



Re: FW: FW: FW: Comparison of the approved drawing and permit set for 1227 Las Pu...

3 messages

halerdley <palisair@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 30, 2014 at 11:32 PM

To: Richard Blumenberg <Richard@rlbarchitecture.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, "Patti Gallagher (p.gallagher2@verizon.net)" <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, "Francine Kirkpatrick (DrFKirk@verizon.net)" <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, "Di Saia, Steven (Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com)" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, "Dianaunger3@gmail.com" <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckarmed.com>

Thanks, Richard, for getting this clarification from Phil. If it all makes good sense to you then we have to put together two identical completely updated drawing sets for combined approvals by owner (Hills) and the PHOA (I have the new approval rubber stamp from Francine that I can use for this purpose unless someone else on the Board wishes to do this). I have the copy of the original LADBS stamped approved plan set which you used for your comparison.

Apparently Phil gave you some additional drawings just now for clarification purposes that probably do not bear the LADBS approval stamp, but do not change the original LADBS stamped and approved design. I suggest that these clarification drawings be kept in a separate pair of identical drawing packages, one of each pair being included as an addendum to each of the LADBS stamped/approved set, but not needing any new LADBS approvals, but both owner and PHOA approvals. (Steve, does this appear OK to you?)

If you can put together the following in this regard:

- 1) The LADBS stamped/approved plan set you have just used for your comparison work.
- 2) Two identical sets of clarification drawings and calculations (if separate) you have just received from Phil

I believe I can assemble the final two overall plan sets for mutual approval and signature by the Hills and the PHOA of the important drawings once we can get your work transported to me.

Steve, do you have any alternate suggestions or need for further information?

Also, Steve, is the payment by the Hills of the total plans fee a prerequisite for the PHOA approval. Has this fee already been paid?

Hal

Hal

On 9/30/2014 6:18 PM, Richard Blumenberg wrote:

This is the response that I got from Phil.

Do you have any comments that I should relay? Looks ok to me.

From: VERTOCH@aol.com [mailto:VERTOCH@aol.com]

Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2014 6:03 PM

To: Richard Blumenberg

Cc: mrsfourthojly@aol.com

Subject: Re: FW: FW: Comparison of the approved drawing and permit set for 1227 Las Pu...

Hello Richard,

Please find the attached drawings for your review and use.

Let us know if you need hard copies of any documents.

regards,

Philip

Vertoch Design Architects Inc.

T: [310.829.6051](tel:310.829.6051)

F: [310.829.2812](tel:310.829.2812)

C: 310:962.5187

1423 Cloverfield Blvd., Suite A
Santa Monica , Ca. 90404

In a message dated 9/26/2014 11:13:55 A.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Richard@rlbarchitecture.com writes:

Please provide the following:

1. Calculation showing that the enlarged flat roof areas and crickets does not exceed 25% of the roof area.

sheet A 5.0

2. Cross section through rear retaining walls. Please clarify what the water feature is.

water feature flows from feature to spa to pool.

See attached sheet Exhibit A

3. Cross section through skylights to show they are lower than max. allowable roof height.

Cross sections see attached sheet

4. How you will deal with the neighbor's tree roots at the closer side yard retaining walls. This is a neighbor concern.

drilled caissons will be used for the footings which is the least obtrusive to plants and root structures.

From: VERTOCH@aol.com [<mailto:VERTOCH@aol.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2014 8:52 AM

To: Richard Blumenberg

Cc: mrsfourthojly@aol.com; fourthojly@aol.com

Subject: Re: FW: Comparison of the approved drawing and permit set for 1227 Las Pulgas

Morning Richard,

Please find our responses and clarifications to the items listed below **in bold**.

All clarifications were items revised in response to the city or final coordination with the structural and architectural.

Let us know if there is anything else that you need in the form of drawings to coordinate and finalize your comparison and approval.

regards,

Philip

Vertoch Design Architects Inc.

T: [310.829.6051](tel:310.829.6051)

F: [310.829.2812](tel:310.829.2812)

C: 310:962.5187

1423 Cloverfield Blvd., Suite A

Santa Monica , Ca. 90404

In a message dated 9/23/2014 6:15:10 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time,
Richard@rlbarchitecture.com writes:

Phil

These are the differences that I found between the approved set and the building permit permit set. Please clarify.

Sht A 2.0: Rear retaining wall is different on the south side.

Retaining wall has been shifted down for a lower overall retaining height. drilling equipment could not extend to this upper reach. Water feature at this area has also been revised.

Right side setback is closer to the right side but is still over a 9 ft. setback.

Right side retaining wall has been adjusted downslope and straightened to provide for additional landscape space behind the wall and the PL. Wall is further away from the PL.

| Sht. A4.0: Right side retaining wall next to the exterior steps is different than the originally approved set.

Trash enclosure was provided as a non retaining wall element, less than 4 ft in height. this will buffer the cans form the street and neighbors view.

| Sht. A4.1: House is slightly smaller than originally approved.

reduced in our continued clarifications.

| Sht. A5.1: Roof is similar. New skylights shown on the permitted set. The low roof is longer in the front.

roof was elongated approx. 4ft. for structural placement on a column being moved to accommodate the location of the stairs at the entry

| Shows lower roof for fau and elect panel in rear.

Dog house created at this area for these functions. Previously shown on plan. roof element coordinated.

| Sht. A6.0: Longer low roof in the front.

See note above for roof plan

roof was elongated approx. 4ft. for structural placement on a column being moved to accommodate the location of the stairs at the entry

| Sht. A7.0: Low part of roof in Section 2 is slightly different.

See note above for roof plan

roof was elongated approx. 4ft. for structural placement on a column being moved to

accommodate the location of the stairs at the entry

Sht. A7.1: Drawings are similar.

thank you.

Warmest regards,

Richard Blumenberg, AIA, LEED AP

RLB Architecture

(310) 459-0244

www.rlbarchitecture.com



=

=

Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>

Wed, Oct 1, 2014 at 7:01 AM

To: halerdley <palisair@gmail.com>

Cc: Richard Blumenberg <Richard@rlbarchitecture.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, "Patti Gallagher (p.gallagher2@verizon.net)" <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, "Francine Kirkpatrick (DrFKirk@verizon.net)" <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, "Di Saia, Steven (Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com)" <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>, "Dianaunger3@gmail.com" <dianaunger3@gmail.com>

I just sent out the bills (\$100 application fee & \$1500 plans fees) this week.

Sent from my iPhone

[Quoted text hidden]

Di Saia, Steven <Steven.DiSaia@sedgwicklaw.com>

Wed, Oct 1, 2014 at 7:14 AM

To: halerdley <palisair@gmail.com>

Cc: Richard Blumenberg <Richard@rlbarchitecture.com>, Larry Friedman <lpfriedman1@gmail.com>, "Patti Gallagher (p.gallagher2@verizon.net)" <p.gallagher2@verizon.net>, "Francine Kirkpatrick (DrFKirk@verizon.net)" <DrFKirk@verizon.net>, "Dianaunger3@gmail.com" <dianaunger3@gmail.com>, Karen Olan <karenolan@beckermed.com>

The plan sounds excellent to me. I do not know if the Hills have been billed and have paid the plan review fee. With the discussion just this last meeting on the rules, I suspect not.

I do not know if we can hold final approval pending payment under the current circumstances. The Hills have waited a fairly long time, in part due to the fact that we did not realize we had the proper plans.

Steve

[Quoted text hidden]

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.
