

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CONTENTS OF THIS FILE

Submissions by the public in compliance with the Commission Rules and Operating Procedures (ROPs), Rule 4.3, are distributed to the Commission and uploaded online. Please note that “compliance” means that the submission complies with deadline, delivery method (hard copy and/or electronic) AND the number of copies. Please review the Commission ROPs to ensure that you meet the submission requirements. The ROPs can be accessed at <http://planning.lacity.org>, by selecting “Commissions & Hearings” and selecting the specific Commission.

All compliant submissions may be accessed as follows:

- **“Initial Submissions”**: Compliant submissions received no later than by end of day Monday of the week prior to the meeting, which are not integrated by reference or exhibit in the Staff Report, will be appended at the end of the Staff Report. The Staff Report is linked to the case number on the specific meeting agenda.
- **“Secondary Submissions”**: Submissions received after the Initial Submission deadline up to 48-hours prior to the Commission meeting are contained in this file and bookmarked by the case number.
- **“Day of Hearing Submissions”**: Submissions after the Secondary Submission deadline up to and including the day of the Commission meeting will be uploaded to this file within two business days after the Commission meeting.

Material which does not comply with the submission rules is not distributed to the Commission.

ENABLE BOOKMARS ONLINE:

**If you are using Explorer, you need will need to enable the Acrobat  toolbar to see the bookmarks on the left side of the screen.

If you are using Chrome, the bookmarks are on the upper right-side of the screen. If you do not want to use the bookmarks, simply scroll through the file.

If you have any questions, please contact the Commission Office at (213) 978-1300.

SECONDARY SUBMISSIONS



History of road improvement at Frontenac Avenue and a final comment (ZA-2019-4701-ZAD-SPP-1A)

1 message

Padraic Cassidy <padraic@padraiccassidy.com>
To: apceastla@lacity.org

Sat, Apr 10, 2021 at 10:31 PM

Attachments available until May 10, 2021

Dear Commissioners,

I've put together a little slideshow* because I realize the history of our mostly unimproved roadway isn't something anyone has additional time to research, while at the same time I believe the actual details to be critical to not just understanding this and the neighboring project at 617, but any and all future work continuing down our mostly unimproved roadway. New single family dwellings are required to improve an unimproved roadway, should they be built on one, and that's how new streets are built in previously undeveloped areas in Los Angeles. The zoning administrator neglected to mention anything about road improvements, both sidewalk and street, and that's the reason I am appealing this project.

Additionally I must note my disappointment in this particular zoning administrator taking 8 months to process her judgment of the hearing. Obviously our neighborhood being mobilized to speak up for ourselves isn't an activity any of us would choose and delaying judgement for so long after the public hearing tends to disable this participation. Furthermore what's come to light in the record based on this appeal is additional communication between Ms. Toy-Lee and the architect and owner, 6 weeks after the meeting, which seems to have influenced her decision to approve with no conditions. I am upset to be portrayed as the only one who cares about this project, and also not wanting anything built. That is simply a lie, I've attached here communication I made to the owner to aid her in building, and in it point out we would be happy to welcome her to our block just want her to do the improvements. The idea of pleading hardship, pretending they are being treated unfairly etc. is absurd.

I appreciate your time in all of this review and hope you can see the patters developing between this property and the adjacent one at 617, and do something on the city side to remedy the situation. Really it should be as simple as an actual database for roadwork, so the fact of the unpermitted roadway, can be plain and simple, and we may all avoid wasting time like this in the future.

Thanks
Padraic

*Attached here in Keynote, and sent separately as Powerpoint- either way about 3 minutes to get through.

Padraic Cassidy Architect
1003 Diamond Avenue #202
South Pasadena CA 91030
t. 626.441.8881 c. 323.394.6618

My Note to Meghan Daum upon her buying the property:

On Oct 25, 2019, at 3:51 PM, Squarespace <no-reply@squarespace.info> wrote:

Name: Padraic Cassidy

Email Address: padraiccassidy@sbcglobal.net

Subject: neighbor

Message: Hi

I read your book on the perfect house and really enjoyed it and just got The Problem with Everything in the mail yesterday. I was especially excited about the house subject upon googling your name from the new construction notice that was posted across the street from our house. I'm an architect and designed and built the white metal house at 620.

I got mail yesterday that our mutual neighbor's architect has been denied in his effort to avoid a street dedication at 617. In addition to appealing other parts of the determination I'm going to make every effort to see they conform to the code. In the hearings he's provoked by seeking variances he's mentioned the adjacent property also wanting to avoid the street improvements. We paved the road that straddles both of your properties with a temporary curb 4' short of their property line and expected when they were developed the respective owners would complete that work (with additional paving, dedication, curb and gutter). That bend sucks for traffic as is, and new construction and the ensuing additional parking will just make it worse. I just wanted to touch base to let you know we are excited for development but don't want anyone skirting rules, the same rules we'll respect at the next adjacent lot down the street, at 631 Frontenac which we bought upon completing our house. Years ago (while saving money to build on the land we'd bought in 2002), fearing being surrounded by ugly buildings like the two spec houses which flank us, we tried to buy your two properties but were unable to get the anti-development dude who lived in the shack at 613 to sell them. In the end he was foreclosed and had to give it all up for nearly free.

You have a power pole on your property and dealing with that on my property shut us down for about 11 months in the midst of construction so you'll really want to figure that out in your planning. I looked up your architect and it looks like he does nice work so I'm looking forward to you both coming up with a good solution. **I definitely prefer the street to be thoughtfully built out vs vacant and a total crapshoot as to what's coming ahead.**

I suppose there a chance IT'S ANOTHER MEGHAN DAUM! Oh well. It's a great place to be for whichever Meghan Daum comes our way.

Save your best energy for your book and anything else but if you ever want any help or input please feel free to email me back.

Good Luck with Everything.
Padraic

(Sent via Meghan Daum)

[Click to Download](#)

Rees, Daum and Toy-Lee communication.pdf
1.6 MB

[Click to Download](#)

Frontenac Avenue for Appeal.key
19.3 MB



Planning APC East LA <apceastla@lacity.org>

621 E. Frontenac Ave Case No. ZA-2019-4710-ZAD-SPP-1A

1 message

Dina DeSanctis LMFT <dinadesanctismft@earthlink.net>
To: apceastla@lacity.org

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 2:17 PM

Dear City Planning,

I am writing to express my concerns about the construction at 621 E. Frontenac Avenue and the refusal to impose street improvements and set back requirements.

We live at 630 Frontenac Ave, adjacent and across the street from project. We are concerned because our street is so narrow, and there are constant hazards as a result - no visibility at times to other cars or pedestrians, no safe passing of cars when there is a delivery, a potential real danger should god forbid there ever be a fire. My daughter and I walk our dogs daily and would like to feel safe doing so. My 85 year old father also walks his poodle and there are dozens of children who walk from Mt. Washington school to the CGS Playground daily. We need these restrictions imposed for the safety of our neighborhood. We lived through the construction of the home next door for years and mistakes on street improvements resulting in the house being vacant for 7 years. We need to have set restrictions that will be in effect for future homes. We need to make our street a safer, and better street, and make this the precedence for future construction. There are up to 6 or more lots left.

We love our neighborhood and hope the City, contractors and new home owners will respect our wishes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dina DeSanctis, Philip DeSanctis, Arline DeSanctis, Tracy DeSanctis and Megan DeSanctis-Monson

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS



Planning APC East LA <apceastla@lacity.org>

Text of my statement for later today.

1 message

Padraic Cassidy <padraic@padraiccassidy.com>
To: apceastla@lacity.org

Wed, Apr 14, 2021 at 12:08 PM

Dear Commissioners,

The following is my planned statement, I assume there may be a two minute limit, and have done my best to time it accordingly. I am capable of answering any questions in the time afterwards and hope my connection, from the parking lot of our son's away soccer game, is clear.

Thank You Commissioners.

This is the second project in a row in which the summarily granted 20' Continuous Paved Roadway waiver is obscuring the more vital issue of necessary onsite street improvements via this ZA review process.

The enmity provoked between new and existing residents by the city's lack of coordination between constituent agencies is unfortunate. An easily accessed database of permitted roadwork extending into these previously unimproved and/or substandard streets is profoundly absent and would directly highlight the issue here.

At the previous appeal for the adjacent property President Stevens and then President Espinoza noted the likelihood of the street and sidewalk improvements setting a positive precedent for future activity. There are more lots to be developed on the street and this forum of highlighting the requirements via the appeals process seems to be our only recourse.

We own the adjacent vacant lot to the south and intend to reinforce both the policy and physical support of the roadway which our own development at 620 Frontenac initiated. This will add similar expense for ourselves. We are confident this cost will improve not only the street's future and enduring value, but also it will immediately improve the safety of the street. We are in favor of building precisely because of this explicit upgrade it brings when properly regulated.

Upon finishing our house across the street at 620 I was motivated to serve the community to help facilitate imminent development. I was elected to the Neighborhood Council and served for the last 2 of my 3 years as Chair of Mt. Washington. We are pro-development and promise to support this and all other projects on our street that show a willingness to meet the requirements of improving this unimproved roadway as we have.

If the costs of improving the requisite infrastructure make the project unaffordable, it is disqualifying to seek relief from these costs at a permanent expense to the neighborhood. Not only would this decrease the safety of the existing residents, but in doing it would also threaten to degrade the value of the neighborhood, and ultimately the development itself.

Thanks
Padraic

Padraic Cassidy Architect
1003 Diamond Avenue #202
South Pasadena CA 91030
t. 626.441.8881 c. 323.394.6618



Planning APC East LA <apceastla@lacity.org>

Case # ZA-2019-4701-ZAD-SPP-1A

1 message

mAX Burgos <max_emm@yahoo.com>
To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>

Wed, Apr 14, 2021 at 12:02 PM

To whom it may concern,

My name is Max Burgos and am the owner and occupant of [659 Frontenac Ave. Los Angeles CA 90065](#) on the same block as the proposed construction at [621 Frontenac Ave.](#) I have an 11 year old and 2 year old who I feel will also be directly impacted by the decision of this commission. I will be present at the appeal hearing today but wished to submit photos regarding Mr. Bobby Rees' claim that the neighborhood does not have sidewalks specifically regarding a map that he has submitted that marks Glen Albyn as a street with no sidewalks.

Attached are photos of 4750 and 4758 Glen Albyn which are adjacent properties that clearly show improved streets with sidewalks that were made for the construction of these homes. Also attached is a photo showing the sidewalk and improved street at 4798 Glen Albyn. All three of these homes are within 5 blocks of 621 Frontenac.

Thank you,

Max Burgos

4 attachments**7697F3B4-CF64-4109-AF13-1C3975598A85.jpeg**
3495K**58B9BBDA-EF21-4D70-8BFC-FF541B386F9C.jpeg**
2563K**BDCF28B5-9D57-4B46-BC75-7D8AC99A44BA.jpeg**
2461K





4798

R650118 622696

R650121 076581



4750

4750





4750



621 Frontenac Avenue / Hearing on 4.14.211 message

gina kwon <ginakwon@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 4:19 PM

To: "apceastla@lacity.org" <apceastla@lacity.org>

Dear Commissioners,

I'm a resident at 620 Frontenac Avenue, across the street from the proposed project at 621 Frontenac.

We built our house in 2014, and were required to retain a City-bonded contractor to widen and improve the street. It was work that we were hoping to somehow avoid, since it represented considerable expense as well as delay to our project. However, having lived here on this block now for 6 years, I am extremely grateful that we were forced to do this work. Simply put, if we hadn't widened the street, it would have been an untenable situation.

The street is too narrow even with our improvements. We cannot do a simple 2 point turn to back out of our driveway, and head down Frontenac to leave Mount Washington. I got in a car accident with our neighbor Paul Girard, directly next door to Megan's proposed project last fall, because I had pulled out of the way of an oncoming car next to his driveway, and he didn't see me when backing up to leave himself, so he hit my car. There is just not enough room to maneuver. The trash trucks back down our street because there is no room to turn around down at the end of the block. If Megan does not widen the street at her property, if for some reason someone is visiting her on that morning of trash pick up & decides to park in front of her house, then there will truly not be enough room for the truck to maneuver around the bend.

There is also a considerable volume of pedestrian traffic - people walking, with or without dogs, and lots of children - on Frontenac. The character of hilly Mount Washington are stretches of sidewalk, coupled with stretches without. The best part of living on the mountain are the beautiful walks & hikes that are available to our residents, and the existence of sidewalks makes it much, much safer, where they are able to take shelter as they yield to cars & trucks making their way through our too narrow streets.

Bottom line, we were required to widen the street, with the understanding that the City code required each new construction project to do their part to improve the street in front of them. 621 is claiming that there is 20' wide street in front of their property, but we have pointed out that it is not an improved road. However, somehow, between all the City departments - Zoning, Planning, Bureau of Engineering - there is not a mechanism to in fact verify that the street is not a bonded, legitimately improved street. If you took an overhead photo of the street right there at 621, you would see a kink in the road, which is visual proof positive that it isn't a proper, legal street. This project is essentially proposing to take City property, changing the property line, the center line of the road, and creating a completely janky zig zag of a street - all because there is no proper coordination by the City of its departments to enforce its own building code.

I do hold Megan and her architect accountable for trying to skirt the rules here - we have politely and helpfully outlined the issue, and said we are in full support of the project but that our requirement was to have proper street improvements. I firmly believe that when the house is built, with full transparency on where the center line of the street is, with sidewalks that will set a precedent for future construction projects, that the resident will fully benefit and come to appreciate that she has improved the value of her own house as well as that of the street. And I say this knowing that by insisting on the widening & sidewalk, that we will have to do the same with our lot at 631 Frontenac - so we are imposing the same cost & burden on our own project.

I can't understate the stress that our residents feel about upcoming construction projects and the increased traffic issues that this density might create on our street, and the importance of setting a precedent for making the street as wide and as safe as possible. It is extremely trying to have to file an appeal over and over, with each project, and we wish that the City would put in place a mechanism that would ensure that future owners just understand this is a given, non-negotiable, as they make their plans to build on our street. It would save everyone a lot of headache and anxiety. Instead, we have a situation where we are pitted against future neighbors and forced to play police for a code that was created for the benefit of the community.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,
Gina Kwon

DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND SAFETY/PUBLIC WORKS
PRELIMINARY REFERRAL FORM FOR
BASELINE HILLSIDE ORDINANCE NO. 181,624 AND HILLSIDE ORDINANCE No. 174,652

Building and Safety

Address 4516 E CATO WAY
Tract TR 6706

District map 141A231
Block

APN 5214011001
Lot 79

Public Works:

Street designations: Standard vs., Substandard Hillside Limited (for all the streets, public or private, abutting or adjacent to the lot(s)) (LAMC 12.21A17(e)(1)) or LAMC 12.21C10(i)(1))

Street Name (1) CATO WAY

R/W width 26'

Roadway width: 0'

Plan Index

☐ Lot fronts on a standard hillside limited street (R/W $\geq$ 36' AND Rdwy $\geq$ 28')

☒ Lot fronts on a substandard hillside limited street Dedication required? ☐ No ☒ Yes - width 5'

Street Name (2) VERDEMOUR AVE

R/W width 30'

Roadway width: 24'

Plan Index

☐ Lot fronts on a standard hillside limited street (R/W $\geq$ 36' AND Rdwy $\geq$ 28')

☒ Lot fronts on a substandard hillside limited street Dedication required? ☐ No ☒ Yes - width 3'

Street Name (3)

R/W width

Roadway width:

Plan Index

☐ Lot fronts on a standard hillside limited street (R/W $\geq$ 36' AND Rdwy $\geq$ 28')

☐ Lot fronts on a substandard hillside limited street Dedication required? ☐ No ☐ Yes - width

Vehicular Access:

1. Is the **Continuous Paved Roadway (CPR)*** at least 28 feet wide from the driveway apron of the subject lot to the boundary of the Hillside Area? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Do **any** of the streets listed in the **Street designations** section have a roadway width of less than 20 feet adjacent to the lot(s)? (LAMC 12.21A17(e)(2) or LAMC 12.21.C10(i)(2))
☐ Yes— A Zoning Administrator Determination (ZAD) is required per 12.24X21 or 12.24X28** OR the roadway shall be widened to a minimum 20 foot width via a Public Works construction permit
☒ No
3. Is the **CPR** at least **20** feet wide from the driveway apron of the subject lot to the boundary of the Hillside Area? (LAMC 12.21A17(e)(3) or LAMC 12.21.C10(i)(3))
☒ Yes
☐ No – A Zoning Administrator Determination (ZAD) is required per 12.24X21 or 12.24X28** OR the roadway shall be widened to a minimum 20 foot width throughout via a Public Works construction permit

*CPR – begins at the driveway apron and must be continuous and without obstacles to the boundary of the Hillside Area

Sewer Connection: (LAMC 12.21.A17(g) or LAMC 12.21.C10(j))

Lot located within 200 feet of available sewer mainline:

☐ Use existing wye and permit

☒ Obtain new connection and new permit

☐ Use existing wye and obtain new permit

☐ Construct mainline (B permit from BOE)

Lot located greater than 200 feet from an available sewer mainline:

☐ Obtain LADBS approval for onsite sewer

☐ Construct mainline (B permit from BOE)

* Michael Castillo filled up this sheet on 8/31/2018.