

From: Nicholas Cregor [<mailto:ncregor@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, May 06, 2018 6:33 PM
To: Allen, Michael <Michael.Allen@culvercity.org>
Subject: Fw: Hillside Development Standards

Hi Michael,

Please see below -- it's the only other feedback that I have received -- Mr. Heckendorf is concerned with the level of second floor setbacks.

Many thanks,

Nick

From: Dave Heckendorf <daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 5, 2018 11:52 PM
To: 'Nicholas Cregor'; 'Robin Turner'; 4mrx2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorrin@gmail.com; mnlorrin@gmail.com; jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayeda@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com; shcmd@ucla.edu; stevenourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com; davidryingling@att.net; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com; frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com; charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Hillside Development Standards

Nick and all,

I have created the attached lot & building envelope plot for a prototypical 5,000SqFt (50'wide by 100'deep) lot. These dimensions and square footage are representative of the majority of Culver Crest lots in the map (and those that is does not represent are nearly all even wider and/or deeper lots that may be impacted to a lesser degree). This covers nearly all of those in Lower Culver Crest, as well as a significant percentage of lots in Upper Culver Crest, bounded by Hill on the North and Cranks on the West (including most lots on Culview, Molony, Stephon, and Tellefson).

Items to note:

- 1) For reference, the current 0.60 Floor Area Ration (FAR) would allow for a 3,000SqFt dwelling.
- 2) The FAR range method would limit the dwelling to 1,600->2,250SqFt, which may not include Garage space of ~400SqFt (20'x20') as Garage space is not called-out in the proposed new Floor Area definition and may only includes habitable square footage. However, I imagine Garages are to be included since they could be converted to an ADU (especially if you know Sol well enough to get your application approved despite a current ADU moratorium and not providing covered off-street parking as required by code, as recently done by one home in Upper Culver Crest).
- 3) The plot assumes that the lot DOES NOT have a slope of 50 percent or greater in the rear, to which a top-of-slope 15' setback would apply.

- 4) I have placed the “Wider” side setback on the left and “Narrow” side of the setback on the right. This could of course be flipped/mirrored as may be desired by lot, but the differential setbacks would still apply.
- 5) As the Second Floor additional side/front setbacks have no provision for being relative to the First Floor placement, the First Floor could use any of the Second Floor setbacks thereby still allowing a 2-story “wall” though only as close as 8’ (instead of 5’) to the property line on one side (would that additional 3’ make the NE side 2+story wall of our favorite new home on Cranks seem less imposing to their neighbor?), and setbacks of the Second Floor relative to the First Floor are not assured.
- 6) The First Floor building envelope allows for 2,600SqFt of buildable area, 150SqFt greater than the Maximum FAR.
- 7) The Second Floor building envelope allows for 1,650SqFt of building area.

The total potential building envelope is 3,250SqFt, which is 1.44x the Maximum FAR and 2x the Minimum FAR, so the FAR is going to limit the SqFt of the dwelling well before even these “Wider” and “Narrow” side setbacks have a meaningful impact. By allowing “Narrow” side setbacks on both sides, the applicant and their architect would have the latitude to design symmetrically, which could also mean that both adjoining properties would be equally affected (though both will benefit from a minimum 3’ additional setback for the Second Floor) rather than artificially shifting it to the favor of one side, at the discretion of the applicant and their architect. Similarly, the 10’ additional front setback of the Second Floor seeks to achieve architectural design rather than the 2-story “walls” that have been built above several Crest garages that were at the current 20’ front setback, which I applaud; however, 10’ further setback is far more than is needed to attain that goal, and limits the applicant and their architect’s options. Again, ~3’ is all that is required, anything more just pushes structural and mechanical elements that traverse Floors (Chimneys, Staircases/Elevators, HVAC, etc.) into the dwelling instead of on the perimeter where they may be better/preferentially placed.

Hope that helps, and apologies to those that do not share my concerns and/or have been put to sleep by my verbosity.

Regards,
David

From: Nicholas Cregor <ncregor@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 5, 2018 9:22 AM

To: 'Robin Turner' <rturner@archaeopaleo.com>; 4mr2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorin@gmail.com; mnlorin@gmail.com; jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayeda@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com; shcmd@ucla.edu; stevengourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com; davidryingling@att.net; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com; frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com; charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com; daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com

Subject: Re: Hillside Development Standards

Good Morning,

Please let me know if anyone else shares David's concerns -- I don't really have a good feel for these things. David -- please could you do a quick sketch to illustrate your point. Now is definitely the time to raise any concerns. The counsel meeting scheduled for May 14 WILL NOT DISCUSS these standards -- they will probably be put back a week or two but we will be informed.

I would be happy to submit a summary/supplement to any points not raised at our meeting yesterday and will submit it to the planning department on Thursday, May 10. Basically we went over the planning departments proposal which was derived from the consultants proposal, and essentially clarified a number of ambiguities and voiced some minor concerns.

Overall we are going to end up with 110% of what we asked for, and the meeting was WAY more productive and cordial than the now legendary Blumenthal smack down in December 2016.

best,

Nick

From: Dave Heckendorf <daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com>

Sent: Friday, May 4, 2018 5:56 PM

To: 'Robin Turner'; 'Nicholas Cregor'; 4mrx2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorin@gmail.com; mnlorrin@gmail.com; jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayeda@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com; shcmd@ucla.edu; stevengourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com; davidryingling@att.net; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com; frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com; charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Hillside Development Standards

Robin,

I understand your concern, and as I stated in the first "paragraph", they appear to have your concern covered in that the First Floor side setback is 10% of lot width with a minimum of 5' on each side. This side setback is relative to the property line, not the dwelling on the adjacent lot. So, by requiring a minimum of 5' on both sides for each dwelling, there should be a minimum of 10' between dwellings on the First Floor (assuming no variance is granted). As I recall, this is setback is unchanged from the current building code throughout the city, though it has been "abused" on a handful of cases where the "side" setback was street-facing on the "side" street (I know of once such example in Sunkist Park).

The Second Floor setback guidelines are still relative to the property line, not the dwelling on the adjacent property, so the guidelines would provide for a minimum of 8' on the "Narrow" and 12' on the "Wider" side (hence the 20' total minimum, which is IMHO too much for the majority of affected lots that are only 50' wide to begin with)...

Regards,
David

From: Robin Turner <rturner@archaeopaleo.com>

Sent: Friday, May 4, 2018 5:30 PM

To: daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com; 'Nicholas Cregor' <ncregor@hotmail.com>; 4mrx2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorin@gmail.com; mnlorin@gmail.com; jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayed@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com; shcmd@ucla.edu; stevengourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com; davidryingling@att.net; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com; frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com; charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Hillside Development Standards

Hi David,

I appreciate your comments. The side setbacks they are talking about are related to building height compared to setbacks on the property. I am talking about building to building side of house setbacks related to adjacent properties (neighbor to neighbor – like kitchen window to kitchen window). There is no way they would force a 10' side setback on a new home away from a neighbor's house. If I am wrong, please let me know. I hope you are right but I think we are talking about two different things.

Thanks,
Robin

From: Dave Heckendorf [<mailto:daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com>]

Sent: Friday, May 04, 2018 4:42 PM

To: 'Robin Turner' <rturner@archaeopaleo.com>; 'Nicholas Cregor' <ncregor@hotmail.com>; 4mrx2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorin@gmail.com; mnlorin@gmail.com; jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayed@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com; shcmd@ucla.edu; stevengourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com; davidryingling@att.net; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com; frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com; charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Hillside Development Standards

Robin and all,

It would certainly seem that they've MORE than covered the side setbacks. The first floor is 10% of lot width, not less than 5' or greater than 10' required. This would mean a minimum of 10' between houses.

That said, all of the Second Floor setbacks (especially the side, but also the front) are, in my opinion, excessive for a majority of the lots in the affected area (those that are some shade of blue with an FAR of 0.41->0.45) as most of these lots are ~2x deeper than they are wide and are only ~50' wide. The new side setbacks for the Second Floor mean that these lots will lose 20' (8' min + 12' min) and be left with only 30' of their lot width to build in. I'm also struggling to imagine how a 10' additional front setback for the Second Floor (30' vs 20') would look from an architectural perspective. I would have thought that we could have avoided the 2-story "modern" boxes being built in Venice and Mar Vista with only +1'-3' side (on both sides) and +5' front setbacks and let the FAR limit the total sqft...

Regards,
David

From: Robin Turner <rturner@archaeopaleo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 3, 2018 3:27 PM

To: 'Nicholas Cregor' <ncregor@hotmail.com>; 4mrx2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorin@gmail.com; mnlorin@gmail.com; jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayed@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com; shcmd@ucla.edu; stevengourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com; davidryingling@att.net; daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com; frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com; charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Hillside Development Standards

Hi Nick and all.

Looks good to me but we also need to make sure that the current state code of no less than 3' between property lines (so 6' between houses) is still enforced. It was made as a fire barrier between dwellings.

Thanks,
Robin

From: Nicholas Cregor [<mailto:ncregor@hotmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, May 03, 2018 2:29 PM

To: 4mrx2@sbcglobal.net; waltshubin@gmail.com; Nicholas Cregor <ncregor@hotmail.com>; kcregor@hotmail.com; pasai@ca.rr.com; mlorin@gmail.com; mnlorin@gmail.com;

jennifer.merlis@gmail.com; dmayeda@LPSLA.com; susanrosales1@gmail.com;
shcmd@ucla.edu; stevengourley@ca.rr.com; seanaveder@yahoo.com; bluebosou@aol.com;
davidryingling@att.net; daveheckendorf@ca.rr.com; audiophile6@sbcglobal.net;
rturner@archaeopaleo.com; HodurJ@jacksonlewis.com; richkissel@outlook.com;
frankissel@ca.rr.com; alex@fullbranch.com; catherine@finamore.net; sdgardner@ca.rr.com;
charlesdstephens@sbcglobal.net; explorer.shu@gmail.com; brukvan@gmail.com

Subject: Hillside Development Standards

Good Afternoon,

Michael Allen has invited a delegation from the neighborhood to preview the proposed recommendations attached which he sent over about ten minutes ago. I apologize for the short notice, but please let me know if you have any particular thoughts or insights which you would like incorporated/discussed by 9am tomorrow morning. It's only 5 pages long and it's not too detailed! They may or may not incorporate our suggestions, but either this or an amended version of it will be presented to the City Counsel on May 14 for their input/direction.

Many thanks,

Nick