



Daniel Luna &lt;daniel.luna@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Public Comments Not Uploaded Council File 24-1136 - 1904-1906 Preuss Rd - Responses to Appeals

1 message

---

**Kevin Scott** <kevin@bsilveira.associates>  
Reply-To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org  
To: clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org

Thu, May 29, 2025 at 2:53 PM

Hello,

Please find attached the project team's responses to the appeals filed in this case, to be heard at PLUM 6/10/25. Thank you.

--

**Kevin Scott**

*Associate Planner/Policy Analyst*

M: 651.210.3652

---

**Brian Silveira & Associates** | Venice, California | bsilveira.associates



---

**1904 Preuss Rd - Responses to May 2025 Appeals.pdf**

315K

## Appeal Justification from Meyer Schwarzstein and Susan Kahn

We live at 1902 Preuss Road, neighboring 1904 Preuss Road, the site of the intended construction.

We have filed appeals several times and all of them have been rejected. We understand that we need more housing, and we have never objected to the development for its own sake.

In the past, we raised concerns shared by our neighbors: traffic, safety, etc. but, given the political demand for new development, we are aware that you are not given the power to address them.

We have also wondered why our neighborhood is being so heavily developed while so much of Los Angeles is going untouched. The zoning of our house was changed by the city while we lived here. Our question is, why can't all of LA be developed like our neighborhood? If the State of California and City of Los Angeles are throwing out the rules when it comes to development, why is it only limited to certain areas? Shouldn't all neighborhoods be treated equally? A rejection of our appeal will enshrine this inequity.

*As the Appellant states, both the State of California and the City of Los Angeles have recognized the urgent need for housing. While there are some exceptions, in general, the Appellant is also correct to point out that single family-zoned areas are largely not subject to laws such as the State Density Bonus Law, and the City of Los Angeles Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP).*

*While this project does use the State Density Bonus Law to allow for a front yard setback reduction, it is otherwise zoning-compliant and does not take advantage of that law or any local program which would allow it to be much larger.*

Those issues are general to our neighborhood, but we have concerns particular to our situation:

1. The new development will encroach on our area, blocking solar panels we installed with the city and state's blessing and support.
  - a. It's unclear to us why you are de facto encouraging developers to block our ability to generate power from alternative energy sources. Is that not a priority for the city? The state?
  - b. And what about the financial impact? It will cost us more money than it does now to have the required amount of electricity. And, if we choose to replace our system, the cost is likely to be more than \$30,000.

If you reject this appeal, the statement your agency will be making is that development is more important than all those things. Common citizens like us will not be provided any mitigation of damages from the developer and we will be forced to pollute our environment more than we do now.

*The Applicant, having previously commissioned a shade study to determine the effects of the proposed structures' shadows on the Appellant's property, acknowledges that during the winter months, the Appellant's rooftop solar panels may produce less electricity. There is no State or City law that obligates a developer to compensate neighboring property owners for potential effects that a new structure may have on those property owners' ability to generate solar power. However, the Applicant, sensitive to the*

concerns of the Appellant, offered to purchase the Appellant a battery, valued at over \$5,000, in order to mitigate some of the potential loss in solar generation capacity. Although this battery would not affect the solar panels' ability to collect sunlight in the winter months, it would allow the Appellant to store excess electricity produced during the daytime year-round, and use that electricity at night—an option that is not currently available with the Appellant's existing solar power equipment.

The Appellant also mentions additional pollution related to reduced ability to generate electricity from solar panels. A vast amount of research—including a recent policy white paper published by Sunrise Movement LA and other local organizations—shows that densification of existing developed areas can have dramatic emissions reductions, when compared to concentrating needed development in farther flung areas.

The paper states “infill housing is one of the best tools that cities and counties have to fight climate change. Building compact, walkable, and transit-oriented housing greatly reduces greenhouse gas emissions and prevents the low-density sprawl that destroys wild habitat. Denser multifamily housing is so environmentally effective that UC Berkeley’s CoolClimate Network emphatically states that “infill housing is probably the single most impactful measure that cities could take to reduce their emissions,” and “Compact communities produce less greenhouse gas emissions by allowing people to choose from an abundance of transportation options, including public transit, lessening their dependence on cars. Communities dominated by single-family homes require driving—even for the most mundane daily errand—because destinations are spread far apart. In contrast, location-efficient multifamily housing allows people to live closer to schools, jobs, and places of worship, encouraging walking, biking, or public transit use, drastically reducing their carbon emissions. This isn’t theoretical either: research shows that every 1% increase in urban population density cuts per capita CO2 emissions by 0.8%.”

From: An environmental policy white paper *Infill housing & land use as a tool to fight climate change* ([Link](#)).

While the Applicant can understand the inconvenience posed by new development, the Applicant has expended considerable effort working with the Appellant over the past year to address his concerns, and does not believe it is appropriate to compensate the Appellant beyond what was previously offered.

2. Our daughter is terminally ill, and she plans to be in hospice in our house. That will likely overlap with the development. The developers have told us that they will not take her needs into consideration. This is one more example of how the city and state have given developers the ability to override the needs of any individuals. A rejection of our appeal will clearly articulate your agency’s lack of compassion and concern for the individual citizens of this city.

The Applicant has deep sympathy for the Appellant and his family in what must be an incredible time of grief. The Applicant met with the Appellant in his home to discuss construction impacts and the Applicant offered in good faith to mitigate the construction and noise impacts during sensitive times.

As the project is now facing its third round of appeals and prepares for its fifth public hearing, the project's ability to remain viable in the face of so many delays is limited.

## Appeal justification from Arielle and Faye Mandell

Dear Councilmembers,

I am writing as a neighbor and long-time resident of the community surrounding Preuss Road to voice my opposition to the proposed development at 1904–1906 S. Preuss Road. While I understand the need for new housing, this particular project raises significant concerns regarding traffic safety, inappropriate use of infrastructure, and environmental risk that would negatively affect those of us who already live here.

### Traffic & Alley Impact

The plan includes 12 units with two-car garages, potentially adding over two dozen vehicles to a small, residential street already prone to congestion. More troubling is the proposed use of the alley for primary vehicle access. This alley is narrow, lacks proper sightlines, and is currently used in a limited and low-speed fashion by nearby residents. Turning it into a de facto street will severely disrupt the safety and privacy of adjacent homes. It's simply not built to handle that kind of daily volume.

*The Los Angeles Department of Transportation has reviewed the proposed project, including its vehicular circulation plan, and did not find that the ingress and egress of vehicles through the alley would create a hazard to any properties or road users along the streets. However, the Applicant is willing to work with CD 10 to address any perceived issues with alley access.*

### Pedestrian & Community Safety

Preuss Road and its connecting alleyways are not equipped to support this increased activity. There are no sidewalks in the alley, meaning pedestrians—particularly children and seniors—would be at risk as more vehicles pass through what was once a quiet, limited-access space. This raises serious concerns about collisions, injuries, and overall pedestrian safety.

*For properties that abut an alley, LADOT typically mandates that vehicular access be provided from the alley rather than from the primary street. This helps to minimize disruptions to pedestrian pathways and reduces conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians on the main street. LADOT has reviewed the proposed project including its circulation plan and has not determined that any unusual hazards exist. As part of its development, the project will widen the existing alley from 15 feet to 17.5 feet in order to complete a 10-foot wide half alley. In order to complete the 20-foot wide full alley, the property located at 1905 Shenandoah Street would need to dedicate a 2.5-foot wide strip of the rear portion of their lot that abuts the alley.*

*Furthermore, it is well-documented across Traffic Engineering and Urban Planning studies that narrower roadways are safer and more effective at preventing speeding and cut-through traffic. In fact, current policy initiatives at the City and State level reinforce this idea.*

*In 2023, the Los Angeles City Council Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) committee unanimously approved a measure to end automatic road widenings triggered by new development, in part to create safer streets. The City has been implementing its revised guidance to reduce automatic roadway widenings since November 2024.*

## Environmental & Geotechnical Concerns

This area is not flat terrain—it sits on a slope that has shown signs of instability in the past. Excavation and grading for a development of this size could compromise soil integrity, increase runoff during heavy rains, and possibly affect nearby foundations. These aren't hypothetical risks—they're real possibilities in hillside communities like ours. Flooding, erosion, and property damage are all foreseeable outcomes if proper environmental assessments are overlooked or dismissed.

*Soils engineering explorations were completed by a Geotechnical Engineer at the proposed project site on April 8, 2017 and January 24, 2022. A subsequent Soils Engineering Exploration Report was prepared for the property on March 24, 2023.*

*Geotechnical explorations of the site included excavating 5 hand-dug test pits up to 20 feet deep and field mapping. Samples of the earth materials encountered were returned to the laboratory for testing and analysis. Downhole observation of the earth materials was performed by the project geologist.*

*The report concludes that no trace of a fault is located on the site nor is the site located within a zone with potential for liquefaction or landsliding. It goes on to state "Due to the nature and density of the earth materials underlying the subject property and the depth to groundwater, earthquake-induced liquefaction, consolidation, and differential settlement are not likely to occur on the site." Furthermore, the report, completed by Schick Geotechnical, Inc., concludes "Based upon the referenced exploration, it is the finding of SGI that the proposed structures is <sic> feasible from a soils engineering standpoint provided the advice and recommendations contained in this report are included in the plans and are properly implemented during construction."*

*The Soils Engineering Exploration Report was submitted to the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS) Grading Division and approved by the same on May 5, 2023 (Log # 125722). The LADBS approval letter contains requirements upon which the acceptability of the referenced reports are conditioned. Among those requirements are conditions that will assure the site's geological stability including:*

*2. The project engineering geologist shall observe all final removal excavations to verify that the conclusions of the current fault investigation are correct and that no fault trace or evidence of ground deformation are exposed in the excavation. Each panel of the shoring excavation shall be logged prior to the installation of lagging and a field memo documenting the panel has been logged shall be prepared for review by the Deputy Grading Inspector and Building Inspector(s). A supplemental report that summarizes the geologist's observations shall be submitted to the Grading Division of the Department upon completion of the excavations. If evidence of faulting is observed, the Grading Division shall be notified and a site meeting scheduled.*

*4. Approval shall be obtained from the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, Development Services and Permits Program for the proposed removal of support and/or retaining slopes adjoining the public way (3307.3.2).*

*10. All man-made fill shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent of the maximum dry density of the fill material per the latest version of ASTM D 1557. Where cohesionless soil having less than 15 percent finer than 0.005 millimeters is used for fill,*

*it shall be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent relative compaction based on maximum dry density...*

*11. Existing uncertified fill shall not be used for support of footings, concrete slabs, or new fill.*

*12. Drainage in conformance with the provisions of the Code shall be maintained during and subsequent to construction.*

*13. Grading shall be scheduled for completion prior to the start of the rainy season, or detailed temporary erosion control plans shall be filed in a manner satisfactory to the Grading Division of the Department and the Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering, B-Permit Section, for any grading work in excess of 200 cubic yards.*

*14. All loose foundation excavation material shall be removed prior to commencement of framing. Slopes disturbed by construction activities shall be restored.*

*16. Temporary excavations that remove lateral support to the public way, adjacent property, or adjacent structure shall be supported by shoring, as recommended.*

*18. The soils engineer shall review and approve the shoring plans prior to the issuance of the permit.*

*19. Prior to the issuance of the permits, the soils engineer and or the structural designer shall evaluate the surcharge loads used in the report calculations for the design of the retaining walls and shoring. If the surcharge loads used in the calculations do not conform to the actual surcharge loads, the soil engineer shall submit a supplementary report with revised recommendations to the department for approval.*

*20. Shoring shall be designed for a minimum EFP of 67 PCF; All surcharge loads shall be included into the design as recommended.*

*21. shoring shall be designed for a maximum lateral deflection of 0.5 inch, as recommended.*

*22. A shoring monitoring program shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the soils engineer.*

*23. All foundations shall derive entire support from native undisturbed alluvial terrace soils, as recommended and approved by the geologist and soils engineer by inspection.*

*24. Foundations adjacent to a descending slope steeper than three to one (horizontal to vertical, closed parentheses, and gradient shall be a minimum distance of 1/3 the vertical height of the slope, but need not exceed 40 feet measured horizontally from the. Bottom to the face of the slope.*

*25. Buildings adjacent to ascending slopes steeper than 3H:1V in gradient shall be set back from the toe of the slope a level distance measured perpendicular to slope contours equal to one-half the vertical height of the slope, but need not exceed 15 feet.*

26. Footings supported on approved compacted fill or expansive soil shall be reinforced with a minimum of four ( 4 ), ½-inch diameter (#4) deformed reinforcing bars. Two (2) bars shall be placed near the bottom and two (2) bars placed near the top of the footing.

27. The foundation/slab design shall satisfy all requirements of the Information Bulletin P/BC 2017-116 "Foundation Design for Expansive Soils."

29. Concrete floor slabs placed on expansive soil shall be placed on a 4-inch fill of coarse aggregate or on a moisture barrier membrane. The slabs shall be at least 4 inches thick, as recommended, and shall be reinforced with ½-inch diameter (#4) reinforcing bars spaced a maximum of 16 inches on center each way.

30. The seismic design shall be based on a Site Class D, as recommended. All other seismic design parameters shall be reviewed by LADBS building plan check.

31. Retaining walls shall be designed for the lateral earth pressures specified in the section titled 'Retaining Walls' starting on page 9 of the 03/24/2023 report. All surcharge loads shall be included into the design.

32. Retaining walls higher than 6 feet shall be designed for lateral earth pressure due to earthquake motions as specified on the wall pressure analysis of the reference report.

33. All retaining walls shall be provided with a standard surface backdrain system and all drainage shall be conducted in a non-erosive device to the street in an acceptable manner.

34. With the exception of retaining walls designed for hydrostatic pressure, all retaining walls shall be provided with a subdrain system to prevent possible hydrostatic pressure behind the wall. Prior to issuance of any permit, the retaining wall subdrain system recommended in the soils report shall be incorporated into the foundation plan which shall be reviewed and approved by the soils engineer of record.

35. Installation of the subdrain system shall be inspected and approved by the soils engineer of record and the City grading/building inspector.

39. All roof, pad and deck drainage shall be conducted to the street in an acceptable manner in non-erosive devices or other approved location in a manner that is acceptable to the LADBS and the Department of Public Works; water shall not be dispersed on to descending slopes without specific approval from the Grading Division and the consulting geologist and soils engineer.

40. All concentrated drainage shall be conducted in an approved device and disposed of in a manner approved by the LA DBS.

43. Prior to pouring concrete, a representative of the consulting soils engineer shall inspect and approve the footing excavations.

45. Installation of shoring shall be performed under the inspection and approval of the soils engineer and deputy grading inspector.



*46. Prior to the placing of compacted fill, a representative of the soils engineer shall inspect and approve the bottom excavations.*

*47. No footing/slab shall be poured until the compaction report is submitted and approved by the grading division of the Department.*

*Furthermore, several new developments have been built on the same slope in the past thirteen years (see 1920 and 1934 Preuss Road above under Issue #2) and none have exacerbated urban runoff or caused landslides or erosion.*

#### Neighborhood Compatibility & Planning Inconsistencies

The design and scale of the project feel disconnected from the existing neighborhood character. Surrounding homes are primarily one or two stories, yet this development proposes three stories with rooftop elements that amount to a fourth level. The architectural style and height stand in stark contrast to nearby properties. Additionally, there appear to be inconsistencies with how the project aligns with the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan, especially regarding design guidelines and zoning expectations.

*The Applicant has made considerable changes to the design of the project since first discussing it with the Appellant, including lowering the overall maximum height to the zoning-compliant 45 feet, adding new and larger windows to the facade, increasing the setbacks around the roof decks, adding new landscaping for additional privacy, and changing the color and materials of the buildings.*

*Additionally, most of the buildings in the area immediately surrounding the subject property, an area zoned for multifamily housing, were built 60 to 100 years ago when demand for housing was much lower. In this current redevelopment cycle, it is likely that areas zoned for multifamily housing will see two-story single-family homes replaced with taller, denser housing typologies. As demonstrated by newer developments on the block, such as the small lot project at 1973 Preuss Rd, the Project is in line with the development trend of the neighborhood.*

*The area including and surrounding the project site is zoned for multifamily development. The project complies with the stated goals and policies of the Community Plan as follows:*

#### *West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan*

***Goal LU7: A community that promotes an environment of safe, inviting, secure and high-quality multi-family neighborhoods for all segments of the community.***

***Policy LU7-1: Address Diverse Resident Needs. Strive for the conservation/preservation of existing assisted affordable and non-assisted housing stock and in particular rent-stabilized units, and for the development of new housing, including restricted affordable housing, to address the diverse economic and physical needs of the existing residents and projected population of the Community Plan Area to the year 2030.***



*The proposed development's configuration as a small lot subdivision project encourages diversity of housing typology within this multifamily neighborhood. Many adjacent properties are single family homes on quarter-acre lots. As much of the cost of new housing comes from the cost of land, the reduced footprint of these new homes allows for a price point much lower than that of newly constructed homes on full-sized lots. Additionally, each small lot home contains an elevator, a feature not common among older homes, which will allow residents with physical mobility concerns to access the entirety of each multi-story house.*

**Policy LU7-3: Compliance with Design Guidelines. Recommend that new multi-family residential development be designed in accordance with the adopted Citywide Residential Design Guidelines.**

*The project was designed in accordance with the Citywide Design Guidelines as they pertain to pedestrian-first design, 360 degree design, and climate-adapted design.*

**Policy LU7-6: Community Engagement. Sponsors of new development projects should initiate early and frequent communication with community residents**

*The Project Team for the proposed development appeared before the South Robertson Neighborhood Council on two separate occasions, and has maintained sustained communication with several of the direct neighbors of the project regarding the project's design and parameters over the course of more than eight months before its public hearing, and the six months after it.*

**Goal LU9: A community of neighborhoods where social capital is promoted by ensuring the provision of adequate housing for all persons regardless of income, age, racial or ethnic background.**

**Policy LU9-1: Affordability. Prioritize housing that is affordable to a broad cross-section of income levels and that provides the ability to live near work and achieve homeownership.**

**Policy LU9-2: Mixed-income Neighborhoods. Strive to eliminate residential segregation and concentrations of poverty by promoting affordable housing that is integrated into mixed-income neighborhoods.**

**Policy LU9-5: Housing Near Schools. Strive to provide a range of housing types and affordable housing units around schools.**

*The project includes one unit reserved for Very Low Income Households, offering a rare home-ownership opportunity to a family that might not otherwise be able to find one. Additionally, the project is located in what the California Department of Housing and Community Development considers a "High Opportunity Area,"*

*meaning an area that features high quality schools, higher income residents, and significant numbers of jobs within several miles. Crescent Heights Elementary, Canfield Elementary, and Shenandoah Elementary schools and Hamilton High School are all nearby, as well as job centers associated with the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center.*

**Goal LU10: A community that supports cohesive neighborhoods and lifecycle housing to promote health, well-being and safety.**

***Policy LU10-5: Minimize Displacement. Encourage that new housing opportunities minimize displacement of existing residents, in particular extremely-low, very-low and low-income households.***

***Policy LU10-6: Increase Homeownership. Provide for development of townhouses and other similar condominium type housing units to increase homeownership options.***

***Policy LU10-9: Cluster Housing. Encourage clustering of housing units to help decrease the effective cost of land per dwelling unit and utilize the natural terrain to its best advantage.***

***Policy LU10-10: Moderate Income Homeownership. Allow for the creation of townhouse and condominium development through new construction, conversion or adaptive reuse in order to meet the demands of moderate income residents thereby increasing access to affordable, and moderate income homeownership opportunities.***

*The proposed development was reviewed by the Los Angeles Housing Department to ensure compliance with SB 330 and SB 8, legislation which, among other objectives, are designed to prevent displacement of lower income individuals. The project will provide eleven market rate for-sale units and one Very-Low-Income affordable unit. The creation of both the market rate units and the affordable unit will represent twelve new homeownership opportunities within the West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan, an area with considerable demand for new housing. The Affordable unit will allow a family which may otherwise have never had the opportunity to purchase a home the chance to do so. The market rate units, developed on lots a fraction of the size typical of new single family home construction, will allow for homeownership opportunities at a price point much lower than what is typical of new construction in the area.*

**Goal LU11: A community where new housing is located in a manner which reduces vehicular trips and makes it accessible to services and facilities.**

***Policy LU11-1: Higher Density Residential Near Transit. Encourage higher residential densities near commercial centers, light rail transit stations and major bus routes where public service facilities, utilities and topography will accommodate this development.***

*The proposed development is located within a mile or less of multiple public transportation options, including Metro Bus Line 617 at Robertson Blvd and Sawyer St approximately 375 feet away, providing direct linkages to multiple major employment and commerce centers including downtown Culver City, the Culver City E Line Station, Beverly Grove, Cedar Sinai, as well as other lines within the Metro Rail system. The project would be located within a mile of Metro Bus Line 17 with service to West Los Angeles VA Medical Center and UCLA and within a mile and a half of the future Metro Purple Line Station.*

*A vast amount of research—including a recent policy white paper published by Sunrise Movement LA and several Los Angeles-based nonprofit organizations—shows that densification of existing developed areas can have an enormous impact on a city's aggregate greenhouse gas emissions. It states "infill housing is one of the best tools that cities and counties have to fight climate change. Building compact, walkable, and transit-oriented housing greatly reduces greenhouse gas emissions and prevents the low-density sprawl that destroys wild habitat.*

*UC Berkeley's CoolClimate Network emphatically states that "infill housing is probably the single most impactful measure that cities could take to reduce their emissions," and "Compact communities produce less greenhouse gas emissions by allowing people to choose from an abundance of transportation options, including public transit, lessening their dependence on cars. Communities dominated by single-family homes require driving—even for the most mundane daily errand—because destinations are spread far apart. In contrast, location-efficient multifamily housing allows people to live closer to schools, jobs, and places of worship, encouraging walking, biking, or public transit use, drastically reducing their carbon emissions. This isn't theoretical either: research shows that every 1% increase in urban population density cuts per capita CO2 emissions by 0.8%."*

*West Adams-Baldwin Hills-Leimert Community Plan Multifamily Residential Design Guidelines*

***Site Planning G55. Main pedestrian entrances should be provided where they can be seen immediately from the primary street(s) of approach. In this regard, main pedestrian entrances should be prominent to the front of the building, providing views into an interior court- yard or focal within a landscaped front open space area. The entrance approach should further be emphasized by employing the use***

***of specialized paving treatments such as brick, tile or other high quality materials preferably set in sand or other pervious bedding.***

*The proposed project includes twelve small lot homes surrounding a central driveway. The two homes with frontage along Preuss Road have main entrances oriented toward the primary street of approach and decorated with finished cedar around the doorway and natural stones at the entryway. All other homes in the project orient their main entrances toward the common pedestrian walkways along the northernmost and southernmost boundaries of the project site.*

*An exhibit showing the primary entrance orientation along with the materials used to emphasize them is included with this submission. The front yard is landscaped with fraiser, box-leaved holly, and St. John's Wort bushes as well as Yoshino cherry trees and paved with permeable concrete.*

***G56: The design of all buildings should strive to be of a quality and character that improves community appearance by avoiding excessive variety and monotonous repetition. To achieve this, the volume of all buildings should be composed of a vocabulary of form and shapes that employ attractive and complementary building materials and architectural features.***

***G57. All exterior building walls should try to provide a break in the plane, or a change in material at least every 20 feet in length and every 15 feet in vertical height. This may be achieved through simple articulation or the introduction of an architectural detail.***

***G58. In general, plaster or stucco finishes should not occupy more than 60% of the surface area of any exterior elevation.***

***G59. All buildings should feature at least three types of complimentary building materials to exterior building facades.***

*The project's design employs a varied facade that features dark grey ribbed metal paneling, light grey stucco, and vertical and horizontal cedar paneling, punctuated by black metal-framed articulated windows, including large three-story windows on the street-facing side of the project. The design allows for regular breaks in plane while avoiding excessive variety.*

***G60. Stand alone trash enclosures that are not located within the parking garage of the building should be designed to be compatible with the architectural vocabulary of the building and enclosed by a minimum five foot high, decorative masonry wall.***

***G61. All projects should provide a minimum of one trash area for every ten units.***

***G62. Each trash area should have a separate area for the containment of trash receptacles.***

***G63. Any trash area should be located no more than 200 feet from the most remote unit it serves. The trash and recycling receptacles serving the proposed development are located within an enclosed area at the rear of the property adjacent to the alleyway. The enclosure is designed with materials that are compatible with the architectural vocabulary of the building and enclosed by a minimum five foot high, decorative masonry wall. The development provides one trash area for every ten units based on its provision of 12 units (i.e.  $0.1 \times 12 = 1.2$  which rounds down to one trash area provided). The furthest unit served by the trash receptacle area is approximately 160 feet away from it.***

***G64. All freestanding walls should be designed to be compatible with the overall architecture of the site and preferably provide architectural interest either through a break in the plane, or a change in material, or an opening in the surface of the wall; in general at least every 20 feet in linear length, or, through articulation or architectural detailing, or other means.***

*The proposed development does not include any freestanding walls.*

***G65. Wherever above grade parking is provided, architectural perforations or other wall openings should be provided to allow sunlight to penetrate the interior parking area and to break up the exterior plane of the parking wall. In general, at least 10% of the exterior wall surface should consist of openings, windows, doors, etc.***

*The proposed project provides two parking spaces per dwelling unit in a garage situated on the ground floor of each dwelling unit. The garages all contain window openings to allow sunlight to penetrate the interior parking area and to break up the exterior plane of the parking wall.*

***G66. Wherever above grade parking abuts any public street, a minimum 5 foot landscaped setback should be provided along the exterior walls of the parking.***

*The project's proposed parking garages do not abut any public streets.*

Community Opposition Ignored

This isn't just my concern. Many of my neighbors, as well as the local neighborhood council, have raised objections. Unfortunately, the planning process seems to have pushed forward without meaningfully addressing these voices. Residents deserve to be part of the decision-making in projects that reshape the environment we live in every day.

*As stated above, the Applicant has made considerable changes to the design of the project since first discussing it with the Appellant, including lowering the overall maximum height to the zoning-compliant 45 feet, adding new and larger windows to the facade, increasing the setbacks around the roof decks, adding new landscaping for additional privacy, and changing the color and materials of the buildings. The Applicant has shown a willingness to work with the neighbors and larger community throughout the decision making process.*