



MASTER APPLICATION FORM

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Office Use Only

Date Submitted: 06/25/2018

Received By: AP

F&G Check Submitted: N/A

2912 Ocean Dr.

Project Address

Legal Description

General Plan Designation

Zoning Designation

Area District

For projects requiring a Coastal Development Permit, select one of the following determinations¹:

Project located in Appeal Jurisdiction

Project not located in Appeal Jurisdiction

☐ Major Development (Public Hearing required)

☐ Public Hearing Required (due to UP, Var, ME, etc.)

☐ Minor Development (Public Hearing, if requested)

☐ No Public Hearing Required

Submitted Application (check all that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal to PC/PPIC/BBA/CC	4225	\$500.00	<input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit (Residential)	4330
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Development Permit	4341		<input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit (Commercial)	4330
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuance	4343		<input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit Amendment	4332
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Landmark	4336		<input type="checkbox"/> Variance	4331
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Assessment	4225		<input type="checkbox"/> Park/Rec Quimby Fee	4425
<input type="checkbox"/> Minor Exception	4333		<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-application meeting	4425
<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision (Map Deposit)	4300		<input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing Notice	4339
<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision (Tentative Map)	4334		<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Merger/Adjust./\$15 rec. fee	4225
<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision (Final)	4334		<input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Business Review	4337
<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision (Lot Line Adjust.)	4335		<input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Report	4340
<input type="checkbox"/> Telecom (New or Renewed)	4338		<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

Fee Summary: (See fees on reverse side)

Total Amount: \$ 500.00 (less Pre-Application Fee if applied within past 3 months)

Receipt Number: _____ Date Paid: _____ Cashier: _____

Applicant(s)/Appellant(s) Information

Bella Stanchansky

Name

2908 MANHATTAN AVE

Mailing Address

NEIGHBOR

Applicant(s)/Appellant(s) Relationship to Property

Bella Stanchansky

424-310-7314

Contact Person (include relation to applicant/appellant)

Phone number / email

2908 MANHATTAN AVE

Address

Applicant(s)/Appellant(s) Signature

Phone number / email

Complete Project Description- including any demolition (attach additional pages as necessary)

Appeal of Planning Commission approval
for development of 2912 Ocean Dr.

¹ An Application for a Coastal Development Permit shall be made prior to, or concurrent with, an application for any other permit or approvals required for the project by the City of Manhattan Beach Municipal Code. (Continued on reverse)

OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I/We Bella Starchansky being duly sworn,
depone and say that I am/we are the owner(s) of the property involved in this application and that
the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted
are in all respects true and correct to the best of my/our knowledge and belief(s).

B Starchansky
Signature of Property Owner(s) - (Not Owner in Escrow or Lessee)

Bella Starchansky
Print Name

2908 MANHATTAN AVE
Mailing Address

424-310-7314
Telephone/email

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me this _____ day of _____, 20____
by _____, proved to me
on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) who appeared before me.

Signature see attached!
Notary Public

SEAL

Fee Schedule Summary

Below are the fees typically associated with the corresponding applications. Additional fees not shown on this sheet may apply – refer to current City Fee Resolution (contact the Planning Division for assistance.) Fees are subject to annual adjustment.

Submitted Application (circle applicable fees, apply total to Fee Summary on application)

Coastal Development Permit

Public hearing – no other discretionary approval required: \$ 4,787 ☐
Public hearing – other discretionary approvals required: 2,108 ☐
No public hearing required – administrative: 1,303 ☐

Use Permit

Use Permit: \$ 6,287 ☐
Master Use Permit: 9,703 ☐
Master Use Permit Amendment: 5,037 ☐
Master Use Permit Conversion: 4,623 ☐

Variance

Filing Fee: \$ 6,078 ☐

Minor Exception

Without notice: \$ 1,452
With notice: 1,952 ☐

Subdivision

Certificate of Compliance: \$ 1,625
Final Parcel Map + mapping deposit: 528
Final Tract Map + mapping deposit: 732
Mapping Deposit (paid with Final Map application): 500
Merger of Parcels or Lot Line Adjustment: 1,133
Quimby (Parks & Recreation) fee (per unit/lot): 1,817
Tentative Parcel Map (4 or less lots / units) No Public Hearing: 1,309
Tentative Parcel Map (4 or less lots / units) Public Hearing: 3,557 ☐
Tentative Tract Map (5 or more lots / units): 4,060 ☐

Environmental Review (contact Planning Division for applicable fee)

Environmental Assessment (no Initial Study prepared): \$ 215
Environmental Assessment (if Initial Study is prepared): 3,079
Fish and Game/CEQA Exemption County Clerk Posting Fee²: 75

☐ Public Hearing Notice applies to all projects with public hearings and covers the City's costs of envelopes, postage and handling the mailing of public notices. Add this to filing fees above, as applicable: \$ 70

²Make a separate \$75 check payable to LA County Clerk, (DO NOT PUT DATE ON CHECK)

CALIFORNIA JURAT

A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document.

State of California

County of Los Angeles

Subscribed and sworn to (~~or affirmed~~) before me on this

22nd day of JUNE, 2018, by
Date Month Year

(1) Bella Stauchansky
Name of Signer

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence
to be the person who appeared before me (.) (X)

(and)

(2) _____
Name of Signer

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence
to be the person who appeared before me.



Place Notary Seal Above

Signature [Signature]
Signature of Notary Public

Further description of Any Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: Owner's Affidavit

Document Date: — Number of Pages 1

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: —

From: Bella Stavchansky <londonsw3@yahoo.com>
To: Ted Fatuross tfatuross@citymb.info
Subject: Notes to my appeal in ref. to the project on 2912 Ocean Drive
Date: Fri 6/29/018 3:06pm

Hi Ted,

These notes should be attached to my appeal filed on the above project. Some of the comments by the Planning Commissioners and staff made it clear to me that this appeal was necessary. A few of the comments (and I paraphrase):

‘Granting this request will not affect any neighbors’ - in fact the neighborhood is affected.

For me personally, allowing that project to go forward directly impacts my view, and while I understand that there is no view protection in Manhattan Beach, if the subject property was held to even a majority of the planning codes, and the owner was still able to develop a home that blocked my view, then so be it, I knew that potential was there.

‘An owner of a property built in 1937 cannot be held to the same standards as a property built more recently’

The fact is we all have to abide by the codes in place at the time we choose to develop. Sometimes the codes change, rendering a property to be legal non-conforming. In the case of the subject property, this was not the original owner of the property. The codes have not significantly changed since this owner purchased the property. Presumably Mr. Strnad understood the limitations of this property (built in 1937) when he purchased it in 2006. There should have been no presumption that he could ever do anything more than remodel what was already there. The price he paid at the time reflected a significant comparative discount. Therefore, the owner is not impacted in any way by being held to the building standards he knew to be in place when he purchased the property.

‘It presents a hardship to the owner not to be able to add onto this Property’

Again no codes changed rendering the owner’s assumptions when he purchased as being significantly altered, so by definition there can be no “hardship” here. Financially, the owner could make a substantial profit simply by remodeling the existing cottage and selling it. So there is certainly no financial hardship. A remodeled cottage here would be perfectly in keeping with the diminutive status of this lot.

‘This will not establish a precedent for future requests for exceptions, because nothing like this exists in the City’

This is patently incorrect. Even though each request is unique, every time someone seeks an exception, anything that was previously approved will still be used as part of the unique argument. In this case there are many exceptions being requested, so the idea of the planning Commission approving multiple exceptions is in and of itself precedent setting. The argument

for granting one or two exceptions (as in this case the stairway intruding on the setback, and insufficient parking) would potentially make sense. But not parking, open space, setbacks on three sides, outdoor living space. It's a bold request when there is no ACTUAL hardship, financially, or due to code changes put in place since this owner purchased the property.

As an easy example, look at the landlocked parcels we have in the City. They have no parking and can therefore not be developed. This ruling would certainly call all of those into question if the argument is that these owners have a hardship because they can do nothing significant with these homes. By the same standard as applied in this ruling all of these owners should apply for similar special treatment. Yet no one has ever been granted any similar treatment even if only requesting relief from the parking requirement. These owners are completely hampered. And none of these have the benefit of being on a corner lot across the street from the Strand like the subject property.

This ruling absolutely opens all this up for discussion and more. This owner should not be unjustly rewarded when he knew what he was buying and what he was not. We need to be able to depend on the standards that are allied so rigidly for everyone else. One exception (maybe two) is reasonable; anything more, especially when it impacts others, is untenable and should be denied

Kind regards,
Bella Stavchansky

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)