



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

14-0057-S8

Re: Urgency is Required for LA's Second Dwelling Unit Repeal (Council File 14-0057-S8) - Martinez

1 message

John Gregorchuk <jmgregorchuk@gmail.com>

Wed, Aug 10, 2016 at 7:43 PM

To: Sharon Dickinson <Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Steven Blau <steve.blau@lacity.org>

Cc: Stephen Gregorchuk <swgregorchuk@gmail.com>, Matthew Gregorchuk <mgregorchuk@gmail.com>, Vivian Li <msvivianli@gmail.com>, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, Jim.dantona@lacity.org, ackley.padilla@lacity.org

Re: Council File: 14-0057-S8

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).

The document to be uploaded to the Council File is an attached PDF and titled: *Public Comment Rebuttal to Martinez (Council File 14-0057-S8).pdf*

Thank you,
John

John Gregorchuk
JMGregorchuk@gmail.com
(818) 519-7044

On Mon, Aug 8, 2016 at 11:26 AM, John Gregorchuk <jmgregorchuk@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi All,

I'd like to bump this again. Councilmember Martinez is on record in the Council File of asking for permits to be revoked (Request #2) from those who followed guidance from LADBS and California State Law (See ZA 120 Guidance attached).

I don't think that is fair that homeowners who followed the laws of the land be punished. It's like if you drove 55mph on the freeway and someone came by a year later and said, "Last year's speed limit is retroactively changed to 35mph and we're issuing you a speeding ticket."

Has there been any change in your stance on the issue?

I imagine it's not your intention, but it seems heartless that you would request that the savings and retirements of your constituents be thrown away and then ignore the people who are begging you for reprieve. If you vote against this temporary fix, I do not think it would be in the best interest of Los Angeles, your district, or your constituents. Further, if you really are willing to destroy our dreams, you can start with mine as long as you can reimburse me for the \$544,000 consumer construction loan I took out based on the City and State Law (I understand \$544,000 is not much money to someone who makes \$200,000 a year... but to a young family, that is a gigantic loan).

If you are open to hearing from someone who is affected by your decision directly, I would greatly appreciate the chance to speak with you or your team.

Thanks,
John

John Gregorchuk
JMGregorchuk@gmail.com
(818) 519-7044

On Fri, Aug 5, 2016 at 1:14 PM, John Gregorchuk <jmgregorchuk@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Councilmember Martinez,

I wanted to bump this thread again and add context based on Councilmember Ryu's comments attached to the council file (CF:14-0057-S8):

We cannot afford to let people who went through the process to construct the SDUs, in compliance with City code, hang in limbo.

What me and the other families stuck in limbo are asking for is in line with Councilmember Ryu's comments. We need to pass this repeal as a **temporary fix** to save people who spent thousands of dollars based on guidance from the city but who were ultimately denied their permit. Passing this repeal protects those of us who were in flight. Once it's passed, if the decision is to limit SDUs, then lets say "No new permits after Jan 1, 2017" so that families who followed the law will have time to know that the program is ending. Your statements in the council file also show you as supporting families, but you have deep fears related to developers, investors, and flippers. I challenge you to listen to the audio of the planning commission meeting and hear that those supporting the repeal are all families who followed the law, not developers (Planning Audio File).

A temporary fix will **not** open the flood gates to new permits. Since 2003, there have only been 347 SDUs completed. That's less than 30 per year out of a city with 10 million people... The reason so few were completed is because the SDUs still require standard setback, height, green building code, and other city building code requirements that make it difficult to find enough room to build an SDU. Setbacks for instance require 15ft rear yards, 5/6 foot side yards, and 10 feet between structures. Homes that meet those requirements are very slim and in effect limit the square footage which is why very few of the SDUs exceed 800 sqft.

As always, I would greatly appreciate it if we could talk about this or have acknowledgment that you are receiving my comments. I noticed the council file has all the emails from negative folks, but not a single email from those of us affected? Listen to the audio of the meetings and read the speaker cards. These are families who work multiple jobs, followed the law, and lawfully started the plan check process well before this lawsuit suddenly halted them. Despite their difficulties being able to attend hearings, families have made large efforts to be there because they're at risk of losing everything. The audio from Planning and PLUM is telling. Not a single person spoke as a flipper or developer. These are families who are building the homes in order to sustain their family (Planning Audio File).

I welcome any comments and I'm looking forward to speaking with you and your team, (818) 519-7044.

Thank you,
John

John Gregorchuk
JMGregorchuk@gmail.com
(818) 519-7044

On Fri, Jul 29, 2016 at 9:38 AM, John Gregorchuk <jmgregorchuk@gmail.com> wrote:
Councilmember Martinez,

I would like to ask you to please vote in favor of Council File: 14-0057-S8 (related to Second Dwelling Units) as a temporary fix to homeowners who followed ZA 120 and California law. We urgently need to get this up for a vote because families who followed the guidance of LA City and California Law are now facing foreclosure.

Myself and others paid ten of thousands of dollars (I've spent ~\$30,000) for architectural drawings, engineering, plan check, grading, and demo of existing structures. This was all made possible through a short-term construction loan (12-months). It's already been 5 months since the freeze occurred in February and now banks may foreclose on our homes if we cannot get permits and finish construction.

I don't know if you've ever had to look loved ones in the eye as they are in tears wondering if their dream has just become a nightmare, but it is a devastating task. There are over 600 families who followed the law and are now in desperate trouble as their lenders could foreclosure and dangerous partially completed projects sit in their backyards.

The legal team finished the write up back in June, July is passed and now August 2nd is our chance to get an up or down vote. This is only a temporary fix to get us in compliance with California Law and save families from foreclosure. Once the bleeding has stopped, I would be the first one standing to help you and your team pass meaningful housing reform.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call or email me.

Please help us,
John

8/11/2016

City of Los Angeles Mail - Re: Urgency is Required for LA's Second Dwelling Unit Repeal (Council File 14-0057-S8) - Martinez

John Gregorchuk
JMGregorchuk@gmail.com
(818) 519-7044



Public Comment Rebuttal to Martinez (Council File 14-0057-S8).pdf

283K