

OFFICE OF ZONING ADMINISTRATION
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 763
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4801
(213) 978-1318

ESTINEH MAILIAN
CHIEF ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

ASSOCIATE ZONING ADMINISTRATORS

JACK CHIANG
HENRY CHU
TIM FARGO
JONATHAN A. HERSHEY, AICP
PHYLLIS NATHANSON
CHRISTINE M. SAPONARA
COURTNEY SHUM
CHRISTINA TOY LEE
JORDANN TURNER

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



KAREN BASS
MAYOR

LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT
OF CITY PLANNING
EXECUTIVE OFFICES

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
DIRECTOR

KEVIN J. KELLER, AICP
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

SHANA M.M. BONSTIN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

HAYDEE URITA-LOPEZ
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

ARTHI L. VARMA, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

LISA M. WEBBER, AICP
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

planning.lacity.org

November 14, 2025

Last Day to File an Appeal: December 1, 2025

Yaron Levy (A)(O)
High Point Venture, LLC
1180 Beverly Drive, Ste. 301
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Aaron Belliston (R)
BMR Enterprises
5250 Lankershim Boulevard, Ste. 500
North Hollywood, CA 91601

CASE NO. ZA-2023-2926-ZAA-HCA
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S
ADJUSTMENT

Related Case: AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA
23139 and 23141 West Collins Street
Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland
Hills – West Hills Community Plan
Zone: RA-1
C.D: 3
D.M.: 174-B-093
CEQA: ENV-2023-2927-CE
Legal Description: Lot 34, Tract 9529

Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act, I hereby DETERMINE:

based on the whole of the administrative record, that the Project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15332, Class 32 (In-Fill Development Projects) and there is no substantial evidence demonstrating that any exceptions contained in Section 15300.2 of the State CEQA Guidelines regarding location, cumulative impacts, significant effects or unusual circumstances, scenic highways, or hazardous waste sites, or historical resources applies.

Pursuant to Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 12.28, I hereby APPROVE:

an Adjustment to allow a 20-foot lot width in lieu of the minimum 70 feet otherwise required in the RA Zone, in conjunction with Parcel B of Parcel Map AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA.

Upon the following additional terms and conditions:

1. All other use, height and area regulations of the Municipal Code and all other applicable government/regulatory agencies shall be strictly complied with in the development and use of the property, except as such regulations are herein specifically varied or required.
2. The use and development of the property shall be in substantial conformance with the plot plan and floor plan submitted with the application and marked Exhibit "A", except as may be revised as a result of this action.
3. The authorized use shall be conducted at all times with due regard for the character of the surrounding district, and the right is reserved to the Zoning Administrator to impose additional corrective Conditions, if, in the Administrator's opinion, such Conditions are proven necessary for the protection of persons in the neighborhood or occupants of adjacent property.
4. All graffiti on the site shall be removed or painted over to match the color of the surface to which it is applied within 24 hours of its occurrence.
5. A copy of the first page of this grant and all Conditions and/or any subsequent appeal of this grant and its resultant Conditions and/or letters of clarification shall be printed on the building plans submitted to the Department of City Planning and the Department of Building and Safety for purposes of having a building permit issued at any time during the term of this grant.
6. Within 30 days of the effective date of this grant, a covenant acknowledging and agreeing to comply with all the terms and conditions established herein shall be recorded in the County Recorder's Office. The agreement (standard master covenant and agreement form CP-6770) shall run with the land and shall be binding on any subsequent owners, heirs or assigns. The agreement with the conditions attached must be submitted to the Development Services Center for approval before being recorded. After recordation, a certified copy bearing the Recorder's number and date shall be provided to the Development Services Center for inclusion in the case file.
7. **Authorization.** Authorized herein is the use and maintenance of a 20-foot lot width in lieu of the minimum 70 feet otherwise required in the RA Zone, in conjunction with Parcel B of Parcel Map AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA.
8. Except as granted above, no other deviation from the Zone Code requirements or limitations have been requested or granted herein.
9. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of approval set forth in parcel Map No. AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA.

10. INDEMNIFICATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF LITIGATION COSTS

Applicant shall do all of the following:

- a. Defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City from any and all actions against the City relating to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of this entitlement, including but not limited to, an action to attack, challenge, set aside, void, or otherwise modify or annul the approval of the entitlement, the environmental review of the entitlement, or the approval of subsequent permit decisions, or to claim personal property damage, including from inverse condemnation or any other constitutional claim.
- b. Reimburse the City for any and all costs incurred in defense of an action related to or arising out of, in whole or in part, the City's processing and approval of the entitlement, including but not limited to payment of all court costs and attorney's fees, costs of any judgments or awards against the City (including an award of attorney's fees), damages, and/or settlement costs.
- c. Submit an initial deposit for the City's litigation costs to the City within 10 days' notice of the City tendering defense to the Applicant and requesting a deposit. The initial deposit shall be in an amount set by the City Attorney's Office, in its sole discretion, based on the nature and scope of action, but in no event shall the initial deposit be less than \$50,000. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (b).
- d. Submit supplemental deposits upon notice by the City. Supplemental deposits may be required in an increased amount from the initial deposit if found necessary by the City to protect the City's interests. The City's failure to notice or collect the deposit does not relieve the Applicant from responsibility to reimburse the City pursuant to the requirement in paragraph (b).
- e. If the City determines it necessary to protect the City's interest, execute an indemnity and reimbursement agreement with the City under terms consistent with the requirements of this condition.

The City shall notify the applicant within a reasonable period of time of its receipt of any action and the City shall cooperate in the defense. If the City fails to notify the applicant of any claim, action, or proceeding in a reasonable time, or if the City fails to reasonably cooperate in the defense, the applicant shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold harmless the City.

The City shall have the sole right to choose its counsel, including the City Attorney's office or outside counsel. At its sole discretion, the City may

participate at its own expense in the defense of any action, but such participation shall not relieve the applicant of any obligation imposed by this condition. In the event the Applicant fails to comply with this condition, in whole or in part, the City may withdraw its defense of the action, void its approval of the entitlement, or take any other action. The City retains the right to make all decisions with respect to its representations in any legal proceeding, including its inherent right to abandon or settle litigation.

For purposes of this condition, the following definitions apply:

“City” shall be defined to include the City, its agents, officers, boards, commissions, committees, employees, and volunteers.

“Action” shall be defined to include suits, proceedings (including those held under alternative dispute resolution procedures), claims, or lawsuits. Actions include actions, as defined herein, alleging failure to comply with any federal, state or local law.

Nothing in the definitions included in this paragraph are intended to limit the rights of the City or the obligations of the Applicant otherwise created by this condition.

OBSERVANCE OF CONDITIONS - TIME LIMIT - LAPSE OF PRIVILEGES

All terms and conditions of the approval shall be fulfilled before the use may be established. The instant authorization is further conditional upon the privileges being utilized within three years after the effective date of approval and, if such privileges are not utilized or substantial physical construction work is not begun within said time and carried on diligently to completion, the authorization shall terminate and become void.

TRANSFERABILITY

This authorization runs with the land. In the event the property is to be sold, leased, rented or occupied by any person or corporation other than yourself, it is incumbent upon you to advise them regarding the conditions of this grant.

VIOLATIONS OF THESE CONDITIONS, A MISDEMEANOR

Section 13A.2.7.G. of Chapter 1A of the Los Angeles Municipal Code provides:

“A Quasi-judicial action or any conditional approval granted by the Director, pursuant to the authority of this Chapter or Chapter I. (General Provisions and Zoning) of this Code shall become effective upon utilization of any portion of the privilege, and the owner and applicant shall immediately comply with its conditions. The violation of any condition imposed by the Director, Zoning Administrator, Area Planning Commission, City Planning Commission, or City Council in connection with the granting of any action taken pursuant to the authority of this Chapter or Chapter I. (General Provisions and Zoning), shall

constitute a violation of this Chapter or Chapter I. (General Provisions and Zoning) and shall be subject to the same penalties as any other violation of this Code.”

Every violation of this determination is punishable as a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$2,500 or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

NOTICE

The applicant is further advised that subsequent contact regarding this determination must be with the staff assigned to this case. This would include clarification, verification of condition compliance and plans or building permit applications, etc., and shall be accomplished **BY APPOINTMENT ONLY**, in order to assure that you receive service with a minimum amount of waiting. You should advise any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After thorough consideration of the statements contained in the application, the plans submitted therewith, and the statements made at the public hearing on September 9, 2025, all of which are by reference made a part hereof, as well as knowledge of the property and surrounding district, I find that the requirements for authorizing a conditional use approval under the provisions of Section 12.28 of Chapter 1 and Section 13B.5.2. of Chapter 1A have been established by the following facts:

BACKGROUND

The subject property is a level, rectangular-shaped, interior, approximately 35,913 square-foot parcel of land with a 120-foot frontage on the north side of Collins Street. The property has an even width and depth of 120 feet and 299 feet, respectively.

The property is developed with a single-family dwelling, first constructed circa 1953, on the southern half of the lot, while the northern half remains generally unimproved.

The property is located within the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan area, and the associated General Plan Land Use Map designates the property for Very Low Low Density Residential land uses with corresponding Zones of RE20, RA, RE15, and RE11; a notation on the map further indicates that this is a horse keeping area. The property is zoned RA-1. The property is further located within an Equine Keeping area (ZI-2438), an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone, Special Grading Area (BOE Basic Grid Map A-13372), a Liquefaction area, and is approximately 12 kilometers from the Malibu Coast Fault.

The site is not within a Hillside Area, Flood Zone, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, Hazardous Waste/Border Zone, High Wind Velocity Area, or Methane Zone. The site is located within an Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone, Special Grading Area, and Liquefaction Zone. There are no oil wells on site. The site is located approximately 12 km from the Malibu Coast Fault. The site is not located within an

Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, Landslide Area, Preliminary Fault Rupture Study Area, or Tsunami Inundation Zone. The project site has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historic Resources, the Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monuments Register, and/or any local register; and was not found to be a potential historic resource based on the City's HistoricPlacesLA website or SurveyLA, the citywide survey of Los Angeles.

The applicant proposes to subdivide the lot into two, with Parcel A having a lot area of 17,600 square feet and Parcel B with a lot area of 18,313 square feet. On July 24, 2025, the Deputy Advisory Agency approved a lot split for a maximum of two lots under related Parcel Map No. AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA. The approval of the map requires the applicant to obtain a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow for a reduced mid-point lot width of 20 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 70 feet in the RA-1 Zone.

According to information submitted by the applicant:

Strict application of the zoning code requires the lot width as measured at the mid-point of the lot to meet the requirement of the lot width dimension required for the underlying zone. Denial of the request would unfairly prevent the applicant from enjoying reasonable use of the subject site. Such regulations however are written on a citywide basis and cannot consider individual unique characteristics which a specific parcel and its intended use may have. In this instance, the Code's desire to achieve compatibility between respective sites and the applicant's desire to provide a more functional configuration for eventual residential dwellings can be accommodated in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of the zoning regulations. The portion of the flag lot on which a building pad will be situated is 120 feet wide, which is 50 feet wider than the minimum lot width required for the zone of 70 feet. The only portion of the lot width which will be substandard is the 20-foot-wide roadway. Thus the dimension of the lot's building pad meets the intent of the code to have a minimum 70 foot lot width, the adjustment allows the access strip to be reduced to a 20-foot width while resolving the definition of the lot width in the municipal code.

The granting of the proposed adjustments do not impose any adverse impact on the adjoining or neighboring properties. Will result in a project with no adverse impacts from the proposed adjustment and no adverse impacts from environmental effects. Furthermore, there are numerous examples of the flag lot condition throughout the RA-1 zoning in the immediate vicinity of the proposed subdivision. None of the extant examples of the flag lot condition with an access strip containing a driveway to reach a wider lot in the rear has proven to adversely affect or degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare and safety.

While the [parcel map] Staff Report referenced several cases that were denied lot split. Those denials had other issues and had they been perfected should have resulted in approval of the maps or at least a more appropriate denial

under the law. Namely the decision maker failed to consider the broader context of the neighborhood and the significant development patterns that exist throughout the RA-1 area referred to as Walnut Acres. Instead, those prior denials rely on an overly generic assessment of prior flag lot conditions having been created by deed and not through an approved subdivision process. (AA-1997-7198-PMLA) While that may be true for some of the lots it is certainly not the case for all of the flag lots present, see detailed table below. The prior denials, and the staff report failed to include the many instances where lots flag lots were created and quite a number of those were done through an appropriate mapping process. Further, several of the lots that were created by deed have since been Approved for Development, which under the Subdivision Map Act would then require the City to issue, without condition, a Certificate of Compliance pursuant to the action the City took in recognizing the lot, pursuant to Section 66499.34(c). The numerous locations where this exists throughout the Walnut Acres neighborhood provide a clear and direct correlation to the development pattern of the neighborhood and the compatibility of the current request with the make-up of the neighborhood as it is.

Further, there are multiple State Laws on the books at this time that would allow the ministerial subdivision of this parcel demonstrating the legislative conditions encouraging these more efficient uses of land. This request complies with the zoning and density of the LAMC.

Addresses of flag lots are as follows. Notably, see the details related to the way in which the flag lots were created, nearly all having been done so in conformance with the Subdivision Map Act. This is a significant contrast to the findings made in the denied cases that were referenced in the staff report. Each lot with a recorded parcel map pursuant to the SMA is hyperlinked below. If further map references are located, we will provide an update to DCP.

- 23112 Hatteras St. DL-1963-589
- 22938 Hatteras St. AA-2025-3502-PMEX Approved in 2017 with flag lot condition
- 22942 Hatteras St. DL-1964-1185
- 23029 Hatteras St. YC 11681 OK Lot Split - Approved for Development
1965VN75337
- 23423 Hatteras St. Parcel Map 1291, recorded 1968
- 22847 Oxnard St.
- 23011 Oxnard St.
- 23015 Oxnard St. Parcel Map 4412, recorded 1980
- 23037 Oxnard St.
- 22905 Oxnard St. Parcel Map 6750, recorded 2000
- 23001 Calvert St. Parcel Map 7118, recorded 1995
- 23032 Calvert St.
- 23020 Calvert St. Parcel Map 5067, recorded 1982
- 22968 Calvert St.
- 22833 Calvert St.
- 22841 Calvert St. Parcel Map 4919, recorded 1981
- 23251 Collins St.

CASE NO. ZA-2023-2926-ZAA-HCA

- 23323 Collins St. Parcel Map 6288, recorded 1989
- 23347 Collins St. Parcel Map 346, recorded 1966
- 23308 Collins St.
- 23346 Collins St.
- 23418 Collins St.
- 23445 Collins St. Parcel Map 6577, recorded 1991
- 22725 Califa St.
- 23116 Califa St. AA-2010-232-PMEX Approved in 2010 with flag lot condition
- 23442 Califa St.
- 23458 Califa St. Parcel Map 2695, recorded 1973
- 23554 Califa St.
- 22933 Collins St. AA-2015-3502-PMEX Approved in 2017 with flag lot condition
- 23526 Collins St.
- 23532 Collins St.
- 23111 Erwin St. AA-2004-4842-PMLA and ZA-2004-4849-ZAA Approved with flag lot condition and no street improvements. Parcel Map 4842, recorded 2005
- 23054 Erwin St. AA-2005-5684-PMLA-1A and ZA-2006-0463-ZAA Approved May 11, 2006, with flag lot condition, berm and 18-foot 1/2 roadway, no curb/gutter/sidewalk/streetlight. Approved for 20' midpoint -lot width in lieu of 70'. Appeal denied. Parcel Map 5684, recorded 2010
- 23127 Erwin St. Parcel Map 1748, recorded 1970
- 23122 Sylvan St.
- 23210 Burbank Blvd.
- 23238 Burbank Blvd. Parcel Map 6581, recorded 1994
- 23230 Dolorosa St.
- 23237 Dolorosa St. AA-2003-5845-PMLA Approved 2004 with flag lot condition with Modification approved in 2011 to delete sidewalk requirement, only curb and gutter. Parcel Map 5845, recorded 2003

The applicant submitted plans stamped by LADBS Plan Check on February 5, 2024, that shows the applicant is proposing to construct a 5,013 square foot, two-story single family dwelling with a maximum height of 25 feet and six inches on Parcel A. Additionally, Parcel A will include covered patios, 310 square foot trellis, 196 square foot recreation room, 680 square foot Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit, and pool. Both the stamped plans and preliminary parcel map show Parcel B to remain vacant with no proposed construction.

The applicant has submitted an Arborist Report prepared by Kay J. Greeley, dated October 18, 2023, indicating that the property contains three protected trees – one Southern California Black Walnut, one Valley Oak, and one California Western Sycamore – as well as nine mature, significant trees. According to the report, one mature Orange tree is proposed for removal, and six additional mature trees along with one protected California Western Sycamore tree located along the proposed rear property line of Parcel A will experience encroachment into their protected zones to accommodate construction on Parcel A.

The applicant has submitted a Soils Report Approval Letter, Log #125898, issued by the Department of Building and Safety on May 22, 2023.

Within the broader Walnut Acres community, there exists a mix of flag lots. Many such lots exist without formal approval by the Advisory Agency and appeal to have been created by deed instead of a subdivision review and approval action. There are also flag lots that were created by formal subdivision action. Some of those flag lots are configured in such a way as they comply with the minimum width requirement of the Zone, some do not. Previously approved parcel map subdivisions resulting in flag lots may have simply formalized existing deed-cut lot configurations, but this cannot be confirmed.

Surrounding properties

The surrounding area is a developed urban area, with all of the adjoining and abutting properties located within the RA-1 Zone and improved with single-family residential dwellings.

Streets

Collins Street, adjoining the subject property on the south, is designated as a Standard Local Street, dedicated to a regular width of 60 feet and improved with asphalt roadway and asphalt berm.

Previous Cases, Affidavits, and Orders

City Planning staff, utilizing the Department's Zoning Information and Map Access System (ZIMAS) and the Planning Case Tracking System (PCTS), reviewed current and prior actions associated with the subject property and those within a 1,500-foot radius of the subject property and found the following:

Subject Property:

Case No. AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA – On July 24, 2025, the Advisory Agency approved the subdivision of the property into two parcels, one of the conditions of approval, Condition No. 14., states:

That prior to the issuance of the building permit or the recordation of the final map, a copy of the Case No. ZA-2023-2926-ZAA-HCA shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Advisory Agency. In the event that Case No. ZA-2023-2926-ZAA-HCA is not approved, the subdivider shall submit and pay the applicable City fees for a Parcel Map modification.

Ordinance No. 129,279 – Effective on February 26, 1965, amending the definition of "Hillside Areas" through the adoption of an amended reference map.

Surrounding Properties:

Case No. AA-2015-3502-PMEX – On February 3, 2017, a Certificate of Compliance and Parcel Map Exemption was issued in conjunction with a Lot Line Adjustment for existing land-locked properties, on property located within

the RA-1 Zone, involving 22933 and 22938 West Hatteras Street and 22949 West Collins Street.

Case No. AA-2010-232-PMEX – On May 5, 2011, the Advisory Agency issued a Certificate of Compliance for a Lot Line Adjustment, resulting in the creation of a flag-shaped lot also having a 70-foot wide midpoint width, on property located within the RA-1 Zone, at 23116 West Califa Street.

Case No. AA-2006-2601-PMLA-1A – On May 1, 2007, the South Valley Area Planning Commission granted an appeal, overturning the action of the Advisory Agency, and denied a subdivision of two adjoining lots into a maximum of three parcels, on property located within the RA-1 Zone, at 23129 West Burbank Boulevard.

Case No. AA-2004-1965-PMLA-1A – On June 21, 2005, the South Valley Area Planning Commission denied an appeal, sustained the determination of the Advisory Agency, and disapproved the subdivision of one lot into two parcels, one of which was a flag lot, on property located within the <> Zone, at <>.

Case No. AA-1997-7198-PMLA – On November 21, 1997, the Advisory Agency denied a subdivision resulting in the creation of a flag-shaped lot, on property located within the RA-1 Zone, at 23130 Hatteras Street.

Case No. YV 19431 – On April 5, 1977, the Zoning Administrator approved yard variances to allow lot widths of 60 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 70 feet, in conjunction with the redivision of a lot into two parcels, on property located within the RA-1 Zone, at 22955-59 Collins Street.

Case No. YV 15733 – On October 23, 1968, the Zoning Administrator approved a yard variance to allow a reduced 57-foot mid-point lot width in lieu of the 70 feet otherwise required for Parcel B, in conjunction with a one-lot subdivision into two parcels, on property located within the RA-1 Zone, at 23045 Burbank Boulevard

Case No. YV 11693 – On May 16, 1961, the Zoning Administrator approved a reduced lot area of 18,000 square feet in lieu of the otherwise required 20,000 square feet for Parcel A, and a reduced lot mid-point width of 35 feet in lieu of the 70 feet otherwise required for Parcel B, in conjunction with a one-lot subdivision into two parcels, on property located within the RA-1 Zone, at 22948 West Hatteras Street.

Correspondence

Councilmember Bob Blumenfield, Third District – In a letter dated November 3, 2025, the Councilmember expressed his opposition to the request, stating in part: “This neighborhood is affectionately known as Walnut Acres and its defining feature are its large RA lots. Flag lots configurations have been consistently denied on nearby properties in the past because they were found to be inconsistent with the neighborhood character. And while the City’s policy direction has evolved to address

urgent need for housing, this Adjustment and associated Lot Split does not even propose a housing project.”

Susan Prestine and David Lowery – In an email with attachment dated October 2, 2025, Ms. Prestine and Mr. Lowery express their opposition to the request and submit a survey to show that there are very few lot splits in the neighborhood.

Guillermo Morales Vitola – In emails dated October 1, 2025, and September 7, 2025, Mr. Vitola expands on the testimony he provided at the public hearing in opposition to the request. He states that it would “undermine the integrity of RA zoning, threaten property values, and set a dangerous precedent for our community” and further citing opposition from the Neighborhood Council, the loss of animal keeping rights, the loss of the low-density character of the neighborhood, loss of privacy, no lot splits approved for over 15 years, the immediate neighborhood maintains private septic systems with no interest to upgrade, would set a negative precedent, would damage property values, does not qualify for Housing Crisis Act. In addition, he expands on the purpose of the mid-point width requirement to protect property values, privacy and livability, animal-keeping rights, and safety and infrastructure.

Nellie Prestine-Lowery – In an email dated September 30, 2025, Ms. Prestine-Lowery expresses her opposition to the project request, citing a desire to preserve the large lot sizes and animal keeping rights.

Donna Schuele, President, Walnut Acres Neighborhood Association – In an email dated September 29, 2025, Ms. Schuele expands on the testimony she provided at the public hearing in opposition to the request. Ms. Schuele states that the mid-point width requirement preserves the intent of the RA Zone and protects property values, privacy between neighbors, animal keeping privileges, the safety of the neighborhood due to its low density, the higher number of adjoining properties the project will impact, and recounts the history of lot splits in the community.

David Lowrey – In emails dated September 28 and September 8, 2025, Mr. Lowery expresses his opposition to the project, citing the lack of similar cases approved since 2006, compromises property owner’s ability for animal keeping and agricultural activities, that this is an attack on the appeal of and the quality of life in the neighborhood, would result in an invasion of privacy on adjoining properties, and results in over-building.

Robert Marshall, Marshall & Associates – In an email dated September 9, 2025, Mr. Marshall expands on the testimony he provided at the public hearing in opposition to the request. He states that the Housing Crisis Act does not apply to the project and that neither lot splits or adjustments are normal in the neighborhood.

Aaron Belliston, BMR Enterprises – In an email with attachment dated September 9, 2025, Mr. Belliston expanded upon the other subdivision actions in the neighborhood.

Caitlin Hawkins – In emails dated September 9 and July 8, 2025, Ms. Hawkins expands on the testimony she provided at the public hearing in opposition to the request, She cites the existing character of the community, the loss of animal keeping

ability, the loss of property value, loss of agricultural rights, more traffic, more parked cars, more development within the community. In addition, Ms. Hawkins argues that there are no other two-story homes on Collins Street; the homes on Collins Street are still on private septic systems; that only side-by-side lots splits are acceptable in the neighborhood; that the project will result in a negative precedent for future projects; that no similar project has been approved since 2006; the neighborhood is very low density; want to preserve animal keeping rights; the project results in a doubling of the density; the increase in criminal activity associated with flag lot configurations; and that higher density Warner Center was allowed in exchange for keeping these neighborhoods lower density.

Penny Bahn – In an email with attachments dated September 9, 2025, a letter with attachment dated September 6, 2025 and an email dated July 3, 2025, Ms. Bahn expresses her opposition to the project and expanding on the testimony she provided at the public hearing, citing the negative impacts associated with lot splits, such as increased crime, loss of privacy, and loss of animal keeping rights; a prior Council Motion to protect Walnut Acres from lot splits, the inapplicability of the Housing Crisis Act to the project, community opposition, the number of properties that it adjoins, a desire to maintain the low residential density of the neighborhood, and the existence of private septic systems.

Charles Prestine-Lowery – In an email dated September 9, 2025, Mr. Prestine-Lowery expresses his opposition to the project request, stating that the project would result in overcrowding and set an undesirable precedent for future development.

Richard and Sandra Shirley – In an email dated September 9, 2025, Mr. and Mrs. Shirley express their concern that the project will increase density along with the problems associated with increased density; will negatively affect property values; and will stress neighborhood infrastructure such as utilities, traffic, parking, emergency services, and increase crime.

Martha Sgriccia – In an email dated September 8, 2025, Ms. Sgriccia expresses her opposition to the project request, stating that she does not want the neighborhood to lose its rural feel.

Susan Prestine – In an emails dated September 8 and July 25, 2025, Ms. Prestine expresses her opposition to the project requests. In her opposition, she states that if approved, the project “will negatively affect us, our immediate neighbors, and the community of our semi-rural agricultural Walnut Acres in innumerable ways.” She continues by arguing that the mid-point lot width requirement is specific and necessary in order to preserve the intent of the RA Zone; that the last approved lot split was in 2006; will result in the loss of animal keeping rights; this portion of Collins Street is the only dead-end in the neighborhood; increased density will result in increased traffic; the Neighborhood Council, Preserve Walnut Acres, and Walnut Acres Neighborhood Association all oppose the project.

Diana Rodriguez – In an email dated September 8, 2025, Ms. Rodriguez expresses her opposition to the project, citing the lack of lot splits since 2006, the negative

impact these types of projects have on animal keeping rights, the increased density and criminal activity, and a prior City Council motion to protect the neighborhood from similar projects.

Armand Egan – In an email dated September 7, 2025, Ms. Egan expresses his opposition to the project, citing the loss of privacy and reduced property value, the loss of security, increased potential for criminal activity, inconsistent neighborhood design, and the negative precedent this would create.

Betty Breneman – In an email dated September 5, 2025, Ms. Breneman expresses her opposition to the project request, citing the negative precedent this would set and the loss of the low density neighborhood.

Heather Barclay – In an email dated September 5, 2025, Ms. Barclay expresses her opposition to the project request, citing the higher number of affected adjoining properties, the creation of privacy issues, and the impact to property values.

Henry – In an email dated September 2, 2025, Henry expresses his opposition to the project request, citing the higher number of adjoining properties, the creation of privacy issues, increased potential for criminal activity, loss of animal keeping privileges, increases stress on existing infrastructure, and establishes a bad precedent for future similar projects.

Dina Reisman – In an email dated July 8, 2025, Ms. Reisman expresses her opposition to the project, citing the change to the character of the neighborhood, increased traffic, and additional strain on public resources and services.

Joyce Fletcher, Woodland Hills-Warner Center Neighborhood Council – In an email dated July 7, 2025, the Neighborhood Council expresses their opposition to the project, citing a reduction in animal keeping rights for surrounding property owners, the loss of property value, a resulting increase in undesired residential density, the creation of privacy issues, the loss of semi-rural neighborhood character, and the continued opposition by the local community to other similar projects.

PUBLIC HEARING

A Notice of Public Hearing was sent to abutting property owners and/or occupants residing near the subject site for which an application was filed with the Department of City Planning. All interested persons were invited to attend the public hearing where they could listen, ask questions or present testimony regarding the project. Interested parties were also invited to submit written comments regarding the request prior to the public hearing. A public hearing was held before the Zoning Administrator on September 9, 2025 at 9:01 a.m. Due to concerns over COVID-19, the hearing was conducted entirely telephonically. 15 individuals participated in the meeting. The purpose of the hearing was to obtain public testimony from affected and/or interested persons regarding the application.

Aaron Belliston, representative for the applicant, summarized the project and request as follows:

CASE NO. ZA-2023-2926-ZAA-HCA

- The parcel map for the project has already been approved.
- The flag lot has been designed with a 20-foot width.
- The developed portion of the lot exceeds the minimum lot width requirement.
- The project is pursuant the Housing Crisis Act (HCA), and would require special findings to deny.
- There are other flag lot cases, both in support and denial.
- Many flag lots were created after the Subdivision Map Act.
- There are approximately 35-40 flag lots in existence.
- The requested flag lot is consistent.
- Cannot deny the request under HCA.
- There is an urgent need for housing.
- The project meets the goals of the Housing Element.
- Additional justifications for flag lots have been submitted in conjunction with the Parcel Map case.

The hearing was then opened to receive testimony from the general public:

Donna Schule

- I represent the Walnut Acres Neighborhood Association.
- We are opposed the project request.
- The lot splits do not meet the nature of the neighborhood.
- Privacy will be impacted.
- Seven lots will be impacted by the project.

Dawn Stead

- I want to echo the prior comments.
- When will the public be able to review the applicant documents?

Nancy Mclane

- I live nearby.
- The 70-foot mid-point needs to be continued.
- This is in opposition to LAMC 12.27 – there is no hardship.
- Housing Crisis Act does not apply.

Susan Prestine

- I am a neighbor.
- I am opposed to the request.
- This is a semi agricultural, animal keeping area.
- The project is in opposition to this.
- The community has fought lot split applications in the past.
- The Neighborhood Council does not support the project.

Caitlin Hawkins

- I want to echo Donna's comments.
- I live in the neighborhood for its rural setting.
- Animal keeping is an important part.
- I don't want the lot split – it results in over-crowded development.
- I don't want to lose my property value.

Emmy

- I live down the street.
- HCA is not about single-family dwellings – does not apply to individual single-family dwellings.
- The project does not comply with LAMC 12.27.
- The project does not comply with the RA Zone regulations.
- The lot split diminishes adjoining lots ability for animal keeping.
- There is court precedent – SFD don't apply to HCA.
- I am opposed to the project.

Arnaud

- I live next to the subject property.
- There will be privacy, security implications – these would be impacted.
- Low density needs to be maintained.

Guillermo Morales Vitola

- I am opposed to the project.
- The Neighborhood Council opposed the project.
- Animal keeping and privacy would be impacted.
- The area is maintained with privately maintained septic systems.
- I want to echo prior comments.

Marty Lipkin

- The Neighborhood Council rejected the request.
- The project takes away animal keeping rights of other property owners.
- This isn't right.

Amy Legrand

- I live next door.
- I want to echo the prior zoning comments.
- Keep the integrity of zoning and neighborhood.

Robert Marshall

- I want to echo the prior comments.

CASE NO. ZA-2023-2926-ZAA-HCA

- There have not been other lot splits for many years.
- Follow the law, deny the request.

Serena

- I oppose the request.
- We love horse keeping in the area.
- I want to echo prior comments.

Grant Gilmore

- I live in the community.
- I do not want any more lot splits in our neighborhood.
- I want to echo prior comments.

Brendan Hawkins

- I am opposed to the request.
- I want to echo the prior comments.

Following public testimony, the applicant's representative was given an opportunity to respond to the comments heard:

Aaron Belliston

- The cited 75-foot separation between new structures and animal keeping, are mis-applied.
- This does not represent an increase in density – there is no increased density request.
- The lot split has been approved.
- There have been a number of subdivisions approved.
- The request is for a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment, not a Zone Variance.
- The project is substantially consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan, and Housing Element.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Zoning Administrator remarked that there was little within the administrative record to support the project request, and that additional time would be given to the applicant to supplement the record. With the consent of the applicant's representative, the Zoning Administrator announced that the matter would be taken under advisement through October 3, 2025, during which time further written comments would be accepted into the record for consideration. After that date, the totality of the record and the testimony presented at the hearing would be considered and a written determination issued.

MANDATED FINDINGS

In order for a deviation from the zoning regulations to be granted, all of the legally mandated findings delineated in 12.28 of Chapter 1 must be made in the affirmative. Following are the findings and the application of the relevant facts to the same:

1. **While site characteristics or existing improvements make strict adherence to the zoning regulations impractical or infeasible, the project nonetheless conforms with the intent of those regulations.**

The subject property is a level, rectangular-shaped, interior, approximately 35,913 square-foot parcel of land with a 120-foot frontage on the north side of Collins Street. The property has an even width and depth of 120 feet and 299 feet, respectively.

The property is developed with a single-family dwelling, first constructed circa 1953, on the southern half of the lot, while the northern half remains generally unimproved.

The applicant proposes to subdivide the lot into two, with Parcel A having a lot area of 17,600 square feet and Parcel B with a lot area of 18,313 square feet. On July 24, 2025, the Deputy Advisory Agency approved a lot split for a maximum of two lots under related Parcel Map No. AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA. The approval of the map requires the applicant to obtain a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow for a reduced mid-point lot width of 20 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 70 feet in the RA-1 Zone. Parcel B, a flag-shaped lot, would have a 20-foot-wide mid-point lot width due to the length of the 20-foot-wide driveway stem accessing Collins Street.

The intent of minimum lot widths is to promote the creation of lots with a regular and similar dimensions within a given Zone designation. With the exception of the RMP Zone, all residential zones have a minimum lot width requirement. The lot width, in conjunction with side yard setbacks, combine to create a sense of density in the development pattern of a community.

The subject property is over-sized: the RA Zone requires a minimum lot area of 17,500 square feet and a minimum lot width of 70 feet; the property contains approximately 35,913 square feet and a lot width of 120 feet. The property is level, with all substantial improvements located toward the southern end of the property.

There are no physical features of the property or existing improvement thereon that precludes the applicant from designing this subdivision to comply with the minimum lot width of the Zone. The project does not propose a dwelling design on the newly created Parcel B, so the property owner could easily design a dwelling in the future to take advantage of the compliant lot design with little trouble. There have been subdivisions within the neighborhood resulting in lot splits of similar-sized over-sized lots. Some have designed those splits such that the calculated midpoint lot width met the required 70 feet. Most of those subdivisions were accomplished via some process other than through the Subdivision Map Act. Based upon the above, it would be neither impractical nor infeasible to strictly adhere to the zoning regulations.

Subdivisions which have resulted in flag-lot configurations, similar to now proposed, are not unusual, and have been approved through the Subdivision Map Act. Several such subdivisions have been approved and recorded within this neighborhood. Both new parcels meet or exceed the minimum lot area required for the RA Zone. The new Parcel A, fronting on Collins Street, will observe a lot width of 100 feet, exceeding the minimum lot width standard for the Zone. Combined with the 20-foot-side driveway to access Parcel B, the appearance of residential density within the neighborhood is unaltered. As observed from the Collins Street public right-of-way, the proposed subdivision does not result in any sense of increased residential development since any new dwelling would be located away from the street and behind the existing street-facing dwelling. In this case, a lot configuration that strictly conforms to the lot width requirement of the Zone confers no practical benefit to either the community or the applicant. The applicant has obtained an approved Parcel Map for the proposed subdivision, contingent upon obtaining the entitlement sought through this Zoning Administrator's Adjustment action.

Therefore, given that flag lots exist within the community and have been approved in the past, and that the 20-foot midpoint lot width in conjunction with the lot design of Parcel B does not interrupt the existing sense of density and spacing between adjoining buildings in the development pattern of the community, the Zoning Administrator finds that the project conforms with the intent of those regulations to promote a regular and similar lot dimension within the RA Zone.

2. **In light of the project as a whole, including any mitigation measures imposed, the project's location, size, height, operations and other significant features will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety.**

The subject property is a level, rectangular-shaped, interior, approximately 35,913 square-foot parcel of land with a 120-foot frontage on the north side of Collins Street. The property has an even width and depth of 120 feet and 299 feet, respectively.

The property is developed with a single-family dwelling, first constructed circa 1953, on the southern half of the lot, while the northern half remains generally unimproved. There are no identified hazards associated with the development and use of the property for residential purposes.

The applicant proposes to subdivide the lot into two, with Parcel A having a lot area of 17,600 square feet and Parcel B with a lot area of 18,313 square feet. On July 24, 2025, the Deputy Advisory Agency approved a lot split for a maximum of two lots under related Parcel Map No. AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA. The approval of the map requires the applicant to obtain a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow for a reduced mid-point lot width of 20 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 70 feet in the RA-1 Zone. Parcel B, a flag-

shaped lot, would have a 20-foot-wide mid-point lot width due to the length of the 20-foot-wide driveway stem accessing Collins Street.

The applicant submitted plans stamped by LADBS Plan Check on February 5, 2024, that shows the applicant is proposing to construct a 5,013 square foot, two-story single family dwelling with a maximum height of 25 feet and six inches on Parcel A. Additionally, Parcel A will include covered patios, 310 square foot trellis, 196 square foot recreation room, 680 square foot Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit, and pool. Both the stamped plans and preliminary parcel map show Parcel B to remain vacant with no proposed construction.

Opposition to the request is strong. The local City Councilmember, Neighborhood Council, neighborhood association, and numerous community members both individually and collectively oppose the request in order to stymie the approved Parcel Map resulting in the subdivision of the property.

Comments in opposition to the request cite incompatibility with neighborhood regulations for animal keeping, increased residential density, increased traffic, increased crime, decreased privacy, decreased property values, and erosion of the character of the neighborhood.

The property is located in an area identified on the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan's General Plan Land Use Map as a horse keeping area, and Zoning Information (ZI) No. 2438, attached to the property, states, "As development pressures have mounted in these traditional lower-density neighborhoods (lots zoned RA, RE20, RE40, A1, and A2), equestrian-oriented lots have been subdivided into sizes too small to accommodate equines, buffers between equine and non-equine uses have been diminished, equine keeping rights have been lost due to new, adjacent development, and commonly used trails have been obscured or interrupted by new developments. These pressures over time have resulted in a loss of valuable and irreplaceable equine keeping lots that contribute to the rich and dynamic character of Los Angeles."

LAMC Section 12.21 C.5(a) requires that "every animal keeping structure ... shall be located not less than 25 feet from all side lot lines ... [and] shall neither be located closer than 35 feet from the habitable rooms of the animal keeper's dwelling unit nor closer than 75 feet from the habitable rooms of a neighbor's dwelling unit."

The proposed subdivision will likely result in an erosion of both new parcel's ability to establish and maintain animal keeping structures on their property, and due to separation requirements, is likely to result in an erosion of the northern and eastern property owner's ability to establish new animal keeping structures as well. No testimony was offered either at the hearing or through written communication that the affected properties presently maintained animal keeping structures that would be affected.

The subject property is over-sized: the RA Zone requires a minimum lot area of 17,500 square feet and a minimum lot width of 70 feet; the property contains approximately 35,913 square feet and a lot width of 120 feet. Though granting the request will effectively enable the construction of a new single-family dwelling, the underlying zoning and overall residential density of the community, as anticipated by the General Plan, will not be exceeded. Since the rear Parcel B will access Collins Street via the 20-foot wide stem, and development will be behind the dwelling maintained on Parcel A which fronts on Collins Street, observation of the property from the public right-of-way will not change the overall appearance of the community.

Collins Street is designated as a Local Street and maintains a standard 60-foot-wide public right-of-way, including an asphalt roadway. This segment of Collins Street terminates to the east as it intersects with Arroyo Calabazas watercourse and flood control channel. As such, there is no through traffic on this street. Local Streets serve properties located in all zoning designations across the city, including those areas with much higher residential densities. The addition of a single-family dwelling onto this street segment would not result in any significant impacts on local traffic.

Comments made arguing that the flag-lot configuration results in increased crime have been anecdotal or second-hand, and no information has been submitted to substantiate this claim.

Zone code regulations that help to facilitate privacy between adjoining lots is limited to perimeter fences, yard setbacks, and to some degree, height limitations. Beyond these, there are no regulations that protect or guarantee privacy between adjoining lots. While the lots adjoining the subject property presently enjoy a lack of use of the rear portions of the property, construction of a residential use on those rear portions is not prohibited. No reduction in required setbacks or increase in height have been sought by the applicant. As such, development of Parcel B does not diminish adjoining properties' expectation of privacy.

Comments made stating that the project will result in decreased property values are speculative, with no information submitted to support the claim.

Comments were made stating that the project will result in an erosion of the character of the neighborhood, leading to a precedent that would alter its character entirely. This argument is not without merit. Given the over-sized lots within the community and existing incentives to develop new housing, there may be enough interest to pursue more projects similar to that being presently proposed.

The underlying RA zoning in conjunction with the over-sized lots within the community supports the increased number of residential uses without exceeding planned densities. The increased development will come at the cost of the available opportunities for animal keeping, which community members

describe as being an important characteristic of the neighborhood. Despite this, the loss of this opportunity through the development of additional residential uses does not affect or degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or endanger public health, welfare, and safety.

The project will result in a residential use, in a Zone that permits such use, on a parcel that meets the minimum lot area requirement, with no relief being sought for any developmental requirement or limitation. All of the surrounding adjoining and abutting properties are developed and utilized for residential purposes. As such the Zoning Administrator finds that granting relief to allow a reduced 20-foot-wide midpoint lot width, in lieu of the minimum 70 feet otherwise required in the RA Zone, in conjunction with the project's location, size, height, operations and other significant features, will be compatible with and will not adversely affect or further degrade adjacent properties, the surrounding neighborhood, or the public health, welfare, and safety.

3. **The project is in substantial conformance with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan, and any applicable specific plan.**

On July 24, 2025, the Deputy Advisory Agency approved a lot split for a maximum of two lots under related Parcel Map No. AA-2023-2925-PMLA-HCA. The Parcel Map will contain Parcel A, having a lot area of 17, 600 square feet, and Parcel B, having a lot area of 18,313 square feet. Recordation of the approved map requires the applicant to obtain a Zoning Administrator's Adjustment to allow for a reduced mid-point lot width of 20 feet in lieu of the otherwise required 70 feet in the RA-1 Zone for Parcel B. Parcel B, a flag-shaped lot, would have a 20-foot-wide mid-point lot width due to the length of the 20-foot-wide driveway stem accessing Collins Street.

The General Plan is the City's roadmap for future growth and development. The General Plan Elements establish goals, policies, purposes, and programs that provide for the regulatory environment in managing the City, and for addressing environmental concerns and problems. The majority of the policies derived from these elements are implemented in the form of Municipal Code requirements. The General Plan is comprised of the Framework Element, seven state-mandated elements, and four additional elements. The Framework Element establishes the broad overall policy and direction for the General Plan.

The Land Use Element of the City's General Plan divides the City into 34 Community Plans. The subject property is located within the Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan area. The associated General Plan Land Use Map designates the property for Very Low Low Density Residential land uses, with corresponding zones of RE20, RA, RE 15, and RE11. A notation on the map further indicates that this is a horse keeping area. The property is zoned RA-1. The property's zoning is thus consistent with the General Plan's land use designation for the site.

The Canoga Park – Winnetka – Woodland Hills – West Hills Community Plan is silent with regards to lot width requirements. In such cases, the Zoning Administrator must interpret the intent of the Plans. Specifically, the project addresses the following goals and policies of the Community Plan:

Goal 1 A Safe, Secure, and High Quality Residential Environment for All Economic, Age, and Ethnic Segments of the Canoga-Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan Area

Objective 1-1 Achieve and maintain a housing supply sufficient to meet the diverse economic needs of current and projected population to the year 2010.

Policy 1-1.6 Promote neighborhood preservation, particularly in existing single family neighborhoods, as well as in areas with existing multi-family residences.

Objective 1-3 Preserve and enhance the character and integrity of existing single and multifamily neighborhoods.

Policy 1-3.2 Approval of proposals to change residential density in any neighborhood shall be based, in part, on consideration of factors such as neighborhood character and identity, compatibility of land uses, impact on livability, adequacy of services and public facilities, and traffic impacts.

Objective 1-4 Provide a diversity of housing opportunities capable of accommodating all persons regardless of income, age or ethnic background.

Policy 1-4.1 Promote greater individual choice in type, quality, price and location of housing.

Policy 1-4.3 Ensure new housing opportunities minimize displacement of the residents.

The project's proposal to facilitate the recordation of an approved Parcel Map through the granting of a deviation from the minimum lot width requirement is in conformance with the Community Plan.

The project will result in two parcels that meet or exceed the minimum lot area requirement of the underlying zone, thus preserving the planned residential

density of the area, in conformance with Policies 1-1.6 and 1-3.2. The project will create a new fee simple lot that will be available for the construction of a new single-family dwelling, facilitating greater individual choice in type, quality, price and location of housing, without the displacement of existing residents, in conformance with Policies 1-4.1 and 1-4.3.

Although flag lot configurations have been denied on nearby properties in the past, the City's policy direction has evolved to address the urgent need for housing. The grant supports the goals and objectives outlined in the 2021–2029 Housing Element, particularly in promoting infill development, expanding housing opportunities on underutilized sites, and removing barriers to housing production.

For the reasons cited above, the Zoning Administrator finds that the project is in substantial conformance with the purpose, intent and provisions of the General Plan, the applicable community plan, and any applicable specific plan.

ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FINDINGS

4. The National Flood Insurance Program rate maps, which are a part of the Flood Hazard Management Specific Plan adopted by the City Council by Ordinance No. 186,952, have been reviewed and it has been determined that this project is located within Flood Zone X, areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain.

APPEAL PERIOD - EFFECTIVE DATE

This grant is not a permit or license and any permits and/or licenses required by law must be obtained from the proper public agency. If any Condition of this grant is violated or not complied with, then the applicant or their successor in interest may be prosecuted for violating these Conditions the same as for any violation of the requirements contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

This determination will become effective after the end of appeal period date on the first page of this document, unless an appeal is filed with the Department of City Planning. An appeal application must be submitted and paid for before 4:30 PM (PST) on the final day to appeal the determination. Should the final day fall on a weekend or legal City holiday, the time for filing an appeal shall be extended to 4:30 PM (PST) on the next succeeding working day. Appeals should be filed early to ensure the Development Services Center (DSC) staff has adequate time to review and accept the documents, and to allow appellants time to submit payment.

An appeal may be filed utilizing the following options:

Online Application System (OAS): The OAS (<https://planning.lacity.org/oas>) allows entitlement appeals to be submitted entirely electronically by allowing an appellant to

fill out and submit an appeal application online directly to City Planning's DSC, and submit fee payment by credit card or e-check.

Drop off at DSC. Appeals of this determination can be submitted in-person at the Metro or Van Nuys DSC locations, and payment can be made by credit card or check. City Planning has established drop-off areas at the DSCs with physical boxes where appellants can drop off appeal applications; alternatively, appeal applications can be filed with staff at DSC public counters. Appeal applications must be on the prescribed forms, and accompanied by the required fee and a copy of the determination letter. Appeal applications shall be received by the DSC public counter and paid for on or before the above date or the appeal will not be accepted.

Forms are available online at <http://planning.lacity.org/development-services/forms>. Public offices are located at:

Metro DSC
(213) 482-7077
201 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012
planning.figcounter@lacity.org

Van Nuys DSC
(818) 374-5050
6262 Van Nuys Boulevard
Van Nuys, CA 91401
planning.mbc2@lacity.org

South Los Angeles DSC
(In person appointments available on
Tuesdays and Thursdays 8am-4pm only)
8475 S. Vermont Avenue, 1st Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90044
planning.southla@lacity.org

West Los Angeles DSC
(CURRENTLY CLOSED)
(310) 231-2901
1828 Sawtelle Boulevard
West Los Angeles, CA 90025
planning.westla@lacity.org

City Planning staff may follow up with the appellant via email and/or phone if there are any questions or missing materials in the appeal submission, to ensure that the appeal package is complete and meets the applicable LAMC provisions.

If you seek judicial review of any decision of the City pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5, the petition for writ of mandate pursuant to that section must be filed no later than the 90th day following the date on which the City's decision became final pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6. There may be other time limits which also affect your ability to seek judicial review.

Verification of condition compliance with building plans and/or building permit applications are done at the City Planning Metro or Valley DSC locations. An in-person or virtual appointment for Condition Clearance can be made through the City's BuildLA portal (appointments.lacity.org). The applicant is further advised to notify any consultant representing you of this requirement as well.



QR Code to Online
Appeal Filing



QR Code to Forms for In-
Person Appeal Filing



QR Code to BuildLA
Appointment Portal for
Condition Clearance

Inquiries regarding the matter shall be directed to Courtney Yellen, Planning Assistant, at courtney.yellen@lacity.org or (818) 374-5059.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jonathan A. Hershey".

JONATHAN A. HERSHEY, AICP
Associate Zoning Administrator

JAH: CR:LFS:CY:bw

cc: Councilmember Bob Blumenfield
Third District
Woodland Hills-Warner Center Neighborhood Council
Adjoining Property Owners
Interested Parties