multi-family residential structures and the construction of a new four (4) unit small-lot subdivision on a 7,281 square-foot site with four (4) individual garages of 400 square feet each. The project includes approximately 1,309 square feet of hardscape and 941 square feet of porch/patio/breezeway/balcony space. This results in a total structure maximum of 9,430 squarefeet (among four (4) units) and a maximum height of approximately 36 feet, and is designed in accordance with the City's Small Lot Subdivision provisions adopted prior to March 22, 2018. The project is in the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Outer Corridor, is not subject to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance, is on an approximately 7,281 square-foot lot, and is zoned RD1.5-1. The project does not propose removal of any protected trees. The project grading includes 331 cubic yards of cut, 403 cubic yards of fill, 0 cubic yards of export, and 72 cubic yards of import.

The Director also determined that, based on the whole of the administrative record, that the Project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 14, section 15332, and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to the categorical exemption applies pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15300.2.

## BACKGROUND

## Site Conditions

The property is located in the Sherman Oaks- Studio City- Toluca Lake- Cahuenga Pass Community Plan and the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, is zoned RD1.5-1, and has a Low Medium Residential General Plan Land Use Designation. All adjacent properties share the same zoning of RD1.5-1. The site is currently comprised of a through lot parcel developed with two (2) multi-family dwellings. All surrounding properties are developed with multifamily residential structures except for two lots to the southwest (see Exhibit A). Lots to the southwest are developed with single-family dwellings. The development of a four (4) fee-simple, residential units (small lots) with an internal shared driveway and open space is an infill of an otherwise mixed density neighborhood (i.e. single family and multi-family).

RD1.5 is a Restricted Density Multiple Dwelling Zone with a minimum lot area of 5,000 square feet and a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 1,500 square feet. Height District 1 allows a maximum height of 45 feet. Based on the lot size, this would permit four (4) small lots with no rear, side, or front yard between the newly created lots except for a five-foot setback where the new lots abut a lot that is not created pursuant to the subdivision, in accordance with the Small Lot Subdivision standards adopted prior to March 22, 2018 (Ordinance No. 176,354). In accordance with the aforementioned Small Lot Subdivision requirements, parcels of land may be subdivided into small lots provided that the density of the subdivision complies with the minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirement established for each zone. Small lot projects, considered as single-family residential do not permit density bonus, but do allow for reduction in yards of up to a minimum of 5 feet adjacent to development. The Deputy Advisory Agency can permit up to the 5 -foot setback per Ordinance No. 176,354. However, there is consideration given for
prevailing setback along the street edge for the front yard setback and yards based on the development of the adjacent lots, zoning and land use designation.

The project is two (2) stories over parking and is approximately 525 feet from Cahuenga Boulevard, which is a major commercial corridor and approximately half a mile from the Orange Line Station to the north. Structures for Lots 3 and 4 include basements that daylight at their respective garage entrances.

The property is a rectangular-shaped through lot that fronts Fredonia Drive on the east and slopes downward to the west to an alley at the rear end of the lot. The project is designed within the setbacks proposed by the Vesting Tentative Tract (See Exhibit B). The project has a five-foot or greater side-yard setback for Lots 2 and 4, and a 21 -foot side yard setback for Lot 1 . The property has a variable lot depth with a maximum of approximately 151.8 feet due to its irregularly-shaped lot cut. The lot is not subject to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance as it is zoned for multi-family dwellings.

Small lots are sold as fee-simple and therefore the properties are individually owned to the center of the common access driveway. The pavers shown along the southwest side of the common driveway for Lots 1 and 2, and pavers and stairs along the sides of the common driveway for Lots 3 and 4, create a pedestrian path to each front door. There are also common areas for trash and recyclables located at the edge of Lot 3 and 4's common access driveway in lieu of individual bins. This will be in substitute for individual bins located in each garage. Maintenance agreements are necessary for upkeep of the shared areas and trash, but in all other areas these are singlefamily homes on individual lots.

The site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, a Liquefaction Area, a Hillside Area, and a Special Grading Area (Bureau of Engineering Basic Grid Map A-13372), but is not located in a slope stability study area, high erosion hazard area, flood zone, methane hazard zone, landslide zone, tsunami inundation zone, or a fault-rupture study zone. According to ZIMAS, the project site is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone but is located within the fault zone of the Hollywood Fault.

The National Flood Insurance Program rate maps, which are a part of the Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan adopted by the City Council by Ordinance No. 172,081, have been reviewed and it has been determined that the property is located in Zone C, outside of the flood zone.

## Street and Circulation

Fredonia Drive abutting the property to the east, is designated a Substandard Hillside Limited Street, dedicated to a width of 30 feet, and improved with a roadway of 24 feet wide. A dedication of three (3) feet on Fredonia is required for the Vesting Tentative Tract approval (Condition 1 for VTT-74217-SL). The Bureau of Engineering is requiring dedication and improvements along Fredonia Drive to construct a new 4 -foot wide sidewalk (Condition S-3(i)(1) of VTT-74217-SL). The Bureau of Street Lighting has conditioned one (1) new street light be added on Fredonia Drive (Condition S-3(c)a of VTT-74217-SL). In addition, all necessary street improvements will be made to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 (Conditions S-1(I) and S3(h) of VTT-74217-SL).

The alley abutting the property to the west is a variable width of 16-20 feet and improved with a roadway. A dedication of two (2) feet along the alley is required pursuant to the Vesting Tentative Tract approval (Condition 2 for VTT-74217-SL).

## Site Related Cases and Permits

ZA-2016-2455-ZAD-DRB-SPP-MSP - The project applicant originally sought a waiver and submitted a Zoning Administrator's Determination (ZAD) application on July 12, 2016 to allow for three (3) retaining walls varying in heights from two (2) feet to seven (7) feet in lieu of the maximum of two (2) retaining walls, per LAMC Section 12.21.C.8(A). Upon redesign of the project however with revised plans submitted on December 8, 2017, the third retaining wall was eliminated from the proposal and the lot count was reduced from five (5) units to four (4). Since the project, as modified, only proposed two (2) retaining walls, the Zoning Administrator no longer needed to make a Determination, and the decision-making authority was transferred on December 8, 2017 to the Director of Planning for the approval of the project, specifically the Project Permit Compliance and Design Review approvals, apart from the requests for the Division of Land. Updated tract maps and plans were submitted to reflect these changes.

## Public Hearings

The entitlement case, DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP was originally filed on July 12, 2016. The proposed project is subject to the design review process because it is located within the boundaries of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. The Mulholland Design Review Board (MDRB) met for the first time on March 16, 2017, and considered the original project, which consisted of five (5) units and three (3) retaining walls. The board convened a quorum of five (5) members and voted unanimously (5-0) to continue the case with the following conditions:
a. The project shall be a maximum of two (2) stories tall.
b. The side yards shall be landscaped. The side yard landscaping shall be a minimum of three (3) feet.
c. Remove roof top decks and the access stairways to the roof decks.
d. Mechanical equipment shall be screened on all sides or located at ground level.
e. All plant material shall be selected from the Preferred Plant List.
f. The front yard setback shall be a minimum of 10 feet. The front yard setback shall include a landscaped area of a minimum of 6 feet in width.
g. The applicant shall provide a centralized through area off-street.

The MDRB met on August 17, 2017 where the board convened a quorum of four (4) members and voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the case with the following conditions:
a. Comply with previous recommendations (a) and (c), listed above.
b. Move the fire access to the exterior of the structures.
c. All materials shall be $20 \%$ greyscale value or darker.
d. Comply with Design Guideline 51 [which recommends that no portion of the proposed project located within 15 feet of the side property line should exceed any portion of an existing main structure on an abutting lot within 15 feet of the property line by more than 10 feet in height].

The MDRB met on January 17, 2018 for the revised plans stamped December 26, 2017, which consisted of four (4) units and two (2) retaining walls; however the hearing for the project was cancelled due to a failure to meet notification posting requirements as outlined by LAMC Section 16.50 E.3(b)(2).

The MDRB met on February 21, 2018 where the board convened a quorum of 6 members. The vote was unanimous (6-0) recommending conditional approval of the project since the project will substantially comply with LAMC Section 16.50 E. of the LAMC, as well as the relevant design guidelines and development provisions of the Plan. The conditions recommended by the MDRB were:
a. LID Planter along driveway is significantly over-planted. Remove everything but Pacific Wax Myrtle from planter on south side of front unit. Show full size of Pacific Wax Myrtle in plans.
b. Narrow planter along north side of front unit. Should be shifted away from wall of house to against the fence.
c. Second floor of Unit 1 reduced five (5) feet from line shown in current drawings. Entire Fredonia facing elevation of first floor as shown remains the same.
d. The currently shown patio may remain covered and extend beyond "Bedroom 1" by maximum seven (7) feet and five (5) inches to align with the current entry element as shown on sheet 35 .
e. Canopy over front entry but shall not be larger than as currently shown.

On June 26, 2018, the Deputy Advisory Agency held a hearing for the vesting tentative tract approval for the Project. The hearing was attended by community members, including the applicants, the applicant's representative, and members of the public who offered public comment on the project.

On October 26, 2018, the Director of Planning issued a Determination that approved the project's Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance and Design Review (see Exhibit F), with conditions.

Also on October 26, 2018, the Deputy Advisory Agency issued a decision approving the Vesting Tentative Tract (see Exhibit E), subject to Conditions of Approval.

On November 5, 2018, an appeal by Harold I. Huttas and Scott A. McPhail was filed within the required 15-day appeal period, challenging the decision of the Deputy Advisory Agency to approve VTT-74217-SL, in part (see Exhibit C).

On November 13, 2018, an appeal by Harold I. Huttas and Scott A. McPhail was filed within the required 15-day appeal period, challenging the decision of the Director of Planning to approve DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP, in part (see Exhibit D).

Specifically, the appeals cite concerns which are discussed in detail below.

## APPEAL ANALYSIS

The same appellants have filed two (2) appeals: one of the Director's Determination in DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP, and one of the Advisory Agency's approval of VTT-74217-SL. The following section will address the contentions of each appeal as filed under each case.

## Appeal of DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP

1. The project should have been evaluated and subject to regulations under the Small Lot Design Standards ordinance adopted on March 22, 2018.

Response: The appellant alleges that the project should have been evaluated under the Small Lot Subdivision Design Standards adopted by the City Council on March 22, 2018. The Master Land Use Application for the project was filed on July 12, 2016, pre-dating the current Small Lot Subdivision standards that were adopted by ordinance on March 12, 2018. Sections 12.02 and 17.15 of the LAMC, and further affirmed by case law, affords the property owner vested property rights to the rules and regulations, or "ordinances, policies, and standards in effect" in December 2017, the date the application was deemed
complete. ${ }^{1}$ The Vesting Tentative Tract application was deemed complete on December 1, 2016, the revised tract map is dated December 26, 2017, and the Specific Plan application was deemed complete on March 8, 2017 before the adoption of the new Small Lot Subdivision standards. The project is therefore subject to the applicable rules and regulations of the Small Lot Subdivision in effect at that time.

The Small Lot Subdivision ordinance is a separate part of the LAMC from the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, and the project was evaluated under the filing of VTT-7421SL, and not DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP. As an Outer Corridor project not-visible from Mulholland Drive, the Specific Plan is limited to regulating Environmental Protection Measures if the project is grading on a prominent ridge, constructing or grading within 100 feet of a stream bank, constructing or grading within 200 feet of a parkland, or removing an oak tree. Because the project is not visible from Mulholland Drive, the Specific Plan does not impose limits on height, grading, or use. None of those regulations are in conflict with or are superseded by the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance. While the Design Review Board did give recommendations to the applicant on the design and siting of their project, the recommendations are either not in conflict with the Small Lot Subdivision ordinance or are superseded by the ordinance.
2. The project does not include affordable housing and the new small lot ordinance was put in place to provide affordability.

Response: The appellant contends that the project offers no affordable housing options. The Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan does not regulate housing affordability. Furthermore, the applicant did not apply for and is not pursuing any Density Bonus or Transit Oriented Communities entitlements which would have incentivized additional units with affordable units provided concurrently. It is not within the purview of the Design Review Board or the Director of Planning as part of the enforcement of the Specific Plan to require that a project seeking the specific entitlements at issue offer affordable housing under the LAMC. The Department of City Planning has no power under those provided by this particular Specific Plan to regulate the price or affordability of projects.
3. The Project does not meet the Neighborhood Compatibility requirements found in the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan ("MSPSP"), which violates Section 11.I. 3 of the MSPSP and Design Guideline 50.

Response: The appellant states that the project is in conflict with the Neighborhood Compatibility requirements of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan relative to its height. This is incorrect. Design Guideline 50, the Neighborhood Compatibility component, recommends that the size, appearance, color and setback of existing homes, as well as the grading and landscaping of the lot of the project be considered for purposes of project compatibility with the existing neighborhood.

The MDRB reviews design and compatibility as described in the Design Guidelines. ${ }^{2}$ The applicant submitted an analysis of 10 properties within a 100 foot radius of the project. Pursuant to Section 11.I. 3 of the Specific Plan, the MDRB evaluated the project and found the design to be compatible, with recommended modifications to the massing to further

[^0]address concerns. While the MDRB did give direction to modify the design of the project, it was not with regard to height. The findings of the project for Design Guideline 50 Neighborhood Compatibility were as follows:
"The project is four (4) small-lot single-family dwellings. The lot is in an area zoned RD 1.5-1 with a General Plan Land Use designation of Low Medium Residential. Low Medium Residential is a Multiple Family designation on the General Plan Land Use Map, and the zone and designation allow for multiple dwelling units on one lot. As such, there is a mix of single-family and multi-family dwellings in the neighborhood, including several duplexes and apartment or condo structures of five or more units. The neighborhood has a mix of architectural styles and building heights of one (1) to two (2) stories. The small lot single-family dwellings are a blend of the single-family and multi-family density of the surrounding neighborhood. The project will be single-family in nature on what is a subdivided small lot that could -and did- have multiple units on one formerly un-subdivided lot. Furthermore, the project's finish materials of wood siding and stucco are also found in nearby homes. As such, the project's design fits with the neighborhood and complies with compatibility Design Guideline 50."

Finally, the nature of Small-Lot Subdivision design versus design for single-family homes is that the setbacks, massing and height for a small-lot subdivision take into consideration spatial constraints that do not normally apply for single-family homes sited in single-family zoned areas. In an area that is zoned for multi-family residential, and that contains a mix of multi-family and single-family dwelling, comparing size, setbacks, and height can be inconsistent. As such, the Introduction to the Design Guidelines states:
"These Guidelines do not create entitlements, nor are they mandatory requirements. They provide direction on how the Mulholland Scenic Parkway can best be preserved while allowing appropriate development, and clarify what can be expected when a project is reviewed by the [MDRB] and the Director. They recognize that individual projects and sites are different and present numerous and different design challenges. These guidelines do not require or expect every project applicant to address all the guidelines."3

The guidelines also state that flexibility and judgement will be used to balance the goals of the Specific Plan with the rights of the property owners. The project approved by the Department is for four (4) small lot single-family dwellings. The height of the structure in Lot 1 as seen from the street is proposed for no more than 21 feet and as a two-story structure. There is another two-story structure at 3676-3680 Fredonia Drive two lots away from the project on the same side of Fredonia Drive that is visible from the street with a chimney that exceeds the structure's roof-line (Exhibit G). Additionally, developments on the opposite side of Fredonia Drive are built into a hill that in several cases has the ground floor sitting above the roofline of many of the projects on the same side of the street as the project. Also, while the project is conditioned to a height not to exceed 33 feet and six (6) inches, only Lots 3 and 4 will have projects that reach that height, and it is measured from the alley which sits at a lower elevation than Fredonia Drive. No part of the building height from Lots 3 and 4 will be visible from Fredonia Drive. For Lots 3 and 4 fronting the alley, there are at least two buildings on the same side of the ally of the project that are three (3) stories or two (2) stories with daylighted basements measured from the roadway. 3696- 3698 Fredonia Drive, approved in 2016 as DIR-2015-1006-DRB-SPP-MSP, is improved with a building at the alley that measures 35 feet and six (6) inches from top to

[^1]bottom. 3676-3680 Fredonia is also improved with a building that measures three (3) stories as measured from the alley's roadway. Given the presence of other buildings with similar heights in the neighborhood, the Department determined that the height was inline with the intent of the Specific Plan and the Design Guidelines.

As mentioned, there are several aspects of compatibility set forth in Design Guideline 50: appearance, color, materials, massing, grading, and landscaping. The Director's finding for the Project with respect to Design Guideline 50 concluded that "the project's finish materials of wood siding and stucco are also found in nearby homes. As such, the project's size and design fits with the neighborhood and complies with compatibility Design Guideline 50" (Exhibit F, p. 8). In this case, the Director of Planning found that the project submitted was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the recommendations of the MDRB, and that the project complies with the standards and intent of the Specific Plan. The project is also within its permitted height of 45 feet under the RD1.5 zone, which is the prevailing regulation that limits project height. As such, the Director of Planning's determination is consistent with the Specific Plan and the Design Guidelines.
4. The project requires a variance for a third retaining wall in lieu of the maximum of two (2) retaining walls allowed per LAMC Section 12.21.C.8(A). By requesting this, the applicants want to disregard safety with their retaining wall request.

Response: The appellant contends that the project is missing a variance for a third retaining wall over the two (2) allowed by-right in the LAMC. For clarification, the procedure to permit retaining walls in excess of the LAMC is a Zoning Administrator Determination (ZAD), not a Zone Variance. Section 12.24 X. 26 of the LAMC authorizes applications for retaining walls on properties located in Hillside Areas which exceed the maximum height or number allowed per Section 12.21 C.8(a). No such third retaining wall is part of the requested entitlements for the Project.

Since the removal of the request for a ZAD, plans that the applicant submitted consistently show only two (2) retaining walls on site, not three (3): one wall running on each side of the length of the originally configured, un-subdivided lot. The initial proposal included a third wall, that may have been located between Lot 2 and Lots 3 and 4, as there is a drop in elevation; however it is clear from plans submitted that the buildings serve as their own retaining walls at the boundaries where those lots are connected. Section 12.21 C.8 allows up to two (2) retaining walls separated by a minimum of three (3) feet in the Hillside Areas, and define a retaining wall as "a freestanding continuous structure, as viewed from the top, intended to support earth, which is not attached to a building." Per the plans submitted in December 2017, no retaining walls are shown in excess of the two (2) allowed by-right, and as the two (2) walls proposed are separated by more than three (3) feet (Exhibit A), no ZAD is needed.

Furthermore, grading in the City of Los Angeles is subject to review and approval with the Department of Building and Safety Grading Division. Hillside grading review may not be absolved of this review out of desire if it is regulatory compliance. Regulatory compliance measures have been called out in the Soils Approval letter (Log Ref No. 92736). The Planning Department has not received information from the applicant that they do not wish to follow regulatory compliance and to date, the applicants have followed proper process and procedure by working with the Department of Building and Safety to receive a soils approval letter. Therefore the project complies with all rules and regulations relating to retaining walls.

## 5. The project exceeds the average Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the neighborhood.

Response: The appellant alleges that the community of Studio City recently "cracked down" on disproportionate building sizes in the area by reducing an FAR limit to $45 \%$. Floor Area Ratio is the calculation of a building's size measured in square footage divided by the lot's square footage. It can be expressed in ratio or percentage form. The project is in the RD1.5-1 zone which limits buildings to a maximum 3:1 FAR and a maximum 45 foot height limit by-right. All of the lots within a 100 foot radius of the project are in the same RD1.5-1 zone, and at least two (2) have Floor Area Ratios that hover around 1:1: 36423644 Regal Place has an FAR of 1.2:1 and 3696-3698 Fredonia has an FAR of 1:1. The project as proposed is below the FAR that is allowed for the site, and at 0.9:1 is lower than the densest projects within the immediate neighborhood.

In the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, applicants are asked to create a neighborhood compatibility study that compares the square footage and FAR of lots within 100 feet of the project (Exhibit A, page 23). As mentioned in Appeal Point Response No. 3 , there are several ways beyond building size in which a project can be found compatible with the neighborhood: appearance, color, materials, massing, grading, and landscaping. The finding for the project with respect to neighborhood compatibility concluded that "the project's finish materials of wood siding and stucco are also found in nearby homes. As such, the project's size and design fits with the neighborhood and complies with compatibility Design Guideline 50" (Exhibit F, p. 8). In this case, the Director of Planning found that the project submitted was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the recommendations of the MDRB, and that the project complies with the standards and intent of the Specific Plan.

Furthermore, the "crack down" on FAR for Studio City that the Appellant refers to, the Studio City Residential Floor Area (RFA) Zoning Supplemental Use District (Ordinance No. 182048), does not apply to the Project for the following reasons:

1) Applied to a geographic area that does not include this project's location;
2) Only applied to lots that were zoned R1 and RE, of which this project is not zoned;
3) Limited Residential Floor Area for single-family homes, of which RFA does not apply to this project; and
4) Was rescinded in January 2018 and is no longer applicable.

As such, the Director of Planning's determination is consistent with the Specific Plan, Zoning Code, and the General Plan.
6. The project does not adhere to recommendations made by the Mulholland Design Review Board in previous hearings of the project.

Response: The appellant alleges that the Applicant has failed to adhere to the MDRB recommendations made at the July 12, 2016 and August 17, 2017 hearings: 1) the project shall be a maximum of two (2) stories tall; and 2) comply with Design Guideline 51. The project was revised after the August 17, 2017 hearing to address the MDRB's comments and revisions were presented to the board at the final meeting on February 21, 2019. The Mulholland Design Review Board is a recommending body to the Director of Planning. The final recommendation from the Design Review Board in approving the project did not include comments limiting the number of stories the project should be. As such, the MDRB approved the project as presented with only minor design modification, not related to building height. For projects in the Outer Corridor that are not visible from Mulholland Drive, there are no regulations or Design Guidelines that limit the number of stories of a
project. The Director of Planning determined that the number of stories was in-line with the intent of the Specific Plan and as such no conditions of approval were included to limit the number of stories.

Design Guideline 51 states that "No portion of the proposed project located within 15 feet of the side property line should exceed any portion of an existing main structure on an abutting lot within 15 feet of the property line by more than 10 feet in height The project satisfies this requirement, as shown in Exhibit A, page 47. The Director of Planning determined that the height of the project was in-line with Design Guideline 51 and the intent of the Specific Plan, and as such no conditions of approval were included to prescribe further restrictions on the height with regard to adjacent structures.
7. The project does not address tenancy issues regulated by the Ellis Act.

Response: The appellant contends that the decision of the Director of Planning does not address items within the Ellis Act. The Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan does not regulate tenancy or the Ellis Act; the Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department does. It is not the purview of the Design Review Board or the Director of Planning as part of the enforcement of the Specific Plan to ensure that the Ellis Act is being abided by. The Department of City Planning has no power under those provided by this particular Specific Plan to regulate the price or affordability of projects seeking approval. More detail regarding this issue is provided for the related case in Appeal Point Response No. 10

## 8. The project adds an unwanted street light to Fredonia Drive.

Response: The Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan only regulates Street Lights on the Mulholland Drive Right-of-Way. It is not the purview of the Design Review Board or the Director of Planning as part of the enforcement of the Specific Plan to ensure that Street Lights added in areas outside of the Mulholland Drive Right-of-Way meet any regulations or standards as required by the Bureau of Engineering. The Director of Planning has no authority under the regulations in this Specific Plan to regulate the requirement of Street Lights by the Bureau of Engineering.

## Appeal of VTT-74217-SL

9. The project should have been evaluated and subject to regulations under the Small Lot Subdivision ordinance adopted on March 22, 2018.

Response: The appellant alleges that the project should have been evaluated under the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance adopted by the City Council on March 22, 2018. The discussion regarding the applicability of the new small lot subdivision ordinance to the subdivision case is referenced and incorporated herein from Appeal Point Response No.1.
10. The project does not include affordable housing, and the project does not address tenancy issues regulated by the Ellis Act.

Response: The appellant contends that the project offers no affordable housing options. The applicant is seeking a discretionary entitlement, such as a General Plan amendment, zone change, height district change, or the granting of a density or development bonus, that would trigger the City's affordability requirements either under Measure JJJ (LAMC Section 11.5.11) or the City's Density Bonus Ordinance (LAMC Section 12.22. A.25), and thus is not being asked to provide affordable housing options onsite. Furthermore, the
applicant has not filed for a Density Bonus or Transit Oriented Communities case that would require affordable housing units.

As the applicant filed a Vesting Tentative Tract Map application prior to the adoption on February 17, 2018 of the Affordable Housing Linkage Fee Ordinance (Section 19.18 of the LAMC), they are also not required to pay a linkage fee to a fund for affordable housing. The Conditions of Approval (Exhibit F) that relate to affordable housing simply regard tenant relocation and Ellis Act compliance:
> "19. Tenant Relocation Conditions. That the applicant execute and record a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6770) in a form satisfactory to the Advisory Agency binding the applicant and any successor in interest to provide tenant relocation assistance and establish a relocation program in a manner consistent with Section 47.07 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code relating to demolition. The covenant and agreement shall be executed and recorded with 10 days after the expiration of the appeal period (and final action thereon) and a copy provided to each eligible tenant within five days of recordation of the covenant and agreement."
> "20. Within 10 days after the time to appeal has expired, the applicant shall execute and record a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP6770) in a form satisfactory to the Advisory Agency binding the applicant and any successor in interest to the affirmative duty to abide by all provisions of the Ellis Act (Government Code §§ 7060, et seq.) and §§ 151.22 - 151.28 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)."

The affordable housing components in the Condition of Approval are enforced by the Los Angeles Housing and Community Investment Department (HCIDLA). HCIDLA is not a member of the Subdivision Committee however, therefore issues related to compliance with the Conditions of Approval of subsequent enforcement of any affordable housing issues related to this project fall outside the scope of this appeal.

## 11. The project exceeds the average Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the neighborhood.

Response: The subdivision of land does not regulate FAR, it regulates the density of uses. The Deputy Advisory Agency has no authority to limit the size of the construction beyond what is limited by the Zoning Code. The appeal point does not apply to the tract case. Responses for the related case is detailed in Appeal Point Response No. 5.

## 12. The project does not comply with the Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Program.

Response: The appellant alleges that the project does not adhere to Transit Oriented Community requirements. The Division of Land Regulations, which VTT-74217-SL is filed under, is focused exclusively on carrying out the State of California's Subdivision Map Act. The stated purpose in Article 7 Division of Land Regulations is as follows:
"Purpose. The purpose of this article is to regulate and control the division of land, within the City of Los Angeles, to provide for the dedication of land, the payment of fees in lieu thereof, or a combination of both, for the acquisition and development of park and recreation sites and facilities to serve the future inhabitants of the subdivision, to supplement the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act concerning the design, improvement and survey data of subdivisions, the form and content of Tentative Maps and Final Maps, and the procedure to be followed in securing the
official approval of the City of Los Angeles on such maps, consistent with the applicable general and specific plans as well as the public health, safety and welfare."4

Any Transit Oriented Communities Affordable Housing Incentive Program approval would require a discretionary case filed under Section 12.22 of the LAMC, separate from the power vested in the Advisory Agency by the Division of Land Regulations section of the LAMC. The applicant has not filed for a TOC or Density Bonus case which would allow for incentives, and affordability is not before the Director or APC as a decision making body.
13. The project requires a variance for a third retaining wall in lieu of the maximum of two (2) retaining walls allowed per LAMC Section 12.21.C.8(A).

Response: The Deputy Advisory Agency does not have the authority to allow for additional walls then otherwise permitted by code. The project is not requesting a deviation from the two retaining walls that are permitted by right under the LAMC. The discussion regarding the non-applicability of the variance or the ZAD to the project from Appeal Point Response No. 4 is fully referenced herein.

## 14. The project does not adhere to recommendations made by the Mulholland Design Review Board in previous hearings regarding the project.

Response: The Deputy Advisory Agency, under its division of land authority, does not have the authority to regulate conditions recommended by the Mullholland Design Review Board or the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. The discussion regarding the recommendations of the Mulholland Design Review Board for the project from Appeal Point Response No. 6 is full referenced herein.

The Mulholland Design Review Board is a recommending body of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. Anything that is regulated by a Specific Plan is filed in a separate case, and is not a party to the decision of the Deputy Advisory Agency for the Vesting Tentative Tract case that this appeal is filed under. An appeal of the Vesting Tentative Tract approval is not the appropriate venue to petition the City to reconsider discretionary approvals made under a Specific Plan.
The Subdivision Map Act requires the Advisory Agency find that the proposed map be consistent with the General Plan. The Small Lot Design Guidelines allow the Advisory Agency to implement the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan and its various elements, and effectively provides the Advisory Agency with the tools to make the consistency findings. In general, the Small Lot Design Guidelines address a project's massing, height, circulation, and compatibility with adjacent properties by promoting design and development that complements the existing neighborhood character. Small Lot Subdivisions are now required to comply or meet the intent of the Small Lot Design Guidelines through either methods listed in the Guidelines or through alternative methods that achieve the same objective.

The Small Lot Design Guidelines does advise applicants to avoid excessive differences in height, but so does the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. In cases where site characteristics, existing improvements, or special circumstances make substantial adherence with the Small Lot Design Guidelines impractical, substantial compliance may

[^2]not be possible; in which case, small lot subdivisions must meet the intent of the Guidelines, as stated above. For the proposed project, the Mulholland Scenic Parkways Specific Plan's Design Guidelines were used to condition the project in the Specific Plan case; however, the Small Lot Design Guidelines were not and cannot be used as the basis for approving or denying a project.

The project has been conditioned (Condition Nos. 16 a-h, 18, and SF-2) so that it complied with the intent of the Small Lot Design Guidelines, including a condition "that the subdivider shall record and execute a Covenant and Agreement to comply with the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit, grading permit and the recordation of the final tract map."

Although the Deputy Advisory Agency has the authority to condition the design of the dwelling units pursuant to the Small Lot Design Guidelines, a small lot subdivision cannot be denied based on the design of the building. Furthermore, given the design review that had been vetted at the MDRB, as well as consideration given to the Small Lot Design Guidelines, the project design, therefore, was found to be in conformance both with the regulations and the neighborhood, and complies with the rules and regulations of the Division of Land Regulations.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, and in the findings of the Director's Determination, the proposed project complies with the applicable provisions of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan. The intent of the Specific Plan is to provide standards to ensure land use and development in a manner that is compatible with or complements the Scenic Parkway environment. Planning Staff evaluated the project's design, building materials, and landscaping, with a unanimous recommendation for conditional approval from the MDRB. Based on the complete plans submitted by the applicant and upon considering the appellant's arguments for appeal, Staff finds that the project meets the standards of the Plan and has satisfied the requirements of CEQA.

The Deputy Advisory Agency approved a vesting tentative tract map for the subdivision one (1) lot into four (4) small lots for the construction of single family homes. The approved tract map complies with the standards of the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance, has been conditioned to substantially comply with the Small Lot Design Guidelines, the Sherman Oaks - Studio City Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass Community Plan, and the Framework Element. The guidelines allow the Deputy Advisory Agency to address design issues such as height and massing, but they cannot be used to disapprove the tract map based on the architectural design of the proposed dwellings. Revisions to the dwellings were made to reduce the building's proposed massing along Fredonia Drive and had been vetted by the MDRB. The project has been determined to be appropriate given its zoning and land use determination in lieu of an apartment building.

Therefore, it is recommended that the South Valley Area Planning Commission deny both appeals and individually sustain the determination of the Director of Planning and the decision of the Deputy Advisory Agency.

# Exhibit A: <br> Approved Plans and Materials Dated 10/26/2018 

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { DIR-2016-2455-DRB- } \\
\text { SPP-MSP-1A } \\
\text { \& VTT-74217-SL-1A } \\
\text { 3686-3688 Fredonia Drive } \\
\text { Hearing Date: } 2 / 28 / 19
\end{gathered}
$$






## GREEN BUILDING CODE PLAN CHECK NOTES

## RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

For each new dvelling and townhouse, provide $a$ listed raceway that can
accommodate a dedicated $208 / 240$ volt branch circuit. The raceway shall
not





For common parking area serving R -occupancies, the electrical system shall
 the full rated amperage of the Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVVE).
Design shall be based upon a 40 -ampere minimum branch circuit. The raceway
 originate at he main service or subpanel and shall teminiate into $a$ listed
cabinet, box or other enclosure in close proximity to the proposed location of

 space(s) reserved for future EV charging purposes as "EV CAPABLE" in
s.
actordance win he los Angeles Etectical Cod.
14. All duct and other related air distribution component openings shall be covered
with tape p lastic or or sheet metal until the final startup of the heating, cooling and ventilataing equipment.
15. Architectural paints and coatings, adhesives, caulks and sealants shall comply
with the Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) limists listectin with the Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) limits listed in T Tables 4.504.1.-
(4.504.
(4.
16. The VOC Content Verification Checklist, Form GRN 2, shall be completed and showing VOC content for all applicable products shall be readily available at

All new carpet installed in the building interior shall meet the esting and product requirements of one of the following: a. Carpet and Rus Institut's Green Label Plus Program
b. Califomia Departent of Public Heellis's Sporction 01350 c. NSF/ANSI 140 a t the Gold level Label Plus Program
c. NSF/ANSI 140 at the God level Sind Scientific Cerififcations Systems Indoor Advantagerm Gold
18. All new carpet cushion installed in the building interior shall meet the
requirements of the Carpec and Rug Instiute Green Label program.
(20)
19. $80 \%$ of the total area receiving resilient flooring shall comply with one or more of the following:
a. VOC emissio
a. Database
b. Cerifified under UL greenguard gold
c. Certification under the Resilient Floor Covering Institute (RFCI) Solar reflectance of at least 0.63 and athermal enittance of a t least 0.75 . Roofts
with slopes $2: 11$ shall have an SRI value of at least 16 or both 3 -year sola
eflectance of at least 0.20 and a thermal emitance of at least 0.75 . (4.106.5)
4. The required hards cape used to reduce heat island effect shall have a solar
reflectance value of at least 0.30 as determined per ASTM E1918 or ATM
5. The flow rates for all plumbing fixurues shall comply with the maximum flow
(4.303.1)
6. When a shower is served by more than one showertead, the combined flow
rate of all the showertheads controlled by s a single valve shall not exceed 2.0 gallons per minute at 80psi, or the shower shall be designed to only allow one
(4.30.1.1.2)
(howerhead to be in operation at a time.

8. For projects that include landscape work, the Landscape Certification, Form
(State Aspembly Bill No. 1881)
9. Annular spaces around pipes, elecric cables, conduits, or other openings in the bulding's envelope at exterior walls shall be protected against the passage
rodents by closing such openings with cement motar, concretet masonry, or metal ppates Piping prone to ocrososion shanl be protected in accordance or with
(4.406.
Section 313.0 of the Los Angeles Plumbing Code.
10. Materials delivered to the construction site shall be protected from rain or orter
(4.40.7)
sources of moisure.
11. Only C City of Los Angeles permitted hauler will be used for hauling of
construction waste.
12. For all new equipment, an Operation and Maintenance Manual including, at a
minimum, the items listed in Section 4.410 .1 , shall be completed and placed in minimum, the items listed in Section 4.410 .1 , shall be completed and placed in
(4.410.1)
(te buid
13. All new gas fireplaces must be direct-vent, sealed combustion type. Wood
buning fireplaces are prohibited per AQMD uule
(445.503.1, AQMD Rule e 445)
20. New hardwood plywood, particle board, and medium density fiberbard
composite wood products used in the building shall meet the formaldehyd composite wood products used in the building shall meet the formaldehyde
limits listed in Table 4.504 .5 .

1. The Formuldehyde Enissions Verification Checchist, Form GRN 3, shall be
completed prior to final inspecion anproval The completed prior to final inspection approci. The manuaracuers specitications
showng formaldehyde conent tor all showing tormaldehyde content tor al a applicable wood podocuts shall be
readily vailable at the job site and be provided to the field inspector for verification. ${ }_{(4.504 .5)}$
2. A 4 -inch thick base of $1 /$ inch or larger clean aggregate shall be provided for
(4.50.
propsed s.1)
3. A vapor barier shall be provided in direct contact with concrete for proposed
(4.505.2.1) on grade construction.
4. Building materials with visible signs of water damage shall not be installed.
Wall and floor framing shall not be enclosed until 1 tis is inpectecd and found to
be saistictory be satisfactory.
5. Newly installed bathrom exhaust fans shall be ENERGY STAR complian
and be ducted to terminate to the uuside of the building Provide the and be ducted to terminate to the outside of the building. Provide the (4.506.1)
manufacturer's cut shee tor verification.

The heating and air-conditioning systems shall be sized and designed using
ANSIIACCA Manual 1 -2004, ANSLIACCA 29 -D-2009 or ASHRAE handbooks and have their equipment selected in accordance with ANSLACCA
36-S Manual $S$-2004. handobook and have
36-S Manual $S$-2004

LA A Dit DB VOC AND FORMALDEHYDE LIMITS
2014 Los Angeles Green Building Code (Incorporate this form into the plans)

FORM GRN 11
PaRTMENT OTOL
$\square$ The tables below are taken from the 2014 Los Angeles Green Building Code



FORMALDEHYDE LIMITS



ADHESIVE VOC LIMIT ${ }^{1 / 2}$


To and trim aadhesive
SUBSTRATE SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS
Metal to metal
Metal to metal
Plastic foams
Porous material (except wood)
Wood



OCT 202018

Storm Water Pollution Control Requirements for Construction Activities Minimum Water Quality Protection Requirements for All Construction Projects

## The following notes shall be incorporated in the approved set of construction/grading plans and

 represents the minimum standards of good housekeeping which must be implemented on all construction projects.Construction means constructing, clearing, grading or excavation that result in soil disturbance Construction includes structure teardown (demolition). It does not include routine maintenance to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, or original purpose of facility; emergency construction activities required to immediately protect public health and safety; interior remodeling with no outside exposure of construction material or construction waste to storm water; mechanical permit work; or sign permit work (Order No. 01-182, NPDES Permit No. CAS004001 - Part 5: Definitions)

1. Eroded sediments and pollutants shall be retained on site and shall not be transported from the site via sheet flow, swales, area drains, natural drainage or wind.
2. Stockpiles of earth and other construction-related materials shall be covered and/or protected from being transported from the site by wind or water.
3. Fuels, oils, solvents and other toxic materials must be stored in accordance with their listing and shall not contaminate the soil nor the surface waters. All approved toxic storage containers are to be protected from the weather. Spills must be cleaned up immediately and disposed of properly and shall not be washed into the drainage system.
4. Non-storm water runoff from equipment and vehicle washing and any other activity shall be contained on the project site.
5. Excess or waste concrete may not be washed into the public way or any drainage system. Provisions shall be made to retain concrete waste on-site until it can be appropriately disposed of or recycled.
6. Trash and construction -related solid wastes must be deposited into a covered receptacle to prevent contamination of storm water and dispersal by wind
7. Sediments and other materials shall not be tracked from the site by vehicle traffic. The construction entrance roadways must be stabilized so as to inhibit sediments from being deposited into the street/public ways. Accidental depositions must be swept up immediately and may not be washed down by rain or by any other means
8. Retention basins of sufficient size shall be provided to retain storm water runoff on-site and shall be properly located to collect all tributary site runoff.
9. Where retention of storm water runoff on-site is not feasible due to site constraints, runoff may be conveyed to the street and the storm drain system provided that an approved filtering system is installed and maintained on-site during the construction duration

Residentiai Occupancies
2014 Los Angeles Green Building Cod 2014 Los Angeles Green Building Code
(Incorporate this form into the plans)

SECTION 4.303.1
FIXTURE FLOW RATES

| FIXTURE FLOW RATES |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| FIXTURE TYPE | MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE FLOW RATE |
| Showerheads | $2 \mathrm{gpm} @ 80 \mathrm{psi}$ |
| Lavatory faucets, residential | $1.5 \mathrm{gpm} @ 60 \mathrm{psi}^{1}$ |
| Lavatory Faucets, nonresidential | $0.4 \mathrm{gpm} @ 60 \mathrm{psi}^{2}$ |
| Kitchen faucets | $1.8 \mathrm{gpm} @ 60 \mathrm{psi}^{3}$ |
| Gravity tank type water closets | 1.28 gallons/flush ${ }^{4}$ |
| Flushometer tank water closets | 1.28 gallons/flush ${ }^{4}$ |
| Flushometer valve water closets | 1.28 gallons/flush ${ }^{4}$ |
| Urinals | 0.125 gallons/flush |

${ }^{1}$ Lavatory Faucets shall not have a flow rate less than 0.8 gpm at 20 ps
2Kitchen faucets may temporarily increase flow above the maximum rate, but not above 2.2gpm@60ps flow rate of $1.8 \mathrm{gpm} @ 60$ psi.
achieve reduction
Includes single and dual flush water closets with an effective flush of 1.28 gallons or less
Single Flush Toilets - The effective flush volume shall not exceed 1.28 gallons ( 4.8 liters). The effective flush volume is the average flush volume when tested in accordance with ASME
Dual Flush Toilets - The effective flush volume shall not exceed 1.28 gallons ( 4.8 liters). The effective flush volume is defined as the composite, average flush volume of two reduced flushes and one full flush. Flush volumes will be tested in accordance with ASME A112.19.2 and ASM A112.19.14

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { OcT } 262018 \\
\text { EXHIBIT "A" }
\end{gathered}
$$

MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST NEWLY CONSTRUCTED RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS (COMPLETE AND INCORPORATE THIS FORM INTO THE PLANS)


FORM
GRN 4 詋A

## $\overline{\text { DEPARTMENT OF BULLDNG AND SAEETY }}$

## FORM GRN 4

| $\left.\begin{gathered} \text { ITEM } \\ \# \end{gathered} \right\rvert\,$ | CODE <br> SECTION | REQUIREMENT | REFERENCE SHEET (Sheet \# | COMMENTS <br> .g. note \#, detail \# or reason for N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 | 4.505.2.1 | Capillary break |  |  |
| 28 | 4.505.3 | Moisture content of building materials |  |  |
| 29 | 4.506.1 | Bathroom exhaust fans |  |  |

[^3]




















XFS DRIPLINE FOR TREES AND SHRUBS

|  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |
| :---: |

DIAGRAMMATIC IRRIGATION PLAN




- NTTAL AL IRRIAATON PIFE N LAMW ANO PLANTIGG BEDS.

$\qquad$


XFS DRIPLINE
 1. SOLL MPE LOAM


## XFS DRIPLINE DESIGN GUIDELINES <br> 





## IWELO IRRIGATION CERTIFICATION <br>  

[^4]

| SUB-SURFACE ZONE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ROOT WATER ZONE



[^5]OCT 26 2019 ${ }^{20}$ BIT "A"


2121 East 7th Place Suite 215

# Exhibit B: <br> Approved Vesting Tentative Tract Map VTT-74217-SL 

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { DIR-2016-2455-DRB- } \\
\text { SPP-MSP-1A } \\
\text { \& VTT-74217-SL-1A } \\
\text { 3686-3688 Fredonia Drive } \\
\text { Hearing Date: } 2 / 28 / 19
\end{gathered}
$$



# Exhibit C: <br> Appeal of VTT-74217-SL 

DIR-2016-2455-DRB-
SPP-MSP-1A
\& VTT-74217-SL-1A
3686-3688 Fredonia Drive
Hearing Date: 2/28/19

## APPLICATIONS:

## APPEAL APPLICATION

This application is to be used for any appeals authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) for discretionary actions administered by the Department of City Planning

1. APPELLANT BODY/CASE INFORMATION

Appellant Body:
$\square$ Area Planning Commission City Planning Commission $\square$ City Council $\square$ Director of Planning
Regarding Case Number: VTT-74217-SL
Project Address: 3686-3688 FREDONIA DR.
Final Date to Appeal: $\quad$ NOVEMBER 5, 2018
Type of Appeal:
Appeal by Applicant/Owner
Appeal by a person, other than the Applicant/Owner, claiming to be aggrieved
$\square$ Appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety
2. APPELLANT INFORMATION

Appellant's name (print): SCOTT A. MCPHAIL \& HAROLD I. HUTTAS
Company: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: 3682 FREDONIA DR.


- Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization or company?


Other: $\qquad$

- Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position?Yes
0 No

3. REPRESENTATIVEIAGENT INFORMATION

Representative/Agent name (if applicable): $\qquad$
Company: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: $\qquad$

| City: |  |  | Zip: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telep | E-mail: |  |  |

4. JUSTIFICATION/REASON FOR APPEAL

Is the entire decision, or only parts of it being appealed?
Are specific conditions of approval being appealed?
 If Yes, list the condition number(s) here: 16 (d) sub iii ; S-1 (h);FoF 2. par 2; FoF 5, par 3

Attach a separate sheet providing your reasons for the appeal. Your reason must state:

- The reason for the appeal
- Specifically the points at issue
- How you are aggrieved by the decision
- Why you believe the decision-maker erred or abused their discretion


## 5. APPLICANT'S AFFIDAVIT

I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true:
Appellant Signature:


Date: 11/5/18
6. FILING REQUIREMENTSIADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Eight (8) sets of the following documents are required for each appeal filed (1 original and 7 duplicates):
- Appeal Application (form CP-7769)
- Justification/Reason for Appeal
- Copies of Original Determination Letter
- A Filing Fee must be paid at the time of filing the appeal per LAMC Section 19.01 B.
- Original applicants must provide a copy of the original application receipt(s) (required to calculate their $85 \%$ appeal filing fee).
- All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC section(s). Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC, pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of the receipt.
- Appellants filing an appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety per LAMC 12.26 K are considered Original Applicants and must provide noticing per LAMC 12.26 K .7 , pay mailing fees to City Planning's mailing contractor (BTC) and submit a copy of receipt.
- A Certified Neighborhood Council (CNC) or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council; persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self.
- Appeals of Density Bonus cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants (must have documentation).
- Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract (TT or VTT) by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission.
- A CEQA document can only be appealed if a non-elected decision-making body (ZA, APC, CPC, etc.) makes a determination for a project that is not further appealable. [CA Public Resources Code ' 21151 (c)].



## VIA HAND DELIVERY

November 5, 2018

Mr. Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP
Director of Planning
City of Los Angeles
6262 Van Nays Blvd. Ste. 251
Van Nuys, CA. 91401

Courtney Schoenwald
Deputy Advisory Agency
City of Los Angeles
6262 Van Nays Blvd. Ste. 251
Van Nuys, CA. 91401

RE: APPELLANTS against the approved vested tentative tract no. 74217. (CASE No. VTT-74217-SL) located at 3686-3688 Fredonia Dr.

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Advisory Agency and Mr. Bertoni and Ms. Schoenwald:

We write to you on behalf of the neighborhood on Fredonia Dr. This letter is drafted to respond to the City Planning and Advisory Agency's decision issued on Oct. 26, 2018 for the approval of vested tentative tract no. 74217. (CASE No. VTT-74217-SL) located at 3686-3688 Fredonia Dr.
("Project").

## SMALL LOT SUBDIVISION.

The Advisory Agency assumes that the project is eligible for a small lot subdivision Ordinance No. 176,354 simply based on the RD1.5 standard guidelines put forth in the Small Lot Design Standards adopted March 22, 2018. The small lot subdivision ordinance was put in place with the primary purpose of providing affordable housing. But in this instance, it is actually doing the opposite. Similar cases like this one dating back to 2016 have triggered many discussions and hearings, which resulted in the passing of ORDINANCE 185642 on April 18, 2018. This ordinance amended the Los Angeles Municipal code Sec. 3 Subdivision 27 of subsection C of section 12.22 to read:


The purpose of this provision is to create alternative fee-simple home ownership within the multifamily and commercial zones. A small lot subdivision shall be permitted in the $R D, R 3, R 4, R 5, R A S$ and the $P$ and $C$ zones pursuant to an approved tract or parcel map. A subdivision for the purposes of small lots enables the construction of new small lot homes and provides opportunities for the preservation of existing residential dwelling units located on a single lot to be rehabilitated as for-sale dwellings on individual small lots. 27. (a) Construction of New Small Lots. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Code relating to minimum lot area, in the RD, R3, R4 1185462 R5, RAS and the P and C zones, parcels of land may be subdivided into lots which may contain one, two or three dwelling units, provided that the density of the subdivision complies with the minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirement established for each zone, or, in the case of a P zone, the density of the subdivision shall comply with the minimum lot area per dwelling unit of the least restrictive abutting commercial or multi-family residential zones).

The current structures on the property in question are 2 small individual dwellings, not two multi-family units as described on the application. The developers are proposing to build four (4) 3 -story individual homes equally 8369 sq ft on a 7281 sq ft lot. The developers themselves have stated that the homes must go for an estimated $\$ 975 \mathrm{~K}$ - $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{M}$ each to make this investment work for their backers. This price tag goes against the very principle and specific intent of this request to allow sub-division lots for low - med income families. Current zoning from the LACITY.ORG website shows this area to be Medium Market for Residents and High Market for non-residents. (attachments)

FAR CONCERNS. Recently, Studio City addressed the issue surrounding FAR (Floor Area Ratio) to crack down even further on disproportionate building in neighborhoods. They adjusted their FAR limit by reducing the \% to LA's standard $45 \%$. This project has a $90 \%$ FAR. Twice the amount of the standard.

Additionally, the average density of the proposed project is currently .90density the additional incentives because it includes low income housing, and simply ignores the provisions in the TOC Ordinance that restrict the use of additional incentives if the project doesn't conform to design guidelines, which is what the [ $Q$ ] Conditions are. As explained in my client's supplemental appeal justification letter, even if the proposed project were located in a Tier 3 incentive area, the project is still not consistent with TOC requirements. In addition to the base incentives, the proposed project makes use of two additional incentives: (1) height - two additional stories, up to 22 additional feet; and (2) a $25 \%$ decrease in required open space. As stated in Section V. 4 of the TOC Guidelines:

ZONING EASEMENT REQUEST. The second LAMC that the developers are requesting a variance on is the approved limitations on retaining walls that a hillside property is limited to. They are
requesting an easement from the Zoning Administrator's office to go beyond the maximum 2 retaining walls and extend it to three. The latest soil report and fault line data for this neighborhood, put those restrictions in place for a reason. They want to disregard that code. .

The fact that they are disregarding laws and codes that this city put into place is frustrating enough to say the least. But on top of these code violations, they have decided to completely disregard the Mulholland Scenic Review Board's recommendations and explicit instructions to adhere to the following:

- "This project shall be a maximum of 2 stories tall." (They are moving forward with 3stories)
- Guideline 51 of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan - Design and preservation guidelines. Guideline 51 states NO PORTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN 15 FEET OF THE SIDE PROPERTY LINE SHOULD EXCEED ANY PORTION OF AN EXISTING MAIN STRUCTUREON AN ABUTTING LOT WITHIN 15 FT OF THE PROPERTY LINE BY MORE THAN 10 FEET IN HEIGHT. (Their plans have the roof of the second unit at $36^{\prime}$ with the adjoining neighbor's roof line being $12^{\prime}$, and our roofline is $15^{\prime}$ up front but drops to $12^{\prime}$ based on the property line. This results in a $24^{\prime}$ and $21^{\prime}$ difference on either side of the proposed property.

ELLIS ACT. Finally, there are potential concerns with regards to displacing one of the current tenants who is over 60. Based on her communication, she has lived in the back unit for over 18 years. She has not been communicated to in over a year and a half, since this case went before the Mulholland Scenic Review Board. There are items within the ELLIS ACT that must be addressed with oversight from this committee.

In closing, I'd like to leave you with this. "Preserving affordable housing is how we preserve the character and inclusivity of our neighborhoods. With every lost RSO unit, our friends, families and neighbors are potentially displaced and priced out of a difficult housing market. By strengthening the Ellis Act restrictions and RSO requirements, we take an important step forward in protecting Angelenos."

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration to this case and to helping protect our neighborhood for future generations.

## Respectfully,

Harold I. Huttas and Scott A. McPhail
3682 FREDONIA DR.

Office: Van Nuys
Applicant Copy
Application Invoice No: 50939

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning


## City Planning Request Recsipt \#: 0202576251

NOTICE: The staff of the Planning Department will analyze your request and acco. your application, regardless of whether or not you obtain the services of anyone to represent you.

This filing fee is required by Chapter 1, Article 9, L.A.M.C.

| Applicant: FISCHER, PAM AND JOEL ( 310-2044200 ) |
| :--- |
| Representative: PARDO LAND USE CONSULTANT - PARDO, RICK ( 424-3350522 ) |
| Project Address: 3688 N FREDONIA DR, 90068 |

NOTES:

| VTT-74217-SL-1A |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Item | Fee | $\%$ | Charged Fee |
| Appeal by Aggrieved Parties Other than the Original Applicant * | $\$ 89.00$ | $100 \%$ | $\$ 89.00$ |
|  | Case Total |  |  |


| Item | Charged Fee |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *Fees Subject to Surcharges | \$89.00 |  |
| Fees Not Subject to Surcharges | \$0.00 |  |
| Plan \& Land Use Fees Total | \$89.00 |  |
| Expediting Fee | \$0.00 | $\cdots$ |
| Development Services Center Surcharge (3\%) | \$2.67 |  |
| City Planning Systems Development Surcharge (6\%) | \$5.34 |  |
| Operating Surcharge (7\%) | \$6.23 |  |
| General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (7\%) | \$6.23 |  |
| Grand Total | \$109.47 |  |
| Total Invoice | \$109.47 |  |
| Total Overpayment Amount | \$0.00 |  |
| Total Paid (this amount must equal the sum of all checks) | \$109.47 |  |

Council District: 4

Plan Area: Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Processed by HENRY, THOMAS on 11/05/2018



# Exhibit D: <br> Appeal of DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP 

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { DIR-2016-2455-DRB- } \\
\text { SPP-MSP-1A } \\
\text { \& VTT-74217-SL-1A } \\
\text { 3686-3688 Fredonia Drive } \\
\text { Hearing Date: } 2 / 28 / 19
\end{gathered}
$$

## APPLICATIONS:

## arim chenchyon

This application is to be used for any appeals authorized by the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) for discretionary actions administered by the Department of City Planning.

1. APPELLANT BODY/CASE INFORMATION

Appellant Body:
Area Planning Commission City Planning Commission $\square$ City Council $\square$ Director of Planning
Regarding Case Number: DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP
Project Address: 3686-3688 FREDONIA DR.
Final Date to Appeal: NOVEMBER 13, 2018
Type of Appeal:
$\square$ Appeal by Applicant/Owner
Appeal by a person, other than the Applicant/Owner, claiming to be aggrieved
Appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety
2. APPELLANT INFORMATION

Appellant's name (print): SCOTT A. MCPHAIL \& HAROLD I. HUTTAS
Company: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: 3682 FREDONIA DR.
City: LOS ANGELES State: CA Zip: 9

Telephone: 323-309-1739 E-mail: SCOTT.A.MCPHAIL@GMAIL.COM

- Is the appeal being filed on your behalf or on behalf of another party, organization or company?
Other: $\qquad$
- Is the appeal being filed to support the original applicant's position?Yes


3. REPRESENTATIVE/AGENT INFORMATION

Representative/Agent name (if applicable): $\qquad$
Company: $\qquad$
Mailing Address: $\qquad$
City: $\qquad$ State: $\qquad$ Zip: $\qquad$
Telephone: $\qquad$ E-mail: $\qquad$

## 4．JUSTIFICATION／REASON FOR APPEAL

Is the entire decision，or only parts of it being appealed？


Are specific conditions of approval being appealed？
If Yes，list the condition numbers）here：2，5；FINDINGS 1 sub－section a；sub f
Attach a separate sheet providing your reasons for the appeal．Your reason must state：
－The reason for the appeal
－Specifically the points at issue
－How you are aggrieved by the decision
－Why you believe the decision－maker erred or abused their discretion

## 5．APPLICANT＇S AFFIDAVIT

I certify that the statements contained in this application are complete and true：
Appellant Signature：


Date：11／9／18

## 6．FILING REQUIREMENTSIADDITIONAL INFORMATION

－Eight（8）sets of the following documents are required for each appeal filed（1 original and 7 duplicates）：
－Appeal Application（form CP－7769）
－Justification／Reason for Appeal
－Copies of Original Determination Letter
－A Filing Fee must be paid at the time of filing the appeal per LAMC Section 19．01 B．
－Original applicants must provide a copy of the original application receipts）（required to calculate their $85 \%$ appeal filing fee）．

寢－All appeals require noticing per the applicable LAMC sections）．Original Applicants must provide noticing per the LAMC，pay mailing fees to City Planning＇s mailing contractor（BTC）and submit a copy of the receipt．

触－Appellants filing an appeal from a determination made by the Department of Building and Safety per LAMC 12.26 K are considered Original Applicants and must provide noticing per LAMC 12.26 K .7 ，pay mailing fees to City Planning＇s mailing contractor（BTC）and submit a copy of receipt．

期－A Certified Neighborhood Council（CNC）or a person identified as a member of a CNC or as representing the CNC may not file an appeal on behalf of the Neighborhood Council；persons affiliated with a CNC may only file as an individual on behalf of self．

蛙都－Appeals of Density Bonus cases can only be filed by adjacent owners or tenants（must have documentation）．
蜼责－Appeals to the City Council from a determination on a Tentative Tract（TT or VTT）by the Area or City Planning Commission must be filed within 10 days of the date of the written determination of said Commission．

W数 A CE QA document can only be appealed if a non－elected decision－making body（ZA，APC，CPC，etc．）makes a determination for a project that is not further appealable．［CA Public Resources Code＇ 21151 （c）］


## VIA HAND DELIVERY

November 9, 2018
Mr. Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP
Director of Planning
City of Los Angeles
6262 Van Nuys Blvd. Ste. 251
Van Nuys, CA. 91401
Courtney Schoenwald
Deputy Advisory Agency
City of Los Angeles
6262 Van Nuys Blvd. Ste. 251
Van Nuys, CA. 91401
RE: APPELLANTS against the project approval of 3686-3688 Fredonia Dr.("Project"), Case No. DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP.

Dear Members of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Plan committee, City Planning committee, Advisory Agency and Mr. Bertoni, Ms. Schoenwald and Ms. Alycia Witzling:

We write to you on behalf of the neighborhood on Fredonia Dr. This letter is drafted to respond to the City Planning, Mulholland Scenic Design committee and Advisory Agency's decision issued on Oct. 26, 2018 for the project approval of 3686-3688 Fredonia Dr.("Project"), Case No. DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MPS.

## SMALL LOT SUBDIVISION.

The Advisory Agency assumes that the project is eligible for a small lot subdivision Ordinance No. 176,354 simply based on the RD1.5 standard guidelines put forth in the Small Lot Design Standards adopted March 22, 2018. The small lot subdivision ordinance was put in place with the primary purpose of providing affordable housing. But in this instance, it is actually doing the opposite. Similar cases like this one dating back to 2016 have triggered many discussions and hearings, which resulted in the passing of ORDINANCE 185642 on April 18, 2018. This ordinance amended the Los Angeles Municipal code Sec. 3 Subdivision 27 of subsection C of section 12.22 to read:

The purpose of this provision is to create alternative fee-simple home ownership within the multifamily and commercial zones. A small lot subdivision shall be permitted in the $R D, R 3, R 4, R 5, R A S$ and the $P$ and $C$ zones pursuant to an approved tract or parcel map. A subdivision for the purposes of small lots enables the construction of new small lot homes and provides opportunities for the preservation of existing residential dwelling units located on a single lot to be rehabilitated as for-sale dwellings on individual small lots. 27. (a) Construction of New Small Lots. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Code relating to minimum lot area, in the RD, R3, R4 1185462 R5, RAS and the P and C zones, parcels of land may be subdivided into lots which may contain one, two or three dwelling units, provided that the density of the subdivision complies with the minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirement established for each zone, or, in the case of a P zone, the density of the subdivision shall comply with the minimum lot area per dwelling unit of the least restrictive abutting commercial or multi-family residential zone(s).

The current structures on the property in question are 2 small individual dwellings, not two multi-family units as described on the application. The developers are proposing to build four (4) 3 -story individual homes equally 8369 sq ft on a 7281 sq ft lot. The developers themselves have stated that the homes must go for an estimated $\$ 975 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 1.1 \mathrm{M}$ each to make this investment work for their backers. This price tag goes against the very principle and specific intent of this request to allow sub-division lots for low - med income families. Current zoning from the LACITY.ORG website shows this area to be Medium Market for Residents and High Market for non-residents. (attachments)

Further, the Mulholland Board (and now the City Planning Commission) was mis-lead by the applicants who claimed there were other multi-unit properties on the west side of Fredonia that were two stories at street level. In fact, while there is one multi-unit property on that side of Fredonia that is two stories, (including parking) it is only 1.5 stories at Fredonia Dr. The building referenced is set back and its two levels begin at least half a level below the street. The proposed structure at 3686 seeks to be 33.5 feet high which is 7 or eight feet higher (and one and a half stories higher when including parking) than the highest structure on the west side of Fredonia and it is almost twice as high as the properties on either side of it. This, and what is noted in the paragraph above, are in total conflict with Section 11.1.3 Design Review Criteria and Guideline 50 of the October 26 letter from City Planning regarding Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan Project Permit Compliance and Review wherein that paragraph states that the project is compatible with the surrounding homes.

Further to the above, it had been pointed out to the applicants on numerous occasions by the MSPB board members that, in order to build this many units on the property, the applicants would need to apply for a variance to allow them to build a needed third retaining wall which was not a by-right structure. We, the appellants, would like make it clear that we strongly oppose The City allowing any variance for a third retaining wall. We'd like to know why this isn't addressed in the Specific Conditions from Building and Safety.

## FAR CONCERNS

Recently, Studio City addressed the issue surrounding FAR (Floor Area Ratio) to crack down even further on disproportionate building in neighborhoods. They adjusted their FAR limit by reducing the \% to LA's standard 45\%. Our neigborhood's average is $41 \%$ (which is pushed higher due to an existing apartment complex in the alley which has $1.21 \%$. If you remove that from the average, we drop to $35 \%$. This project has a $90 \%$ FAR. Twice the amount of the standard.

## ZONING EASEMENT REQUEST

The second LAMC that the developers are requesting a variance on is the approved limitations on retaining walls that a hillside property is limited to. They are requesting an easement from the Zoning Administrator's office to go beyond the maximum 2 retaining walls and extend it to three. The latest soil report and fault line data for this neighborhood, put those restrictions in place for a reason. They want to disregard that code.

## MULHOLLAND SCENIC DESIGN AND REVIEW BOARD

Based on the finding of the Mulholland Scenic Review Board, the developers have repeatedly ignored the recommendations of this committee found on page 6 and 7 of the findings report. They have decided to completely disregard the Mulholland Scenic Review Board's recommendations and explicit instructions to adhere to the following:

- "This project shall be a maximum of 2 stories tall." ** (They are moving forward with 3stories)
- Guideline 51 of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan - Design and preservation guidelines. Guideline 51 states NO PORTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT LOCATED WITHIN 15 FEET OF THE SIDE PROPERTY LINE SHOULD EXCEED ANY PORTION OF AN EXISTING MAIN STRUCTUREON AN ABUTTING LOT WITHIN 15 FT OF THE PROPERTY LINE BY MORE THAN 10 FEET IN HEIGHT. (Their plans have the roof of the second unit at 36 ' with the adjoining neighbor's roof line being $12^{\prime}$, and our roofline is $15^{\prime}$ up front but drops to $12^{\prime}$ based on the property line. This results in a $24^{\prime}$ and $21^{\prime}$ difference on either side of the proposed property.


## ELLIS ACT

Finally, there are potential concerns with regards to displacing one of the current tenants who is over 60. Based on her communication, she has lived in the back unit for over 18 years. She has not been updated in recent months. There are items within the ELLIS ACT that must be addressed with oversight from this committee.

## BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - STANDARD CONDITIONS S-3(c) a

The appellants would like to respectfully ask the City to remove this condition from this project. Fredonia Dr. is a sleepy street and the addition of street lights will take away the quiet secluded nature that makes it so special. We don't desire the light pollution.

In closing, I'd like to leave you with this. "Preserving affordable housing is how we preserve the character and inclusivity of our neighborhoods. With every lost RSO unit, our friends, families and neighbors are potentially displaced and priced out of a difficult housing market. By strengthening the Ellis Act restrictions and RSO requirements, we take an important step forward in protecting Angelenos."

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration to this case and to helping protect our neighborhood for future generations.

Respectfully,

Harold I. Huttas and Scott A. McPhail 3682 FREDONIA DR.

Office: Van Nus
Applicant Copy
Application Invoice No: 51144

City of Lo ${ }^{\wedge}$


City Planning Ri
NOTICE: The staff of the Planning Department will analyze your request; your application, regardless of whether or not you obtain tut

This filing fee is required by Chapter 1, ,


| Item | Charged Fee |
| :--- | ---: |
| *Fees Subject to Surcharges | $\$ 89.00$ |
| Fees Not Subject to Surcharges | $\$ 0.00$ |
|  |  |
| Plan \& Land Use Fees Total | $\$ 89.00$ |
| Expediting Fee | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Development Services Center Surcharge (3\%) | $\$ 2.67$ |
| City Planning Systems Development Surcharge (6\%) | $\$ 5.34$ |
| Operating Surcharge (7\%) | $\$ 6.23$ |
| General Plan Maintenance Surcharge (7\%) | $\$ 6.23$ |
| Grand Total | $\$ 109.47$ |
| Total Invoice | $\$ 109.47$ |
| Total Overpayment Amount | $\$ 0.00$ |
| Total Paid(this amount must equal the sum of all checks) |  |
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## Council District: 4

Plan Area: Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass
Processed by VIDAL, ANNA on 11/13/2018
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\begin{gathered}
\text { Exhibit E: } \\
\text { Deputy Advisory Agency } \\
\text { Decision VTT-74217-SL } \\
\text { DIR-2016-2455-DRB- } \\
\text { SPP-MSP-1A } \\
\text { \& VTT-74217-SL-1A } \\
\text { 3686-3688 Fredonia Drive } \\
\text { Hearing Date: } 2 / 28 / 19
\end{gathered}
$$

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING
200 N. Spring Street, Room 525
Los Angeles, CA 90012-4801
6262 Van NuYs BLVD., Sume 351
Van Nuys, CA 91401
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SAMANTHA MILLMAN PRESIDENT

VAHID KHORSAND VICE-PRESIDENT

DAVID H. J. AMBROZ CAROLINE CHOE
RENEE DAKE WILSON KAREN MACK MARC MITCHEL VERONICA PADILLA-CAMPOS DANA M. PERLMAN

ROCKY WILES
COMMISSION OFFICE MANAGER
(213) 978-1300

Case No. VTT-74217-SL
3686-3688 North Fredonia Drive Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake Cahuenga Pass Community Plan Zone: RD1.5-1
D.M. 159-B-177
C.D.: 4

CEQA: ENV-2016-2456-CE
Legal Description: Lot FR 37; Tract 5593

Derick Flynn (R)
SODAISM, Inc.
2121 E. $7^{\text {th }}$ Place
Los Angeles, CA 90021
Rick Pardo (R)
Pardo Land Use Consultants
9720 Wilshire Boulevard
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
In accordance with provisions of Sections 17.03 and 17.15 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC), the Advisory Agency issued a categorical exemption ENV-2016-2456-CE as the environmental clearance, and approved Vesting Tentative Tract No. 74217-SL located at 3686 and 3688 North Fredonia Drive on a 7,281 square foot lot for a maximum of four (4) single-family small lots, pursuant to the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance No. 176,354, as shown on map stamp-dated December 26, 2017 in the Sherman Oaks Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass Community Plan. This unit density is based on the RD 1.5-1 Zone. (The subdivider is hereby advised that the LAMC may not permit this maximum approved density. Therefore, verification should be obtained from the Department of Building and Safety which will legally interpret the Zoning Code as it applies to this particular property.) The Advisory Agency's approval is subject to the following conditions:

NOTE on clearing conditions: When two or more agencies must clear a condition, subdivider should follow the sequence indicated in the condition. For the benefit of the applicant, subdivider shall maintain record of all conditions cleared, including all material supporting clearances and be prepared to present copies of the clearances to each reviewing agency as may be required by its staff at the time of its review.

## BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

1. That a 3 -foot wide strip of land be dedicated along Fredonia Drive adjoining the tract to complete an 18 -foot wide half right-of-way.
2. That a 2 -foot wide strip of land be dedicated along the alley adjoining the tract to complete a 10 -foot wide half right-of-way.
3. That if this tract map is approved as "Small Lot Subdivision" then, and if necessary for street address purposes all the common access to this subdivision be named on the final map satisfactory to the City Engineer.
4. That if this tract map is approved as small lot subdivision then the final map be labeled as "Small Lot Subdivision per Ordinance No. 176354" satisfactory to the City Engineer.
5. That if necessary public sanitary sewer easements be dedicated on the final map based on an alignment approved by the Valley Engineering District Office.
6. That the owners of the property record an agreement satisfactory to the City Engineer that they will provide name signs for the common access driveways.
7. That the subdivider make a request to the Valley District Office of the Bureau of Engineering to determine the capacity of existing sewers in this area.

Note: Any questions regarding this report should be directed to Mr. Georgic Avanesian or Julia Li of the Land Development Section, located at 201 North Figueroa Street, Suite 200, or by calling (213) 202-3484.

## DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, GRADING DIVISION

8. That prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, or prior to recordation of the final map, the subdivider shall make suitable arrangements to assure compliance, satisfactory to the Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division, with all the requirements and conditions contained in Inter-Departmental Letter dated May 5, 2016, Log No. 92736 and attached to the case file for Tract No. 5593.

## DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY, ZONING DIVISION

9. That prior to recordation of the final map, the Department of Building and Safety, Zoning Division shall certify that no Building or Zoning Code violations exist on the subject site. In addition, the following items shall be satisfied:
a. Obtain permits for the demolition or removal of all existing structures on the site. Accessory structures and uses are not permitted to remain on lots without a main structure or use. Provide copies of the demolition permits and signed inspection cards to show completion of the demolition work.
b. Provide a copy of affidavit AFF-12309 and AFF-24417. Show compliance with all the conditions/requirements of the above affidavit(s) as applicable. Termination of above affidavit(s) may be required after the Map has been recorded. Obtain approval from the Department, on the termination form, prior to recording.
c. Provide a copy of ZA case ZA-2016-2455-ZAD-DRB-SPP-MSP. Show compliance with all the conditions/requirements of the ZA case(s) as applicable.
d. Show all street/alley dedication(s) as required by Bureau of Engineering and provide net lot area after all dedication. "Area" requirements shall be rechecked as per net lot area after street/alley dedication. Front and rear yard requirements shall be required to comply with current code as measured from new property lines after dedication(s).
e. Lot 1 do not comply with the minimum 15 ft . front yard setback along Fredonia Drive after required street dedication is taken as required for the RD1.5-1 Zone. Revise the Map to show compliance with the above requirement or obtain approval from the Department of City Planning for the setbacks indicated in the Setback Matrix.
f. Resubmit the map (Lots 1 to 4 ) to provide and maintain a minimum 20 ft . common access strip open to the sky for the lots all the way to the public street for access and frontage purpose per Section 12.03 under the definition of "Lot". No projections are allowed into the 20 ft . minimum common access strip. Provide the 20 ft . wide common access open to the sky or obtain approval from the City Planning Advisory Agency to allow for a reduced and/or projection into the common access strip all the way to the public street.
g. Dimension the reciprocal private easement for pedestrian and driveway egress and ingress, back up space, drainage, and utilities on the final map or record a covenant to provide and maintain the easement.

Notes:
This property is located within the Mulholland Scenic Parkway (Outer Corridor). Small Lot Subdivision within the boundary of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway (Outer Corridor) shall comply with the Specific Plan Area requirement.

This property is in the RD Zone within the Hillside Area and may require to comply with the Hillside Ordinance (Section 12.21A.17 Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)).

This property is located in a Liquefaction Zone.
The proposed building plans have not been checked for and shall comply with Building and Zoning Code requirements. With the exception of revised health or
safety standards, the subdivider shall have a vested right to proceed with the proposed development in substantial compliance with the ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the time the subdivision application was deemed complete. Plan check will be required before any construction, occupancy or change of use.

The proposed buildings may not comply with City of Los Angeles Building Code requirements concerning exterior wall, protection of openings and exit requirements with respect to the proposed and existing property lines. Compliance shall be to the satisfactory of LADBS at the time of plan check.

If the proposed development does not comply with the current Zoning Code, all zoning violations shall be indicated on the Map.

Backup space for parking space with less than 26 '- $8^{\prime \prime}$ shall provide sufficient parking stall width and garage door opening width to comply with the current Zoning Code requirement. Comply with the above requirement at the time of Plan Check or obtain City Planning approval.

No parking space can back up onto a street when the driveway is serving more than two dwelling units. Comply with the above requirement at the time of Plan Check or obtain City Planning approval.

An appointment is required for the issuance of a clearance letter from the Department of Building and Safety. The applicant is asked to contact Eric Wong at (213) 482-6876 to schedule an appointment.

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

10. That prior to recordation of the final map, satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Department of Transportation to assure:
a. A minimum 20-foot reservoir space is required between any security gate or parking space and the property line, to the satisfaction of DOT.
b. A two-way driveway apron width of $\mathrm{W}=26$ feet is required for the common access driveway.
c. A parking area and driveway plan should be submitted to the Citywide Planning Coordination Section of the Department of Transportation for approval prior to submittal of building permit plans for plan check by the Department of Building and Safety. Transportation approvals are conducted at 6262 Van Nuys Blvd., Room 320, Van Nuys, CA 91401.
d. That the subdivision report fee and condition clearance fee be paid to the Department of Transportation as required per Ordinance No. 183270 and Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section 19.15 prior to recordation of
the final map. Note: the applicant may be required to comply with any other applicable fees per this new ordinance.

Note: If you have any questions, you may contact Vicente Cordero at vicente.cordero@lacity.org or 818-374-4697.

## FIRE DEPARTMENT

11. That prior to the recordation of the final map, a suitable arrangement shall be made satisfactory to the Fire Department, binding the subdivider and all successors to the following:
a. Submittal of plot plans for Fire Department review and approval prior to recordation of Tract Map Action.
b. This project is located in the very high fire hazard severity zone and shall comply with requirements set forth in the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) 57.25.01.
c. Mitigating measures shall be considered. These measures shall include, but not be limited to the following:
i. Boxed-in eaves.
ii. Single pane, double thickness (minimum $1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ thickness) or insulated windows.
iii. Non-wood siding.
iv. Exposed wooden members shall be two inches nominal thickness.
v. Noncombustible finishes.
d. Irrigated and managed greenbelts around the perimeter of all structures for a distance of 100 feet shall be considered as a buffer between the brush and the proposed project.
e. All landscaping shall use fire-resistant plants and materials. A list of such plants is available from the contact Brush Clearance Unit at 6262 Van Nuys Blvd., Room 451, Van Nuys 91401, (800) 994-4444.
f. All homes shall have noncombustible roofs. (Non-wood)
g. The brush in the area adjacent to the proposed development shall be cleared or thinned periodically by the homeowner's Association under supervision to the Los Angeles City Fire Department in order to reduce the risk of brush fires spreading to the homes.
h. Any required roadway improvement within the Hillside Ordinance shall be completed prior to the Fire Department signing off on building plans or building permit application.
i. For any new construction of, or addition to, a one-family dwelling on a lot that does not have a vehicular access route from a street improved with a minimum 20 foot wide continuous paved roadway from the driveway apron that provides access to the main residence to the boundary of the Hillside Area, no building permit or grading permit shall be issued unless the construction or addition meets the requirements of this Subdivision or has been approved pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) Section $12.24 \times 21$.
j. Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.
k. No building or portion of a building shall be constructed more than 150 feet from the edge of a roadway of an improved street, access road, or designated fire lane.
I. Adequate public and private fire hydrants shall be required.
m . Any roof elevation changes in excess of 3 feet may require the installation of ships ladders.

Note: The applicant is further advised that all subsequent contact regarding these conditions must be with the Hydrant and Access Unit. This would include clarification, verification of condition compliance and plans or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished BY APPOINTMENT ONLY, in order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting please call (818) 374-4351. You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

## BUREAU OF STREET LIGHTING - SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

12. Street Lighting clearance for this Street Light Maintenance Assessment District condition is conducted at 1149 S . Broadway Suite 200. Street Lighting improvement condition clearance will be conducted at the Bureau of Engineering District office, see condition S-3. (c).

If new street light(s) are required, then prior to the recordation of the final map or issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy (C of O), street lighting improvement plans shall be submitted for review and the owner shall provide a good faith effort via a ballot process for the formation or annexation of the property within the boundary of the development into a Street Lighting Maintenance Assessment District.

## BUREAU OF SANITATION

13. Wastewater Collection Systems Division of the Bureau of Sanitation has inspected the sewer/storm drain lines serving the subject tract and found no/or potential problems to their structure or potential maintenance problem, as stated in the memo dated February 24, 2017. Upon compliance with its conditions and requirements, the Bureau of Sanitation, Wastewater Collection Systems Division will forward the necessary clearances to the Bureau of Engineering. (This condition shall be deemed cleared at the time the City Engineer clears Condition No. S-1. (d).)

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AGENCY

14. To assure that cable television facilities will be installed in the same manner as other required improvements, please email cabletv.ita@lacity.org that provides an automated response with the instructions on how to obtain the Cable TV clearance. The automated response also provides the email address of three people in case the applicant/owner has any additional questions.

## DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARKS

15. That satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Department of Recreation and Parks to assure: that the Quimby Fee be based on the RD1.5 Zone.

Note: Effective January 11, 2017, RAP is responsible for calculating the required park fees owed by each residential development project, including subdivision projects, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) 12.33, and issuing the fee calculation letters to applicants. RAP will also be responsible for calculating the required fees for vested projects that are not subject to a park fee pursuant to LAMC 12.33 but were subject to the Recreation and Park Fee provisions that were effective prior to January 11, 2017 (Quimby Fee). The Quimby Fee is calculated on a per dwelling unit basis with the per unit fee determined by the zone in which the dwelling unit is located. The application for this vested tentative tract map was deemed complete on December 1, 2016.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this information please feel free to contact the RAP Park Fee staff at (213) 202-2682.

## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING - SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

16. Prior to the recordation of the final map, the subdivider shall prepare and execute a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6770) in a manner satisfactory to the Planning Department, binding the subdivider and all successors to the following:
a. Limit the proposed development to a maximum of four (4) lots.
b. Provide a minimum of 2 covered off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit.
c. Note to City Zoning Engineer and Plan Check. The Advisory Agency has reviewed and approved the location(s) of the following item(s) as it applies to this subdivision and the proposed development on the site.

The project shall comply with the setbacks as indicated in the table below:

| Lot <br> No. | East (Front) | West (Rear) | North (Side) | South (Side) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 7 feet (front) | 6 feet | 7 feet | 16 feet <br> 4 inches |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 5 feet <br> 8 inches | 0 feet | 5 feet | 5 feet |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 0 feet | 7 feet | 5 feet | 0 feet |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 0 feet | 5 feet | 0 feet | 5 feet |

In lieu of the required 20 feet of frontage and 20 foot wide access strip, a five (5) foot common access easement for lots 3 and 4, and a 12 foot wide common access driveway for lots 1 and 2 shall be provided.
d. The use and development of the property shall be in substantial conformance with the plans submitted with the application and marked Exhibit "A", attached, the Conditions of Approval set by the Department of City Planning in DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP, except as may be revised as a result of this action and as follows:
i) Lot 1 front yard setback shall be along the east property line facing Fredonia Drive
ii) Lot 3 and Lot 4 front yard setbacks shall be along the west property line facing the alley
iii) The front yard setback shall be within five (5) feet of the average of setbacks of adjacent properties.
iv) The primary entryway for Lot 2, Lot 3, and Lot 4 shall be oriented toward and be visible from a pedestrian pathway that is connected to Fredonia Drive and the alley.
v) All front entrances shall incorporate transitions such as landscaping, paving, porches, stoops, and canopies.
vi) Pedestrian pathways to each unit and within the driveway easement area shall be clearly marked with decorative stamped concrete, brick, stone or similar contrasting material.
vii) Space for entry, front landing, and transitional landscaping between the public sidewalk and private entryway along Fredonia Drive shall be provided.
viii) Distinguishable pedestrian paths to connect parking areas to articulated individual entries shall be provided for units that share common driveways.
ix) Shade trees and ornamental plants shall be planted to define the edge and increase visual interest to both the public and private realms. Avoid placing 4-foot-tall or higher shrubs immediately adjacent to the sidewalk.
x) The project shall provide articulation along the street frontage, and visual breaks to diminish the scale and massing.
xi) The project shall employ architectural details to enhance scale and interest by breaking the facade up into distinct planes that are offset from the main building facade.
xii) The project shall use materials that appropriately respond to the neighborhood context.
xiii) Use of permeable paving materials (such as porous asphalt, porous concrete, permeable concrete pavers and grid systems filled with gravel or grass) shall be employed where allowed by the Alternative Paving Material Ordinance (No. 182431).
e. That a solar access report shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency prior to obtaining a grading permit.
f. That the subdivider consider the use of natural gas and/or solar energy and consult with the Department of Water and Power and Southern California Gas Company regarding feasible energy conservation measures.
g. A Community Maintenance Agreement shall be prepared, composed of all property owners, to maintain all common areas such as trees, landscaping, trash, parking, community driveway, walkways, monthly service for private fire hydrant (if required), etc. Each owner and future property owners shall automatically become party to the agreement and shall be subject to a proportionate share of the maintenance. The Community Maintenance Agreement shall be recorded as a Covenant and Agreement to run with the land. The subdivider shall submit a copy of this Agreement, once recorded, to the Planning Department for placement in the tract file.
h. That copies of all recorded Covenant and Agreement(s) for all reciprocal private easements shall be submitted to the Planning Department for placement in the tract file.
17. That the subdivider shall record and execute a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6974) that a Certificate of Occupancy (temporary or final) for the building(s) shall not be issued until the final map has been recorded.
18. That the subdivider shall record and execute a Covenant and Agreement to comply with the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan prior to the issuance of a building permit, grading permit and the recordation of the final tract map.
19. Tenant Relocation Conditions. That the applicant execute and record a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP-6770) in a form satisfactory to the Advisory Agency binding the applicant and any successor in interest to provide tenant relocation assistance and establish a relocation program in a manner consistent with Section 47.07 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code relating to demolition. The covenant and agreement shall be executed and recorded with 10 days after the expiration of the appeal period (and final action thereon) and a copy provided to each eligible tenant within five days of recordation of the covenant and agreement.
20. Within 10 days after the time to appeal has expired, the applicant shall execute and record a Covenant and Agreement (Planning Department General Form CP6770 ) in a form satisfactory to the Advisory Agency binding the applicant and any successor in interest to the affirmative duty to abide by all provisions of the Ellis Act (Government Code $\S \S 7060$, et seq.) and $\S \S 151.22$ - 151.28 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

## 21. INDEMNIFICATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION COSTS.

Applicant shall do all of the following:
(i) Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.
(ii) Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.
(iii) Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than $\$ 50,000$. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
(iv) Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure
to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
(v) If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, of if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:
"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.
"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Action includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

## DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING - STANDARD SINGLE-FAMILY CONDITIONS

SF-1. That approval of this tract constitutes approval of model home uses, including a sales office and off-street parking. If models are constructed under this tract approval, the following conditions shall apply:

1. Prior to recordation of the final map, the subdivider shall submit a plot plan for approval by the Development Services Center of the Department of City Planning showing the location of the model dwellings, sales office and offstreet parking. The sales office must be within one of the model buildings.
2. All other conditions applying to Model Dwellings under Section 12.22A, 10 and 11 and Section 17.05 O of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)
shall be fully complied with satisfactory to the Department of Building and Safety.

SF-2. That a landscape plan, prepared by a licensed landscape architect, be submitted to and approved by the Advisory Agency in accordance with CP-6730 prior to obtaining any grading or building permits before the recordation of the final map. The landscape plan shall identify tree replacement on a $1: 1$ basis by a minimum of 24 -inch box trees for the unavoidable loss of desirable trees on the site.

In the event the subdivider decides not to request a permit before the recordation of the final map, a covenant and agreement satisfactory to the Advisory Agency guaranteeing the submission of such plan before obtaining any permit shall be recorded.

## BUREAU OF ENGINEERING - STANDARD CONDITIONS

S-1. (a) That the sewerage facilities charge be deposited prior to recordation of the final map over all of the tract in conformance with Section 64.11.2 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).
(b) That survey boundary monuments be established in the field in a manner satisfactory to the City Engineer and located within the California Coordinate System prior to recordation of the final map. Any alternative measure approved by the City Engineer would require prior submission of complete field notes in support of the boundary survey.
(c) That satisfactory arrangements be made with both the Water System and the Power System of the Department of Water and Power with respect to water mains, fire hydrants, service connections and public utility easements.
(d) That any necessary sewer, street, drainage and street lighting easements be dedicated. In the event it is necessary to obtain off-site easements by separate instruments, records of the Bureau of Right-of-Way and Land shall verify that such easements have been obtained. The above requirements do not apply to easements of off-site sewers to be provided by the City.
(e) That drainage matters be taken care of satisfactory to the City Engineer.
(f) That satisfactory street, sewer and drainage plans and profiles as required, together with a lot grading plan of the tract and any necessary topography of adjoining areas be submitted to the City Engineer.
(g) That any required slope easements be dedicated by the final map.
(h) That each lot in the tract complies with the width and area requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
(i) That 1-foot future streets and/or alleys be shown along the outside of incomplete public dedications and across the termini of all dedications abutting unsubdivided property. The 1-foot dedications on the map shall include a restriction against their use of access purposes until such time as they are accepted for public use.
(j) That any 1-foot future street and/or alley adjoining the tract be dedicated for public use by the tract, or that a suitable resolution of acceptance be transmitted to the City Council with the final map.
(k) That no public street grade exceeds $15 \%$.
(I) That any necessary additional street dedications be provided to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 2010.

S-2. That the following provisions be accomplished in conformity with the improvements constructed herein:
(a) Survey monuments shall be placed and permanently referenced to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. A set of approved field notes shall be furnished, or such work shall be suitably guaranteed, except where the setting of boundary monuments requires that other procedures be followed.
(b) Make satisfactory arrangements with the Department of Traffic with respect to street name, warning, regulatory and guide signs.
(c) All grading done on private property outside the tract boundaries in connection with public improvements shall be performed within dedicated slope easements or by grants of satisfactory rights of entry by the affected property owners.
(d) All improvements within public streets, private streets, alleys and easements shall be constructed under permit in conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Bureau of Engineering.
(e) Any required bonded sewer fees shall be paid prior to recordation of the final map.

S-3. That the following improvements are either constructed prior to recordation of the final map or that the construction is suitably guaranteed:
(a) Construct on-site sewers to serve the tract as determined by the City Engineer.
(b) Construct any necessary drainage facilities.
(c) Install street lighting facilities to serve the tract as required by the Bureau of Street Lighting:
a. Construct one new light on Fredonia Drive.

Notes: The quantity of street lights identified may be modified slightly during the plan check process based on illumination calculations and equipment selectin. Conditions set: 1) in compliance with a Specific Plan, 2) by LADOT, or 3) by other legal instrument excluding the Bureau of Engineering condition S-3 (i), requiring an improvement that will change the geometrics of the public roadway or driveway apron may require additional or the reconstruction of street lighting improvements as part of that condition.
(d) Plant street trees and remove any existing trees within dedicated streets or proposed dedicated streets as required by the Street Tree Division of the Bureau of Street Maintenance. All street tree plantings shall be brought up to current standards. When the City has previously been paid for tree planting, the subdivider or contractor shall notify the Urban Forestry Division ((213) 847-3077) upon completion of construction to expedite tree planting.
(e) Repair or replace any off-grade or broken curb, gutter and sidewalk satisfactory to the City Engineer.
(f) Construct access ramps for the handicapped as required by the City Engineer.
(g) Close any unused driveways satisfactory to the City Engineer.
(h) Construct any necessary additional street improvements to comply with the 2010 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Standards for Accessible Design.
(i) That the following improvements are either constructed prior to recordation of the final map or that the construction is suitably guaranteed:
a. Improve Fredonia Drive being dedicated and adjoining the subdivision by the construction of the followings:
(1) A concrete curb, a concrete gutter, and a 4-foot full width concrete sidewalk.
(2) Suitable surfacing to join the existing pavements and to complete a 14-foot wide half roadway for a minimum of 20 foot wide total roadway.
(3) Any necessary removal and reconstruction of existing improvements.
(4) The necessary transitions to join the existing improvements.
b. Improve the alley being dedicated and adjoining the tract by the removal of the existing improvements to provide a new 18-foot wide
alley with 2-foot wide longitudinal concrete gutter satisfactory to the Valley District Engineering Office.
c. Construct the necessary on-site mainline sewers satisfactory to the City Engineer.

## NOTES:

The Advisory Agency approval is the maximum number of units permitted under the tract action. However the existing or proposed zoning may not permit this number of units. This vesting map does not constitute approval of any variations from the Municipal Code, unless approved specifically for this project under separate conditions.

Any removal of the existing street trees shall require Board of Public Works approval.
Satisfactory arrangements shall be made with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Power System, to pay for removal, relocation, replacement or adjustment of power facilities due to this development. The subdivider must make arrangements for the underground installation of all new utility lines in conformance with Section 17.05-N of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

The final map must be recorded within 36 months of this approval, unless a time extension is granted before the end of such period.

The Advisory Agency hereby finds that this tract conforms to the California Water Code, as required by the Subdivision Map Act.

The subdivider should consult the Department of Water and Power to obtain energy saving design features which can be incorporated into the final building plans for the subject development. As part of the Total Energy Management Program of the Department of Water and Power, this no-cost consultation service will be provided to the subdivider upon his request.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

## FINDINGS OF FACT (CEQA)

1. DETERMINED Based on the whole of the administrative record the Project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to state CEQA Guidelines Article 19, Section 15332, and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15300.2 applies.

## FINDINGS OF FACT (SUBDIVISION MAP ACT)

In connection with the approval of Vesting Tentative Tract No. 74217-SL the Advisory Agency of the City of Los Angeles, pursuant to Sections 66473.1, 66474.60, . 61 and .63 of the State of California Government Code (the Subdivision Map Act), makes the prescribed findings as follows:

## 2. THE PROPOSED MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

The requested Small Lot Subdivision allows for the subdivision of underutilized land in multi-family areas into fee-simple homes. Intended as an infill development and a smart-growth alternative to traditional, suburban style single-family subdivisions, small lot homes have smaller lot areas with compact building footprints and reduced yard setbacks, street frontages, passageways between buildings, and open space. As such, small lot subdivisions oftentimes create parcels with a unique set of design and spatial complexities.

The adopted Sherman Oaks - Studio City - Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass Community Plan designates the subject property for Low Medium Residential (multi-family) land use with the corresponding zone of RD1.5-1. The site is located within the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. The property is zoned RD1.5-1 and is approximately 7,281 gross square feet and 7,031 net square feet after dedication. The proposed development of four (4) lots is allowable under the Small Lot Subdivision Ordinance passed prior to April 18, 2018 (Ordinance No. $176354)(7,281 / 600=12.135$ units). The proposed single family dwellings will be two- and three-story over parking at grade to a maximum height of 33 feet and six (6) inches. Height District 1 allows a maximum height of 45 feet. Each dwelling unit will include individual two car garages at ground level and private entrances.

The proposed project will activate the site by providing new homes. The project will provide a fully landscaped front yard setbacks along Fredonia Drive which will enhance the appearance of the site from the street. Articulation of the buildings will reduce the project's massing compared to the existing one story and two-story residential properties in the immediate area.

The development is supported by the Citywide General Plan Framework Element objective and policies:

Objective 4.1: Plan the capacity for and development incentives to encourage production of an adequate supply of housing units of various types within each City subregion to meet the projected housing needs by income level of the future population.

Policy 4-1.1: Provide sufficient land use and density to accommodate an adequate supply of housing units by type and cost within each City subregion to meet the twenty-year projections of housing needs.

Policy 5.2.3: Encourage the development of housing surrounding or adjacent to centers and along designated corridors, at sufficient densities to support the centers, corridors, and the transit system. While densities and distances will vary based on local conditions, the following residential density standards, which are based on the City's adopted Land Use/Transportation Policy, should be used as a general guide when updating community plans through a public participation process: ... (c)

Two-stories over parking (RD1.5) within 750 feet of major bus corridor intersections;.

Policy 5.5.3 Formulate and adopt building and site design standards and guidelines to raise the quality of design Citywide.

Policy 5.5.4 Determine the appropriate urban design elements at the neighborhood level, such as sidewalk width and materials, street lights and trees, bus shelters and benches, and other street furniture.

The project is will be one of the newer developments in the immediate area and as such, will provide a greater number of residential units as allowed by the RD1.5 zone. The project will provide needed new home ownership opportunities for the Community Plan area. New sidewalks and street lights will be added to the street frontages where currently no sidewalk and street light exists. The project is two (2) and three (3) stories over parking and is approximately 525 feet from Cahuenga Boulevard, which is a major commercial corridor and approximately half a mile from the Orange Line Station to the north. The project will include decorative pedestrian pathways within the site to ensure safety and pedestrian entrances facing Fredonia Drive with landscape frontage. As noted, street improvements and new street lights will be included as well.

This project is subject to Project Permit Compliance and Design Review with DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP as the property is within the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan area. Compliance with this case will ensure compliance with the Specific Plan. As conditioned, the proposed tract map is consistent with the intent and purpose of the applicable General and Specific Plans.

The National Flood Insurance Program rate maps, which are a part of the Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan adopted by the City Council by Ordinance No. 172,081, have been reviewed and it has been determined that the property is located in Zone C, outside of the flood zone.

Therefore, as conditioned, the proposed tract map is consistent with the intent and purpose of the applicable General and Specific Plans.

## 3. THE DESIGN OR IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION IS CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PLANS.

For the purposes of approving a small lot subdivision, the "design" of the tract or parcel map refers to the configuration and layout of the proposed lots in addition to the proposed site plan layout and building design. Easements and/or access and "improvements" refers to the infrastructure facilities serving the subdivision. The project was reviewed by various city agencies that have the authority to make improvement recommendations.

The design and layout of the map is consistent with the design standards established by the Subdivision Map Act and Division of Land Regulations of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC). Several public agencies (including Fire

Department, Department of Building and Safety, Bureau of Engineering, and Bureau of Sanitation) have reviewed the map and found the subdivision design satisfactory and have imposed improvement requirements and/or conditions of approval. Sewers are available and have been inspected and deemed adequate in accommodating the proposed project's sewerage needs. The subdivision will be required to comply with all regulations pertaining to grading, building permits, and street improvement permit requirements. Conditions of Approval for the design and improvement of the subdivision are required to be performed prior to the recordation of the vesting map, building permit, grading permit, or certificate of occupancy.

Fredonia Drive is a Local Street with a designated right of way width of 30 feet under the Mobility 2035 Plan. The Bureau of Engineering is requiring dedication and improvements along Fredonia Drive to include a new 4 -foot sidewalk. The Bureau of Street Lighting has conditioned one new street light be added on Fredonia Drive. In addition, all necessary street improvements will be made to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990.

The Subdivision Map Act requires that the proposed map be consistent with the General Plan. The discussion of how the project complies with the general and specific plan of finding (a) are fully incorporated and referenced herein.

This project is subject to the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan requirements and pursuant to Case No. DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP, will comply with the Specific Plan. As conditioned, the proposed tract map is consistent with the intent and purpose of the applicable General and Specific Plans.

## 4. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT.

The site is currently comprised of a through lot parcel developed with two (2) single family dwellings. The development of a four (4) residential units (small lots) with an internal shared driveway and open space is an infill of an otherwise mixed density neighborhood (i.e. single family and multi-family).

The site is sloped and is in a BOE Special Grading Area, a High Fire Hazard Zone, and a Hillside Area, but is not located in a slope stability study area, high erosion hazard area, flood zone, methane hazard zone, landslide zone, tsunami inundation zone, or a fault-rupture study zone. The site is located within the Hollywood Fault and a liquefaction area, however, specific Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs) in the City of Los Angeles regulate the grading and construction of projects in these particular types of "sensitive" locations and will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant.

The Department of Building and Safety, Grading Division, has reviewed the project soils report and has found the report is acceptable for site development with conditions per Soils Report Approval Letter (Log No. 92736), dated May 5, 2016. The Bureau of Engineering has reviewed the project and has found the project is acceptable for site development with conditions per letter, dated May 4, 2017. The Bureau of Sanitation has reviewed the project and has found the project is
acceptable for site development with conditions per letter, dated February 24, 2017. As conditioned, the proposed tract map is physically suitable for the type of the development.

## 5. THE SITE IS PHYSICALLY SUITABLE FOR THE PROPOSED DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT.

The subject block and properties on the north side of Fredonia Drive are zoned RD1.5-1 and developed with mix of single family and multi-family dwellings, all mostly one or two story. West on Fredonia Drive is zoned R1-1 and developed with single family dwellings. There are no parks or schools within 500 feet of the project site.

The environmental document (Case No. ENV-2016-2456-CE) established that the physical characteristics of the site and surrounding area is consistent with development and urban character of the surrounding community. The site is sloped and is in a BOE Special Grading Area, a High Fire Hazard Zone, and a Hillside Area, but is not located in a slope stability study area, high erosion hazard area, flood zone, methane hazard zone, landslide zone, tsunami inundation zone, or a fault-rupture study zone. The site is located within the Hollywood Fault and a liquefaction area, however, specific Regulatory Compliance Measures (RCMs) in the City of Los Angeles regulate the grading and construction of projects in these particular types of "sensitive" locations and will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. Furthermore the Department of Building and Safety Grading Division has reviewed the project and found the development acceptable as conditioned.

The proposed project will comply with all Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) requirements for parking, yards, and on-site circulation. As conditioned the proposed tract map is physically suitable for the proposed density of the development.
6. THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION OR THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS ARE NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SUBSTANTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE OR SUBSTANTIALLY AND AVOIDABLY INJURE FISH OR WILDLIFE OR THEIR HABITAT.

The project site is currently developed with two separate dwelling units and the surrounding area is presently developed with structures and do not provide a natural habitat for either fish or wildlife. There are no trees along the street frontages. The project will require new trees and landscaping planted as conditioned. The lead agency has determined that this project would not have a significant effect upon the environment.
7. THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION OR TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS IS NOT LIKELY TO CAUSE SERIOUS PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEMS.

No potential public health impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed subdivision.

The development is required to be connected to the City's sanitary sewer system, where the sewage will be directed to the LA Hyperion Treatment Plant, which has been upgraded to meet Statewide ocean discharge standards. The Bureau of Engineering has reported that the proposed subdivision does not violate the existing California Water Code because the subdivision will be connected to the public sewer system and will have only a minor incremental impact on the quality of the effluent from the Hyperion Treatment Plant.
8. THE DESIGN OF THE SUBDIVISION OR THE TYPE OF IMPROVEMENTS WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH EASEMENTS, ACQUIRED BY THE PUBLIC AT LARGE, FOR ACCESS THROUGH OR USE OF PROPERTY WITHIN THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION.

No such easements are known to exist. Needed public access for roads and utilities will be acquired by the City prior to recordation of the proposed tract.
9. THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION SHALL PROVIDE, TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE, FOR FUTURE PASSIVE OR NATURAL HEATING OR COOLING OPPORTUNITIES IN THE SUBDIVISION. (REF. SECTION 66473.1)

1) In assessing the feasibility of passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the proposed subdivision design, the applicant has prepared and submitted materials which consider the local climate, contours, configuration of the parcel(s) to be subdivided and other design and improvement requirements.
2) Providing for passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities will not result in reducing allowable densities or the percentage of a lot which may be occupied by a building or structure under applicable planning and zoning in effect at the time the tentative map was filed.
3) The lot layout of the subdivision has taken into consideration the maximizing of the north/south orientation.
4) The topography of the site has been considered in the maximization of passive or natural heating and cooling opportunities.
5) In addition, prior to obtaining a building permit, the subdivider shall consider building construction techniques, such as overhanging eaves, location of windows, insulation, exhaust fans; planting of trees for shade purposes and the height of the buildings on the site in relation to adjacent development.

## 10. BEFORE APPROVING A TENTATIVE MAP FOR AN AREA LOCATED IN A VERY HIGH FIRE SEVERITY ZONE, THE FOLLOWING THREE FINDINGS SHALL BE MADE:

i) THERE IS SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD THAT THE DESIGN AND LOCATION OF EACH LOT IN THE SUBDIVISION, AND THE SUBDIVISION AS A WHOLE, ARE CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE STATE BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROECTION PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 4290 AND 4291 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE.

The Tentative Map will front Fredonia Drive and an alley. Fredonia is 24 feet wide, minimum for firetruck is 20 feet minimum wide. Both are Substandard Hillside Limited Streets, and a dedication of three (3) feet on Fredonia and two (2) feet in the alley is required for the lot. The alley dedication will widen the alley access for fire vehicles. Furthermore, per Condition 16.c, in lieu of the required 20 feet of frontage and 20 foot wide access strip, a five (5) foot common access easement for lots 3 and 4 and a 12 foot wide common access driveway for lots 1 and 2 will be provided.

The already developed streets currently have signage denoting the street names. As indicated in the letter from the Fire Department dated January 30, 2018, adequate public and private fire hydrants shall be required for the Final Map. Furthermore, per the Bureau of Engineering Standard Condition S-1, satisfactory arrangements shall be made with both the Water System and the Power System of the Department of Water and Power with respect to water mains, fire hydrants, service connections and public utility easements.

The requirements from the Fire Department also include planting restrictions, brush clearance, and irrigated and managed greenbelts around the proposed structures. As conditioned, once constructed, the structures will be required to maintain defensible space and do fuel modification such that a wildfire burning under average weather conditions would not likely ignite the structures.
ii) THERE IS SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD THAT STRUCTURAL FIRE PROTECTION AND SUPRESSION SERVICES WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR THE SUBDIVISION THROUGH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES.

As per the letter dated January 30, 2018 from the Fire Department, fire protection and suppression services will be available for the subject site.
iii) THAT, TO THE EXTENT PRACTICABLE, INGRESS AND EGRESS FOR THE SUBDIVISION MEET THE REGULATIONS REGARDING ROAD STANDARDS FOR FIRE EQUIPMENT ACCESS ADOPTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 4290 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE AND ANY APPLICABLE LOCAL ORDINANCE.

As noted in Finding 10a, the Tentative Map will front two (2) substandard streets dimension but will allow for the access of fire vehicles.

These findings shall apply to both the tentative and final maps for Tract No. 74217-SL.

Vincent P. Bertoni, AICP

Director of Planning

Note: If you wish to file an appeal, it must be filed within 10 calendar days from the decision date as noted in this letter. For an appeal to be valid to the City Planning Commission or Area Planning Commission, it must be accepted as complete by the City Planning Department and appeal fees paid, prior to expiration of the above 10 -day time limit. Such appeal must be submitted on Master Appeal Form No. CP7769 at the Department's Public Offices, located at:

| Figueroa Plaza | Marvin Braude San Fernando | West Los Angeles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 201 North Figueroa Street, | Valley Constituent Service Center | Development Services Center |
| 4 $^{\text {th }}$ Floor | 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Suite | 1828 Sawtelle Boulevard, |
| Los Angeles, CA 90012 | 251 | and Floor |
| (213) 482-7077 | Van Nuys, CA 91401 | Los Angeles, CA 90025 |
|  | (818) 374-5050 | (310) 231-2901 |

*Please note the cashiers at the public counters close at 3:30 PM. Forms are also available on-line at http://cityplanning.lacity.org

The time in which a party may seek judicial review of this determination is governed by California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. Under that provision, a petitioner may seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, only if the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section is filed no later than the $90^{\text {th }}$ day following the date on which the City's decision becomes final.
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## MULHOLLAND SCENIC PARKWAY SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT PERMIT COMPLIANCE \& DESIGN REVIEW

October 26, 2018

## Applicant/Owner

Joel and Pamela Fischer Trust Joel and Pamela Fischer, Trustees 10331 Cheviot Drive Los Angeles, CA 90064

Applicant
Derick Flynn
SODAISM, Inc.
2121 E. $7^{\text {th }}$ Place, Suite 215
Los Angeles, CA 90021

## Representative

Rick Pardo
Pardo Land Use Consultants
9720 Wilshire Boulevard
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Case No. DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP<br>Related Case: VTT-74217-SL<br>CEQA: ENV-2016-2456-CE<br>Location: 3686-3688 North Fredonia Drive<br>Council District: 4-Ryu<br>Neighborhood Council: Hollywood Hills West<br>Community Plan Area: Sherman Oaks - Studio City -<br>Toluca Lake - Cahuenga Pass<br>Land Use Designation: Low Medium Residential<br>Zone: RD1.5-1<br>Legal Description: Lot FR 37 (Arb 3) of Tract 5593<br>For full legal description, see<br>Exhibit "A" survey.

Last Day to File an November 13, 2018
Appeal:

## DETERMINATION

Pursuant to LAMC Sections 11.5.7 C and 16.50, and Section 11 of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan (Ordinance No. 167,943), and based upon the recommendation of the Mulholland Design Review Board, I have reviewed the proposed project and as the designee of the Director of Planning, I hereby:

Approve with Conditions a Project Permit Compliance and Design Review for the demolition of two existing, one-story, multi-family residential structures and the construction of a new, 8,643 square-foot, small-lot subdivision with four (4) units each with individual garages of 400 square feet. The project includes approximately 1,309 square feet of hardscape. The project's maximum height is approximately 33 feet and 6 inches on an approximately 7,281 square-foot lot. The project does not propose removal of any protected trees and proposes grading in the following quantities: 331 Cubic Yards (CUYD) of cut, 403 CUYD of fill, 72 CUYD of import, and no export.

Determine, based on the whole of the administrative record, that the Project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15332, and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption applies pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15300.2.

The project approval is subject to the attached Conditions of Approval, and is based upon the attached Findings:

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Site Development. Except as modified herein, the project shall be in substantial conformance with the plans and materials submitted by the Applicant, labeled Exhibit "A," dated $2 / 21 / 18$, and attached to the subject case file. No change to the plans shall be made without prior review by the Department of City Planning, Plan Implementation Division, and written approval by the Director of Planning. Each change shall be identified and justified in writing. Minor deviations may be allowed in order to comply with the provisions of the Municipal Code, the project conditions, or the project permit authorization.
2. Floor Area. The project shall be limited to a total of 8,643 square feet of Floor Area for all four (4) homes. This gross area includes the main house, garage, and covered patio areas; as an RD zone, the property is not subject to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance or the definition of RFA. The project shall be limited to the following square footage for each unit, in conformance with Exhibit "A":

| Unit | Gross Square Footage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Unit 1 | 2,208 |
| Unit 2 | 2,500 |
| Unit 3 | 1,781 |
| Unit 4 | 2,154 |
| TOTAL | 8,643 |

3. Height. The project shall be limited to 33 feet and six (6) inches in height.

## Design Review Conditions

4. Revised Landscape Plans. Prior to final sign-off, the landscape plan shall be revised to show the following:
a. All plants except the Pacific Wax Myrtle shall be removed from the planter on the south side of Unit 1. The full size of each Pacific Wax Myrtle shall be shown in the revised plans.
b. The planter along the north side of the Unit 1 shall be relocated in-kind in length and narrowed in width to along the north fence opposite of location shown in Exhibit "A."
5. Building Articulation. Prior to final signoff, the applicant shall provide revised plans to change the exterior surface (building elevations) as follows:
a. The second floor of Unit 1 shall be stepped back five (5) feet further away from the line shown in current drawings in Exhibit "A" along the Fredonia Drive - facing side.

The first floor perimeter of Unit 1 shall remain the same as shown in Exhibit " $A$ ", page 35 .
b. The patio for Unit 1 that is located to the east of "Bedroom 1" may remain covered with dimensions not to exceed seven (7) feet and five (5) inches in width and 13 feet and 4 inches in length as shown in Exhibit "A", page 35.
c. The canopy over the front unit (Unit 1) shall not be enlarged.

## Administrative Conditions

6. Final Plans. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for the project by the Department of Building and Safety, the applicant shall submit all final construction plans that are awaiting issuance of a building permit by the Department of Building and Safety for final review and approval by the Department of City Planning. All plans that are awaiting issuance of a building permit by the Department of Building and Safety shall be stamped by Department of City Planning staff "Final Plans". A copy of the Final Plans, supplied by the applicant, shall be retained in the subject case file.
7. Notations on Plans. Plans submitted to the Department of Building and Safety, for the purpose of processing a building permit application shall include all of the Conditions of Approval herein attached as a cover sheet, and shall include any modifications or notations required herein.
8. Approval, Verification and Submittals. Copies of any approvals, guarantees or verification of consultations, review of approval, plans, etc., as may be required by the subject conditions, shall be provided to the Department of City Planning prior to clearance of any building permits, for placement in the subject file.
9. Certification of Landscape Installation. Prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy, the project architect, landscape architect, or engineer shall certify in a letter to the Department of City Planning and to the Department of Building and Safety that the approved landscape plan has been implemented.
10. Code Compliance. Use, area, height, and yard regulations of the zone classification of the subject property shall be complied with, except where granted conditions differ herein.
11. Department of Building and Safety. The granting of this determination by the Director of Planning does not in any way indicate full compliance with applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code Chapter IX (Building Code). Any corrections and/or modifications to plans made subsequent to this determination by a Department of Building and Safety Plan Check Engineer that affect any part of the exterior design or appearance of the project as approved by the Director, and which are deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety for Building Code compliance, shall require a referral of the revised plans back to the Department of City Planning for additional review and sign-off prior to the issuance of any permit in connection with those plans.
12. Enforcement. Compliance with these conditions and the intent of these conditions shall be to the satisfaction of the Department of City Planning through the enforcement of the Department of Building and Safety.
13. Expiration. In the event that this grant is not utilized within three years of its effective date (the day following the last day that an appeal may be filed), the grant shall be considered
null and void. Issuance of a building permit, and the initiation of, and diligent continuation of, construction activity shall constitute utilization for the purposes of this grant.
14. Indemnification and Reimbursement of Litigations Costs. Applicant shall do all of the following:
(i) Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.
(ii) Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.
(iii) Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than $\$ 50,000$. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
(iv) Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (ii).
(v) If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:
"City" shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.
"Action" shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions includes actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

## FINDINGS

The proposed project is the demolition of two existing, one-story, multi-family residential structures and the construction of a new, 8,643 square-foot, small-lot subdivision with four (4) units with four (4) individual garages of 400 square feet each. The project includes approximately 1,309 square feet of hardscape. The project's maximum height is approximately 34 feet. The project is in the MSP Outer Corridor on an approximately 7,281 square-foot lot. As a property zoned RD, the project is not subject to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance. The project is downslope from the Fredonia Drive right-of-way and downslope of Mulholland Drive. The project is not visible from Mulholland Drive. The project does not propose removal of any protected trees and proposes grading in the following quantities: 331 Cubic Yards (CUYD) of cut, 403 CUYD of fill, 72 CUYD of import, and no export.

A concurrent tract map application has been applied for in order to subdivide the land. The granting of this determination is separate and distinct from related case VTT-74217-SL for the subdivision of land into four (4) small lots, and which is subject to the California Subdivision Map Act and any applicable rules and regulations therein.

## 1. A recommendation was made by the Mulholland Design Review Board, pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 16.50:

The proposed project is subject to the design review process because it is located within the boundaries of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan.

The Design Review Board met on March 16, 2017 where the board convened a quorum of five (5) members and voted unanimously (5-0) to continue the case with the following conditions:
a. The project shall be a maximum of two (2) stories tall.
b. The side yards shall be landscaped. The side yard landscaping shall be a minimum of three (3) feet.
c. Remove roof top decks and the access stairways to the roof decks.
d. Mechanical equipment shall be screened on all sides or located at ground level.
e. All plant material shall be selected from the Preferred Plant List.
f. The front yard setback shall be a minimum of 10 feet. The front yard setback shall include a landscaped area of a minimum of 6 feet in width.
g. The applicant shall provide a centralized through area off-street.

The Design Review Board met on August 17, 2017 where the board convened a quorum of four (4) members and voted unanimously (4-0) to continue the case with the following conditions:
a. Comply with previous recommendations one (1) and three (3).
b. Move the fire access to the exterior of the structures.
c. All materials shall be $20 \%$ greyscale value or darker.
d. Comply with Design Guideline 51.

The Design Review Board met on January 17, 2018; however the hearing for the project was cancelled due to a failure to meet notification posting requirements as outlined by LAMC Section 16.50 E.3(b)(2).

The Design Review Board met on February 21, 2018 where the board convened a quorum of 6 members. The vote was unanimous (6-0) recommending conditional approval of the
project since the project will substantially comply with Section 16.50 , Subsection E of the Los Angeles Municipal Code as well as the relevant design guidelines and development provisions of the Plan. The conditions recommended by the board were:
a. LID Planter along driveway is significantly over-planted. Remove everything but Pacific Wax Myrtle from planter on south side of front unit. Show full size of Pacific Wax Myrtle in plans.
b. Narrow planter along north side of front unit. Should be shifted away from wall of house to against the fence.
c. Second floor of Unit 1 reduced five (5) feet from line shown in current drawings. Entire Fredonia facing elevation of first floor as shown remains the same.
d. The currently shown patio may remain covered and extend beyond "Bedroom 1 " by maximum seven (7) feet and five (5) inches to align with the current entry element as shown on sheet 35 .
e. Canopy over front entry but shall not be larger than as currently shown.
2. The project substantially complies with the applicable regulations, findings, standards, and provisions of the specific plan.

Based on a review of the plans submitted with the application, marked Exhibit "A," dated 2/21/18, DIR-2016-2455-DRB-SPP-MSP, the Director of Planning makes the following findings in accordance with the applicable design review criteria of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan, Ordinance No. 167,943, effective June 29, 1992:

## Section 6.A: Uses

The project proposes the use of land for a four (4) small-lot single-family dwellings, which is a permitted use and as such, the project use complies with Section 6.A of the Specific Plan.

## Section 6.B: Environmental Protection Measures

Section 6.B of the Specific Plan refers back to Section 5.B, stating that all measures required for the Inner Corridor are to be complied with for properties in the Outer Corridor. The subject property is not defined as a "prominent ridge" as per the definition in Section 4 since no ridgeline appears near the property on the map of the Specific Plan Area: Map 11 of 12. As such, the project complies with Sections 5.B.1.a and 5.B.1.b, which limit grading and visibility on the defined Prominent Ridges in the Plan area. Furthermore, according to the same map and http://zimas.lacity.org the project is further than 100 feet from a watercourse and more than 200 feet from public parkland; complying with Section 5.B.2, which limits grading within 100 feet of a stream bank and Section 5.B.3, which limits construction and grading within 200 feet of public parkland. The project does not propose to remove, move, or alter any protected or native trees, which include Oak trees, in accordance with Section 5.B.4. Finally, should the applicant encounter any archeological or paleontological resources while grading for the project, the applicant will need to follow the necessary notification procedures pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Sections 7000 et sequentia to appropriately handle these resources, fulfilling the intent of Section 5.B. 5 that seeks to protect these resources. As such, the project complies with Section 6.B of the Specific Plan.

## Section 6.C: Grading

The project requires 331 cubic yards to be cut, and 72 cubic yards will be imported, for a total of 403 CUYD to be used for fill; zero cubic yards will be exported. In Section 5.C the Plan states that:

The Director may approve grading up to two cubic yards of earth per four square feet of lot area per lot after making the following findings:
a. The Department of Building and Safety or the Bureau of Engineering has determined that such grading is required to provide access driveways, pedestrian accessways, drainage facilities, slope easements, and/or dwelling foundations.
b. All grading conforms to the standards set forth in the Landform Grading Manual, unless the Department of Building and Safety has determined that landform grading will conflict with the provisions of Divisions 29 and 70 of Article 1 of Chapter IX of the Code.
c. The graded slopes have a natural appearance compatible with the characteristics of the Santa Monica Mountains.
d. The Department of Building and Safety has determined that grading will minimize erosion.
Per this Section, the applicant would be limited to 3,641 cubic yards of grading for the 7,281 square-foot lot. This grading is necessary for the reasonable development of the property for the small lot dwellings, conforms with the Landform Grading manual, and as conditioned in this determination letter the design of the home will be compatible with the Santa Monica Mountains. Furthermore, the applicant is subject to stricter grading requirements by the LAMC, and is required to obtain grading permits and follow all practices imposed on them during the process of grading from the Building and Safety Grading Division. As such, the project complies with Section 6.C of the Specific Plan.

## Section 6.D: Building Standards

The project's height is limited to 33 feet, six (6) inches, which complies with the height limit identified in subdivision 6.D which has no height limit for structures not visible from Mulholland. However, per Section 3.B of the Specific Plan, where the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) has a lower height requirement, the LAMC prevails and as such, the project is also subject to the envelope height requirements of the Baseline Hillside Ordinance.

## Section 11.I.3: Design Review Criteria

Based on a review of the project proposal, and the recommendation of the Design Review Board, the proposed small lot development, as modified by the conditions herein, is compatible with the surrounding homes and the parkway environment in terms of design, massing, materials, and color and as such complies with Section 11.I.3 of the Plan.

## Design Guideline 34: Building Articulation

As per Condition of Approval Number 5, the project shall design the exterior surface of the structure such that the second floor shall be articulated from the first floor. As such, the project complies with Design Guideline 34 which states that the exterior surfaces of any structure should be designed to be articulated, presenting a variety of surfaces, textures, and angles, and should avoid large flat sides.

## Design Guideline 50: Neighborhood Compatibility

The project is four (4) small-lot single-family dwellings. The lot is in an area zoned RD 1.51 with a General Plan Land Use designation of Low Medium Residential. Low Medium Residential is a Multiple Family designation on the General Plan Land Use Map, and the zone and designation allow for multiple dwelling units on one lot. As such, there is a mix of single-family and multi-family dwellings in the neighborhood, including several duplexes and apartment or condo structures of five or more units. The neighborhood has a mix of architectural styles and building heights of one (1) to two (2) stories. The small lot singlefamily dwellings are a blend of the single-family and multi-family density of the surrounding neighborhood. The project will be single-family in nature on what is a subdivided small lot
that could -and did- have multiple units on one formerly unsubdivided lot. Furthermore, the project's finish materials of wood siding and stucco are also found in nearby homes. As such, the project's design fits with the neighborhood and complies with compatibility Design Guideline 50

## Design Guideline 67: Existing landscape modifications

As per Condition of Approval Number 4, all plants except the Pacific Wax Myrtle shall be removed from the planter on the south side of Unit 1. The full size of each Pacific Wax Myrtle shall be shown in the revised plans. Also, the planter along the north side of the Unit 1 shall be relocated in-kind in length and narrowed in width to along the north fence opposite of location shown in Exhibit "A." As such, the project complies with Design Guideline 67 which states that when the existing landscape is to be modified, designed the modifications so that they are compatible with both the existing landscape and with other existing landscaping in the neighborhood

## Design Guideline 70: Landscape Planting/Irrigation Plan Detail

As per Condition of Approval Number 4, landscape plans must have specified species. As such, the project complies with Design Guideline 70, which states all new home construction and additions to existing homes which enlarge the building footprint must submit a complete landscape planting plan, with a plant legend keyed to the plan using symbols and listing the quantity, botanical name, common name, size at planting, size at maturity and time to maturity of all proposed plantings, and a complete irrigation plan.

## Design Guideline 71: Planning and Design for Sustainable Building Practices

 The project will follow the Green Building and Low Impact Development codes, as seen on Exhibit "A." As such, the project complies with sustainable building practice Design Guideline 71.3. The project incorporates mitigation measures, monitoring measures when necessary, or alternatives identified in the environmental review, which would mitigate the negative environmental effects of the project, to the extent physically feasible.

Based on the whole of the administrative record, the Project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15332, and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that an exception to a categorical exemption applies pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15300.2.

## OBSERVANCE OF CONDITIONS - TIME LIMIT - LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES

All terms and conditions of the Director's Determination shall be fulfilled before the use may be established. The instant authorization is further conditioned upon the privileges being utilized within three years after the effective date of this determination and, if such privileges are not utilized, building permits are not issued, or substantial physical construction work is not begun within said time and carried on diligently so that building permits do not lapse, the authorization shall terminate and become void.

## TRANSFERABILITY

This determination runs with the land. In the event the property is to be sold, leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent that you advise them
regarding the conditions of this grant. If any portion of this approval is utilized, then all other conditions and requirements set forth herein become immediately operative and must be strictly observed.

## VIOLATIONS OF THESE CONDITIONS, A MISDEMEANOR

Section 11.00 of the LAMC states in part ( $m$ ): "It shall be unlawful for any person to violate any provision or fail to comply with any of the requirements of this Code. Any person violating any of the provisions or failing to comply with any of the mandatory requirements of this Code shall be guilty of a misdemeanor unless that violation or failure is declared in that section to be an infraction. An infraction shall be tried and be punishable as provided in Section 19.6 of the Penal Code and the provisions of this section. Any violation of this Code that is designated as a misdemeanor may be charged by the City Attorney as either a misdemeanor or an infraction.

Every violation of this determination is punishable as a misdemeanor unless provision is otherwise made, and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $\$ 1,000$ or by imprisonment in the County Jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both a fine and imprisonment."

## APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE

The applicant's attention is called to the fact that this grant is not a permit or license and that any permits and licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. Furthermore, if any condition of this grant is violated or not complied with, then the applicant or his successor in interest may be prosecuted for violating these conditions the same as for any violation of the requirements contained in the Municipal Code, or the approval may be revoked.

The Determination in this matter will become effective and final fifteen (15) days after the date of mailing of the Notice of Director's Determination unless an appeal there from is filed with the City Planning Department. It is strongly advised that appeals be filed early during the appeal period and in person so that imperfections/incompleteness may be corrected before the appeal period expires. Any appeal must be filed on the prescribed forms, accompanied by the required fee, a copy of this Determination, and received and receipted at a public office of the Department of City Planning on or before the above date or the appeal will not be accepted. Forms are available on-line at http://www.planning.lacity.org/forms.htm.

Planning Department public offices are located at:

| Figueroa Plaza | Marvin Braude San Fernando | West Los Angeles |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 201 North Figueroa Street, | Valley Constituent Service Center | Development Services Center |
| 4 $^{\text {th }}$ Floor | 6262 Van Nuys Boulevard, Suite | 1828 Sawtelle Boulevard, |
| Los Angeles, CA 90012 | 251 | 2nd Floor |
| (213) 482-7077 | Van Nuys, CA 91401 | Los Angeles, CA 90025 |
|  | (818) 374-5050 | (310) 231-2901 |

Verification of condition compliance with building plans and/or building permit applications are done at the Development Services Center of the Department of City Planning at either Figueroa Plaza in Downtown Los Angeles or the Marvin Braude Building in the Valley. In order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting, applicants are encouraged to schedule an appointment with the Development Services Center either by calling (213) 482-7077 or (818) 374-5050 or (310) 231-2901 or through the Department of City Planning website
at http://cityplanning.lacity.org. The applicant is further advised to notify any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

The time in which a party may seek judicial review of this determination is governed by California Code of Civil Procedures Section 1094.6. Under that provision, a petitioner may seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, only if the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section is filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision becomes final.

Note of Instruction Regarding the Notice of Exemption: Applicant is hereby advised to file the Notice of Exemption for the associated categorical exemption after the issuance of this letter. If filed, the form shall be filed with the County of Los Angeles, 12400 Imperial Highway, Norwalk, CA 90650, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 (b). More information on the associated fees can be found online here: https://www.lavote.net/home/county-clerk/environmental-notices-fees. The best practice is to go in person and photograph the posted notice in order to ensure compliance. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167 (d), the filing of this notice of exemption starts a 35 -day statute of limitations on court challenges to the approval of the project. Failure to file this notice with the County Clerk results in the statute of limitations, and the possibility of a CEQA appeal, being extended to 180 days.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning

Approved by:


Michelle Levy, Senior City Planner
Prepared by:

Alycia Witzling, Pranning Assistant alycia.witzling@lacity.org
cc:
Cøuncil Office, District 4
Adjoining Property Owners
Hollywood Hills West Neighborhood Council

Reviewed by:


Courtney Schoenwald, City Planner
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