

Kavadas, William

From: Daniel Mayeda <dmayeda@lpsla.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 9:49 PM
To: Kavadas, William
Subject: Public Comment re: Zoning Development Changes

Mr. Kavadas,

Please associate this email with Public Comments made in connection with the Zoning Development Changes being considered by the Culver City Council at the May 26, 2020 meeting.

I am one of dozens of residents of the Culver Crest neighborhood who participated in many months of workshops, studies, public meetings, and Planning Commission and City Council meetings relating to development standards for new construction in the City. It was due in part to the engagement of my neighbors and me that the City hired an expert consultant to evaluate development standards in Culver City and surrounding jurisdiction, and to solicit public input into possible changes in such standards. The consultant's work involved an analysis of the special issues arising out of construction on the hillside areas in the Culver Crest neighborhood, as well as a consideration of the "Mansionization" concerns raised by residents across the City.

Following extensive public input and analysis, the Consultant determined that a maximum FAR of 0.45 should be adopted for construction on flat areas but that development on the hillside areas in Culver Crest ought to be reduced depending on how steep the slopes were on the specific parcels in question. The Consultant determined that a maximum FAR of 0.45 would be consistent with neighboring jurisdictions while also addressing "Mansionization" issues. The City Council did largely adopt the Consultant's proposal for new development standards for the Culver Crest area.

I understand that at its May 26, 2020 meeting, the City Council will consider adopting new development standards for other areas of the City. Such standards ought to build upon the excellent work that the Consultant already completed. I understand, however, that at a recent Planning Commission meeting, without any public input, the Commissioners voted 3-2, to unilaterally raise the proposed 0.45 FAR maximum to a 0.5 maximum. It appears that this effort was led by Commissioner Dana Sayles who is principal of a real estate consulting firm that is aptly named "Max Development, LLC." (You can't make this stuff up!)

I urge the City Council to disregard the split vote of obviously developer-friendly Planning Commissioners to raise the maximum FAR for the City from 0.45 to 0.5. There is no reasonable justification for this change, which was made without any apparent support from City residents. All areas of the City ought to be governed by the same maximum FAR on flat land areas. Even if a uniform maximum FAR is adopted for the entire City, the Culver Crest area will still have lower density due to the presence of hillside areas, as well as the absence of ADUs which are banned in the Crest area. That makes sense; it would make no sense, however, for flat areas of the Crest to have a lower FAR than flat areas in other parts of the City.

Furthermore, adopting a maximum FAR of 0.5 in any part of Culver City will only incentivize speculators to target our city to overbuild since neighboring cities will have a lower maximum FAR. There is no reason for the City to spend time and money on a Consultant who developed sound proposals only to unilaterally reject them

without public input. Both "good government" and sound public policy counsel that the City Council should retain the maximum FAR of 0.45 for the entire City.

Thank you for taking my views into consideration.

Daniel Mayeda

30-year resident of Culver Crest; 34-year resident of Culver City

May 12, 2020

Aliza Farrell
10966 Barman Avenue
Culver City, CA 90230
Ph 310 866 3394

Michael Allen
Current Planning Division Manager
Culver City

Re: Air Conditioner - Side Setback - Request for Amendment

Dear Mr. Allen,

I have been a resident of Culver City for nearly 10 years and reside in Veterans Park on Barman Avenue with my husband and two children.

The reason I am writing to you is to voice my concerns on the matter of allowing an air conditioner unit to be located on the side of one's property when it borders the neighboring property even if it is a permitted set back.

Our neighbor(10958 Barman Avenue) installed an airconditioning unit in Spring of 2019 and since then the vibration noise levels we hear are horrendous and impacts our quality of life.

Unfortunately, our bedrooms are located on the same side as the location of the unit. We are no longer able to open our windows at night and have to wear ear plugs. Sometimes we end up sleeping in the living room. I understand that this particular installation was legal but I wanted to convey to the Planning Division how this has impacted the persons' standard of living facing the unit.

I hope no one has to endure what we hear every day and hope that we might be able to work together to make some changes going forward.

I would like to propose the following recommendations:

1/ Units should NOT be located adjacent to neighbor's bedroom windows.

2/ A sound barrier fence should be installed to screen the noise. An acoustic screen may be an effective means of reducing the impact of noise.

We asked the owner to please install a compressor sound blanket (Amazon \$65) but he informed us it would void his warranty.

Does a rubber mounting rubber pad prevent vibration noise?

3/ The location of the unit should be discussed prior to installation with the neighbor directly affected to minimize noise and the unit's impact it will have on the neighbor.

4/ Enforcing a time restriction for the noise level such as operation between 7am and 10pm. The unit should be a premium quality unit designed for quiet operation with a night time quiet mode further reducing the sound levels.

I hope we can discuss the above recommendations when you are available.

Thank you for your time,

All my best wishes,

Aliza Farrell

Phone 310 866 3394

Email: alizajoe@hotmail.com

I was dismayed when at the Planning Commission Meeting on January 22, 2020 attended by only 6 members of the public, Commissioner Sayles refused to support the reduction of FAR to 0.45 for the whole of Culver City, claiming it was unduly restrictive. Reducing FAR is the single most effective way of reducing bulk and mass, and after much deliberation, 0.45 was unanimously agreed upon as the right amount a year ago for Culver Crest. The most compelling argument is that it is the standard used by most of Los Angeles, and some cities like Burbank and Pasadena have even opted to go with 0.4. It is a proven number that is working perfectly for millions of homeowners. If we opt for 0.5, it will make Culver City one of the cities offering the highest FAR in LA County.

It is shocking, that this suggestion goes directly against the wishes of hundreds of residents who participated in community meetings and online surveys, the vast majority of whom want to see a reduction in over development. It is also important to note, that the new California assembly bill gives homeowners an additional 1,200 sq. ft. for an ADU that doesn't count towards FAR, raising the effective FAR to around 0.7. JKA supports the 0.45 ratio, and exceptions have already been made for garages and hallways that raise it. So, let's stop the madness, which promotes the idea of one FAR for Culver Crest, and another for the rest of the City.

Commissioner Voncannon voted for 0.5 and commented that if the City Council didn't like it, they could overrule it. PLEASE, let's not disappoint him, and give Culver City homeowners what they want – respectful development that demands a 0.45 FAR, which is totally consistent with our neighboring cities.

The notion that it is unduly restrictive is ludicrous, and is being championed by Ms. Sales, who is a consultant to large scale professional developers.

As a longtime resident of Culver City, I am writing to ask you to look carefully at the building codes to be updated.

In the past many years developers and new homeowners are building huge homes on small properties. These huge homes are impacting the neighborhood by blocking sunlight, creating privacy issues and blocking outside circulating air of the existing homes.

While I do not object to homeowners who want to remodel or update their homes, it has gotten out of control. The homes seem to take up every inch of property.

There have been many meetings and surveys of current homeowners and the consensus is that these huge mansions change the charm of the neighborhood and infringe on the privacy of the existing homes.

Please look carefully at the FAR that would help reduce how huge these homes are and setbacks that would also help make the size more manageable. The consultants that you hired to study this issue recommended a FAR of 45 but the planning committee narrowly recommended 50.

I hope the six years that have been spent with this issue make things significantly better...not just making them a little bit better!

Thank you for all the work you are doing to improve the quality of life in Culver City!

Amy Levit