

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

December 1, 2025

HAND DELIVERED

Marianne Maddalena
3536 Berry Drive
Studio City, CA 91604

Dear Ms. Maddalena

My wife and I are the owners of the property at 3506 Berry Drive. As you are aware, on October 31, 2025 the City of Los Angeles approved our request to construct an addition to our home. On November 18 we were informed that you filed an appeal to the approval of our project.

The purpose of this letter is to address the substantive concerns you have detailed in your filed appeal documentation.

As of the writing of this outreach reply to you, the barbed wire atop our perimeter fencing (put up for home invasion security and to keep coyotes off our property) has been removed. The height of our fences will comply with condition number 11 of the approval of our project and other city regulations at the completion of construction.

In addition, we will change the color of the fence covering to green, replacing the now present black covering, to present a more pastoral feel to that part of the fencing adjacent to your backyard.

Responding to your concern about the widening of Berry Drive, as stated by the City of Los Angeles Associate Zoning Administrator (AZA) in the approval of our project, Case No. ZA-2024-6869-CU1-DRB-SPPC-MSP, ... "I hereby APPROVE a Class 1 Conditional Use to allow the major remodel and addition to an existing single-family home on a hillside lot fronting an existing Substandard Hillside Limited Street (Berry Drive) without providing a 20-foot-wide minimum Adjacent Roadway as required by Section 12.21 C.10(i)(2)" (emphasis added).

In support for the above finding by the AZA, a report from civil engineer Harvey Goodman, attached as Exhibit 1, details the impracticality of widening Berry Drive along the street frontage of our lot.

The AZA cited in our project approval that "...the Continuous Paved Roadway improvement requirement could actually be detrimental to the adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood due to the extended construction and traffic issues that would be created along Berry Drive....if Berry Drive were to be widened to a pavement width of 20 feet, the entire roadway fronting the property will require widening of between 2 feet to 4.5 feet. In about 200 feet of frontage there would be need for retaining walls up to 6 feet high to be constructed where the widened roadway encroached into the sloping hillside...Such reduced

roadway width would require extraordinary traffic control for the duration of this construction in this hillside area.”

For your information, I have also attached as Exhibit 2, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) prepared by the transportation engineering consulting firm Hirsch Green that outlines the measures and procedures that we will utilize to mitigate the impacts of the construction of our project.

The attached TMP report discusses and recommends actions and measures to be utilized by the construction practices at the subject site including, but not limited to the following:

- Adherence to municipal code construction hours limitations;
- Designation of a construction site contact to respond to concerns of the neighborhood;
- On-site construction activity will be conducted in 4 phases to ensure that storage of all construction materials, as well as the staging of vehicles that are used for delivery/retrieval of materials, can be accommodated on the Project site;
- Construction site security will be utilized to prevent safety on and around the site and neighborhood.
- In accordance with code requirements, the project will maintain the site and surrounding vicinity to minimize all fire dangers and work with Los Angeles Fire Department local station number 86 to ensure that the project maintains fire safety and minimizes fire hazards during construction.

The proposed residential addition will be built in accordance with all hillside regulations and will comply with all applicable code regulations except the Continuous Paved Roadway improvement requirement. The proposed project will not be materially detrimental at any time or potentially injurious once construction has been completed

Ms. Maddalene, you close your appeal letter to the city by stating that...” maintaining the safety, character, and integrity of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway” is important to you. Please understand we also support the safety and character of our neighborhood and have designed the addition to our house to accommodate the children we intend to raise in our home so as to not be at odds with the goals and intent of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway.

I hope I have shown you by the information detailed above that we have anticipated and tried to mitigate the impact of our project on our neighbors and the adjacent neighborhood. I welcome the chance to meet with you an attempt to work out any concerns you have short of taking this matter to an appeal hearing.

Sincerely,

Matt Kaplan

December 1, 2025

HAND DELIVERED

Michael Roud
3525 Berry Drive
Studio City, CA 91604

Dear Mr. Roud,

My wife and I are the owners of the property at 3506 Berry Drive. As you are aware, on October 31, 2025 the City of Los Angeles approved our request to construct an addition to our home. On November 18 we were informed that you filed an appeal to the approval of our project.

The purpose of this letter is to address the substantive concerns you have detailed in your filed appeal documentation. I will respond below to each of your concerns as you have written in your appeal:

1. Parking/access

Most certainly the impact of any construction activity in a hillside area with narrow, winding streets is consequential to the neighborhood. Nonetheless, we have the right to improve our property provided we mitigate the impact to the area by utilizing our best and most practical efforts. In that regard, please find attached for your review the below described documentation:

Exhibit 1: Diagrams prepared by our architects depicting the vehicular ingress and egress paths of travel for delivery and construction vehicles servicing the building of our home addition project. As noted on the diagrams, all vehicles can enter the subject site, off-load materials, and turn around within the property and exit the site without blocking the roadway on Berry Drive.

Exhibit 2: A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) prepared by the transportation engineering consulting firm Hirsch Green that outlines the measures and procedures that we will utilize to mitigate the impacts of the construction of our project.

The attached TMP report discusses and recommends actions and measures to be utilized by the construction practices at the subject site including, but not limited to the following:

- Adherence to municipal code construction hours limitations;
- Designation of a construction site contact to respond to concerns of the neighborhood;
- On-site construction activity will be conducted in 4 phases to ensure that storage of all construction materials, as well as the staging of vehicles that are used for delivery/retrieval of materials, can be accommodated on the project site;
- Construction site security will be utilized to prevent safety on and around the site and neighborhood.

- In accordance with code requirements, the project will maintain the site and surrounding vicinity to minimize all fire dangers and work with Los Angeles Fire Department local station number 86 to ensure that the project maintains fire safety and minimizes fire hazards during construction.

The proposed residential addition will be built in accordance with all hillside regulations and will comply with all applicable code regulations except the Continuous Paved Roadway improvement requirement. The proposed project will not be materially detrimental at any time or potentially injurious once construction has been completed

2. Pattern of Non-Compliance

As of the writing of this outreach reply to you, the barbed wire atop our perimeter fencing (put up for home invasion security and to keep coyotes off our property) has been removed. The height of our fences will comply with condition number 11 of the approval of our project and other city regulations at the completion of construction.

3. Your other concerns labeled "What I'm asking for" in you filed appeal

- Verify and correct current violations. See above response in numbered paragraph 2.
- Do not approve any construction activity without real, enforceable off-site parking and shuttle plan. See condition 13 of the approval of our project.
- A full-time site monitor accountable to the City to manage day-to-day compliance, access and emergency coordination. See condition numbers 13c and 13d of our project approval.
- Street widening. As stated by the City of Los Angeles Associate Zoning Administrator (AZA) in the approval of our project, Case No. ZA-2024-6869-CU1-DRB-SPPC-MSP, ... "I hereby APPROVE a Class 1 Conditional Use to allow the major remodel and addition to an existing single-family home on a hillside lot fronting an existing Substandard Hillside Limited Street (Berry Drive) without providing a 20-foot-wide minimum Adjacent Roadway as required by Section 12.21 C.10(i)(2)" (emphasis added). In support for the above finding by the AZA, please also find attached Exhibit 3, a report from civil engineer Harvey Goodman that details the impracticality of widening Berry Drive along the street frontage of our lot.

Mr. Roud, you close your appeal letter to the city by stating that "I love this neighborhood and want to be reasonable...". We love our neighborhood as well and have designed the addition to our house to accommodate the children we intend to raise in our home.

I hope I have shown you by the information detailed above that, contrary to your stated appeal allegation that ... "the practical day-to-day impacts here are being glossed over" ... that in fact, we have anticipated and tried to mitigate the impact of our project on our neighbors and the adjacent neighborhood. I welcome the chance to meet with you to work out any concerns you have short of taking this matter to an appeal hearing.

Sincerely,
Matt Kaplan

DAY OF HEARING SUBMISSIONS

MEMORANDUM

TO: South Valley Area Planning Commission
CASE NO: ZA-2024-6869-CU1-DRB-SPPC-MSP-1A (Project)
SITE: 3506 N. Berry Drive, Studio City (Property)
SUBJECT: Opposition to Appeals

TO THE COMISSIONERS OF THE SOUTH VALLEY AREA PLANNING COMMISSION:

Detailed below please find the Applicants rebuttal to the appeal grounds filed by the Appellants.

Appeal Filed by Mr. Michael Roud (3525 Berry Drive)

Concern #1: Parking and Access

Appellant states: *"There is nowhere to park on Berry... and the street will become dangerous with the street being blocked."*

Response by Applicant:

Most certainly the impact of any construction activity in a hillside area with narrow, winding streets is consequential to the neighborhood. Nonetheless, the Applicant has the right to improve its' Property provided it mitigates the impact to the area by utilizing its best and most practical efforts.

Diagrams prepared by the Project architects depict the vehicular ingress and egress paths of travel for delivery and construction vehicles servicing the building of the home addition Project. As noted on the diagrams, all vehicles can enter the subject site, off-load materials, and turn around within the Property and exit the site without blocking the roadway on Berry Drive.

A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) prepared by the transportation engineering consulting firm Hirsch Green outlines the measures and procedures that will be utilized to mitigate the impacts of the construction of the Project.

Concern #2: Pattern of Non-Compliance

Appellant states: *"The site already has a roughly 10-foot fence topped with barbed wire ..."*

Response by Applicant:

The barbed wire atop the Property perimeter fencing (put up for home invasion security and to keep coyotes off the Property) has been removed and the side yard and rear yard fencing has been lowered to 6 feet. The height of the Berry Drive front yard fencing will be in compliance with city regulations at the completion of construction as required by condition number 11 of the Letter of Determination (LOD) issued by the Office of Zoning Administration.

Concern #3: "What I am asking for"

Responses by Applicant:

- *Verify and correct current violations.* See above response in Concern #2.
- *Do not approve any construction activity without real, enforceable off-site parking and shuttle plan.* See condition 13 of the LOD approval of the Project.
- *A full-time site monitor accountable to the City to manage day-to-day compliance, access and emergency coordination.* See condition numbers 13c and 13d of the Project approval.
- *Street widening.* The LOD finding of the Office of Zoning Administration states... "I hereby APPROVE a Class 1 Conditional Use to allow the major remodel and addition to an existing single-family home on a hillside lot fronting an existing Substandard Hillside Limited Street (Berry Drive) without providing a 20-foot-wide minimum Adjacent Roadway as required by Section 12.21 C.10(i)(2)" (emphasis added). In support for the above finding, a report from civil engineer Harvey Goodman details the impracticality of widening Berry Drive along the street frontage of the subject Property.

Appeal Filed by Ms. Marianne Maddalena (3536 Berry Drive)

Concern #1: Height of Fencing

Response by Applicant:

The barbed wire atop the Property perimeter fencing (put up for home invasion security And to keep coyotes off the Property) has been removed and the side yard and rear yard fencing has been lowered to 6 feet. The height of the Berry Drive front yard fencing will be in compliance with city regulations at the completion of construction as required by condition number 11 of the LOD.

Concern #2: Widening of Berry Drive

Response by Applicant:

The Associate Zoning Administrator cited in the LOD Project approval that "...the Continuous Paved Roadway improvement requirement could actually be detrimental to the adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood due to the extended construction and traffic issues that would be created along Berry Drive....if Berry Drive were to be widened to a pavement width of 20 feet, the entire roadway fronting the property will require widening of between 2 feet to 4.5 feet. In about 200 feet of frontage there would be need for retaining walls up to 6 feet high to be constructed where the widened roadway encroached into the sloping hillside...Such reduced roadway width would require extraordinary traffic control for the duration of this construction in this hillside area."

In close, it is the position of the Applicant that all the issues raised by the Appellants have been addressed by the provisions of the LOD Project approval and that the responses detailed above answer the concerns of the Appellants.

The Applicant requests that the subject appeal filings be denied and the Project be approved by the Commission.