



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

cf:14-0057.58

1 message

Sylvia V <sylviav2005@yahoo.com>

Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 11:03 AM

Reply-To: "sylviav2005@yahoo.com" <sylviav2005@yahoo.com>

To: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, "councilmember.english@lacity.org" <councilmember.english@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>, "councilmember.busciano@lacity.org" <councilmember.busciano@lacity.org>, "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>, "councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>, "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org" <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>, "councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org" <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>

Dear councilmembers:

My name is Sylvia Valenzuela. I am asking you to please vote in favor of repealing the ordinance that was in place before Ab1866. I have a 9 to 5 job. I am not a developer. My family depends on it. I have invested everything on building a small 732 sq ft house behind my house. I have improved the area. It used to be wasted space with nothing but weeds. It is now a useful space in an area where there is no housing available. I depleted my savings and retirement on this project. I paid the city upwards of \$20,000 in permit fees. We have satisfied all city requirements.

This is a huge improvement in our neighborhood. Please vote to repeal the outdated ordinance. Thank you

Sincerely

Sylvia Valenzuela. 8/12/2016

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Repeal Ordinance Public Comment (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

IraBelgrade@aol.com <IraBelgrade@aol.com>

Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 11:12 AM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, steve.blau@lacity.org
Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org,
councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org,
councilmember.busciano@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org,
councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org,
councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

Hi Sharon,

I would like to ask that you please add my comments to the council File
Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance
(CF:14-0057-S8)

Dear City Councilmembers,

My name is Ira Belgrade and I've been a homeowner in the La Brea/Hancock area for the past 20 years. I have a 1,190 sq. ft. two story ADU that I've rented out for the past six years without any issue or burden to my community and without it, my family and I could no longer afford to live in our home. AB 1866 has been the de facto law in our city since 2010 and has worked without a single incident and must be restored as the law in our city until we can come up with a way to permit the approximately 50,000 unpermitted units that already exist. That will move our city forward for generations to come. The old "Grannyflat Ordinance" is a relic, including its name, of another time, when our housing situation wasn't in crisis. PEOPLE CAN'T AFFORD TO LIVE HERE ANYMORE, and we must seize an opportunity to change that. All of the negative comments from various homeowner associations are completely unwarranted and have no basis in actual fact. My unit has caused none of the negative affects the various homeowner associations claim will occur with AB 1866 and it has been a good and vital part of my neighborhood and community, offering a below market rent when rents in my area are out of reach for most people. It has also kept my family stable, has allowed me to continue to be an involved and supportive member of my community, and most importantly, has allowed our family to continue living in and owning our home. We must repeal the old second unit ordinance, restore AB 1866 and move our city forward!

Sincerely,

Ira Belgrade
Homeowner, Los Angeles
La Brea/Hancock, Council District 4
cell: 818-519-0099



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Repeal Ordinance Public Comment (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Brandon Lindauer <brandon.lindauer@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 11:28 AM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Sharon Dickinson <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, steve.blau@lacity.org
Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, David Ryu <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.busciano@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

Hi Sharon,

I would like to ask that you please add my comments to the council File Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance (CF:14-0057-S8)

Dear City Councilmembers,

I would like to ask you to please vote in favor of the repeal of the Second Dwelling Ordinance.

I am writing on behalf of my friends and family in the City of Los Angeles. The inability to initiate construction due to this outdated ordinance is not only tying up the finances and properties of citizens, but is also stopping workers from earning a living and providing for their families as well.

Failure to correct this situation results in the reduction, not the creation of job. Making the right decision, however, and repealing the 1985 Second Dwelling Ordinance (in accordance with State law) creates jobs, reduces poverty, and increases property values across the city. This is one of those rare situations where the choice is clear, and there is no down side. I trust you will all make the correct decision.

I welcome any comments that you may have and would greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak with your office and let you hear from a family affected by your decision.

Sincerely,

Brandon Lindauer



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Repeal Ordinance Public Comment (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Matthew Gregorchuk <mgregorchuk@gmail.com>

Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 10:09 AM

To: steve.blau@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org
Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org,
councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org,
councilmember.busciano@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org,
councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org,
councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

Hi Sharon,

I would like to ask that you please add my comments to the council File Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance (CF:14-0057-S8)

Dear City Council members,

I am a general contractor in Los Angeles. The economy was just starting to pick-up for my business last year. Last year i began to design a second dwelling units under AB1866. My client was able to get funding and has paid all the planning fees, however the City won't issue a permit so construction can't start. Since the court injunction my work has stopped. I have had to layoff my crew of 6 and I am unsure of whether i should start another project or continue to wait for the City to approve a new measure. I have been trading water for three months now, losing all my savings, and unsure of what the outcome will be.

Los Angeles is becoming harder and harder for a small construction company to do anything but a bathroom remodel. Permit fees, planning requirements, and other City costs are forcing my bids ever higher. More and more "Bootleg" projects are going on, when i ask guys at the supply houses they tell me to stop looking for permits and just risk the penalties. I can't compete with guys that are going around the system.

Second Dwelling units were a niche i thought I could get into, give my guys steady work, and support my family. My wife and I rent a one bedroom aptment in the Valley, I'm not some huge Wilshire development firm. It feels that Los Angeles is trying to outlaw my profession while paying lip service to wanting homes for homeless. Who will build your "Homeless Initiative" homes?

Matthew Gregorchuk
805-856-8899
mgregorchuk@gmail.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Repeal Ordinance Public Comment (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Pouya <pouya@archi10.com>

Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 1:29 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Sharon Dickinson <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, steve.blau@lacity.org
Cc: "Cc:" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org,
David Ryu <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org,
councilmember.busciano@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org,
councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org,
councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

To Whom it may concern

Subject: City Council File: CF:14-0057-S8

I hope all is well with you. I am an Architect and have been working in residential filled for over 10 years. I am also a home owner with a 2nd dwelling unit on My property located at 3601 Wasatch Ave. and have designed handful of 2nd dwelling units. I really believe that the projects I designed using 2nd dwelling units law were designed to the owners life style and use where as we have design a lot of Mac Mansions on the other hand where the final product is much more massive (in compare) and don't have the sensitivity of space because it is not really designed with the end user who is sensitive about the space he/she is living in.

I really believe that 2nd dwelling unit rule is meeting the intention of the code and I believe that a lot of the families who have build or in the process of building it have their life depending on this (financial and life style).

I would urge you to vote to allow construction of 2nd dwelling units.

Thank you

Pouya Payan , Leed AP, Labyrinth design studio Inc.

1600 Sawtelle Blvd, Suite 230, Los Angeles, California 90025

Tel: (818) 200-5005

www.labyrinth-ds.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Repeal Ordinance Public Comment (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Elliot Zarabi <elliottzarabi@yahoo.com>

Fri, Aug 12, 2016 at 12:14 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, Steven Blau <steve.blau@lacity.org>
Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org,
councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org,
councilmember.busciano@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org,
councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org,
councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

Hi Sharon,

I would like to ask that you please add my comments to the council File
Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance
(CF:14-0057-S8)

To the Hon. City Council Members,

My name is Elliot Zarabi, and my parents purchased a property in Reseda back in April of 2015. The purchase all included approved permits to build two single family residences on a single lot. The money to build and to purchase this property did not come easy to my parents. My father moved here in 1978 escaping religious persecution. He came here with \$20.00 in his pocket and with poor english. Throughout his life, he has worked very hard to provide for his wife and children. Now that both my sister and I are independent of him, he was able to start saving (along with my mother) and purchase the property in questions. With their savings they saw this project as being their future retirement.

Knowing that they had legitimate permits and knowing that they were moving forward with the blessing of the City of Los Angeles the began construction. After completing roughly 90% of the construction, they received a notice that they could no longer move forward on building the back unit unless they signed a document statement they acknowledge they can be sued. I, as an attorney, advised against them signing this document because they did everything by the book, and the should not and cannot be punished as a result of this.

By not repealing the ordinance in question, many people, such as my parents are going to lose on their future. Many people who worked hard their entire lives, will not be unable to live comfortably in their retirement years.

Besides legal issues that will most definitely arise if the ordinance is not repealed, there are other issues that face this City. The rental market is outrageously high, and more and more people are unable to afford to live in Los Angeles anymore. Citing an article written by Dennis Romero of LA Weekly entitled "People Are Leaving L.A. Because it's Just Too Damn Expensive (MAP)," which stated that "a recent analysis by Realtor.com found that Los Angeles was one of top five 'cities losing the most residents' in the United States." Showing that this is not just a "investor/homeowner issue" but rather a City problem as well.

I can only urge the council to take the correct approach and repeal LAMC section 12.24 W.43 and W.44 so that people, like my parents, who have relied on the City granting permits do not lose their life savings and their ability to sustain their lives and that the rental market will be able to be manageable so that we do not lose our residents.

Regards,

Elliot Zarabi, Esq.

Phone: 213-784-2524

Fax: 213-784-2514

515 South Figueroa Street
Suite 1200

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Disclaimer: The information you obtain in this email is not, nor is it intended to be, legal advice, as without all of the pertinent facts, we cannot give definitive legal advice at this time. Further, contacting us does not create an attorney-client relationship. Please do not send any confidential information to us until such time as an attorney-client relationship has been established.

IMPORTANT AND CONFIDENTIAL: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This message contains information from Elliot R. Zarabi, Esq., which may be privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this in error, please telephone us immediately at (213) 784-2524.

Dear City Council Members:

There are many benefits provided by Secondary Dwelling Units ("SDUs"). At a high level, SDUs increase the stock for affordable housing units and partially assist in mitigating the Los Angeles City housing crisis. However, I am not going to discuss this topic in this e-mail or debate whether it is right or wrong to build SDUs. In this e-mail, I will discuss the current state of confusion faced by law abiding citizens like myself as a result of a lack of SDU policy in the City of Los Angeles. People like me that are at different stages of completion of their SDUs. More simplistically, I am going to discuss the topic of fairness.

I personally have invested time and money. Close to \$20 thousand invested thus far comprised of architect fees, survey fees, engineer fees, City fees including plan check fees, various clearance fees and close to \$10 thousand in permitting fees. All of this in order to receive a permit that is not good anymore. My permit was issued post 2/25/16, which places me in an odd position and not allowed to build. The reason that the permit date is post 2/25/16 is also due to the inefficiencies and the delays at Building and Safety. Throughout the entire process, there has also not been a single communication from Building and Safety regarding returning the funds that have been paid to them thus far. Furthermore, there has also not been communication as to the changes in the SDU policy. I should also note that I have also secured financing that matures in less than a year.

I did all of this because I relied upon the LA City's SDU policy in effect at the time. I started my process over one year ago. The people that I met in various committee meetings related to the "overnight" change in SDU policy also relied on the LA City's SDU policy in effect. These people for the most part can be classified as the City's smallest builder. My story is only one of many. I have met people that:

- Placed marriages on hold because they were hoping to live behind their parents.
- Have disabilities and were planning to build a living space for their nursing/health staff.
- Have backyards with half completed construction and full of materials that they have paid for that are lying in the backyard getting destroyed by the weather.
- Facing financial hardships.
- Are architects and contractors that have lost a significant portion of income and have to answer to angry clients because their business plan was based on the City's SDU policy.
- Put other everyday life activities on hold.

All this suffering, because we decided to do the right thing. Instead of illegally converting a garage and exposing a potential tenant/family member to an unsafe living environment or the neighborhood to overcrowded parking situation, we decided to invest money and pay city fees and taxes to create additional housing the right way. None of us had "pipe dreams" for building an SDU. We relied on the SDU policy in effect, which allowed us to implement on our plans as outlined by the City policy. Furthermore, Building and Safety has taken money from us in order to review plans and provide various clearances and permits. None of these funds have been returned throughout this stand-still process.

I encourage you to 1) continue with the SDU projects that are already in process (plan check and permit issued) and 2) support for recommendation to repeal the 1985 Grannyflat Ordinance and allow state law

AB 1866 to remain in effect, as it has been for the past 6 years. This will eliminate any further confusion and monetary and emotional hardship on all of us. We should not be the ones that are paying for the Building and Safety and City Attorney careless action of implementing a change through a memorandum as opposed through an Ordinance. The current situation is mass confusion and not logical. We are the smallest builders that the City has and can afford these types of hardships the least. This will also set the right example for doing the right thing and encourage building of SDUs legally.

The term "grandfathered" is most used in City planning. I propose to first and foremost to grandfather in the SDU's that are in the plan check phase or have issued permits already, irrespective of the date. People like me that are already heavily invested (money, time, emotions) by relying on the policy in effect should not be punished as a result of the careless policy implementation by the powers that be. We are already "pregnant" and can do very little to change our situation without having a large financial hardship. The famous comment that was made to me by my architect was that "I lived in Iran and I have not seen this kind of an overnight change and punishment on the people that relied on the City and followed all the rules". This is the topic of fairness that hopefully I was able to clearly communicate to you. It is only fair to allow me to finish what I started and heavily invested in by relying on LA City's SDU policy.

Can you imagine paying for a service in the range of \$20 thousand, have that payment accepted by the opposing party, have a promise that the service would be provided ("issued permit to build") and at the end that service provider refusing to provide the service or a suggesting to return the funds that were paid? This is exactly what we are facing with Building and Safety. Building and Safety has happily accepted our money and in my case issued a permit that I cannot use. This is not fair! The entire process has a feel of a third world country!

Please vote in favor of the repeal.

Best Regards

Garen Papazyan

(213) 453-7806

To Whom it May Concern:

Are we living in "America", what we all know as the land of freedom and fairness? As an American citizen, this is the question that I ask myself every morning after hearing and attending the meetings regarding Second Dwelling Unit (SDU) policy change that happened overnight. I am a disappointed and frustrated citizen and I feel that my rights have been violated when being issued a permit by the Los Angeles Building and Safety and later coming to find out that it's no longer valid.

I personally have invested my valuable time and hard worked money to build a Second Dwelling Unit. I was issued a permit on 3/2/16 by the LADBS after going through the entire permit application and clearance process. I have spent about \$30 thousand dollars on architect, engineering, permit, and supplies fees. I have supplies sitting in my back yard from March 2016 (6 months) that have gone bad and no longer can be used. I have taken out a loan for this project, which I am accruing daily interest as of today. Please stop for a minute and ask yourself how would you feel or what would you do if you were in my place. We all know that money does not grow on trees. We can't get back our wasted valuable time. The only thing that I plead and consider fair is to move forward and allow us the people whom currently have approved plans to proceed with their project and for LADBS to stop taking new applications. In fact, not once have I been notified by the LADBS that they will be liable for my loss.

In some of these meeting I have heard several reasons from the opposing party as to why a second dwelling unit should not be permitted. Some reasons were that a second dwelling is causing overcrowded parking or their view is being blocked. Have these people not realized that they live in LA, where it's one of the most crowded cities??? Their view can be blocked even if their neighbor decides to build a 'single' two-story house on their lot. They can have a crowded parking even in a 'single' dwelling situation by having a neighbor with a large family who each need a car for transportation in "crowded" LA. I actually think that Secondary Dwelling Units should continue. We want things to be done the right away and not have people illegally convert their garages to an unsafe living environment.

I love America, I love LA, and I love having laws and regulations. Please act fast on this matter and allow hard working citizens such as us to proceed with our approved permits in building the Second Dwelling Unit. Please do not destroy our dreams and hopes especially since we have approved permits.

Thank you for your valuable time,

Piruz Papazyan