


		<b>CITY OF LOS ANGELES</b> California	
		Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council	
<p>DALE GIBSON president</p> <p>BILLY HAYS vp administration</p> <p>CRIS HUGHES vp communications</p> <p>KEVIN DAVIS treasurer</p> <p>ROYAN HERMAN recording secretary</p> <p>NANCY WOODRUFF correspondence secretary</p>	<p>BOARD MEMBERS</p> <p>BART PAUL CHERYL GRESLIE CILE BORMAN ERWING DAVIS FRITZ BRONNER JACOB LOHR JOHN BLUE HERGET KEN KEEBLE TERRY KAISER</p>	 <p>ANTONIO R. VILLARAIGOSA MAYOR</p>	<p>9747 WHEATLAND BLVD, SHADOW HILLS, CA 91040 818-353-2000 www.ftdnc.org</p> <p>C/O DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT Attn: Barry Stone Project Coordinator 340 E. 2<sup>nd</sup> St., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, Ca, 90012 213-485-1585 <a href="mailto:barry.stone@lacity.org">barry.stone@lacity.org</a></p>

May 21, 2009

Claudia Rodriguez, City Planning Assistant  
Robert Z. Duenas, Senior City Planner  
6262 Van Nuys Blvd., Suite 351  
Van Nuys, CA 91401

**CASE NO. DIR-2009-1089-SPP**

9129 W. La Tuna Canyon Road, Sun Valley, CA 91352  
CEQA Clearance: [ENV-2009-1090-CE](#)  
Plan Area Sun Valley – La Tuna Canyon  
Neighborhood Council: Foothill Trails District  
Zone A2-1-1C

Project Applicant: Rafael Dieppa  
9129 La Tuna Canyon Road  
Sun Valley, CA 91352  
818-357-1733

***At the Regularly Scheduled Board Meeting on May 21, 2009 of the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council, the Board approved a motion to SUPPORT the Appeal as presented by the La Tuna Canyon Community Association regarding this project. In its Appeal the Association states:***

This appeal rejects in its entirety the approval of the proposed accessory building. The building is not in compliance with the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Plan and the municipal code for the City of Los Angeles. The plans call for the building to be built in the front half of the lot, in front of the existing house. This is an unacceptable site design and is in violation with many City codes and the Specific Plan. This storage building is also too large. The proposed 2100sq.ft. building exceeds that of the existing house. This also in violation of City Codes

Planning did not address the following sections in the San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Plan.

**Section 2. PURPOSE**

3. Scenic Highway Corridors Viewshed Protection measures establish standards for **site design**, landscaping (including parking lot landscaping), and signage to assure that the design of projects and related improvements within designated scenic highway corridors

*preserve, complement and/or enhance the views from these corridors.*

The proposed design has a large accessory building in the front of the property. Well within view from the street. The accessory building is of a standard steel construction with a gable roof. This type of building would be appropriate only in a manufacturing or industrial zone. The location of this building would be consistent on Tuxford St. where all the auto dismantling and dumps are located. This design would not be consistent nor compatible in any residential area within the City much less within a scenic highway corridor view shed protected area..

*Accessory buildings are a special case in that their permitted location is expressly addressed in the Code. They are permitted to be located in required side and rear yards under certain specified conditions. (Code item, Training Officer memo 11-12-91)*

The proposed building should be denied due to the inappropriate location. If any accessory building should be allowed it must meet the required standards within the Code. An accessory building can be built in the rear or side yard. If in the side yard can not be closer than 75 ft. from the front lot line

The building is too large

### **Section 12.03 Accessory Building. Definition.**

*The definition of Accessory Building in the code. It states in part: "A detached **subordinate** building, the use of which is customarily incidental to that of the main dwelling...". At issue here is the interpretation of the word subordinate. Webster's dictionary defines it as something placed in a lower rank or class; **inferior in order**, nature, importance etc. In this definition, physical characteristics are not involved. This would support the concept that the intensity of use and other characteristics are relevant when determining what constitutes a subordinate building but not the building height and/or stories.*

*Further, L.A.M.C. Section 12.21C5(f) LADBS has for a long time, interpreted that the cumulative **floor area of all accessory buildings cannot exceed the area of the main dwelling**. This policy is valid since intensity of use is generally dependent on floor area.*

The accessory building should be denied because the area will be 2100sq.ft. and the area of the existing house is 1308sq.ft.. This makes the main dwelling the subordinate structure on the site. The accessory use area would be the dominant use on this lot not only because of it's size but because of the placement of the structures in relation the house.

### **Section 4. DEFINITIONS**

**Scenic Highway Corridor.** *The area extending 500 feet on either side of the centerline of the roadway of each of the Scenic Highways.*

**Visible.** *Able to be seen from the ROW of any of the Scenic Highways as determined by the Director of Planning or the Advisory Agency.*

The proposed design of this site places the accessory building in the front of the lot which is not consistent with this rural equestrian community or any residential area in the City of Los Angeles. Within the Scenic Preservation Plan the visual impacts should be considered of any development from 500' from the center of the street. This building is visible from either side of the property and directly in front. This building will be a permanent eyesore within a scenically protected area.

This is a residential/rural neighborhood where accessory buildings, barns, and storage containers are located to the rear or the side of homes. There isn't one storage building of this kind that fronts La Tuna Canyon Rd. and approval of this structure would be inconsistent and incompatible for any residential neighborhood and particularly egregious within San Gabriel/Verdugo Mountains Scenic Preservation Plan.

The right to have an accessory building is not guaranteed in a residential area. Unless the proposed accessory building strictly conforms to the municipal code in which it is being proposed. This is the third appeal in the last couple months, from this neighborhood, of approvals that are inconsistent with the Scenic Preservation Plan. If approvals of this sort continue to be allowed, then our neighborhood and the scenic corridor will deteriorate in value.

***Respectfully submitted,***

***Dale Gibson, President  
Foothill Trails District Neighborhood Council***

CC  
La Tuna Canyon Community Association  
Jim Dantona CD 2  
Adolf Egyed