

**From:** MM <dianeh1022@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 3:35 PM  
**To:** Comments  
**Subject:** July 16, 2020 Public Hearing about 28623 Acacia Glen

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like my voice to be heard about the rebuilding of the property at 28623 Acacia Glen St., Agoura Hills. As you know, this property, prior to being burned down by the November 2018 fire was a 1 story home approximately 1,924 sq ft with an attached garage. It's not about square footage. It's turning a lot meant for a one story (a third of the lot is not buildable because of an embankment) and putting a two story on too small of a lot encroaching on prior views and sight lines for those of us who have lived in this neighborhood specifically on this street for over 34 years.

From the proposed looking home to be built on this specific property it does not conform to the rest of the neighborhood or the ambiance of our cul de sac. This building would be totally out of place and an eyesore for us neighbors as we drive up and down our own street.

Thank you,

Diane Huddleston  
28614 Acacia Glen St.  
Agoura Hills  
(818) 422-2091

**From:** john omalley <johnomalley818@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 14, 2020 6:56 PM  
**To:** Comments  
**Subject:** 28623 Acacia Glen Street, Agoura Hills

Hello,

I find the design of this proposed house somewhat interesting, with it's multi layering of roof lines, set back of second story rooms and the like. Just wanted to say I can appreciate the thought and approach to this home.

However, I went up on my roof this evening with a measuring tape in hand. My home is the exact size and shape of what use to be across the street.

The peak of my roof is 17 feet. The proposed house is at 27 feet.

This for me is hard to comprehend. If I go to my mailbox and look over it will be very close to a three story building. (30 feet) The width of the street, a sidewalk and maybe twenty to thirty feet of setbacks would make it be about 70 feet away. Unfortunately that's very close.

Can one of you in planning calculate that angle. I would then make a pointing model and duplicate the angle from my mailbox and see the results. Wondering also if you can story pole the corners and heights of the proposed before moving any further along.

Windows: If you drive anywhere in Fountainwood you will notice many two story homes with having only one bedroom upstairs window looking at the street. You see a long sloped roof and pretty much privacy. The proposed house has four larger windows looking at the street ( 70 to 80 feet away)

I after careful review would request a no vote on this design.

I calculated available land behind the initial footprint from the plot plan, there is in fact enough available land to keep very close to the proposed new square footage and actually build it as one story home. I am getting constant mailers from realtors which show a great demand for one story homes. Something to consider.

John OMalley  
28626 Acacia Glen Street  
Agoura Hills, Ca 91301

---

**From:** Max Greenberg <maxgberg@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 15, 2020 6:47 PM  
**To:** Comments; Doug Hooper  
**Cc:** Sue Talley; Sam Greenberg  
**Subject:** SPR Review 7/16/20 Item 2  
**Attachments:** Case No. SPR-01730-2020 (2).pdf

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Dear Doug Hooper and Planning Commission,

Please disregard the prior comment submitted from this email address and find our **updated** comments attached in PDF regarding Case No. SPR-01730-2020; Planning Commission Hearing 7/16/20; Site Plan/Architectural Review application.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Sue Talley, Steve Greenberg, Diane Hudleston, John and Viveka O'Malley, Bob Sexton, David and Melissa Mellman, Ying Ying Wu

July 15, 2020

**VIA EMAIL:**

Doug Hooper, Planning Director  
City of Agoura Hills Planning Commission  
30001 Ladyface Court  
Agoura Hills, CA 91301  
dhooper@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us

**Re:** Case No. SPR-01730-2020; Planning Commission Hearing 7/16/20; Site  
Plan/Architectural Review application

Dear Chair Asuncion and Honorable Planning Commissioners:

On behalf of the Fountainwood neighbors (Sue Talley and Steve Greenberg at 28617 Acacia Glen Street, John and Viveka O'Malley at 28626 Acacia Glen Street, Diane Huddelston at 28614 Acacia Glen Street, Bob Sexton at 28611 Acacia Glen Street, David and Melissa Mellman at 28608 Acacia Glen Street, Ying Ying Wu at 28629 Acacia Glen Street), we respectfully write to urge you to deny the application for Site Plan/Architectural Review requested by Eli Lugasi ("Applicant") for the proposed residence at 28623 Acacia Glen Street ("Project"). The scale and design of the proposed Project conflict with the character of the existing neighborhood, and the required findings Site Plan/Architectural Review application findings under Agoura Hills Municipal Code ("AHMC") Sections 9677.5 9 and 9677.7.G, respectively, cannot be made.

**I. Background**

The residents at the east adjacent property (28617 Acacia Glen Street), Steve Greenberg and Sue Talley, lived in their home for nearly 30 years before the Woolsey Fire destroyed everything they owned. Now they have been displaced for nearly two years waiting to rebuild. These residents would love nothing more than to return back to their Fountainwood home and enjoy the same level of privacy and scenic views that attracted them to their property from the beginning, and that encouraged them to invest in rebuilding.

The Applicant is seeking Site Plan/Architectural Review for a residential project that exceeds the mass of the previous residence on the site by 522 square feet, including the addition of an entire floor. Several of the required findings assess impacts on neighborhood compatibility. The staff report provides very little information about the dimensions of the previous residence, and instead compares the proposed Project to what is essentially an empty lot. Therefore both the public and the Planning Commission must draw on memory and the limited available public sources (ex.: Google Maps) to assess the potential impacts of the Project on surrounding land uses. Most notably, the staff report does not address whether the obvious setback decrease on the west property line will impact the adjacent neighbors' sightlines.

**II. The required findings for Site Plan Review cannot be made**

The Project differs significantly in mass, scale, and design from neighboring properties. Site Plan Review may only be granted if the following specific factual findings are made:

- A. That the proposed use is consistent with the objectives and provisions of Article IX - Zoning of the Agoura Hills Municipal Code ("AHMC") and the purposes of the land use district in which the use is located;
- B. That the proposed use and the manner in which it will be operated or maintained will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare;
- C. That the proposed use shall not conflict with the character and design of the buildings and open space in the surrounding area;
- D. That the proposed use will comply with each of the applicable provisions of Chapter 6 of Article IX - Zoning of AHMC, except for approved variances or modifications;
- E. That the proposed use is consistent with the city's general plan;
- F. That the proposed use preserves and enhances the particular character and assets of the surrounding area and its harmonious development.

See AHMC § 9677.5. It is clear that these findings cannot be made with respect to this Project. The Project is inconsistent with the City's General Plan, namely Policies LU-7-1 and LU-7-2. Land Use Goal LU-7-1 pertains to neighborhood quality and preservation. LU-7-2 states that:

... new or and renovated housing within single- and multi-family neighborhoods be located and designed to maintain their distinguishing characteristics and qualities, including prevailing lot sizes; building form, scale, massing, and relationship to street frontages; architectural design; landscape; property setback; and comparable elements.

The additional scale, mass, and height of the project will disrupt the sightlines from the properties located both south adjacent and east adjacent to the project. From the south adjacent property, the increased scale, added mass, and added height will obstruct views north of the open Ventura county park land. From the east adjacent property, the increased scale, mass, height and building form will obstruct western views and compromise privacy of the second story bedrooms and deck. The obstructed sight lines and reduction of privacy unreasonably interferes with the enjoyment of these existing properties and does not provide a desirable environment for the project's neighbors. Therefore, the Project conflicts with the General Plan, and required finding of use consistent with the city's general plan (as specified in AHMC § 9677.5(E)) cannot be made. Likewise, the Project will conflict with the character and design of the buildings and open space in the surrounding area, and required finding of use not conflicting with the character and design of the buildings and open space in the surrounding (as specified in AHMC § 9677.5(C)) cannot be made.

### **III. The required findings for Architectural Review cannot be made**

As mentioned above, the proposed Project differs significantly from the residence that previously occupied the site. An architectural review application may only be granted if the following findings of fact are made:

1. That the proposed development is consistent with the general plan, any specific plans, and any design standards adopted by the city council;
2. That the design and location of the proposed development and its relationship to existing or proposed developments and traffic in the vicinity thereof is such that it will not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood; and that it will not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of existing or proposed developments in the vicinity thereof, and that it will not create traffic hazards or congestion;
3. That the design of the proposed development is in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhood is not detrimental to the harmonious, orderly, and attractive development contemplated by this ordinance and the general plan of the city;
4. That the design of the proposed development would provide a desirable environment for its occupants, as well as for its neighbors, and that it is aesthetically of good composition, materials, textures, and colors;
5. That the proposed use complies with all applicable requirements of the district in which it is located and all other applicable requirements;
6. That the overall development of the subject property is designed to ensure the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare.

AHMC § 9677.7.G. The adjacent residents who have lived in the neighborhood for more than 30 years maintain that the previous residence did not negatively impact the neighborhood. Here, the obstructed sightlines, views, and reduction of privacy would result in decreased desirability of investment and occupation in the neighborhood. Therefore, required findings of fact 2, 3, and 4 cannot be made.

### **IV. Conclusion**

The Fountainwood families who tragically lost their homes in the Woolsey Fire are abiding by the ministerial requirements to rebuild, and expect their neighbors to do the same. These families chose to live in Agoura Hills – and in this neighborhood in particular – because of its unique character, and this standard should be rightfully upheld. In sum, the mass and scale

of the proposed Project differ significantly from the previous residence and existing uses, the required findings of fact cannot be made, and the Project cannot be approved at this time.

Thank you,

Sue Talley, Steve Greenberg, Diane Hudleston, John and Viveka O'Malley, Bob Sexton, David and Melissa Mellman, Ying Ying Wu