

Communication from Public

Name: Tracy Stone

Date Submitted: 06/11/2019 11:07 AM

Council File No: 16-1468

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to comment on the following section of the proposed ordinance: Detached ADUs shall not be located between the proposed or existing single family dwelling unit and the street adjoining the front yard, except in the following cases: (i) Where the building is on a Through Lot and complies with LAMC 12.22 C.19 and 12.21 C.5(k); or (ii) Where the ADU is being added to a lawfully existing garage or accessory structure building. I would respectfully recommend that section (ii) above be changed as follows: (ii) Where the ADU is being added to a lawfully existing garage or accessory structure building, or where a lawfully existing accessory structure building is converted to an ADU. NOTE: Some upslope properties result in large exposed retaining walls where the garage is buried into grade at the street level (front 1/2 of the lot). It can be easy (structurally), and more attractive, to construct an accessory structure above the garage to hide the retaining wall, and to take advantage of the excavated area. If that structure is legally constructed, why not allow it to be converted to an ADU? Sincerely Tracy Stone AIA LEED AP BD&C

Communication from Public

Name: Kory Cox

Date Submitted: 06/13/2019 09:06 PM

Council File No: 16-1468

Comments for Public Posting: Planning and Land Use Management Committee, Your efforts in ensuring a well coordinated and thoughtfully considered draft ordinance are much appreciated. We can rest easy knowing that the ordinance, in whatever form it passes, will be one that has been fully vetted and with ample consideration for all concerns from city departments and concerned citizens alike. My reading of the draft has uncovered an item that may need clarification in regards to the space required between buildings on the same lot. The proposed ordinance reads: Sec 2. (8) "No passageway for the ADU, nor space between buildings, as per LAMC 12.21.C.2, is required in conjunction with the construction of an ADU. Building Code Separation requirements still apply." I had interpreted this to mean that the 10' between the main house and the ADU would no longer be required. However, I met with a planning official who interpreted it more narrowly since it specifically references 12.21.C.2, and the requirement for 10' is also referenced in 12.21.C.5. Their determination was that an ADU qualifies as an accessory building and therefore a 10' separation would still be required. 12.21.C.5 pertains to accessory buildings, and the verbiage reads as follows: 5. (d) "in the A and R zones all accessory buildings shall be located not less than ten feet from any main building or accessory living quarters on the same lot." The situation appears to be in conflict with the spirit of the proposed ordinance as written as I am unable to see a circumstance where an ADU would not be required to comply with the requirements of an accessory building and therefore would always require a 10' offset. I suggest a clarification to the ordinance that would allow Sec 2. (8) to be applied more broadly, and in conformance with the spirit of the authors intent. Either striking the reference to 12.21.C.2 or adding a line that exempts ADU's from the requirements of Accessory Buildings would allow the verbiage to apply to both C.2 and C.5. Thank you again for your careful consideration of this ordinance. I look forward to it's passage into law. Best Regards, Kory Cox

Communication from Public

Name: Joe Salerno

Date Submitted: 06/10/2019 09:26 PM

Council File No: 16-1468

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Committee, My wife and I own a small house in LA that we're in the process of adding an ADU to. We're in final inspection, and looking forward to doing our small part toward adding a legal unit to the supply of rental houses in LA during the housing crisis. As you all know, Los Angeles is in desperate need of additional housing stock. ADUs are the perfect vehicle to encourage small business / mom & pops like my wife and I to do their part, expanding housing supply and encouraging small business. Looking at this proposal, it would eliminate the need to pay a Parks fee for an ADU in our case, as our property (despite being a single-family house) is technically in R2 zoning. The proposal would save me \$6 or 7 thousand dollars, which with a one year old daughter (and not being a big developer) is a lot of money to me. It makes sense to keep parks fees for large developers building big projects, large developments. It doesn't make sense to burden mom & pop homeowners who are trying to add ADUs with \$6,000 levies they cannot afford. Such fees are prohibitive to small single-family home owners, like us. Large developers wouldn't bat an eye at such a parks fee. But large developers wouldn't waste their time with ADUs... so getting rid of this fee by passing this proposal will do exactly what you want, what your constituents want. It will encourage homeowners to add ADUs and increase the housing supply in Los Angeles. Thank you for your service, and for supporting small LA homeowners who want to help build out the housing stock by adding an ADU. Best, Joe and Adrienne