



Armando Bencomo <armando.bencomo@lacity.org>

Public Comments Not Uploaded PLUM APPEAL STATEMENT FOR HEARING

1 message

Padraic Cassidy <padraic@padraiccassidy.com>

Tue, Sep 21, 2021 at 12:01 PM

Reply-To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org

To: Armando Bencomo <clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org>

Hi Armando for your records this is the text of my statement today:

PLUM APPEAL STATEMENT 9/21/21

Hi, my name is Padraic Cassidy, thank you commissioners for hearing my appeal. Please refer to the survey found in your council file 21-0656 submitted 9/20/21.

I have 3 points to make:

1. Appeal of Exemption

This project is part of a known succession of projects: single family dwellings on vacant lots fronting a previously unimproved substandard hillside street. The cumulative impact of this sequential development, was highlighted in the approval conditions of its immediately north neighbor at 617 Frontenac (ZA-2018-307-ZAD-SPP) when its Zoning Administrator (Maya Zaitzevsky) determined:

"When the adjacent vacant properties to the south are developed, the four-foot sidewalk can be continued, which will further improve the safety of the street for pedestrians and drivers."

2. Conditions Imposed

This adjacent project at 617 Frontenac was conditioned to include a street improvement, sidewalk, curb, and gutter within their 8' dedication. The Planner for 621 omitted conditions due to its B-Permit referral form stating it fronts an existing 20' street. This referral doesn't address this pavement's lack of permit or its placement only 6' beyond the centerline of the Public Way. The planner was limited to correcting the form's dedication to 8' and left the remaining description of curb, gutter, and sidewalks to the discretion of the Bureau of Engineering who in turn declared their hands tied absent explicit conditions by the planner, as at 617 Frontenac. After these conditions were not added by appeal to the Area Planning Commission, the BOE recommended I make this appeal to you. However, in that recorded APC hearing in April, all 3 commissioners expressed unanimous support of a sidewalk for this site, and sought assurance on the BOE enforcing the sidewalk, from both the city attorney and the planner.

3. Encroachment

This project's site plan proposes encroaching into the public way with both its driveway and entry stair access beyond the dedication in excess of 12" limit of LAMC Chapter 16, Sections 3201 and 3202. It fails to include at minimum a curb and gutter along its property line in place of the temporary asphalt berm at its side of the road. **I'm asking this Committee to condition the projects approval** to remedy the absence of explicit instructions and corrective measures in this project's review process so far, which would permanently impair the Public Way in a Very High Fire Hazard Zone.

A substantial adverse change in physical conditions is foreseeable in the cumulative impact of the city providing waivers from adjacent street improvements via the ZA process, preserving illegal and inferior roadwork by judging it aerially in the B-Permit referral form instead of relying on a database inquiry of engineered roadwork to identify the gaps and/or properly pave previously unimproved streets.

As long as our city relies on individual developers to build previously unimproved streets in our Public Way, it is imperative all of the oversight committees supervise this work in a coordinated manner, to the best of their ability, without restriction.

Of course this is too complex a problem to solve within the limits of this hearing. I'm happy to answer any questions and share my own experiences improving the road for my house directly across the street.

Thanks for including it in the file and your assistance in preparation for the hearing.
Padraic

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