

Re: Council File 14-0057-S8
Case: CPC-2016-1245-CA
Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Sept 9, 2016

Members of the City Council:

I urge you to reconsider your position for this vote on the amended ordinance. I am not a real estate developer or a builder trying to build some giant, inappropriate house in my neighborhood. I am homeowner in a modest North Hollywood home who had planned to build a second dwelling so that our property could accommodate two generations of our family in an affordable way. We are not one of the many hoping for a grandfathering in... that is important... but we are asking now that **you consider the impact on the future of L.A. housing.** We tried to apply for permits at LADBS up in April, just two weeks after the court order suspended all permitting. We are the forgotten voice in all the loud voices asking to be heard on this matter. By reverting to the old standard of 640sf you are **effectively rendering ADUs useless in terms of helping people create affordable housing** and begin to alleviate the citywide housing shortage.


Now, somewhat suddenly, it seems that the City Council is acceding to concerns raised about the state standards (specifically the allowable 1200sf) and that some of the neighborhood councils feel that the Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance allows for overbuilding and mansionization of neighborhoods. **The ADU ordinance really has little impact on mansionization** and the related concerns of residents. My family can actually build a larger addition if I build as an attached ground floor addition rather than using the 1200 sf ADU ordinance. So, for residents to complain that this ordinance is allowing people to build inappropriately size homes is somewhat misguided. And so, families like ours are caught in the middle. We are trying to use the ordinance as a solution to the shortage of affordable homes in Los Angeles, but the Council is now giving in to pressure against this ordinance from groups really pursuing other goals (namely, a change in mansionization guidelines).

As the city planner's thorough report suggests, the ADU ordinance is generally used to allow families to build affordable housing for multi generational use or perhaps for some rental income. It is not some loophole being exploited rampantly by people building "McMansions." Mansionization ordinances are in place to prevent that. The people lobbying against the state ADU standards seem to be lumping these issues together.

You are asking the City Planning Dept to reconsider what they have already thoughtfully outlined. The original recommendation report to adopt the state standards cited substantial data explaining the benefits to individual homeowners and the city's general plan as a whole, and it addressed/considered any impact on neighborhood aesthetics.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,


David Scharf
Concerned residents, North Hollywood, CA
818-802-0726

Re: Council File 14-0057-S8
Case: CPC-2016-1245-CA
Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Sept 8, 2016

City Council Members,

It seems that residents concerned with overbuilding and imposing "McMansions" have raised their voices loudly in opposition to an already existing and well-functioning ADU ordinance. The ADU ordinance is about providing a pathway to affordable housing, rather than a way to build giant, tall houses that offend your neighbors.

Passage of the amended draft ordinance and reverting to restrictive 640sf old ordinance would be a step backwards for the city's housing policy and solutions to the housing shortage.

Please reconsider your reconsiderations. For the last 4 months, all indications from the City Planning Commission (recommendation report), City Council subcommittee (unanimous vote), City Attorney, and even public comments from the Mayor's office have expressed the City's support for the state standards. Now, in a last minute change of opinion, the Council is allowing the vote to be swayed unnecessarily. The outcry over the state standards comes from a real concern, so I do not want to dismiss it, but it is not the issue at hand here. That concern is an issue of mansionization restrictions. It is not about 2nd dwelling unit size. A homeowner can usually build bigger and taller by doing an attached addition, rather than a second dwelling.

There are many of us out there wanting to build modest 2nd dwellings for family members, grandparents, etc. 640 square feet is really not enough to make a comfortable home. The state standard of 1200 sf is more sensible while restrictive enough to prevent developers from using it as a mansionizing loophole.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,



Roxanne Gonzalez

Los Angeles city resident, homeowner, and Special Education teacher
roxanneteaches@gmail.com