June 1, 2020

Palos Verdes Estates Planning Commission
340 Palos Verdes Drive West
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Re: 2321 Via Acalones

Commissioners:

Below is a summary of the modifications that were made to the plans from the last Planning Commission hearing based off of commissioner comments and subsequent meetings with the neighbors:

MASSING:
- The main part of the structure has been rotated again to roughly align with the rear property line and we pulled the entire home further from the rear property line to open up additional view corridors for the neighbors.
- We have relocated two of the upper level bedrooms to the lower level in order to relocate the master bathroom to the other side of the property to further increase the ocean views from the Winston’s Den.
- We pulled back the garage 5 feet from the setback line to open up additional view angles for Ms. Gdowski.
- We removed the Living Room to decrease square footage since we now have an additional bedroom on the lower level. The Kitchen has also been relocated.
- The Garage has been dropped below the curb height of the street and with the shift towards the rear it will allow for views around and over the top of the garage.
- The covered Entry gate house has been removed.

RIDGE HEIGHTS:
- He have dropped the highest ridge an additional 18” making the overall height drop 3’-8” since the first hearing.
- Our height from natural grade has decreased again to a height of 20.01’ which represents a 10” drop from the previous hearing.
- The Garage ridge was dropped over 16” and now is only 13 feet above natural grade.

MISC:
- Due to the lowering of the home our grading cut increased and our fill decreased. We now have a height of 14’-3” of cut and only 4’ of max fill height.
- We pulled the walls further from the rear property line allowing us to reduce the number of retaining wall terraces at the rear of the property. This reduced the height of the retaining walls by over 18”.
- 68% of our home is less than 6’ from the upper level finished floor which means we are considered a one-story home with a basement.
- Site walls that are on the shared property line with the Lake residence have been reduced.
- The top of the site walls at the shared property line with the Winston residence have stayed the same height but because we have lowered the grade our overall height was increased.
- The pool equipment has been enclosed.
**SQUARE FOOTAGE:**
We have reduced the overall square footage. Here are the current square footages vs. the previous two submittals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEC.</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>DIFF FROM APRIL</th>
<th>DIFF FROM DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GARAGE</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER (basement)</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER (main)</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>-230</td>
<td>-529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVERED PATIO BATH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6610</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,016</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>-286</strong></td>
<td><strong>-880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL HOUSE SQ.FT.</strong></td>
<td>5,924</td>
<td>5,259</td>
<td>5,007</td>
<td><strong>-252</strong></td>
<td><strong>-917</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.A.R.</strong></td>
<td>35.45%</td>
<td>31.70%</td>
<td>30.10%</td>
<td><strong>-1.60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.35%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>DIFF FROM APRIL</th>
<th>DIFF FROM DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOWER GROSS</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>+23</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN GROSS</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROSS TOTAL</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please let me know if you have any questions, concerns or need any clarification on the changes.

Regards,

Keith Johnson, Architect
March 27, 2020

City of PVE Planning Department  
340 Palos Verdes Drive West  
Palos Verdes Estates, CA 90274

Re: 2321 Via Acalones

To Whom It May Concern:

Below is a summary of the items that we are requesting approval as part of our Miscellaneous Application, which we are concurrently submitting with a Neighborhood Compatibility Application.

Because we are digging our project into the slope we are creating retaining walls and guardrails in excess of 8'-0".

Please see sheet A.1f for the property line wall elevations:

Along the South East property line, we have broken up the height of the wall with planters. The height varies from 3'-6" at the front property line to 16'-10 1/2". The max height of 16'-10 1/2" includes the guardrail, where required, and is measured from finished grade. The wall then continues to follow the natural grade of the land and gets down to 7'-5" at the rear corner of our property. Our height has increased from the last meeting because we have dropped the house further into the ground.

Along the rear of the property, we have removed one of the terraces to reduce the number of retaining walls so we now have proposed 2 planters to transition the grade up to our patio. The planter walls vary in height due to the grade but are each about 2' tall. The total height of the walls have been reduced. We pulled the walls further from the rear property line and because we are keeping more natural grade. Stepping the walls back helps to mitigate the neighbors feeling like they are in a hole.

Along the West property line we used minimal heights required by code where possible. Either we needed a 3'-6" guardrail or we needed to make sure we had a 5’ wall for our pool enclosure. Due to the difference in finished grades the tallest our wall is from natural grade is ±9'-5" near the bottom of the stairs. After that the wall slopes down to our rear yard with various heights from finished grade or natural grade which exceed 8'-0" in a few locations. Because we have lowered our garage we no longer need a guardrail in the front yard setback so that has been removed from this application. We have again reduced the total length of the wall on this side to help transition the grades better to the adjacent neighbor.

The decorative free-standing trellis and gateways are still no longer being proposed.
We are now only proposing one detached accessory structures that exceeds 8’-0”. The Entry Gate house has been removed from this application. However, the height of the wall that remains is 7’-3” tall, the pilasters are 7’-7” tall and the gate is 8’-6” tall. Because the wall acts as a 42” tall guardrail on the East side we kept that height going across which makes the walls higher than 6’-6”. The Arch top of the gate is what makes the height of the door higher than 6’-6”. The height of the gate from natural grade is only 5’-9” because we have kept the pad dropped down into the grade.

Our covered patio is still proposed and is 24’ from the rear property line and the structure sits outside of the sideyard setback. The structure is open on 2 sides and includes a BBQ/dining area as well as a 31 sq.ft. Pool Bath. We have slightly reduced the covered patio to about 378 sq.ft. The overall height has been slightly lowered to about 10’-6” tall from finished grade and is ±13’-10” tall from natural grade at the downslope side of the ridge. The angle of the structure has been rotated and pushed back again towards the street which helps keep it further away from the down slope neighbors. Setting this structure in the East corner also limits the impact by keeping it away from the main living areas of the neighbors.

Regards,

Keith Johnson, Architect