



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Mansionization**

1 message

---

**David Ian Weis** <diw3@cornell.edu>  
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Nov 7, 2016 at 9:08 PM

Ms. Dickinson,

I am vehemently opposed to the pending legislation that would impose restrictions on the home I hope to build for my family. We have three young children, and pets, and since most of our relatives are still back in the Boston area, need a house with decent sized guest accommodations. I work from home and therefore require a home office. Essentially we need a home that is at least 4200 square feet. This is not a mansion. It is merely a proper home for a large family.

We are currently renting in Cheviot Hills, a neighborhood where prices have skyrocketed. If these new regulations pass, I would need to find a lot that is at least 9000 square feet. And even if I could find a lot like this I would not be able to afford it. These absurd regulations would force families like ours to leave the LA area and would deprive architects, builders, contractors and all the affiliated tradesmen of the work they need to support their families.

In my opinion there is no mansionization problem in LA. It is simply a buzzword proposed by a small number of homeowners that some disgruntled anti-progress folks have latched on to. There is absolutely no real reason for these changes.

Respectfully,

– DW

David Ian Weis  
diw3@cornell.edu



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Mansionization

1 message

---

**Christopher Kearley** <Christopher.Kearley@ey.com>

Mon, Nov 7, 2016 at 6:20 PM

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" &lt;Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org&gt;, "CPC@lacity.org" &lt;CPC@lacity.org&gt;, "shawn.bayliss@lacity.org." &lt;shawn.bayliss@lacity.org&gt;

I am a resident of Cheviot Hills and hope we do not pass the ordinance to reduce the size of approved new homes. While it sounds nice what it really means is several things:

1. Now that I have my big house I don't want anyone else to have one.
2. A measure that will deflate home values in our neighborhood. By limiting the ability to build we reduce the value of all property in the area. Why would we do this.
3. Its' government intervention at its worst. If you can't control the valuable development of your own home what's left.

This is a terrible plan and I hope we have a counsel that thinks of what's best for homeowners and our community.

Chris Kearley

2502 Aiken Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90064

Any tax advice in this e-mail should be considered in the context of the tax services we are providing to you. Preliminary tax advice should not be relied upon and may be insufficient for penalty protection.

---

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

Notice required by law: This e-mail may constitute an advertisement or solicitation under U.S. law, if its primary purpose is to advertise or promote a commercial product or service. You may choose not to receive advertising and promotional messages from Ernst & Young LLP (except for EY Client Portal and the ey.com website, which track e-mail preferences through a separate process) at this e-mail address by forwarding this message to no-more-mail@ey.com. If you do so, the sender of this message will be notified promptly. Our principal postal address is 5 Times Square, New York, NY 10036. Thank you. Ernst & Young LLP



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Mansionization ordinance**

1 message

---

**Michael** <m.ernstoff@larents.biz>  
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org  
Cc: "Sara D. Roos" <roos@biology.ucla.edu>

Mon, Nov 7, 2016 at 6:13 PM

The short answer .. I'm for limiting the size of homes in R-1 residential areas, and especially the height and the sun shadows cast by tall structures.

When I bought my home, I thought I was buying into a area that would be occupied by people interested in building a community. There are many of those, but with increased frequency, housing is being built on R-1 lots that looks far more like a residential hotel or resort than a single or even extended family residence.

I'm aware that anti-discrimination ordinances preclude controlling who lives in a house. There is no law that says eight unrelated people can't share the rent or mortgage. So that way is blocked.

What I'd like to see is that structures that look like hotels or boarding houses be forced to comply with regulations appropriate for hotels and boarding houses. I would like to see houses with more than five bedrooms and five bathrooms has to have sprinklers in the bedrooms and meet emergency exit requirements. I'd like to see regulations where the taxes are higher if the owner doesn't call the house his / her home.

--

Michael Ernstoff  
(310) 398-3572 - office & 24/7 machine for low priority messages and rental information.

Urgent request contact points:  
(310) 890-5334 - Michael's Cell  
(310) 405-5072 - Chris Torrez's cell also: chris@LArents.biz  
(310) 821-4842 - Maintenance: David Villanueva's office, david@LArents.biz