

## PO Box 29155 Los Angeles, CA 90029-0155

July 31, 2013

Susan Swan, President Hollywood United Neighborhood Council P.O. Box 3272 Hollywood, CA, 90078

RE: 2240 Mountain Oak Dr., Case ZA 2013-444

Hi Susan,

We have received the revised drawings for the above-mentioned project with the file name "2013.07.23\_Mountain\_Oak\_Neightborhood\_Council\_Package.pdf" created on 7.26.13.

With reference to our previous position (see attached letter of 4.12.13):

- 1. We do see that the house conforms to the Oaks D limitations
- 2. We have been assured by the Architect that the grading quantities fall under what is allowed for the baseline hillside ordinance. We do not see that the proposed addition conforms to minimum front yard and side yard setbacks. (See attached marked up first and second floor drawings).
- 3. Per the last PLUM meeting, we understand the applicant is in agreement on this issue.
- 4. Per the last PLUM meeting, we understand the applicant is in agreement on this issue.
- 5. Per the last PLUM meeting, we understand the applicant is in agreement on this issue.
- 6. Per the last PLUM meeting, we understand the applicant is in agreement on this issue.
- 7. The proposed building is 83' long, 2 story's high and approximately 3' from the property line. While the existing house and garage building are close to the street, only a portion of the existing structures are 2 stories in height. While we appreciate the attempt to break down the scale of the façade with the new design modifications, we still feel this long façade that is only 3' from the property line will appear much like a tall wall on the street. There are no 2 story homes that run the entire lot frontage and are tight to the property line on this street, or perhaps the entire neighborhood. Making the front of the house more 3 dimensional, by conforming to the minimum front yard, and sideyard setbacks (see #2) would greatly improve the project.

Additionally, the issue of hillside stabilization came up in the last PLUM meeting, and the possibility of eliminating a retaining wall in the back yard. Considering that the

project is located in an earthquake induced landslide zone, we would like assurances that a retaining wall will be located in the backyard to stabilize the hillside.

At this time we have voted not to support the above referenced project. If items 2 and 7 were addressed, we could support the project with the above mentioned conditions.

Best regards,

Caroline Schweich

President

Attachments: 2 drawings with comments regarding remaining issues