



Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>

---

## FW: 16058 Anoka Drive

1 message

**Di Saia, Steven** <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>  
To: Diana Ungerleider <dianaunger3@gmail.com>

Wed, Aug 27, 2014 at 1:23 PM

For file.

Steve

---

**From:** Di Saia, Steven  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 27, 2014 1:22 PM  
**To:** 'DANIELA M BERNHARD'  
**Subject:** 16058 Anoka Drive

Daniela:

We have completed our review of the full-sized plans provided, as stamped by the Building Department in or around June of this year. On review, we do note one issue which needs to be addressed as soon as possible, which likely arose from that period of time when this matter changed hands from your predecessor, Will Vallecios, to you. I have attached below my relevant proper exchange of e-mails with Will on this issue for your review, as well as the attachments which Will provided with his communication of October 14, 2013, as also attached.

The plans which you have submitted for approval by the City are dated July of 2013. Will had previously sent these to me and, on review, we noted that they still demonstrated a violation of our height restrictions. I notified Will of this fact by subsequent e-mail and, on October 14, he provided a newly revised set by e-mail which we then reviewed and approved. Those approved plans, as provided and dated October 14, are attached. They met our restrictions essentially by explaining some proposed deviations and actual errors on the plan descriptions and, more importantly, pulling back the cantilevered section of the roof at the hillside edge of the property on the West Elevation. Plan A6.1 is the most key in this latter regard.

I do not have the full-sized prints for these specific sheets, but these are the ones which should be followed for construction of the residence to meet the CC&Rs.

The only other remaining issue for preliminary approval is the roof deck use restrictions, which we need to provide to you for review and signature by the owner. We have drafted a set of restrictions for this purpose, but we do not possess the name of the actual owner of the residence. If you can provide it, we will be happy to fill it in and forward the document for review.

Steve Di Saia

Chairman, Plans Committee

*Palisair Home Owners Association*

---

**From:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com) [mailto:[will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, October 14, 2013 3:05 PM

**To:** Di Saia, Steven

**Cc:** 'Eran Gispan - N.E Designs Inc'

**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Steven,

I will address your e-mail in the order in which you listed your questions / concerns.

First, the Information about the height of the structure as it includes plants, materials, and fixtures placed on the roof deck.

In terms of the building structure from the Architectural plans, the main entrance as shown on the West Elevation (sheet A6.1) is the highest point on the entire residence. This point is 5'-6" higher than the roof deck level, additionally this point is nine to six inches below the overall height requirement. For us to fall within the height limits, nothing on the roof should be beyond 6 feet off the height of the deck.

As of now, the deck has been designed to have a fire pit (2.5 feet in height), sitting around the fire pit (3 feet high), the roof deck itself is enclosed by railing (3.5 feet high)

Second, the issue with 2 different scales shown on the sheet have been addressed. The sheets now show 1/8" = 1'-0"

Third, you brought up the fact that we had incorrectly offset the dashed line representing the maximum height perpendicular rather than vertically from the grade. If you notice, we have shown the correct line on the revised sheet A6.1 (attached ) and consequently pulled back the cantilevered portion of the roof.

Fourth, in terms of the grading plan, I could send you the full scale physical grading plan to your office or a different address if you prefer. Otherwise, I agree with you, it is difficult to read the small numbers unless you print full size. Let me know where I can send these sheets. Thank you.

Regards,

Will Vallecios

Project Manager



DESIGNS, INC.

15230 Burbank Blvd. #106

Sherman Oaks, CA 91411

Office: 818 789-6439

Cell: 818 856-5220

Fax: 818 789-6286

[www.NEDesignsinc.com](http://www.NEDesignsinc.com)

---

**From:** Di Saia, Steven [mailto:[Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com](mailto:Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2013 7:39 AM

**To:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)

**Subject:** 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Will:

I have had a chance to review my notes on the review conducted of the most submission of plans for 16058 Anoka Drive. As mentioned in my note of yesterday evening, there remains a few issues to iron out, but these demonstrate to me a substantial improvement in keeping with the CC&Rs, even as compared to the last set, which had already come a long way from some earlier versions submitted for our review. Thank you very much for the effort made.

First, we need further information as to the height of the structures plants, and other materials to be placed on the roof deck, as well as the elevation of the floor of the roof deck itself. The height restriction of the CC&Rs applies not only to the architectural structure, but also to all fixtures, railings, furniture, and planting to be placed on the roof.

Of course, if the roof deck is significant lower than the top of the surrounding railing, which appears to be depicted on the Elevations Plan Sheets, the materials to be placed and installed on the roof may be immaterial to our analysis. At present, however, we simply cannot make this determination. Please provide this information.

Secondly, on the elevation of the structure itself, there remain two issues to address. The first is one simply of

interpretation. The Elevations Plan Sheets (Plan Sheets Nos. A6.0 and A6.1) both provide in their notes, the lower right hand corner, that the scale is  $1/8"=1'$ . However, both Sheets provide on their face that  $3/32"=1'$ . The distinction presents a substantial difference when we apply one and then the other to the demonstrated height of the structure. On application of a ruler, it appears that the  $1/8"=1"$  scale is controlling, but we request that you confirm the applicable scale.

Of related note, the Plans continue to demonstrate a deviation from the instructions which we had provided with reference to an earlier set of plans submitted for our review. On Sheet Nos. A6.0 and A6.1, you have continued to provide a dotted line reference to show the point at which the 15.5 foot height restriction would be met from each point along the original grade of the lot, if one measures 15.5 feet perpendicularly from the grade line. The height restriction, however, exists entirely to prevent unreasonable view blockage for the affected neighbors. As such, the measurement is not made perpendicularly from the grade line, but rather vertically at each point.

If we apply that means of measurement, and the  $1/8"=1"$  scale, the structure depicted maintains its compliance with the height restriction of the CC&Rs, except for the cantilevered end of the roof shown on the West Elevation on Sheet No. A6.1. The last few feet of the cantilevered end rise over a foot above the height restriction, based on the measurements we have made.

Unless we have missed some element of the design or scale distinction, we need to address this potential remaining violation by one of two means. You can certainly make some correction to the plan to bring the entire structure under the presented height restriction and we would be happy to review the amended plans following this effort. Alternatively, you can seek a variance for the area of distinction from the Board, which will require the erection of story poles, for that area where the height restriction has been exceeded, and review by the Board of the impact presented. Please just let us know your preference.

Of a last note, the grading plan sheet, which you provided by PDF with your earlier e-mail was useful to some extent, but amazingly hard to read at the size at which we can view and print the document. It would be far more useful and appropriate to have the actual full-sized grading plan submitted, or to be submitted, to the Building Department for the lot itself. Does this documentation yet exist for our review?

Please feel free to contact me directly as to any aspect of this correspondence. My direct office number is (213) 615-8017.

Steve Di Saia  
Chairman, Plans Committee  
Palisair Home Owners Association

---

**From:** will@nedesignsinc.com [mailto:[will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2013 5:31 PM  
**To:** Di Saia, Steven  
**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Steven,

Hope you're doing well. Is there anything else you need from us for HOA approval?

Regards,

**Will Vallecios**

Project Manager



15230 Burbank Blvd. #106

Sherman Oaks, CA 91411

Office: 818 789-6439

Cell: 818 856-5220

Fax: 818 789-6286

[www.NEDesignsinc.com](http://www.NEDesignsinc.com)

---

**From:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com) [mailto:[will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 22, 2013 7:44 PM  
**To:** 'Di Saia, Steven'  
**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Steven,

Here is the file you requested. Thank You.

---

**From:** Di Saia, Steven [mailto:[Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com](mailto:Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 14, 2013 1:48 PM

**To:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)

**Subject:** 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Will:

I have had the chance now to review the plans that you provided with regard to the above-referenced project. Thank you for providing this set of full-sized plans.

While they provide the information needed for the structure itself and the landscaping plan, I had asked as well for a copy of the Grading Plans, as filed with, and approved by, the Building Department. The Grading Plans, however, were not included with the others. Can I please get a copy of the approved plans?

Steve Di Saia

---

**From:** Di Saia, Steven

**Sent:** Monday, July 22, 2013 10:48 AM

**To:** ['will@nedesignsinc.com'](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)

**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Hello Will:

To present, I have not received any of the full-sized plans. Are you planning on brings the full set of both the landscape and structure? I received the PDFs, but, as I had indicated previously, these were useful for discussion purposes with the Board only. We cannot evaluate the plans meaningfully unless they are full-sized and to scale.

If so, please do leave them off at my home – 1156 Las Pulgas Place. If you give me an approximate time, I can see if my wife will be home.

Steve Di Saia

---

**From:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com) [mailto:[will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)]

**Sent:** Monday, July 22, 2013 10:15 AM

**To:** Di Saia, Steven

**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Steven,

I will be visiting the site today and have the landscape plans with me. Anyway I can drop this off to you? Please let me know. Thank you.

---

**From:** Di Saia, Steven [<mailto:Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 16, 2013 5:00 PM  
**To:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com)  
**Cc:** 'Ramtin Nosrati'; 'Dariush Fakheri'; 'Eran Gispan'  
**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Thanks very much.

Steve

---

**From:** [will@nedesignsinc.com](mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com) [<mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 16, 2013 4:47 PM  
**To:** Di Saia, Steven  
**Cc:** 'Ramtin Nosrati'; 'Dariush Fakheri'; 'Eran Gispan'  
**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Steven,

Our landscape plans are done, I'm attaching a PDF version here for you to preview. I will be sending the physical copies tomorrow.

**Will Vallecios**

Project Manager



15230 Burbank Blvd. #106

Sherman Oaks, CA 91411

Office: 818 789-6439

Cell: 818 554 8831

Fax: 818 789-6286

**From:** Di Saia, Steven [<mailto:Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 9:04 AM  
**To:** Will Vallecios - N.E. Designs Inc.  
**Cc:** 'Ramtin Nosrati'; 'Eran Gispan - N.E Designs Inc'  
**Subject:** RE: 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Thank you. I will have a look and discuss at our meeting and then await the full-sized set for further analysis.

One question – is there more detail available as to the roof deck plan? I know the prior set had more details as to walls, gardens, and the like which were to be placed. To complete our evaluation of potential view blockage, especially given the location of the affected neighbors, I can expect that aspect to be an issue which we will need to evaluate.

Steve Di Saia  
Plans Committee Chairman  
Palisair Home Owners Association

---

**From:** Will Vallecios - N.E. Designs Inc. [<mailto:will@nedesignsinc.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 8:43 AM  
**To:** Di Saia, Steven  
**Cc:** 'Ramtin Nosrati'; 'Eran Gispan - N.E Designs Inc'  
**Subject:** 16058 Anoka Dr. - HOA

Steven,

Here is the set of plans in PDF. Thank you for your patience.

**Will Vallecios**  
Project Manager



DESIGNS, INC.

15230 Burbank Blvd. #106

Sherman Oaks, CA 91411

Office: 818 789-6439

Cell: 818 554 8831

Fax: 818 789-6286

[www.NEDesignsinc.com](http://www.NEDesignsinc.com)

---

The information in this email is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain privileged and confidential matter. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this email. Do not disclose the contents to anyone. Thank you.

---

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To ensure compliance with Treasury Department regulations, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this correspondence (including any attachments) is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed under the U.S. Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

---

---

## 2 attachments

 **A6.0.pdf**  
421K

 **A6.1.pdf**  
462K