



Los Angeles County  
Department of Regional Planning

*Planning for the Challenges Ahead*



Richard J. Bruckner  
Director

October 1, 2015

TO: Hearing Officer

FROM: Kristina Kulczycki *KK*  
Zoning Permits North Section

**SUBJECT: Project No. R2015-00201-(5)  
Conditional Use Permit No. 201500009  
HO Meeting: October 6, 2015  
Agenda Item: 10**

The above-mentioned item is a request to reduce the required side and rear yard setbacks as specified in the Altadena Community Standards District in order to construct a second unit.

Please find two enclosed objection letters for the above referenced item that were received subsequent to hearing package submittal to the Hearing Officer.

The will-serve letter from the Lincoln Avenue Water Company has expired. The applicant has requested a new will-serve letter, but has not received it yet. Staff recommends that the public hearing be continued to November 3, 2015 in order to provide the applicant with sufficient time to obtain a revised will-serve letter and present this project to the Altadena Town Council.

**SUGGESTED MOTION:**

**I MOVE THAT THE HEARING OFFICER CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO NOVEMBER 3, 2015.**

If you need further information, please contact Kristina Kulczycki at (213) 974-6443 or [kkulczycki@planning.lacounty.gov](mailto:kkulczycki@planning.lacounty.gov). Department office hours are Monday through Thursday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The Department is closed on Fridays.

RG:KK

Enclosures: Objection letters dated September 26<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015



## Kristina Kulczycki

---

**From:** Chez Voz [chezvoz@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 26, 2015 2:12 PM  
**To:** Kristina Kulczycki  
**Subject:** Re: Project No. R2015-00201-(5), Conditional Use Permit No. 201500009

Ms. Kulczycki,

After reviewing the plans, we strongly object to the proposed construction plan at 91 E. Wapelo St., primarily for the lack of adequate setback on the side. The proposed two story structure at that location on the lot will loom over the house next-door to the east.

Citing other nearby properties that do not conform to the current setback standards without noting when they were built does not supply adequate proof that the current standards should be waived in this instance. Many homes in the area do not conform to current standards because they were built before these standards were enacted.

The number of garage spaces on the lot is our other objection. Five garage spaces for one lot seems excessive and does not conform to neighborhood norms.

We hope these points will be noted when making the decision.

Sincerely,

Dan and Claudine Voznick  
3378 N. Fair Oaks Ave.  
Altadena, Ca 91001

On 9/9/15 7:36 AM, "Kristina Kulczycki" <[kkulczycki@planning.lacounty.gov](mailto:kkulczycki@planning.lacounty.gov)> wrote:

Good morning Ms. Voznick,

Thank you for contacting me. I am happy to assist you with any questions you may have regarding this case. I've attached the site plan, floor plan, elevation plans, and the applicant's burden of proof statement to give you a better idea of what is proposed. The hearing package should be available on our website two weeks before the hearing.

The applicant is requesting a second unit under the Second Unit Ordinance and will be complying with all requirements except for the side and rear yard setbacks. The side yard setback in the Altadena Community Standards District is based on 10 percent of the average lot width which comes out to approximately 11 feet for the subject property. The applicant is requesting a reduction for a three-foot side yard. This project also includes a request to reduce the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 19.5 feet. The attached burden of proof provides the applicant's justification for these reductions.

If you need additional information, please feel free to contact me. Also, if you would like to submit comments for the public record that the Hearing Officer can include as part of his/her analysis, you can email me those comments. If you submit something in writing to me, it is considered public record.

Regards,

Kristina

Kristina Kulczycki  
Regional Planning Assistant II  
Zoning Permits East  
Department of Regional Planning  
<http://planning.lacounty.gov> <<http://planning.lacounty.gov>>  
213-974-6435

**From:** Claudine Gueniot Voznick [<mailto:claudine.gueniot@sbcglobal.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 08, 2015 4:30 PM  
**To:** Kristina Kulczycki  
**Cc:** Dan Voznick  
**Subject:** Project No. R2015-00201-(5), Conditional Use Permit No. 201500009

Dear Ms. Kulczycki,

We have concerns about this conditional use permit and would like more information. Our work precludes us from attending the hearing date and time (Tuesday, Oct. 6, 2015, at 9:00 am) at 320 Temple Street, Hall of Records, Room 150, LA, CA 90012.

What are the specifics of this case and/or how may we proceed to find out more about it, if you are not the correct person to reach out to?

Kind regards,

Claudine Voznick

Gueniot Voznick

Altadena California 91001

Mobile (323) 528-8268

## Kristina Kulczycki

---

**From:** A Downer [ajdowner@ucanr.edu]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2015 3:51 PM  
**To:** Kristina Kulczycki  
**Subject:** RE: Project No. R2015-00201-(5). Conditional use permit no. 201500009

Given the size of the applicant's front yard I think they should respect the rear setback as directed for the Altadena community standards District. Encroaching closer to my mom's rear line will place a dominating two story building closer to her lot and compromise her privacy. So we formally object to the request to encroach. Thank you for the prompt and detailed response.

Jim

---

**From:** Kristina Kulczycki [mailto:kkulczycki@planning.lacounty.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2015 3:45 PM  
**To:** A Downer <ajdowner@ucanr.edu>  
**Subject:** RE: Project No. R2015-00201-(5). Conditional use permit no. 201500009

Mr. Downer,

Thank you for your comments. I will include your email in the supplemental package presented to the Hearing Officer. It will most likely be posted on our website (<http://planning.lacounty.gov/case/view/r2015-00201/>) by tomorrow afternoon.

In response to your questions:

We are also wondering if this is an addition or a second residence? What do the words "second unit" imply? The application is for the establishment of a second residential unit on the property. Per County Code Section 22.08.190, "Second unit" means a dwelling unit authorized by Part 16 of Chapter 22.52 that is either attached to or located on the same lot or parcel of land as an existing single-family residence.

While the rear yard setback request is for 19.5 feet we were wondering what the normal setback would be? The subject site is located in the R-1 zone. In most areas of the County, the setback for the R-1 zone is 15 feet, but in the Altadena Community Standards District, there is a more restrictive rear yard setback of 25 feet. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a reduction of 5.5 feet.

You can watch the hearing remotely by visiting our website: <http://planning.lacounty.gov/video>

If you have additional questions or comments, please feel free to contact me.

Regards,

Kristina

Kristina Kulczycki  
Senior Regional Planning Assistant  
Zoning Permits North

Department of Regional Planning

<http://planning.lacounty.gov>

213-974-6443

---

**From:** A Downer [<mailto:ajdowner@ucanr.edu>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 30, 2015 2:47 PM

**To:** Kristina Kulczycki

**Subject:** Project No. R2015-0021-(5). Conditional use permit no. 201500009

Ms. Kulczycki.

I am the son of Mary Downer who lives at 120 East Loma Alta Drive, directly north of (and adjacent to) the applicant of the above listed permit for 91 Wapello Street. My mother is opposed to the request for the variance to the side yard setback. We are also wondering if this is an addition or a second residence? It appears that construction has already begun on a large wall. What do the words "second unit" imply? Unfortunately my mother is at an age that she can not drive to attend meetings in Los Angeles. While the rear yard setback request is for 19.5 feet we were wondering what the normal setback would be?