

Franklin / Hollywood West Residents Association

7470 Franklin Avenue andres2007@sbcglobal.net
Hollywood, CA 90046-2242 323.333.7445

5 June 2016

LA City Council Planning & Land Use Management Committee
Councilmember José Huizar, Chair
Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson
Councilmember Gilbert A. Cedillo
Councilmember Mitchell Englander
Councilmember Felipe Fuentes
Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Via Email to Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Re: CF #14-0057-S8 – Opposing Repeal of LAMC 2nd Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Dear Councilmember Huizar & PLUM Committee Members:

My name is Don Andres and I am President of the Franklin/Hollywood West Residents Association representing over 250 residents in the Hollywood area near Runyon Canyon. As noted on the LA City Website, “The mission of the City Planning Department is to create and implement plans, policies and programs that realize a vision of Los Angeles as **a collection of healthy and sustainable neighborhoods, each with a distinct sense of place**, based on a foundation of mobility, economic vitality and **improved quality of life for all residents.**”

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state’s default standards for second dwelling units applying to every neighborhood in the City. This “one size fits all” approach is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and is inconsistent with the Planning Department’s mission stated above. The existing LAMC Sections are much better for Los Angeles because they take into account the range of L.A.’s many diverse communities, neighborhoods, and ecologies.

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc. recently voted to oppose the City’s proposed repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44 and to instead retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. This neighborhood association is in agreement with the position of the Hillside Federation.

The Franklin / Hollywood West Residents Association joins the Hillside Federation in urging you to delay any PLUM Committee action until there has been a *full analysis* of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Don Andres".

Don Andres, President
Franklin/Hollywood West Residents Association



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Repeal of Second Dwelling Ordinances should not be a blanket law

1 message

Barbara Mitchell <bjm@barbarajmitchell.com>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 3:37 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Jose Huizar, Chair and Sharon Dickinson

Dear Councilman Huizar and Ms. Dickinson,

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc., recently voted to oppose the City's proposed repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44 and to instead retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. We are particularly concerned that the City Council is rushing the proposed repeal without giving our City's neighborhoods and residents an adequate opportunity to provide their input.

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state's default standards for second dwelling units applying in every neighborhood in the City. This "one size fits all" approach is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and will have a negative and lasting impact on our single-family neighborhoods. A major policy decision such as the repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances should be considered only after a thorough study of the potential neighborhood impacts and the options available to the City.

The Hillside Federation urges you to delay any action by the PLUM Committee until it has received a full analysis of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Barbara Mitchell

2810 Belden Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90068



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Opposition to repeal of LA Muni Code 12.24.W.43 & 12.24.W.44 (re: 2nd dwelling units)

1 message

HHA <info@hollywoodland.org>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 5:01 PM

To: Councilmember.Ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilman Ryu and Councilman Huizar and Ms. Dickinson:

The Hollywoodland Homeowners Association, represents 560 single family hillside homes. We are located in a mountain fire district beneath the Hollywoodland sign, with narrow, substandard streets and no sidewalks. We stand with the Hillside Federation to strongly OPPOSE the repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44. We urge you to retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. The City Council is rushing the proposed repeal without giving our City's neighborhoods and residents an adequate opportunity to provide their input.

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state's default standards for second dwelling units applying in every neighborhood in the City. This is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and will have a negative and lasting impact on our single-family neighborhoods. A major policy decision such as the repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances can be considered only after a thorough study of the potential neighborhood impacts and the options available to the City.

Please delay any action by the PLUM Committee until it has received a full analysis of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Tara Stephenston-Fong, President
Christine O'Brien, Vice President
The Hollywood Homeowners Association



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Fwd: Planning and Land Use Management Committee

1 message

John Bullock <johnjamesbullock@gmail.com>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 5:02 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **John Bullock** <johnjamesbullock@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 4:44 PM

Subject: Planning and Land Use Management Committee

To: Infanzon@lacity.org, Gerald.ubatan@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, Doug.Tipp@lacity.org, Hannah.lee@lacity.org, councilmember.Englander@lacity.org, Clare.Eberle@lacity.org, Shawn.Kuk@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickerson@lacity.org, cd4.issues@lacity.org

Cc: Michael Feinstein <mikef227@gmail.com>

Councilmen Ryu et. al.,

I am writing to voice my strong objections to the "Second Unit Planning Repeal". I am a home own for over 37 years in CD4 living in an R1 single family home. My home is located in close proximity to the intersection of Burbank Blvd and Sepulveda Blvd in Sherman Oaks on a residential side street consisting of mid 50's ranch style homes on 7000 sq ft lots. By virtue of the current zoning most of these residences have two car garages and our single family occupied residences of anywhere from 1200 to 1800 sq ft. In fact most of these homes being occupied by families have anywhere from 2 to 4 cars parked at their location, which currently results in a number of cars being parked on the street.

At the present time the traffic has reached saturation point on both Burbank Blvd and on Sepulveda Blvd with bumper to bumper stop and go traffic during peak traffic hours. Currently dwelling densities already result in significant life and safety concern since traffic already severely impedes emergency traffic flow due to the large number of apartments being constructed in this immediate area. Additional structures added to existing lots would severely impact the quality of life in this area, which has already been severely impacted by the increased apartment and condominium structures which have been approved by the zoning commission. In fact the construction of apartment units has consistently exceeded the zone apartment capacity on both Burbank Blvd and on Magnolia Blvd. The changes to the additional 1200 sq ft additional building unit was never anticipated in the current plan and has never been studied. Further I can assure you that any such action without appropriate environmental impact studies will be irresponsible. I can further assure you that such action, if taken, will result in my participation in any court action taken to block such a plan from impacting our communities.

My home is within blocks of our neighborhood school, which has expanded to capacity and is no longer able to accept additional children. Electrical capacity in addition is currently at its design capacity and we are currently facing the potential for electrical brown outs due to the DWP's limited capacity to meet our needs during the peak summer months here in the valley.

Los Angeles and a number of neighboring cities also face pressures on their existing resources due to new pressures from organizations such as AirBNB, which have created hardships in parking and the decline of neighborhoods due to the transient nature of the people living in the community. Our police force is stretched to the limit to control crime in our areas and addition of addition transient populations will only serve to exacerbate that issue.

I certainly don't encourage you to increase housing density in the valley, but if you must please try to limit those changes to areas that are already zoned for commercial rental properties. We are all aware that many areas of the valley are definitely over zoned for development and housing densities are rising astronomically. Please take this opportunity to preserve our local communities and preserve our quality of life.

I am aware that a frequent ploy of those supporting increasing population density and development has been to get local councilmen outside of the area affected to approve out of scope property development. However in this instance, you are making changes of an unsound nature to our entire city. We all are aware of the rebellion that has occurred at a national level with respect to our congress and senate. The people of Los Angeles will be heard and if necessary we will act to take local action to insure that our voices are heard. In the past we have had proposition 13 and are currently expressing our dis-satisfaction at the national level with the nomination of Donald Trump and the strong movement to support Bernie Sanders. The citizens of Los Angeles will be heard and I would pray that you take heed of our input to this process.

I would hope to hear from Council Ryu's office regarding actions he may be taking along with his fellow council people to address my concerns. Lack of action or pleading lack of control of this situation will not be an acceptable response. Councilman Ryu's responsibility is to effectively represent his constituents and failure to do so is not an acceptable response. A significant part of that representation is to effectively advance our concerns with his fellow representatives.

John and Julie Bullock
5440 Burnet Avenue
Sherman Oaks, CA 91411
home (818) 785-2376
cell (818) 426-7359

Shannon and Thomas Burns
2215 Colby Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90064
(310) 473-7000

June 5, 2016

councilmember.bonin@lacity.org
councilmember.huizar@lacity.org
councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org
councilmember.englander@lacity.org
councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org
councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org

Re: Council File # CF 14-0057-S8
Planning & Land Use Committee Meeting 6/7/16
Agenda Item No. 2

Dear Councilmembers,

I strongly support the Planning Department's proposal to repeal the City's existing second unit ("SDU") ordinance. I agree with the Staff Recommendation Report. I think it is a very smart way to handle the issue currently.

Presumably, though, at some point in time the Planning Department will look into establishing a new City Ordinance that will comply with State Law, but tailor it to the needs of the City of Los Angeles. Those needs, in my opinion, must work with **all** areas, and not prejudice the rights of some areas that the current ordinance does.

On the Westside, our single family residential lots generally run between 5,000 and 6,900. Under the current ordinance (requiring a 7,000 square foot lot), most residential lots on the Westside are precluded from building an SDU based upon the ordinance you will hopefully repeal. Although I think that the state size of up to 1,200 for a secondary unit is too large for most SFRs in the City of Los Angeles . . . especially considering that my primary resident is just a little over 1,200 square feet (on a 6,888 square foot lot). The City's current Ordinance requiring a lot size of over 7,000 square feet means that most of the single family residential lots in West Los Angeles cannot legally build an SDU. **Which violates the spirit of State Law.**

What you need to consider, and I think the Planning Department has, is that this city has an aging population and a growing population. Our adult children, just out of college, simply cannot afford the rentals being offered, nor do they want to continue living at home. While a rental for a modest studio apartment on the Westside has gone up to approximately \$2,000/month, the entry level job for a recent college graduate could hardly cover rent and other housing and living basics. Our aging parents now need assistance, and this is also a growing concern, with the costs of assisted living and facilities increasing even more than a studio apartment on the westside.

For that reason, in the last 20 years, we have been seeing more and more multi-generational families living on the same property together. And, frankly, we don't always get along! So having an SDU makes sense. Yes, there will be people who abuse the privilege, but **why deny everyone the right** just because of the abusers?

Thus, for me, having a 1,200 SF house on a 6,800 SF, with an ADA adult child who could never afford even a tiny unit in the City of Los Angeles, it makes perfect sense for us to build a small unit over our garage to give him the independence he needs, but be close enough to assist us and our very elderly parents. We wish to do this legally. We have a detached garage that is 400 SF. The proposed SDU over the garage would be approximately 450 SF, leaving over 5,000 square feet of garden and open space. Many neighbors are building exactly the same thing we wish to build, but seek to permit their units by applying for a "recreation room", presumably to one day open it up as an SDU for their family members. Those permits are flourishing in our area, but we know that once the "basics" are in, what it ultimately turns into. So why the façade? Why the pretense? We suffer, because we are one of the few that insist on getting permits for everything we do.

The "waiting game" of pros and cons does not help most of the baby boom generation. We don't have a lot of time to do this . . . being in our '60's, we need to do it before we retire, and now so our adult children and elderly parents will have a safe place to live.

In short, we want to do this to accommodate our families, and we need to do it NOW. I understand that the City of Los Angeles is not accepting new applications until this is resolved. I do not know whether that is legal or not, I implore you to act now, approve the file number, move this to City Council to repeal these ordinances. I implore you to start accepting our applications, and allow us to be able to legally build to provide a small, but safe place for our multi-generational families.

Following repeal, the City Planning Department can move to tailoring a new ordinance that reflects these changing times that allows all SFR lot sizes the ability to build in the spirit of the state law without unduly burdening our infrastructure.

Sincerely,

Shannon and Thomas Burns

cc: matthew.glesne@lacity.org
Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24 W43 and 12.24 W44

1 message

Tj Escott <tjescott@me.com>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 5:11 PM

To: Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Legislative assistant:Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org &

Jose Huizar, Chair: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Dear Councilman Huizar:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc., recently voted to oppose the City's proposed repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44 and to instead retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. We are particularly concerned that the City Council is rushing the proposed repeal without giving our City's neighborhoods and residents an adequate opportunity to provide their input.

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state's default standards for second dwelling units applying in every neighborhood in the City. This "one size fits all" approach is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and will have a negative and lasting impact on our single-family neighborhoods. A major policy decision such as the repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances should be considered only after a thorough study of the potential neighborhood impacts and the options available to the City.

The Hillside Federation urges you to delay any action by the PLUM Committee until it has received a full analysis of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

I have lived in the Hollywood Hills for many years with it's substandard streets and infrastructure, allowing more growth to an already overly dense community only adds to the dangerous conditions that we all face.

Sincerely,

TJ Escott
3009 N Beachwood Dr
LA CA 90068



PLUM Meeting June 7, 2016: Re: ITEM NO. (2), 14-0057-S8

1 message

Jim Van Dusen <wjvd@roadrunner.com>
To: Huizar@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

June 5, 2016

PLUM Legislative assistant:
Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org &
Jose Huizar, Chair: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Huizar:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc., recently voted to oppose the City's proposed repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44 and to instead retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. I agree with their vote and am particularly concerned that the City Council is rushing the proposed repeal without giving our City's neighborhoods and residents an adequate opportunity to provide their input.

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state's default standards for second dwelling units applying in every neighborhood in the City. This "one size fits all" approach is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and will have a negative and lasting impact on our single-family neighborhoods. A major policy decision such as the repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances should be considered only after a thorough study of the potential neighborhood impacts and the options available to the City.

I urge you to delay any action by the PLUM Committee until it has received a full analysis of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Jim Van Dusen
3148 N.Beachwood Dreive
Los Angeles, CA 90068
213-304-7410

cc: Councilmember David Ryu



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Unit ordinances

1 message

The Kashkooli Family <kashkoolifamily@gmail.com>

Sun, Jun 5, 2016 at 9:10 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilman Huizar:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc., recently voted to oppose the City's proposed repeal of Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44 and to instead retain the protections embedded within those code sections, particularly the prohibition on second dwelling units in Hillside Areas and on substandard streets. We are particularly concerned that the City Council is rushing the proposed repeal without giving our City's neighborhoods and residents an adequate opportunity to provide their input.

The repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances would result in the state's default standards for second dwelling units applying in every neighborhood in the City. This "one size fits all" approach is the wrong land use policy for a City with so many different neighborhoods and will have a negative and lasting impact on our single-family neighborhoods. A major policy decision such as the repeal of the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances should be considered only after a thorough study of the potential neighborhood impacts and the options available to the City.

The Hillside Federation urges you to delay any action by the PLUM Committee until it has received a full analysis of the options that the City has to comply with state law, the policy implications of repealing the Second Dwelling Unit ordinances, and the potential negative impacts to our neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Anne Marie Coyne-Kashkooli
2851 N. Beachwood Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90068