



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council Files 16-1460 and 14-0656

Suzanne Furst <suzannefurst@me.com>

Sun, Feb 5, 2017 at 1:26 PM

To: shawn.bayliss@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, expo@cheviot hills.org, joan.pelico@lacity.org

Dear Council Members,

I am a resident in Cheviot Hills and purchased our property 15 years ago. We demolished the then existing 2,600 sq. ft. cottage and replaced it with a 6,800 sq. ft. Custom home with a 4 car garage, and a cabana in the rear of the property, by our pool. Our lot is almost 14,000 square ft and we saw no harm in building our house to suit our needs. Many of our neighbors have done the same on smaller sized lots.

Houses do get run down over time and I feel the owners have a right to use their money as they see fit to provide comfort and maximize their investments. Oddly, this also increases the sales value of the entire neighborhood, including the smaller homes, because of their location. So, I do not see or understand why such a fuss is being made over both home and neighborhood improvements by people with smaller homes. Just because they either don't want to increase their house size or perhaps can't afford to should affect the rights of other home owners. Our kids had to sell their house as it was not large enough to fit their needs and they were only given the right to add 1,500 new sq. ft. due to the new BMO laws. They had to buy a larger 2-story home for an additional \$1.3 million, which is more than twice what it would have cost to add a full second floor. I don't understand the rational in that. All of their neighbors were doubling the size of their homes before the BMO came into affect. It's just plain wrong.

I do not believe in any restrictions but if I'm forced to accept one of them, it would have to be RIVNew.

Thank you,

Suzanne Furst

Sent from my iPhone