



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Blair Hills/Hetzler Road Listening Workshop Comments

Date: July 2, 2018  
 Re: Blair Hills/Hetzler Road Listening Workshop Summary  
 Location: Stoneview Nature Center, Training Room, 5950 Stoneview Drive, Culver City, California, 90232

On June 26, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the Stoneview Nature Center to discuss single family development in the Blair Hills and Hetzler Road neighborhoods. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City staff input, heard feedback from stakeholders about their vision and concern for future development in these neighborhoods.

Community members who attended included:

- John Brown
- Lydia Brown
- Bobbi Gold
- Terry Keelan
- S. Maxberry
- Tony Miller
- Champak Modi
- Vanessa Parham
- Queen Pruitt
- Rebecca Searl
- Dorothy Steiner

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Michael Allen, Susan Herbertson, William Kavadas, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Ashley Hefner, Brent Oltz, Tracy Bromwich
- JKA: John Kaliski, Carolyn Matsumoto

A thirty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of both Blair Hills and Hetzler Road. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second twenty-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

Survey Exercise Findings

1. **Second stories are agreeable if they are respectful of neighbor’s views, light, and sky.**  
 Residents confirmed that new second story construction has, for the most part, been voluntarily mediated between neighbors to ensure that their views, light, and sky are not obstructed. One homeowner was said to have sited the main mass of their home towards the street so as to avoid blocking their neighbor’s view. Overall, the most favorably reviewed two story houses were ones where the second story is setback from the first story, where the massing is well modulated, the façade well composed with two or more materials in “calming” colors, and where landscaping is lush, complimentary to the design of the house, and well maintained.

**2. Blank facades with minimal openings/transparency are not agreeable.**

Consistently, houses with stucco façades that lack openings and massing that lacks modulation were noted as “overbuilt” and “prison”-like. These houses tended to feel larger and less inviting to residents than similarly sized homes with a percentage of openings consistent with the original tract homes and also utilizing two or more materials on the façade. However, one “blank front” house was given leniency by a resident, as there was not a facing neighbor across the street. Houses with front facing garage doors were regarded more favorably when utilizing purposeful material, color, or archways complimentary to the overall style and design of the house.

**3. Coherent architectural style done well is appreciated.**

The original mid-1950’s tract development of Blair Hills, of single story ranch style homes with cross gabled roofs and wall cladding comprised of two materials, has remained predominantly untouched by new development. A remodel of a ranch style home into a modern style that simplified the façade with the use of smooth stucco and increased window openings was generally well received as a “fresh” update but also in part due to the lack of impact to increased height or mass. Some voiced concern for the “flattening” of the façade and of these homes not “fitting into the neighborhood.” Spanish-style homes were noted as “unusual in this neighborhood”, but “I wouldn’t tell people they couldn’t build it.” A two-story home utilizing material expression but lacking a cohesive architectural style was noted as “deviant” and “definitely different”, but also was split in votes between likes and dislikes.

## Community Comments Findings

**4. No change needed.**

One resident voiced concern that no change to existing standards or guidelines was needed in Blair Hills and that design decisions should be between a homeowner and their architect.

**5. A pro-active approach to potential development.**

Residents concluded that although new development has not negatively affected Blair Hills because of the neighborly approach to building second stories and Blair Hills’ “under-the-radar” anonymity, a pro-active approach to development issues facing other Culver City neighborhoods was generally stated as beneficial to residents of Blair Hills.

**6. Blair Hills Association Handbook is a neighborhood resource to review.**

Residents notified JKA of an Association Handbook, a non-legally binding document formed by residents, which JKA requested a copy of to review.



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
(213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

### Summary of Carlson Park Listening Workshop Comments

Date: September 14, 2018  
Re: Carlson Park Listening Workshop Summary  
Location: Culver City Senior Center, Room B47, 4095 Overland Avenue, Culver City, California, 90230

On July 24, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:20 PM, a community meeting was held at the Culver City Senior Center to discuss single family development in the Carlson Park neighborhood. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City Staff input, heard feedback from residents about their vision and concern for future development in their neighborhood.

Community members who attended included:

- Stefani Ames
- Peter Baxendale
- Susannah Baxendale
- Louis Block
- Marilyn Burns
- Chuck Daila
- DiAnn Davis
- Roseanne Di Gregorio
- George Dougherty
- Jan Ginther
- Lee Hanson
- Kay Heinemun
- Matt Howell
- Andrew Leist
- Philip Lelyued
- Amy Levit
- Aaron Moss
- Rosa Moss
- Lisette Palley
- Norman Palley
- Hope Parres
- Dennis Parrish
- Jody Reichel
- Ellen Renga
- Robert Renga
- Judy Richter
- Jon Riddle
- Sarah Riddle
- Barbara Silverstein
- Anita Skaden
- Kipp Skaden
- Pete Stern
- Michael Teofai
- Susan Tillerson

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Michael Allen, Susan Herbertson, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Brent Oltz
- JKA: John Kaliski, Carolyn Matsumoto

A fifty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of Carlson Park. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second twenty-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

## Survey Exercise Findings

**1. Existing standards for side yard setbacks at the first floor and setbacks at the second floor are not adequate to provide light, air, and privacy to neighboring properties.**

The original tract development of Carlson Park placed garages in the rear yard northwest of Farragut Drive and placed side-facing garages in the front yard southeast of Farragut Drive. The driveways leading to both garage configurations provide default open space and side yard setbacks from neighboring properties, with 10-foot driveways along side yards and 30-foot driveways for side-facing garages. Repeatedly, residents expressed disapproval towards new construction built to the five (5) foot setback standard at both side yards. Concerns included:

- a. The loss of light, air, and privacy when two-story construction is built adjacent to one-story homes, especially where windows or balconies appear to “look into” adjacent lots.
- b. Change of neighborhood character from single-family residential to multi-family residential when homes of similar style and materials (sometimes built by the same developer) are built to the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) and zoning envelope and are adjacent to one another.

**2. Strong dislike for front facing garages, which indicate homes built to minimum required side yard setbacks.**

Consistently, houses with front facing garages were voted with red cards. Front facing garages were not a garage configuration from the original tract development. New construction or remodels that utilize front facing garages are built to the five-foot side yard setback in order to make room for both the garage and entry and therefore tend to be larger and to loom over adjacent properties. Correspondingly, residents were more tolerant of large unmodulated two-story homes that maintained the original side-facing garage or driveway configurations, as they maintained more open space, greater setbacks, and mitigated the sense of looming over adjacent properties.

**3. Strong dislike of New Tradition style homes for being over-scaled and developer-driven.**

Residents unanimously voted dislike for a two-story New Traditional style home despite it maintaining a rear yard garage with a 10-foot driveway along the side yard setback. A series of New Traditional homes, called Modern Farmhouse by developers, have been built and continue to be built in Carlson Park. One resident noted, “I’m not against two-story houses but I am against two-stories of a version that should be quaint. A modern house is so much more acceptable than this house, which is blown out. It looks like a farmhouse that just got gargantuan. It’s a style that is inappropriate for that size of house.” The continued construction of similar houses that maximize the FAR and “flipped” is upsetting for residents. “I live in fear that my neighbors are going to sell and a developer will come in and build a huge inappropriate house. The flippers are ruining the neighborhood.”

**4. Split opinion of modern style homes with flat rooflines.**

Residents were split on their like/dislike of modern style homes with flat rooflines. While reviewing a single story contemporary home with a flat roof overhang, one resident noted, “It doesn’t bother me when there are ten different styles. I wouldn’t like it if everything was the same style.” Conversely, another resident responded, “It’s so modern. Maybe it’s because of the flat roof. It doesn’t fit in the neighborhood.” Overall, residents were more inclined to vote favorably for modern style homes with flat rooflines if they maintained the rear yard garage, side yard driveway, and if they were modulated at the second story.



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Park West Listening Workshop Comments

Date: September 14, 2018  
 Re: Park West Listening Workshop Summary  
 Location: Culver City Senior Center, Room C71, 4095 Overland Avenue, Culver City, California, 90230

On July 31, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the Culver City Senior Center to discuss single family development in the Park West neighborhood. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City Staff input, heard feedback from residents about their vision and concern for future development in their neighborhood.

Community members who attended included:

- Francisco Duenas
- Toni Glick
- Terry Kiel
- Rosa Maurtua
- Sue Newman
- Jane Thomas
- John Thomas
- Jennifer Trapwell
- Gerald Weiner

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Michael Allen, Susan Herbertson, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Tracy Bromwich
- City of Culver City, Planning Commission: Edward Ogosta
- JKA: Carolyn Matsumoto, Wenchong Lai

A sixty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of Park West. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second ten-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

Survey Exercise Findings

1. **Massing should be modulated along both the front and side yard setbacks.**  
 Residents felt that houses lacking modulation along both the front yard and side yards lack architectural character, lack sensitivity to adjacent properties by creating looming and monolithic walls, and “overfill” the average 50-foot wide lot. A resident noted that the five (5) foot second-story front yard setback is not sufficient to ensure modulated and well designed houses and that the City may consider standards similar to the Maximum Residential Floor Area Bonus utilized by the City of Los Angeles that regulates mass by limiting the maximum façade length or the allowable percentage of second story area above the first story. The flexibility of these standards better avoid the “wedding cake” effect of setbacks based on uniform dimensions. Houses that were considered attractive or well designed by residents were still voted negatively due to unmodulated massing being too large for the average 50-foot wide lot. “My main concern is proportion. Don’t build so much on a small lot.”

**2. Second-story additions that are stylistically consistency with the main house and setback behind the first-story roof ridgeline are preferred.**

Examples of second-story additions shown to residents included: additions that covered the full first floor footprint, additions that were a different architectural style than the main house, and additions built behind the roof ridgeline in a consistent architectural style. Residents differed in how much design consistency should be maintained between additions and the main house. Some residents disliked the inconsistency between traditional tract homes with modern additions. Other residents were open to additions built in a different style as long as there were some consistent elements with the main house, such as consistent windows or materials.

**3. Residents prefer houses designed for individuals versus houses designed for market value.**

Houses built to maximize the allowable floor area ratio (FAR), zoning envelope, and height are perceived as insensitive to neighboring properties and change the character of neighborhoods from one-story homes averaging a 0.28 FAR (1,400 square feet<sup>1</sup>) to two-story homes utilizing the maximum 0.60 FAR (3,000 square feet<sup>1</sup>). The design intent of these houses were perceived to maximize resell market value rather than design intended for an individual i.e. a community member of Culver City. Most residents agreed that speculative housing or houses that maximize the 0.60 FAR with no modulation depersonalize the character of the neighborhood.

**4. Different architectural styles should not be prohibited but architectural styles should be well executed.**

Overall, residents favored well-maintained houses with architecturally consistent styles, modulated massing, and landscaping that is consistent with the architectural style of the house. Houses that lacked a clear architectural style were strongly disliked. Residents didn't want to limit the types of architectural styles allowed. However, residents did want to ensure that buildings commit to an architectural style and conform to the highest quality expression of that style.

**5. New front facing garages will change the pedestrian-oriented character of neighborhoods as more driveways and curb cuts dominate sidewalks.**

The original tract development of Park West placed garages predominantly within the rear yard. New construction, including renovations, favor front facing two-car garages with 16-foot wide driveways that are allowed as an exception to the 25% maximum allowed paving within a front yard setback on the average 50-foot wide lot. Some residents favored maintaining the existing character of the neighborhood with pedestrian-oriented porches located at the entry door and with detached garages in the rear yard. Other residents noted the convenience of a front-facing garage. Encouraging tandem parking was discussed as a possible option. Some residents noted that with new larger houses, a two-car garage no longer fits in the rear yard and that providing open space in the backyard is a favorable convention. Several residents noted that cars regularly parked in driveways are common and convenient but detract from the pedestrian nature of the street.

---

<sup>1</sup> On a typical 5,000 square foot lot.



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Studio Village Listening Workshop Comments

Date: September 14, 2018  
 Re: Studio Village Listening Workshop Summary  
 Location: El Marino Park, Recreation Center, 5301 Berryman Avenue, Culver City, California, 90232

On August 7, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the El Marino Park Recreation Center to discuss single family development in the Studio Village neighborhood. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City Staff input, heard feedback from residents about their vision and concern for future development in their neighborhood.

Community members who attended included:

- Greg Arnold
- Kathy Barreto
- Mitch Blake
- Kathleen Lanzakotta
- Ann Miks
- Ken Nabiner
- Grace Nadel
- Kate O’Connor
- Art Perez
- Ida Rabiner
- Mike Scarano

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Susan Herbertson, William Kavadas, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Tracy Bromwich
- JKA: John Kaliski, Carolyn Matsumoto

A sixty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of Studio Village. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second twenty-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

Survey Exercise Findings

1. **Houses that extend past neighboring houses towards the rear yard are strongly disliked.**  
 Residents consistently disliked houses that extended beyond their neighbors’ rear building footprint because of the contrast in size and the privacy concerns of one house looking at or into another. When asked why a resident raised a red card for a house, their reply was, “the house goes all the way back into the lot.” Another resident commented, “The privacy issue: when you get a large house that takes up most of the lot, they’re looking into your master bedroom. That’s an issue for us. The houses are falling into our yards.”

**2. New two-story homes that are modulated and maintain the original building footprint are preferred.**

New two-story construction was liked, regardless of architectural style, if it was modulated at the front and side yards, it maintained the original building footprint, and it maintained the 10-foot driveway along the side yards. Regarding a new two-story home, one resident commented, “I give them credit, they stayed in the original footprint of the house.” Another resident agreed, “It could have been worse. It could have gone further back. At least they kept the rear garage.”

**3. Remodels and additions that are consistent with the architectural styles of the main building and remain within the first-floor footprint are preferred.**

Second-story additions and remodels were liked if they were consistent with the architectural style of the main house and if they stayed within the footprint of the existing building. When asked whether standards such as color restrictions should be encouraged, a resident responded, “An association in our neighborhood worries me because it might be too restrictive. I could live next door to it but I don’t have to like it and I won’t tell them to repaint it.” Houses that had cantilevered elements elicited dislike votes from half of the residents. One resident commented, “Hangovers [cantilevers] introduce a dynamic not seen in traditional architecture.”

**4. Residents were split on their like/dislike of modern style homes.**

Modern homes were favored if they generally maintained the original tract footprint, were well modulated, and did not maximize the allowable FAR. One resident noted the neighborhood transition with new modern houses being built, “I’m beginning to adjust to this. The first few ones were not attractive as this but I’m adjusting. The veranda softens it. A couple of years ago, I wouldn’t have liked it.” A resident who raised a green card commented, “I like the design. I like the lines, glass, and different materials. I would love to see more houses like this for our neighborhood.” Another resident who voted red for the same house commented, “It’s totally changing the character of the neighborhood and we’ll no longer be Culver City. It’s Manhattan Beach.”

**5. Garage standards could be updated to reflect current lifestyles and improve pedestrian safety.**

One resident strongly felt that front-facing garages are a safety issue, especially for children and senior community members, which disrupt the continuity and walkability of sidewalks. Another resident noted that required covered parking could be eliminated as a majority of residents use their garage as storage space and in anticipation of a driverless future with the expansion of public transit options. One resident noted that new cars are increasingly growing larger and no longer fit within the minimum 20-foot length required for a backup aisle (i.e. driveway) leading to a front facing garage. A home with a subterranean front-facing garage was unanimously disliked because the house maximized the allowable FAR, filled the zoning envelope, and appeared taller because of the subterranean garage.

**6. Code enforcement of landscaping could be improved.**

Several comments were made regarding the improvement landscaping could bring to otherwise “boxy” or bland houses as well as the lack of City enforcement of landscaping. “I wish they would enforce them. Anything is better than just bare dirt. It’s been that way for a decade.”

## Community Comments Findings

**7. Reduce the existing 0.60 floor area ratio (FAR).**

Several residents agreed that the existing 0.60 FAR allows for houses that are too large for the existing context, “Recommend the FAR be reduced: 0.60 is too big.” One resident preferred to maintain the existing 0.60 FAR and commented, “I think we should maintain the ability to go up in stories and add volume. The overreach is when people are blowing out side yards and are three feet from the fence.”





JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Blanco Park / Sunkist Park Listening Workshop Comments

Date: September 25, 2018  
 Re: Blanco Park / Sunkist Park Listening Workshop Summary  
 Location: El Marino Park, Recreation Center, 5301 Berryman Avenue, Culver City, California, 90232

On August 14, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the El Marino Park to discuss single family development in the Blanco Park and Sunkist Park neighborhoods. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City staff input, heard feedback from residents about their vision and concern for future development in these neighborhoods.

Community members who attended included:

- Karen Amorelli
- Michael Amorelli
- Alice Balliciello
- Bernice Barton
- Susana Benton
- McNeill Bishop
- Arlene Goodwich
- Leann Hennig
- Ann Hook
- Peter Jacobs
- Kristin McCathey
- Stephen Paull
- Jennifer Ryba
- Howard Shabsis
- Marcy Shah
- Natalie Stanger
- Dave Twichell
- Patty Winder

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Michael Allen, Susan Herbertson, William Kavadas, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Tracy Bromwich
- JKA: John Kaliski, Carolyn Matsumoto

A thirty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of both Blanco Park and Sunkist Park. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second twenty-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

Survey Exercise Findings

**1. Second-story additions set behind the ridgeline and that match the architectural style, materials, and roof forms of the main building are preferred.**

Residents preferred additions that did not fill the first-floor footprint and had matching roof pitches, materials, and windows. “I like when there are different shapes in the front than an addition that is just one big rectangular box. It’s nice and visually appealing.” One resident noted the context, “It’s not hovering over the next door house. It fits the space.” Another resident commented, “I’m not against second stories but do it thoughtfully. Give it character.”

**2. Residents dislike unmodulated two-story homes built to maximize the zoning envelope.**

Several two-story homes were shown to residents that ranged in architectural styles (minimal traditional, spanish, farmhouse, modern) and construction type (new construction, second-story additions). Residents consistently disliked houses that lacked modulation at all façade elevations, including the lack of second-story setbacks along the front and side yards. Residents did vote against architectural styles they felt were out of place for Culver City, but residents did not want to regulate the types of styles allowed in Culver City.

**3. Young families have lifestyles needs that are different than the original tract development was designed to provide.**

One resident with a young family commented, “I have kids and I’m a different generation and I need more than the 1,000 square feet they needed in the 1950s.” The original tract developments of Culver City followed the nationwide development pattern of modestly-sized minimal traditional and ranch houses built between the 1930s-1950s. The original tract homes in Blanco Park and Sunkist Park averaged roughly 1,650 square feet. The current average house size in America is 2,687 square feet<sup>1</sup>, an increase of over 1,000 square feet than the tract homes of Blanco Park and Sunkist Park.

**4. Several residents took into consideration the landscaping surrounding a house when voting.**

Houses, including typical tract homes, were voted for negatively if they lacked a combination of ground cover, shrubbery, and trees that were well trimmed and maintained. Conversely, houses that lacked architectural character or modulation were voted for positively if the landscaping had character, “A year ago it had no landscaping and it was the ugliest house in the whole wide world. It looks tons better than what it used to.”

## Community Comments Findings

**5. Residents want to find a balance between community interests and individual rights.**

Residents had several ideas for how community interests and individual rights could be balanced. One resident emphasized privacy and constancy for their individual lot, “I don’t care what other people want to do. I don’t want them staring into my bedroom window. As long as they leave me alone and the way I want to live in my 1950s house: me and my cat. As long as we can live and not to someone else’s whims and pocketbook, I’m fine.” Another resident emphasized constancy for the neighborhood, “I agree that not too much interference with people being individual. But there should be some consideration for the neighbor and not just the self. We’re in a society now where we’re not interested in the neighbor. In the context of this, if the neighborhood is saying, “We don’t want McMansions” then don’t buy into it. If you want to spend all the money you have, by all means, move to Beverly Hills. Pick the right neighborhood. Don’t just move here and change it.” Residents who have lived in Culver City for several decades remember a form of neighborliness that worked, “I moved in 56 years ago. We had to get permission from our neighbors so we didn’t encroach into their yards. I don’t know why we don’t do that anymore.” Another resident emphasized the street appearance of homes, “The thing that we should maintain is the openness and friendliness that creates the neighborhoods. I see so many houses putting up fences and shrubbery that blocks the house. Gives too much opportunity to let the house run down.”

**6. No change.**

A couple of residents voiced their approval of the existing development standards and would like to see no change made to them. One resident noted the need for larger homes, “Make sure people are allowed to do what they want to do. This is not a cheap neighborhood. We decided not to leave Culver City and the only choice was to build up.” Another resident chose to move to Culver City because of the lack of an HOA

<sup>1</sup> 2015 United States Census Bureau.

(homeowners' association), "I think that house looks ugly but I like it because that's why I moved to Culver City. I didn't move here because there are CC&Rs [covenants, conditions, and restrictions], so the City can tell me what I can or can't do. I would like things to stay exactly as they are."



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of McLaughlin Listening Workshop Comments

Date: October 19, 2018  
 Re: McLaughlin Listening Workshop Summary  
 Location: Veterans Memorial Building, Garden Room, 4117 Overland Avenue, Culver City, California, 90230

On August 21, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the Veterans Memorial Building to discuss single family development in the McLaughlin neighborhood. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City staff input, heard feedback from residents about their vision and concern for future development in their neighborhood.

Community members who attended included:

- Virginia Blades
- Rodney Bernardin
- Chun Lo
- Joel Myerson
- Marilyn Russell
- Janice Santos

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Michael Allen, Susan Herbertson, William Kavadas, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Ashley Hefner
- City of Culver City, Planning Commission: Kevin Lachoff, David Vodcannon
- JKA: John Kaliski, Carolyn Matsumoto

A thirty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of McLaughlin. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second twenty-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

Survey Exercise Findings

1. **Residents prefer two-story homes that are modulated, maintain the existing 10-foot driveway along the side yard, and are consistent with the existing architectural styles found in Culver City.**  
 New development is altering, to varying degrees, the character of neighborhoods surrounding McLaughlin. The McLaughlin neighborhood has not been developed to as high a degree as these surrounding neighborhoods. Residents of McLaughlin are attuned to the existing conditions that are not protected under existing development standards, such as the existing 10-foot driveways along the side yards, which contribute to the overall openness of McLaughlin. One resident noted that current lifestyles require larger homes and the challenging transition this creates for existing neighbors, “If someone wants to put up a second story, they should have the right, if it’s done in relation to the neighbors. But neighbors will lose privacy, that’s just a fact of life. Somebody will sell, buy your home, and put a second story on it because no

one lives in a 1,500 square foot house anymore. So you've got five neighbors that go to church because they'll be upset." One resident noted the out-of-character homes developers have introduced to the neighborhood, "These developers come in and put in these houses. They put in two houses, side by side, that look like Cape Code and now my street looks like Manhattan Beach. The cookie cutter style is happening more and more."

**2. Residents prefer second-story additions that are consistent and integrated with the original tract home and set behind the ridgeline.**

Residents were critical of the style inconsistencies of additions that did not follow the architectural style of the original tract home. Responding to an image of a second-story addition, one resident commented, "There should be restrictions for integrating your add-on to your home." Another resident agreed, "It's a box behind and there's not an attempt to integrate it." A resident noted an out-of-character glass sliding door where typically a picture window would be placed in a minimal traditional home, "I think it makes no sense to have sliders out in the front. I would say that's a rule."

**3. Residents prefer remodels of single-story houses that utilize high quality materials, modulation, and that are consistent with the architectural styles of the neighborhood.**

Residents preferred remodels consistent with the existing minimal traditional and ranch styles found in McLaughlin. Of the examples of modern-style remodels shown to residents, half liked the homes for being a modern style and the other half preferred a single-story modern building to a two-story building. One resident commented, "It's contemporary and modern but it's not out of scale. I appreciate the single driveway." A resident who disagreed commented, "It doesn't go with the neighborhood. It looks like a box."

**4. Residents like landscaping that is consistent with and enhances the architectural style of the house.**

Residents voted positively for houses that were large and unmodulated if the landscaping mitigated the bulk of massing, "It's landscaped in a way that helps break up the scale." Residents also voted negatively for houses that had poor landscaping, "I think there's a nice house there but it's hard to get past the landscape."

## Community Comments Findings

**5. Maintain a balance of new development within a neighborhood predominated by original tract homes.**

Residents wanted to find a balance between allowing new two-story construction while also maintaining the characteristics of the original tract development. One resident commented, "What's amazing about McLaughlin is it's not a generic looking neighborhood. The look and feel is unique for the LA area. Houses were built in the 30s and 40s and then frozen in time for a while and that's how it looks today. It's not a bad thing and may be a unique opportunity. We like this look and we want to keep it. I would balance it respectfully [in relation to new development]. I've seen things today that were okay and others that crossed the line. We can't just say no to two-stories. All of this has to be baked in." Another resident commented, "I think we need to keep the human scale but people should be able to do two stories. Can we go down to 0.35 FAR and people can still have two-stories?"



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Culver West Listening Workshop Comments

Date: September 27, 2018  
 Re: Culver West Listening Workshop Summary  
 Location: Alexander Park, Recreation Center, 4162 Wade Street, Culver City, California, 90066

On August 28, 2018, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the Alexander Park to discuss single family development in the Culver West neighborhood. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City staff input, heard feedback from residents about their vision and concern for future development in their neighborhood.

Community members who attended included:

- Jean Ballantine
- Noel Bell
- Deborah Boynion
- Madrona Carey
- Kelly Finn
- Jerry Kaye
- U Maid
- KC Mancelo
- Judy Schwafil
- Ryan Zufryden

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Michael Allen, Susan Herbertson, William Kavadas, Deborah Hong
- City of Culver City, Advanced Planning Division: Ashley Hefner
- JKA: John Kaliski, Carolyn Matsumoto

A thirty-minute survey exercise was conducted with the group as a whole. The survey exercise consisted of twenty site photographs of Culver West. The group voted with red and green cards to indicate their “like” or “dislike” of each photograph. A second twenty-minute community comment exercise followed which gave participants the opportunity to share their interests/concerns and to describe what works and doesn’t work in their neighborhood.

Survey Exercise Findings

**1. Residents prefer two-story houses that maintain the existing building footprint, modulate the front and side yard facades, and retains an existing architectural style found in the neighborhood.**

Although residents were not opposed to architectural styles different from the existing minimal traditional and ranchettes found in Culver West, residents consistently voted more positively for houses that follow existing styles. One resident commented, “Even though it’s a two-story, it stayed within the character of the neighborhood.” Residents gave credit to houses that did not maximize the floor area ratio (FAR) and zoning envelope, “It’s a traditional two-story and not trying to maximize the square footage of the lot. You can see they simply wanted a larger house.” A concern several residents shared was the loss of privacy when houses are built to maximize the zoning envelope, “There’s no privacy for the neighbors. It’s looming over their yard.” One resident who commented on adjacent two-story houses noted, “They have a good setbacks. I’ve been sort of used to it: two houses next to each other with setbacks and space in the front and trees.”

**2. Residents prefer second-story additions that are set behind the ridgeline, are consistent with the existing architectural style of the original tract, and do not maximize the zoning envelope.**

Residents were tolerant of second-story additions as long as they did not maximize the FAR or zoning envelope, at which point residents felt the additions would loom over and intrude on the privacy of neighboring yards. One resident commented, "That second-story is part of the house. At least it's in the back and at different levels. It's not as intrusive. It blends in. If the roofline was brought all the way to the setback, it would be a different story." Another resident commented on a different second-story addition, "I give them credit for trying to update the house. They matched the roofline. It's attractive. It towers over the house next door. On one hand, you tried. On the other hand, you didn't try hard enough."

## Community Comments Findings

**3. Residents value neighborhood consistency and neighborliness.**

Residents are concerned that the existing neighborhood character of Culver West will be lost to new development. One resident commented, "I have a 1924 Craftsman that I have redone extensively in the 17 years I've been here. And I'm adhering very closely to the requirements, four-foot setback, trying to maximize it and thinking about space in my 1,100 square foot home. Given that diligence, it's insulting what's happening with developers who are being paid by people who won't be residents of our community." Another resident noted, "It's becoming Pacific Palisades here." A resident noted the disparity between the allowable building area and the existing neighborhood character, "Is there no awareness of maintaining the character of the neighborhood? I'm not talking about people adding second stories in the back and doing it tastefully so it looks good. There needs to be concern for preexisting residents. Not that we deserve extra consideration but a neighborly concern for our lifestyle. Allowing a 30-foot house so some guy can sell it and move it: it's inconsiderate."

**4. Residents noted areas of concern related to air conditioning units, street facing downspouts, and street facing fire alarms on construction sites.**

A resident living in an original tract development commented, "Everything being built now has one or sometimes two huge HVAC units. My neighbor has a huge unit. No more quiet summer nights for us ever. We have to have our windows open so we can breathe. It has changed the whole character of summers." Per City of Culver City standards, air conditioners are allowed to project into the front and rear yard setbacks by 24-inches and must be screened from public view. Another resident noted the placement of street-facing fire alarms on new construction sites as well as placement of downspouts on the front elevation of new buildings. Current City of Culver City standards allow downspouts to project 12-inches into the front, side, and rear yard setbacks.

**5. Reduce the FAR.**

One resident commented, "The ratio of 0.60 seems like it's out of line with all of the surrounding areas. Only Beverly Hills was larger. It seems like Culver City is out of step. That, to me, would be the most logical thing to go after."



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Sunkist/Blanco Park and Carlson Park Community Meeting Comments

Date: October 30, 2019  
 Re: Sunkist/Blanco Park and Carlson Park Community Meeting Summary  
 Location: Culver City Senior Center, Room B45, 4095 Overland Avenue, Culver City, California, 90232

On October 15, 2019, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the Culver City Senior Center to discuss single-family development in the Sunkist/Blanco Park and Carlson Park neighborhoods. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City Staff input, heard feedback from 14 homeowners about their vision and concern for future development in these neighborhoods.

Community members who attended included:

- Lee Hanson
- Amy Levit
- David Stout
- P. Mortin
- Richard Slechta
- Celia Ramos
- George Dougherty
- Thomas Hu
- Kuoyeug Hu
- Michael Cohen
- Sherwood Kingsley
- Douglas Hunter
- R. Sergeant
- Susan Tillerson

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Susan Herbertson, William Kavadas
- JKA: John Kaliski, Ariel Brenner

A thirty-minute presentation covered thirteen (13) Draft Recommended Updates for the Culver City R-1 Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Development Standards. Participants then offered feedback on the proposed recommendations.

Community Feedback

The following summarizes feedback received verbally during the Community Meeting as well as via written comments submitted into the Comment Box.

1. **FAR:** A number of participants voiced concern regarding the amount of space that existing standards allow a home to occupy relative to the size of a lot. One resident believed that the FAR should be additionally reduced to 0.45, while another community member was unsure of whether the proposed FAR reduction from 0.60 to 0.50 plus an ADU would make any substantial change. Another resident articulated that the 50' x 100' lot on which FAR analysis was conducted was neither typical nor relevant in the Carlson Park neighborhood.
2. **Garages:** One community member advocated for the allowance of open garages without doors, while another participant articulated that garages could be integrated nicely into a front façade without the proposed 5'-0" setback. This attendee argued that there should instead be a standard addressing the design of garage faces rather than a required setback.



3. **Timing and future development:** A number of residents were concerned about the amount of development occurring before the proposed standards take effect. One Carlson Park resident was concerned about the “20-25 lots” in their neighborhood that currently have no homes and would soon be developed. This resident and several others urged the City to consider a moratorium to stop incoming development until the presented recommendations were adopted, or to somehow find another way to limit new construction until the proposed guidelines were in place. Another Carlson Park resident articulated that it was difficult to see their neighborhood shifting, and would prefer not to see any more “boxes by people who don’t care” constructed in their neighborhood. Several residents expressed that they wanted to see these recommendations in place immediately.
4. **Rear Lot Setback:** One resident articulated the opinion that the proposed encroachment plane along side yards should also apply to rear yards so that two-story buildings could not dominate rear neighbors’ backyards.
5. **Building Height:** One community member asked how the proposed height limit of 27’-0” including a parapet would impact solar panels placed on roofs.
6. **Duplexes:** One Carlson Park resident requested more information about the allowance of duplexes in the R1 Zone.
7. **ADA Compatibility:** One community member suggested that there should be more guidance for homes aiming to be senior-friendly, noting Culver City homes that required the ascension of three stairs to access the front door. This resident argued that new construction should be ADA-compatible.
8. **Design Guidelines:** One resident questioned whether design guidelines would still be considered for the R1 Zone.



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Park West, Studio Village, McLaughlin, and Culver West Community Meeting Comments

Date: October 30, 2019  
 Re: Park West, Studio Village, McLaughlin, and Culver West Community Meeting Summary  
 Location: Culver City Senior Center, Room B45, 4095 Overland Avenue, Culver City, California, 90232

On October 22, 2019, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held at the Culver City Senior Center to discuss single-family development in the Park West, Studio Village, McLaughlin, and Culver West neighborhoods. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City Staff input, heard feedback from 18 homeowners about their vision and concern for future development in these neighborhoods.

Community members who attended included:

- Paula Wilson
- Tom Wilson
- Carmen Patti
- Letha Kemper
- Ron Gorman
- Ginny Blades
- Roseanne DiGregorio
- EP Rubien
- Dana Markez
- Genahl Wein
- Jennifer Trapwell
- Dave Hall
- Kathleen Barreto
- Lance Richter
- Phoebe Liebig
- Mimewa Couo
- Angie Lee Poston
- Maureen Muranaka

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: Jose Mendivil, Gabriela Silva
- JKA: John Kaliski, Wenchong Lai, Ariel Brenner

A thirty-minute presentation covered thirteen (13) Draft Recommended Updates for the Culver City R-1 Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Development Standards. Participants then offered feedback on the proposed recommendations.

Community Feedback

The following summarizes feedback received verbally during the Community Meeting as well as via written comments submitted into the Comment Box.

1. **Rear-yard garages and driveways:** A number of community members voiced concern regarding garages placed in the rear of the lot. Participants claimed that neighbors with rear-yard garages instead parked their cars in the front of their properties or on the street because driveways were long, narrow, and difficult to navigate. Rear garages, they claimed, instead became storage areas. Other community members, conversely, cited driveways accessing rear yards as instrumental to providing adequate light and air to neighboring structures; in situations where two-story structures were constructed up to the side yard setback line, for example, driveways located in between two structures provided necessary separation between homes. One attendee went so far as to request a requirement that driveways be placed on the

right side of each property so that two houses would not stand in close proximity to each other. Another participant was concerned that a resident would be able to put an ADU, in addition to a garage, in their rear yard, which would burden neighbors in proximity to their rear yard.

2. **FAR:** At least two community members believed that a 0.50 FAR was still too large, and thought that a 0.40 or 0.45 FAR would be more appropriate for their neighborhood. Another participant was concerned that a 600-square foot ADU, in addition to the 400 square feet that would be exempted for a rear garage, would put the maximum FAR back to the existing 0.60.
3. **Second-story front yard setbacks:** One resident wondered whether a second-story front yard setback based on a percentage relative to lot size would better avoid the “wedding cake” effect. In response to the recommended second-story front yard setback increase, another resident articulated that having the structure pushed as far forward as possible was preferable because it allowed them to have a large backyard that preserved privacy from their neighbors.
4. **Timing and urgency:** A number of attendees were concerned about the amount of current construction that would not be subjected to the recommended standards. They urged for an acceleration of this process or a moratorium on demolitions until changes were adopted. One participant additionally requested transparency regarding the amount of permits issued and homes constructed on a monthly basis.
5. **Character:** Two community members expressed the importance of considering the character of Culver City residential neighborhoods in the proposed standards. They cited the architectural character, and particularly the residences built in the 1940’s and 1950’s, as one of Culver City’s core attractions.
6. **Property value:** One community member asked how the proposed standards would affect property value.
7. **Landscaping:** One participant questioned why landscaping was not addressed in these recommendations, stating that the proposed standards should address the entirety of a typical 5,000 square foot lot.
8. **Alleys:** One participant voiced dissatisfaction with how alleys located in their rear yard were currently utilized, particularly during after-school pick-up times.
9. **Privacy:** One resident requested the consideration of increasing the height of rear yard fences to 8’-0” where two-story homes had been constructed.



JOHN KALISKI ARCHITECTS  
 3780 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 300  
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010  
 (213) 383.7980 *ph*  
*www.johnkaliski.com*  
*John Kaliski, AIA C17945*

Summary of Blair Hills Community Meeting Comments

Date: October 30, 2019  
 Re: Blair Hills Community Meeting Summary  
 Location: Culver City City Hall, Dan Patacchia Room, 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, California, 90232

On October 24, 2019, from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM, a community meeting was held in Culver City City Hall’s Dan Patacchia Room to discuss single-family development in the Blair Hills neighborhood. John Kaliski Architects (JKA), with City Staff input, heard feedback from 5 homeowners about their vision and concern for future development in these neighborhoods.

Community members who attended included:

- Crystal Alexander
- Gregg Criswell
- Britta Eriksson
- Yuko Buuck
- Andrew Kung

Staff and consultants that attended included:

- City of Culver City, Current Planning Division: William Kavadas, Jose Mendivil, Gabriela Silva
- JKA: John Kaliski, Wenchong Lai, Ariel Brenner

A thirty-minute presentation covered nine (9) Draft Recommended Updates for the Culver City R-1 Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Development Standards and the proposed Overlay Zone for the Blair Hills neighborhood. Participants then offered feedback on the proposed recommendations.

Community Feedback

The following summarizes feedback received verbally during the Community Meeting. No written comments were submitted by community members via the Comment Box.

1. **ADUs:** One community member questioned why ADUs were prohibited in Culver City’s Hillside areas, stating their understanding that the City and community were excited to be supplying more housing.
2. **Views:** Two community members cited the importance of preserving views in the Blair Hills neighborhood. One resident wanted to ensure that the proposed changes would prevent future construction that blocked hillside views, while another participant acknowledged that the recommendations presented would work in a property seller’s favor because potential buyers would be assured that future development could not block views.
3. **Cost impact:** One community member questioned whether the proposed recommendations would in any way impact property values or cost to new construction and renovations in the Blair Hills neighborhood, but reasoned that the proposed changes, particularly those pertaining to FAR, would not have too negative of an effect because the proposed FAR was comparable to surrounding cities.
4. **Side Yards:** One resident wanted to ensure that the proposed recommendations preserved side yard setbacks.
5. **Traffic:** One resident expressed concern pertaining to traffic in the lower portions of the neighborhood, particularly along corridors that access the industrial portions of the City.