



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance

1 message

Gaye Barnes <barnes.gaye@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 10:01 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.english@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@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

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance.

Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

Sincerely,

Gaye Barnes
4259 Fulton Avenue
Sherman Oaks 91423



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Support for Item #19 CF 14-0057-S8

1 message

Sarah Hunt <sarah@spincycle.tv>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 11:14 PM

To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, 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.buscaino@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

Dear Councilmember Ryu,

I am writing in **support** of Item #19 CF 14-0057-S8 but with reservations and a request that the following suggestions be included.

- 1/ In terms of the design of the second dwelling neighbourhood conformity should be adhered to.
- 2/ The floor area ratio (FAR) of the second dwelling should not exceed that of the original neighbourhood structures, i.e. the size and scale shouldn't be larger than the primary dwellings surrounding it.
- 3/ Street parking should not be compromised by the second dwelling.
- 4/ There should be adequate green space incorporated into the design, i.e. the second dwelling shouldn't take up most of the garden of the original property.
- 5/ Significant landscaping should be a part of the design.
- 6/ The Scenic Corridor Planning Guidelines should be adhered to in hillside communities.
- 7/ Wildlife corridors should not be blocked by the dwelling.
- 8/ Set-backs and distance from the immediate neighbours should be taken into consideration.
- 9/ The second dwelling should be for close family members and should not be built as a resale for profit structure.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Hunt
3701 Fredonia Drive, 90068



Re: Code Amendment/Second Dwelling Units/Proposed Ordinance
CF# 14-0057-S8

August 30, 2016

Los Angeles City Council
John Ferraro Council Chamber
Room 340, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

On August 22, 2016, The Old Granada Hills Residents' Group Board of Directors voted to support the following position:

The Old Granada Hills Resident's Group BOD strongly urges the Los Angeles City Council to oppose the repeal of the currently adopted second unit standards and replacement of those standards with weak and less restrictive State "default" provisions.

Furthermore, there is no urgency and sufficient time should be allowed for a more thorough review and extensive public input regarding:

- Amending the LAMC to ensure procedural compliance with AB 1866 while maintaining the original standards established in LAMC Subsections 12.24 W.43 and 12.24 W.44.
- Utilizing best practices from other California municipalities' second unit ordinances that provide additional protections for Los Angeles City's residential districts.
- A legitimate permitting process for second units that are now under construction.

Thank you,

Dave Beauvais, President
Old Granada Hills Residents' Group

Maria Fisk, Board Member
Old Granada Hills Residents' Group



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Comment for the council File Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Bibi Horacek <bb41a1@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 8:40 AM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, Council Member Koretz <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, Dan Love <danlove378@gmail.com>, pointsofcaution <booboo90@earthlink.net>, Joe Horacek <jhoracek@manatt.com>

Dear City Council Members,

We are writing to voice our opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance.

Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods. It would also increase traffic and safety risks.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

Sincerely,

Beatriz Horacek
Joseph Horacek III
10510 Rocca Place
Los Angeles, CA 90077
Ph: 310 440-8890



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

The Granny Flat War . From Someone Who's Been In It

1 message

14-0057-58

homeowners-encino@sbcglobal.net <homeowners-encino@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 8:07 AM

To: Jeffrey Ebenstein <jeffrey.ebenstein@lacity.org>, Tom Henry <Tom.Henry@lacity.org>, Cara Goldman <cara.goldman@lacity.org>, Gurmet Khara <gurmet.khara@lacity.org>, Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>, Paul Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, Joan Pelico <Joan.Pelico@lacity.org>, Faisal Alserri <Faisal.Alserrri@lacity.org>, Andy Shrader <andy.shrader@lacity.org>, Renee Weitzer <Renee.Weitzer@lacity.org>, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Sarah Dusseault <sarah.dusseault@lacity.org>, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, Felipe Fuentes <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, Mitchell Englander <Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org>, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, Mike Bonin <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org

The Granny Flat War ... From Someone Who's Been In It

Dannielle Langlois
29 August 2016



UP CLOSE AND PERSONAL--On August 31, 2016, the LA City Council could make a huge mistake that will have lasting impacts on our community.

Once upon a time, the city of Los Angeles created regulations that protected the characteristics of single family home zones. In essence, some of these regulations prevented homeowners from building big second homes on a single family home property. Makes sense, right? Because that's what "single family home zone" means. So, in LA, a wide variety of different neighborhoods are zoned R-01. And these R-01 neighborhoods are really a great place to live, partly because our city's zoning regulations have helped to keep them that way.

These regulations did allow homeowners in those zones to build another detached home on the property. But that structure had to be small, low profile, and it couldn't have a separate address. According to LA's regulations, homeowners were free to build "granny flats" for their relatives to live in. And remember, they are always free to add an addition to their home. That was never in question.

This worked, for the most part, to protect the character of the neighborhood. It guarded against overdevelopment.

But one day, in 2010, the Planning Department made a mistake, based on incorrect legal advice,

instructing officials to ignore the City's standards, and instead, to follow the state standards, which are much more lenient. For the next six years, the City issued about 75 permits each year for second units in these single family home neighborhoods. Almost all of the permits were for structures that exceeded the City's adopted standards.

Earlier this year, a judge determined that the Planning Department's "ZA Memo 120" was not legal. Since then, permitting for these structures (even the small ones that would have met the city's regulations) has been halted.

But instead of amending the City's regulations, City Council is now considering throwing out the regulations entirely and defaulting to the considerably more lenient state's standards. In essence, this would mean returning to ZA Memo 120, which a Judge has already revoked.

Why does LA have different zoning standards than the state of California? Because LA has specific needs. Just like every other major metropolitan city in this country, our city has adopted regulations to protect against overdevelopment and against negative impacts on the environment, infrastructure, and the character of neighborhoods.

All of this may seem silly to Angelenos who live on larger parcels of land or in apartment buildings. They might say, what's the point? If it is your land, you should be allowed to use it any way you want. Right?

I can see why some may think that. But imagine if you lived in my neighborhood:

Welcome to the quintessential San Fernando Valley single family neighborhood. Our houses are very close together. In my cute, quiet little neighborhood known as "Kester Ridge" in Van Nuys, our mostly small houses sit on mostly small lots. Our fences (which cannot exceed eight feet in our backyard) create the barriers which afford us some visual, if not acoustic, privacy.

Our backyards aren't huge, but they offer a great place to relax; most of them are big enough to accommodate a small pool or a nice little garden. Most of the lots are approximately 50 feet wide and average about 6,000 square feet. Almost every house in the neighborhood is only one story high.

So imagine you've just bought your dream home, right here in this cute little neighborhood. It took every penny you had. But you've worked hard, you turned it into a beautiful home, and you've promised yourself that you are finally going to relax and lay out by the pool in your lovely backyard.

A few months later, the property right behind you goes up for sale. And the guy who buys it is a developer. He tells you that he doesn't have any intention of actually moving to your little neighborhood. His car, an Aston Martin, gives you an idea of where he calls home.

He's going use the property to generate rental income. His plan is to rent out the main property, and, thanks to ZA Memo 120, he's also going to rent out a second house which he plans to build in the backyard! It's going to be two stories high with just as much square footage as the main house.

The backyard isn't very big, so he's going to have to build as close to your back fence as the law allows. He tells you that he's got properties like this all over LA.

This developer has started an LLC for the property, and between the two homes on a single lot, he will be generating \$6,000 a month in rental income. He doesn't care one bit about the fact that your ability to enjoy your yard (to say nothing of your property value) just went down as a result of his actions.

He says: "This isn't my first rodeo."

So, you take a moment. You try to process this: A large, two-story tall, very visible structure in the small backyard -- even though the *very concept* of a single family neighborhood means that this sort of thing isn't supposed to happen.

But he gets the permit. And no one in the City even notifies you that this was happening. You live right next to the property, well within the 500-foot range. How is this possible? If there had been a particular time to voice your opinion on the matter, no one in the government told you when it was.

You try to talk to your political representative in City Council. They keep calling it a "granny flat." But it's not a granny flat. It's huge. It's a fully functioning second home, with its own house number, mailbox, and soon, a whole bunch of tenants.

You do some research online. Even California's Legislative Analyst has determined that this type of "urban infill" in single family home zones is not going to solve the affordable housing crisis. In fact, this type of new structure isn't even going to make a dent in the affordable housing crisis, because there is no requirement to price it affordably. They'll be renting at market rates. But the politicians keep throwing around the term "affordable housing" when they discuss this issue. Strange, isn't it?

So this developer builds -- full steam ahead. The framing goes up. It's big. And tall. And man, it's close! You think, well, maybe we'll get used to it. And then one day you come home to see the framing for the second story window: it looks right down onto your pool, your yard and into your bedroom!

The building is so close to its own property line that the people living in it won't be able to see their own yard from the window. But yours? Well, they'll be thrilled that you've given them such a lovely view. Too bad that you can't say the same about your new view. (See photo above.)

This is how it happens. And because this unfair and previously illegal thing has happened to you, you decide to sell your dream home. And the winning bidder? Well, wouldn't you know it -- a developer. If this process continues *ad infinitum*, say goodbye to the very notion of a single-family neighborhood.

Wealthy developers will have a huge opportunity to make a lot of money for themselves if the SDU ordinance is repealed. They will be able to outbid the average homebuyer and will *overdevelop* every property they can get their hands on.

I have read a few misinformed articles that frame this issue differently. The politicians who are in favor of the repeal of the SDU Ordinance are likely in the pockets of wealthy developers whose projects have been put on hold. These smart politicians are smart to hold actual, legitimate granny flats hostage: they know all too well that if you create a crisis that arouses public sympathy, you can exploit it.

This is all about greed. It opens the door to rampant overdevelopment...not granny.

Here's what I'm hoping my City Councilmembers will do:

Investigate the environmental impacts of any possible changes to zoning laws before they make those changes. For instance, more "urban infill" means more concrete, therefore less groundwater is absorbed, making both the drought and the flooding, due to the lack of storm drains in my neighborhood, even worse.

Discuss this issue with the public, and do it in a way that is intellectually honest. Don't tie this repeal to the creation of affordable housing. And that includes *you*, Mr. Mayor! California's Legislative Analyst's Office has determined that urban infill will not solve the affordable housing shortage in Los Angeles. In fact, the LAO has determined that this repeal won't even offer a small supply of "affordable" housing for another *twenty-five years*. Our politicians need to stop spinning this issue. It's unethical to confuse constituents into submission. We deserve better.

Remember, this isn't about granny flats. While I strongly oppose the repeal, I support the public's right to build granny flats that are appropriate for the size of one's immediate community. We just need our politicians to create the right laws -- or common-sense amendments to existing regs -- to make that happen.

Our politicians have a number of potential solutions that don't involve repealing the Second Dwelling Unit Ordinance, leaving us vulnerable to overdevelopment. They should do their due diligence and behave with integrity. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach. It is not in LA's best interest to discard our protective local standards.

I repeat: the politicians have several options at their disposal. Those options should not include throwing the baby out with the bathwater.

Please contact your LA City Councilmember before Wednesday, August 31 about this important issue. We need a lot more support because the developers have been lobbying the City Council hard for the past six months.

(Dannielle Langlois is film and television actress who lives in Van Nuys, next door to the above "second unit dwelling.") Edited for CityWatch by Linda Abrams.



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Comment for the council File Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

O'Connells <poconnellhome@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 4:03 PM

Reply-To: O'Connells <poconnellhome@sbcglobal.net>

To: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>

Cc: "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@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.buscaino@lacity.org" <councilmember.buscaino@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.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance.

Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

Sincerely,

Anita O'Connell
Van Nuys



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Support for Accessory Dwelling Units (Support for File 14-0057-S8)

1 message

Luke Klipp <lukehklipp@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 4:06 PM

To: matthew.glesne@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, steve.blau@lacity.org, david.michaelson@lacity.org
Cc: councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, Councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, Councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, Councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org

Dear Members of the LA City Council,

I am writing in order to ask you to vote to repeal the 1985 LAMC section 12.24 W.43 and W.44. It is unfair to prevent homeowners who relied upon the city's Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) rules from now being able to finish their work. This is an unfair taking and, frankly, will likely and rightfully land the city in protracted and expensive litigation for years to come.

I am not currently building an ADU, but I believe that the City of Los Angeles badly needs additional housing. I've said it in public forums and in my private settings: I believe that ADUs, or "granny flats" as they're often called, are one of our city's best available means to provide housing for our growing population - and these are the kinds of homes that are more affordable than most of the new housing that we see getting built today. These backyard homes fit in well with their surroundings, help families stay together, and make more Angelenos into their own developers. Furthermore, they used to be quite commonplace throughout LA, until we downzoned massive sections of the city, so anyone calling on LA to respect its history ought to know that hearkening back to our earlier years would mean vigorously supporting homeowners' ability to build ADUs.

Finally, once the City has repealed its old 1985 ADU rules, it should pass a new ADU ordinance making it easier for more residents to legally build second units. We recommend that you look to the Bloom and Wieckowski bills in the State legislature for ideas on improving our local rules. That we would continue to make the construction of ADUs as difficult as we have in the past would be a crime against our families, our growing city, and the imperative upon you to ensure that everyone has a roof over their heads at night.

Thank you for supporting more housing to help make LA a more affordable place for all to live.

Best regards,
Luke H. Klipp
Resident of Los Feliz



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

I don't recognize my neighbors-please OPPOSE the repeal of SDU ordinance

1 message

Lynn Kuwahara <lynnkuwahara@yahoo.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 4:20 PM

Reply-To: Lynn Kuwahara <lynnkuwahara@yahoo.com>

To: "councilman.wesson@lacity.org" <councilman.wesson@lacity.org>

Cc: Councilmember Bonin <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org"

<councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>,

Councilmember Blumenfield <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, "councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org"

<councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org"

<councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>, Curren

Price <councilmember.price@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>,

"councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>, "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org"

<councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>, Sharon

Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Councilmember Harris-Dawson <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>

Dear Councilmember,

There is a reason that I budget for my mortgage, insurance, repairs, and property taxes, because I wanted to live in a house in a Single-family area.

I'm paying for breathing room, I don't want to live like a rat in a maze. When working in my front yard, I used to be able to recognize the people taking

a nightly stroll. I don't know maybe half of the people passing now.

The next block west of me has apartments. A car parks in front of my house all week, only moving for street cleaning and then immediately moves back.

This resident walks over from the other block because there is no parking.

Also, WAZE must have my street listed as a cut-through, because during rush hours, the line of taillights waiting at the end of the block looks like

a freeway on-ramp.

These are irritants that are slowly eroding the quality of living in Los Angeles and to add a poorly researched and written ordinance allowing the virtual unregulated building of Second Dwelling Units will put the nail in the coffin.

Thank you,

Lynn Kuwahara

CD #10 stakeholder

Lynn Kuwahara

(310) 871-0957 Cell

lynnkuwahara@yahoo.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File: 14-0057-S8: Please Do Not Repeal Our Existing Second Dwelling Ordinance.. The Single Family Neighborhoods Need Protective Rights

1 message

Tim Email <Timpreim@roadrunner.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 4:37 PM

Council File: 14-0057-S8

Dear City Council Members,

We are writing to voice our opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance.

Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

Sincerely,

The Preimesberger Family

Cindy, Tim, Brandon, and Kara

Council File: 14-0057-S8

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Repeal of the 2nd dwelling ordinance

1 message

William Lasarow <wlasarow@mindspring.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 4:50 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

August 30, 2016

To all members of the Los Angeles City Council,

My husband, William J. Lasarow and I wish to inform you of our opposition to the repeal of the 2nd dwelling ordinance. The character and spirit of too many neighborhood areas would be negatively transformed and compromised, should this repeal be enacted.

We thank you for including our position on this matter, before considering your action tomorrow.

Sincerely,

Marilyn and William Lasarow

11623 Canton Place
Studio City, California 91604
wlasarow@mindspring.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

In support of the Granny Flats Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Judy Lai-Norling <judylai99@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 5:11 PM

To: councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, Matthew.Glesne@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, Steve.Blau@lacity.org, David.Michaelson@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Dear Los Angeles City Councilmembers and City Officials,

I encourage you to vote to repeal the 1985 LAMC section 12.24 W.43 and W.44. It is unfair to prevent homeowners who counted on the city's ADU rules from finishing their projects. While I am not currently building an ADU, I believe that the City of Los Angeles badly needs additional housing. ADUs are a great way to add units that are more affordable than most new housing. These backyard homes fit into their surroundings, help families stay together, and make more Angelenos into their own developers.

After repealing the old 1985 ADU rules, the city should pass a new ADU ordinance making it easier for more residents to legally build second units. We recommend that you look to the Bloom and Wieckowski bills in the state legislature for ideas on improving our local rules.

Thank you for supporting more housing to help make LA a more affordable place for all to live.

Thank you,

Judy Lai-Norling

Concerned resident and homeowner in the City of Los Angeles

Address: 11350 Alethea Dr, Sunland CA 91040 (LA Council District 7)

Phone: 323-825-1513

Occupation: Systems Engineer, NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena CA



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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

1 message

Yvonne Ellett <fashunchik@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 5:11 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, 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.buscaino@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

Dear City Council Members,

This is a request for the LA City Council to vote “NO” regarding the proposal to repeal the existing Second Unit Dwelling Ordinance. The City of Los Angeles must maintain its own Building & Safety and Planning standards to preserve the character of its single family neighborhoods, and to ensure a proper evolution of the City’s current housing stock to meet its future needs.

Best Regards,

Nick and Yvonne Hill

Los Angeles, 90008



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Reference Case Number - City Council Case No: 16-0876, 16-0876-S1, 16-0876-S2, 16-0876-S3

1 message

indy flore <iflore@gmail.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 5:15 PM

OPPOSITION TO PARAMOUNT MASTER PLAN

Dear Sirs

I am writing to oppose the Paramount master plan proposed development. I am a resident of nearby Hancock Park and my neighborhood will be seriously and negatively impacted by this proposed development. Allowing this size of project to proceed in a residential area is tantamount to destroying the community.

I agree with the points raised by Susan Grossman and the Hancock Park Homeowners' Association est. 1948. There are also other reasons why the plan does not work for me or other local residents, hence all the opposition you are receiving.

Electronic bill boards do not belong in this neighborhood. This is a quiet residential neighborhood, not the Las Vegas strip or Hollywood Boulevard.

In addition, the neighborhood can barely sustain existing levels of traffic, let alone the incremental traffic that this huge proposed development will bring to the neighborhood, where the streets are already overburdened. The proposed traffic mitigation is ill conceived and reveals a fundamental lack of understanding of the traffic dynamics of the area and / or a disregard for the local community, which is already facing traffic challenges.

Before ANY plan is approved, there needs to be a full traffic and feasibility survey. Where is this? If a proper survey and analysis was done, why is such a menial amount -- less than the cost of one set of traffic lights -- being set aside for mitigation?

There has already been a wave of new large commercial and residential developments along Melrose and just to the north thereof and while the impact of incremental traffic is already being felt, the full impact is still ahead given many of the developments are not yet live and more are being planned and approved.

Furthermore, the Planning department has a ridiculously long backlog of planning applications from hundreds of homeowners. Some homeowners have been waiting 7 months or longer just for Planning to revert. This is supposed to take one week and Planning understands the status quo is unacceptable.

The Planning backlog is mounting by the day. Calls to planners are all going unanswered, and emails and voice messages are routinely ignored.

Given this dynamic, and the pitiful level of resource and service made available by the City to taxpaying homeowners, I'd like to know (1) how on earth Planning feels equipped to handle a master plan of this magnitude and (2) why consideration of this master plan is being expedited and taking priority over hundreds / thousands of Planning applications by taxpaying homeowners across the city.

Why does the City keep supporting and expediting corporate Planning applications and thereby adding to the already ridiculous delays homeowners are facing? Why are corporate applications so much more important to the City? Why is the City directing so much resource to Paramount's plan while homeowners are forced to stomach the financial costs of endless planning delays??

Finally, I am very concerned about how the City will be able to oversee a plan of this size when resource constraints make implementation and enforcement of basic traffic flow, road safety and parking issues a monumental challenge. In short, vis a vis limited resources, the City should be focusing on fixing current delays and staffing problems, not increasing its workload by undertaking a mega plan unsuitable for a residential area.

8/31/2016

City of Los Angeles Mail - Reference Case Number - City Council Case No: 16-0876, 16-0876-S1, 16-0876-S2, 16-0876-S3

It's about time the City support its homeowners and taxpayers instead of commercial developers who run roughshod over historic residential communities across LA.

Yours,

Indy Flore
646.315.3975

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Dwelling Units, CPC-2016-1245-CA

1 message

David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 5:44 PM

Reply-To: David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

To: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@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.buscaino@lacity.org" <councilmember.buscaino@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.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>

Cc: Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Tarzana Property Owners Association

Los Angeles City Council
Los Angeles City Hall

August 29, 2016

Subject: **Second Dwelling Units, CPC-2016-1245-CA**

The proposed ordinance, CPC-2016-1245-CA, would repeal Sections 12.24 W43 and 12.24 W44 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. The ordinance would grandfather in all second dwelling units approved by Sections 12.24 W43 and 44 as well as by ZA Memo 120. Second units would then be allowed under the state's default development standards in SB1866, Government Code Section 65852.2(b).

This is a serious matter and needs some real analysis, not a knee jerk reaction. The Tarzana Property Owners Association agrees with the provision to grandfather in previously approved second dwellings, but strongly urges you to simply repeal the Conditional Use Permit provision of Section 12.24 in accord with the SB1866 requirement that approval be "ministerially without discretionary review or a hearing". We feel that Sections 12.24 W43 and W44 would adequately support the intention of the City Council to alleviate the housing shortage in Los Angeles. In addition, it would provide the opportunity for rental of the second units, and provide housing for singles, persons with disabilities, and extended, multi-generational families in close proximity to the primary unit. It would also comply with the provision of SB1866 that requires a legislative action by the City instead of simple adherence to the provisions of SB1866. The revised ordinance would provide those benefits without unduly infringing on neighboring properties and would facilitate the retention of the feel and continuity of communities throughout the City.

We do not believe it is in the best interest of single family residential housing preservation or of the City Council to simply follow the provisions of SB1866 which, in essence, turns single family zoned area into duplexes.

Again, simply grandfather in previously approved second dwelling units and modify Sections 12.24 W43 and 12.24 W24 by eliminating the Conditional Use Permit to allow by-right approval of second

dwelling units that conform to the rest of the provisions of those sections of the Los Angeles Municipal Code.

David Garfinkle
President, Tarzana Property Owners Association.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

FW: Please vote NO on repeal of City's Second Dwelling Unit ordinance!

1 message

Kegaries <kegaries@earthlink.net>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 5:51 PM

To: david.ryu@lacity.org

Cc: mike.bonin@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, paul.krekorian@lacity.org, bob.blumenfeld@lacity.org, herb.wesson@lacity.org, mitch.ofarrell@lacity.org, mitchell.englander@lacity.org, curren.price@lacity.org, jose.huizar@lacity.org, nury.martinez@lacity.org, joe.buscaino@lacity.org, felipe.fuentes@lacity.org, Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, chairman@hillsidefederation.org, Krista Michaels <kristamichaels@earthlink.net>, gilbert.cedillo@lacity.org, mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

RE: CF 14-0057-S8; SDU Repeal

Dear Councilmember Ryu and all Councilmembers:

I oppose repeal of the City's Second Dwelling Unit ordinance through an emergency, fast-track action. The City can "grandfather" permits issued under its previous administrative procedure to provide relief to homeowners who reasonably relied on it, but must not change long-standing City policy and rules protecting hillside and other areas. The City should consider any changes of the ordinance only through an open and customary deliberative process that allows for the views of all impacted stakeholders to be thoughtfully considered.

Please vote NO!

Sincerely,

David R. Kegaries

(an Officer and Director of Cahuenga Pass Property Owners Association)

323/876-5551



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File : 14-0057-S8

1 message

Cindy Preimesberger <c.preim@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 6:05 PM

Council File: 14-0057-S8

Dear City Council Members,

We are writing to voice our opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance.

Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

Since Building and Safety has allowed developers to build second homes in the backyard of single family residences, our family has lost our privacy not only in our backyard but inside our home. Our home, built in the 1950s, has open window architecture facing the backyard. Now, our LLC neighbor has built a two story second home with views into our backyard and into 2 bedrooms and our living room. They can literally see us in our beds and as we live in our home throughout the day. Since this new, second two story home does not fit the scale of the neighboring homes, we have already spent thousands of dollars to stop the developer in building an out of scale home which failed; since there are no protections for the existing families. Further, we will have to pay tens of thousands more to try and gain some privacy back in our home. We will never have the privacy we once had. We were never notified, we did not sign up for this, and all of our life's investment went into this home to support our growing family. This is wrong. There needs to be controls in place and by repealing our existing ordinance will ONLY empower the developers and NOT growing single families. Please do not repeal our existing ordinance, please enforce our existing Second Dwelling ordinance so there are some protections for the single family.

Sincerely,

The Preimesberger Family

Cindy, Tim, Brandon, and Kara

Council File: 14-0057-S8

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

File 14-0057-S8

1 message

Rebekka Taubman <beccakai@hotmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 6:17 PM

To: "Matthew.Glesne@LACity.org" <matthew.glesne@lacity.org>, "Sharon.Dickinson@LACity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "Steve.Blau@LACity.org" <steve.blau@lacity.org>

Pass it.

-Bekka



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Comment for the council File Related to the Second Dwelling Unit Repeal Ordinance (CF:14-0057-S8)

1 message

Dove Rose <dove@dovesbodies.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 6:21 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, councilmember.englisher@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@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

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance.

Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

This is simply outrageous and cannot happen.

While I have your attention we must put an end to this rapid and disrespectful development occurring in our city. In Colfax Meadows, Studio City, we are losing the quaint neighborhood we once had. I have lived here for 30 years.

There are now 10 of the exact same houses on practically every block in our neighborhood and it is happening everywhere. How many more homes will this one developer be allowed to build that look exactly the same and are monster homes that ruin our city. Residents who have lived here for decades are leaving because this atrocious eye-sore development continues with no end in sight.

Please do something. We are losing our community and beginning to live in track housing due to this one developer.

Sincerely,

Dove

Private Training • Group Fitness • Private Yoga • Restorative • Yin • Nidra • Energy Clearing • Voice Dialogue Facilitation

Dove's Bodies

5200 Lankershim Blvd. Suite 100 North Hollywood, CA 91601

818.980.7866 outgoing only

www.dovesbodies.com

24 hour cancellation is required in order not to be charged for appointment made.

To opt out of email list please reply with UNSUBSCRIBE in subject line.



Appropriate Sizing of Second Dwelling Units is Critical

Councilman Bonin, The size of Second Dwelling Units (SDU) or "Granny Flats" in R-01 neighborhoods in Los Angeles City must be based upon the 1) *lot size*, 2) *total build area*, 3) *setbacks* and 4) *original house footprint*. This is really a very simple matter, one which the Council can easily fix. A one-size fits all is absolutely the wrong answer for Los Angeles and us voters, who elected you to represent our interests.

Is it not enough that we R-01 dwellers are being overrun, outbid and out-sized in the ever quickening march toward greater developer profits? You know that SDU construction will not beneficially impact upon the critical shortage of affordable housing in Los Angeles. Indeed, massive SDU, like those presently allowed and proposed as allowed, drive up the costs of R-01 property and firmly rip the dream of owning property in Los Angeles from the grasp of would-be home owners.

I would like for you to consider the following concerns:

SDU Construction Increases the Cost of Land and Housing in Los Angeles

It is clear that SDU construction does not solve the critical lack of affordable housing in Los Angeles, but can actually increase property costs! How is this? Presently the SDU are restricted to 1,200 square feet, which is larger than the original homes in our neighborhood. Typically these SDU are created to serve as rental property. The SDU gets its own postal address; why would this be needed if it is for extended family? Well, because it is not for extended family. Building a SDU larger than the original house on the property allows for a sizable rental income that can be used to finance the construction of a larger primary house. This creates two properties on an R-01 lot and now the property is valued not as R-01, but as R-2. Even moderately wealthy families cannot afford the prices for R-2 properties.

The most recent SDU to go up in our neighborhood is a 3 bedroom, 3 bath, 3 story (the only three story in the neighborhood), 1,249 sq. ft. SDU with and asking lease of nearly \$5,000



Figure 1: 3-Story SDU towers over neighboring properties on Wellesley and is on the market for nearly \$5,000 lease each month.

each month (Zillow Link). This SDU is larger than the original house on this property. The SDU towers over the neighbors' one story homes. Now, instead of an inexpensive backyard rental, we have two very pricey units on the land, neither of which is helping to make Los Angeles real estate affordable.

Improperly Regulated SDU Construction Destroys the Character of R-01 Neighborhoods

Official adoption of the state standard turns R-01 neighborhoods into R-2 neighborhoods. There would be no distinction between the two. It remains unclear as to why the City wants to remove R-01 neighborhoods. The present proposal results in a degradation of R-01 neighborhoods.



Figure 2: Street view of two large SDU. Neither should be seen from the street. This looks like a mini-City.

In essence, the City is stealing our neighborhoods from under our own feet and we, the voters, are left powerless to do anything about it, until the next election. Here is an example of two other SDU in our neighborhood. Mind you, our neighborhood is but six square blocks. Thus, while there may not be many permits issued each year within the City, SDU

cluster within particular neighborhoods, compounding their negative impact.

Overly Large SDU Removes Privacy and Increases Stress in R-01 Neighborhoods

The SDU size should be scaled to the neighborhood. When lots are large and setbacks generous, it might make sense to allow for 1,200 sq. ft. of SDU. However, much of Los Angeles consists of small homes on small lots with setbacks of less than five feet.

R-01 neighborhood conjures the thought of private yards, sunny space for gardens and secluded areas for quiet contemplation away from the stresses and noise of Los Angeles life. Our homes are build very close together, with garages set off the property line by less than three feet. What happens to our privacy and sense of space when you, our elected representative, allow large SDU that are out of proportion and character for our neighborhood? The very fabric of R-01 neighborhoods is torn, tossed aside for developer greed.



Figure 3: Privacy is a thing of the past with large SDU.

Large Construction is Not Green Construction

Smaller houses cost less to buy and build, both in monetarily and environmentally. By mandating smaller SDU, no larger than 640 sq. ft. in older neighborhoods like our own, you become a champion for both green construction and affordability.



Figure 4: Backyard privacy in a new age. Large SDU like these two units shown here in our Sawtelle neighborhood, together with increased mansionization, eliminate privacy.

Sincerely,
Aric Gregson, MD



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

(no subject)

1 message

Judy Chaikin <judy@jchaikin.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 7:57 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, 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.buscaino@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

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the proposed repeal of the second dwelling ordinance. Repealing this ordinance will have lasting negative impacts on the character and infrastructure of our neighborhoods. Abandoning the city's local control of second dwelling units will leave us at the mercy of incredibly weak state standards, and throw open the gates to developers to further fuel real estate speculation in our neighborhoods.

You have several options at your disposal to bring the City into compliance with state law on second units. There is simply no reason to discard our protective local standards. If revisions to the Second Dwelling Unit ordinance are necessary, at the very least they must be considered with adequate public outreach, not on the current "fast track" basis, so that all stakeholders have the opportunity to consider proposed changes and express their opinion.

Sincerely,



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

In support of file 14-0057-S8

1 message

Nick Burns <nkburns3@gmail.com>

Tue, Aug 30, 2016 at 8:59 PM

To: Matthew.Glesne@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, Steve.Blau@lacity.org, David.Michaelson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Dear City Councilmembers, City Planning Staff, and City Legal Staff,

I encourage you to vote to repeal the 1985 LAMC section 12.24 W.43 and W.44. It is unfair to prevent homeowners who counted on the city's ADU rules from finishing their projects. While I am not currently building an ADU, I believe that the City of Los Angeles badly needs additional housing. ADUs are a great way to add units that are more affordable than most new housing. These backyard homes fit into their surroundings, help families stay together, and make more Angelenos into their own developers.

After repealing the old 1985 ADU rules, the city should pass a new ADU ordinance making it easier for more residents to legally build second units. We recommend that you look to the Bloom and Wieckowski bills in the state legislature for ideas on improving our local rules.

Thank you for supporting more housing to help make LA a more affordable place for all to live.

Sincerely,

Nick Burns
2120 S Bentley Ave. Apt. 306
Los Angeles, CA 90025



Re: Code Amendment/Second Dwelling Units/Proposed Ordinance
CF# 14-0057-S8

August 30, 2016

Los Angeles City Council
John Ferraro Council Chamber
Room 340, City Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90012

On August 22, 2016, The Old Granada Hills Residents' Group Board of Directors voted to support the following position:

The Old Granada Hills Resident's Group BOD strongly urges the Los Angeles City Council to oppose the repeal of the currently adopted second unit standards and replacement of those standards with weak and less restrictive State "default" provisions.

Furthermore, there is no urgency and sufficient time should be allowed for a more thorough review and extensive public input regarding:

- Amending the LAMC to ensure procedural compliance with AB 1866 while maintaining the original standards established in LAMC Subsections 12.24 W.43 and 12.24 W.44.
- Utilizing best practices from other California municipalities' second unit ordinances that provide additional protections for Los Angeles City's residential districts.
- A legitimate permitting process for second units that are now under construction.

Thank you,

Dave Beauvais, President
Old Granada Hills Residents' Group

Maria Fisk, Board Member
Old Granada Hills Residents' Group