

Google Groups

Public Comment for Council File 16-1468

Amy Turnbull

Mar 20, 2017 7:02 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Representative:

Please find my public comment for Council File 16-1468 attached.



LIVE A BIG LIFE. GO TINY.

AMERICAN TINY HOUSE ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM

To: Los Angeles City Planning and Land Use Committee

Date: March 20, 2017

From: Amy Turnbull, Vice President, American Tiny House Association

Subject: Draft Ordinance on Accessory Dwelling Units

The American Tiny House Association (ATHA) is a National, member-based network that promotes creative and affordable housing as part of a more sustainable and self-reliant lifestyle. ATHA believes the inclusion of movable tiny houses as accessory dwelling units aligns with many of the goals, policies and objectives of the Los Angeles General Plan Housing Element. Movable tiny houses as ADUs will:

- **Expand affordable home ownership**
- **Expand affordable rental housing**
- **Facilitate new construction**
- **Facilitate innovative models**
- **Strengthen the capacity of development**
- **Provide incentives that extend affordability**
- **Promote sustainable neighborhoods**
- **Preserve quality rental and ownership housing**
- **Encourage and incentivize the preservation of affordable housing**
- **Promote sustainable buildings**
- **Promote livable neighborhoods with a mix of housing types**
- **Ensure an adequate supply of emergency and temporary housing**

ATHA's mission is to promote the tiny house as a viable, formally acceptable dwelling option for a wide variety of people. Toward that end, ATHA hopes the Los Angeles Planning and Land Use Committee will include movable tiny houses in the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance, especially as Los Angeles continues to seek solutions in providing more affordable housing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Google Groups

Re: Council File 16-1468 Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Emily Jagoda

Mar 20, 2017 11:53 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee Members,

I support AB 2299 as it is and strongly oppose the proposed City ADU ordinance that would restrict ADU's from almost 1/3 of our land area.

The first home I bought is in Eagle Rock on the corner of Ellenwood Drive at Las Colinas Ave. The property was developed in 1924 with one 882 square foot house and two 600 square foot houses that today would be called Accessory Dwelling Units.

Because these three units are separate buildings they integrate very nicely into the neighborhood, unlike nearby newer houses and apartments that combine all the square footage into a single large structure.

This property gave me an important leg up. I was able to live in the main house and rent out the two smaller houses to help pay my mortgage as I got my start.

I still own the property and rent all three houses out at affordable rates.

Now more than ever as housing is increasingly more expensive our city needs to not only allow for but encourage small accessory dwelling units like mine to be built.

The proposed new ordinance is overly restrictive.

The only topography on my lot is at the sidewalk that has been lifted up by street trees, yet the City says my lot is a hillside lot. Because the new ordinance dictates that second dwelling units cannot be built on hillside lots (with some exceptions in the current draft) it is effectively saying houses like mine could not be built today, yet they have contributed in many positive ways to the community since 1924 and will continue to do so into the future. Perversely, I could tear them down and build a single much larger house that would benefit fewer people and would do nothing to solve our housing crisis. Nor would it suit the scale of the neighborhood.

The proposal to limit the size of new second dwelling units to half the size of the existing house is also unreasonably restrictive. There are many extremely small houses throughout the city that don't work for the way people live today. A second dwelling unit built up to the 1,200 square foot state maximum would give people the flexibility they need to make their homes work for them without having to tear down their existing house to build a larger consolidated house or make a single larger house with an attached addition. There are already provisions within the zoning code that limit the amount of square footage that can be added to a lot - those provisions can be relied on to prevent Accessory Dwelling Units from being built at a size not appropriate for individual lots.

Emily Jagoda
(323) 397-9757

Google Groups

Council File 16-1468 Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance - Please Post to the Public File

James McQuaide

Mar 20, 2017 11:09 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

RE: COUNCIL FILE 16-1468 PROPOSED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ORDINANCE

Dear Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee Members:

We are property owners in Council District 5 and in the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council Area.

The views expressed by Councilmember Koretz and the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council favoring additional city limits on ADU's do NOT represent our views.

We strongly believe that Assembly Bill No. 2299 should be left as is.

It is unfortunate that young people - and not just low income but those of middle income means - can't afford housing in Los Angeles. Accessory Dwelling Units are one of the tools that must be allowed to work in order to begin to address this crisis.

Furthermore, the proposal to exclude ADU's from properties covered by the Baseline Hillside Ordinance - nearly 1/3 of all single family lots in the city - is so arbitrary that it can't possibly be held up as legal. We have to believe that once the City Attorney understands the loose and arbitrary manner in which the city defines hillside lots they will agree; and, if for some reason they don't, a judge will certainly do so in the future.

Finally, our property falls in the BHO zone and none of the stereotypical attributes listed by the Planning Department as justification for excluding ADU's from properties covered by the BHO apply to our property other than our not being adjacent to public transportation. Our lot is 17,688 square feet with an existing house that is only 2,145 square feet. A straight-running private road serving only eight houses connects to Mulholland Drive where it is paved to a width of 65 feet. Fire Station 99 is less than 1,000 feet from the end of our private road. There is no logical reason why we should not be allowed to build a small 700 square foot ADU when, by right, we could build a 3,000 square foot addition or tear down our existing house and build a 5,000 square foot house in its place. A small ADU allows us to meet our current and future needs while maintaining the small 1950's house that we love. We asked the Planning Department to provide justification for why our property should be excluded from building an ADU and we were met with silence.

An ADU would allow our aging parents to stay with us for extended stays and would also give us room to work from home which would benefit the city by keeping two adults from commuting on our roads.

Again, we strongly believe that Assembly Bill No. 2299 should be left as it is.

Thank you,

Hilary & James McQuaide

Google Groups

Council File 16-1468 Draft ADU Ordinance

Micol Hebron

Mar 20, 2017 9:03 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Re: Council File 16-1468 Draft ADU Ordinance

Dear Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee Members,

I live in Eagle Rock in Council District 14.

I support AB 2299 as it exists and **strongly** oppose the proposed draft of the City of Los Angeles Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance.

I teach in a university and I see first hand that more and more bright young people are unable to afford to stay in Los Angeles after they graduate. This is a great loss to the future culture and commerce of our city.

The building of ADU's should be encouraged as one of many necessary tools to help make Los Angeles an affordable choice again, not discouraged as the draft ordinance would do by excluding ADU's from most lots the city labels as hillside which comprise close to 1/3 of single family lots in Los Angeles.

My lot and the surrounding lots are as flat as any lot you would find in the so called flats of Los Angeles. I have a small 1,397 square foot house with a large open yard behind it. I should not be excluded from building an ADU in my backyard simply because of the way my lot is arbitrarily labeled by the city. I should also be allowed to build an ADU based on the size of my lot not on the size of my small house. It makes no sense that I would be limited to an ADU 1/2 the size of my 1,397 square foot house or a 698 s.f. ADU when a neighbor across the street who tore down an existing 1920's bungalow and built a much larger house in the 1990's on the same size lot as mine would be able to build an ADU up to the full 1,200 s.f. allowed by AB 2299.

Sincerely,

Micol Hebron

--

-Micol

<http://gallerytally.tumblr.com/><http://micolhebron.com/>

Google Groups

Council File 16-1468 Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance Please post to the public record

John Colter

Mar 20, 2017 1:02 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee Members,

I am writing in support of AB 2299 being left to work the way it is. I am concerned that the proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance puts arbitrary barriers in the way of new ADU's being built.

When only 29 hillside located ADU's have been issued permits and only 13 have been completed going back to 2003 efforts to exclude new ADU's from hillside areas is a solution in search of a problem. The affordable housing crisis is real to people and we should be working toward a solution to the problem of not having enough housing, not making up new problems.

The Baseline Hillside Ordinance already prevents ADU's from being built on any hillside lot where an ADU would be inappropriate. Under the BHO particular lot characteristics that make an ADU appropriate, such as the lot being especially large, being a through lot, or being a flat hillside in name only must exist for permits to be issued for a new ADU.

Since hillside codes changed fundamentally when the BHO went into effect in 2011 knowing which of the 29 hillside ADU's were issued permits prior to 2011 and which were issued permits after is important basic information that the City should have before a wholesale exclusion of ADU's in hillside areas is proposed. I asked for this information from the Planning Department and was told that the City doesn't have this information and that "they may have just overlaid the hillside map and counted by hand."

Without that basic data it is impossible to perform any sort of analysis on the 29 hillside ADU's to understand what particular characteristics of the lots made it possible to obtain permits, whether the ADU's with permits from before 2011 could get permits today, and of fundamental importance whether the built hillside ADU's have proven to be detrimental or beneficial to the neighborhood.

When I asked the Planning Department their rationale for the proposed hillside exclusion, I was directed to the paragraph in the staff report that describes hillside areas as "...often characterized by larger amounts of natural vegetation and substandard streets. They are typically far from public transit, services or jobs....Hillside areas also have a higher fire and natural disaster risk, while the winding roads slow emergency response times. For these reasons the draft ordinance places a restriction on ADU's in hillside areas."

While the above stereotypical characteristics certainly describe some hillside areas they most definitely do not describe all areas that fall into the city's hillside map boundaries. This is especially the case the further east you go. In Northeast Los Angeles and Eagle Rock where I live large swaths are composed of low rolling hills and even flat areas very often with rectangular city blocks and streets set on a grid that the city labels as hillside but that no person would consider to be hillside.

Excluding ADU's from nearly 136,000 hillside lots and hillside in name only lots is a decision that should be studied and based on facts not assumptions and stereotypes.

It is irrational and unfair to base ADU size limits on the size of the existing house. Using my block as a case study, because my house is only 1,112 square feet I would be limited to an ADU of 640 square feet while my neighbor with a lot the exact same size as mine would be able to build a 1,200 square foot ADU because they tore an existing house down and replaced it with a much larger one 20 years ago.

While it might sound reasonable to limit new ADU's in hillside areas to lots that adjoin a street meeting "standard roadway dimensions" that is an extreme requirement if by "standard roadway dimensions" the ordinance means a "Standard Hillside Limited Street" which is defined in municipal code as 36 feet wide with a minimum of 28 feet of paved roadway. This is enough for two lanes of traffic, street parking, and sidewalks. It is an amount of roadway that isn't suitable or desirable for all areas and represents the sort of planning for cars not for people that we should be moving away from. If by "standard roadway dimensions" the proposed ordinance means 20 feet wide of paved roadway which is the minimum requirement for other new residential hillside construction then that is reasonable.

Sincerely,

John Colter
2368 Norwalk Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Google Groups

Public comment for PLUM agenda item # 7 - Accessory Dwelling Units

Elizabeth Timme

Mar 20, 2017 1:52 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear City Clerk,

Please see attached for public comments for Council File 16-1468 for tomorrow's PLUM meeting. Thanks for posting!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth

--

Elizabeth Timme
Co-Executive Director

LA-Más

elizabeth@mas.la

www.mas.la

MÁS

DATE

Monday, March 20th, 2017

RE

Item # 7 (16-1468)
Accessory Dwelling Units

Dear Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee:

I am writing to provide public comment to Item # 7 (16-1468) on the agenda for Tuesday, March 21st for the proposed amendments to Accessory Dwell Units (ADUs). On behalf of LA-Más, a non-profit urban design organization that helps lower income and underserved communities shape their growth, our comments are based on our experience working on the City's ADU Pilot Project with the Mayor's Innovation Team and Council District 1 over the past year and a half. We are based in northeast Los Angeles and work across the city where we have heard from many homeowners who believe that local ADU policy needs to better reflect CA state law, and who want ADUs in their own backyards.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx



We understand that there has been a proliferation of out of context ADUs in the valley and west side. However, designing a one size fits all local policy in response to those concerns does not address the different needs across the city, especially homeowners of standard size lots and small primary homes.

OFFICE
3051 N. Coolidge Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

PHONE
+1 323 244 3630

EMAIL
info@mas.la

WEBSITE
www.mas.la

In the spirit of proactively crafting a policy that works across the city, we strongly suggest not starting from a 640 sq. ft. maximum, a number from a 1985 ordinance. The city has significantly changed since then and we need to make sure our policy does the same. We believe that the recently adopted R1 Variation Zone is a great strategy in that direction.

The suggestions below are grounded in our belief that ADUs should allow for two-bedroom units because that promotes economic feasibility, multi-generational living, and greater housing affordability. Furthermore, our suggestions is based on the City's ADU Pilot Project, which would NOT BE ALLOWED under proposed rules, despite

MÁS

DATE

Monday, March 20th, 2017

securing the support of the local Neighborhood Council and the approval of the one of the most strict Historic Preservation Overlay Zones in the City.

Specifically, we recommend the following considerations:

RE

Item # 7 (16-1468)
Accessory Dwelling Units

Proposal A:

“Detached Accessory Dwelling Units are allowed a maximum size of the larger of: 900 square feet or less than the total floor area, excluding garages, of the existing single-family dwelling unit, up to a maximum of 1200 square feet. Detached Accessory Dwelling Units cannot be greater than two stories.”

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Argument A:



The lower limit of 640 square feet is arbitrary to a 1980s ordinance and will not allow for two-bedroom ADUs, which are necessary to accommodate a parent/child, senior/caregiver, etc. As architects, we believe a modest two-bedroom ADU abiding by ADA standards can be designed for 900 square feet.

OFFICE
3051 N. Coolidge Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

PHONE
+1 323 244 3630

EMAIL
info@mas.la

WEBSITE
www.mas.la

The fifty percent of floor area rule punishes property owners who have small SFD and disregards the reality that some smaller SFD are on standard sized lots. This current 50% approach rewards property owners with larger SFD to be able to have larger ADUs. If the goal is to limit out of context development, a two story cap addresses concerns raised in the San Fernando Valley.

Proposal B:

“An Accessory Dwelling Unit is permitted only on a parcel that contains an existing single-family dwelling unit or where a new single-family dwelling unit is proposed.”

MÁS

DATE

Monday, March 20th, 2017

RE

Item # 7 (16-1468)
Accessory Dwelling Units

Argument B:

Limiting ADUs to lots that 'contain existing SFDs' restrict ADUs from being planned with new SFDs. There are cost savings in designing/permitting/constructing a SFD and ADU at once. Also, the best time to address parking requirements is in the planning stage for a new SFD. Sec. 5 of Exhibit A (the Urgency Clause) acknowledges that "the City is currently in the midst of a housing crisis, with the supply of affordable options unable to support the demand for housing in the City."

Proposal C:

Remove the transit clause and request Department of City Planning to provide an overlay in which hillside properties are within 1/2 mile to transit - to prove (or disprove) the ability for hillside properties to meet the transit requirement.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx



OFFICE

3051 N. Coolidge Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

PHONE

+1 323 244 3630

EMAIL

info@mas.la

WEBSITE

www.mas.la

Argument C:

With hillside properties making up 28% of single-family lots in Los Angeles and with the likelihood that many hillside properties are not serviced by transit, this requirement will unnecessarily limit the number of possible ADU sites in the City. In addition, parking will likely be provided for the ADU in the driveway and if the issue is more cars in narrow hillside roads - the issue is addressed in subclause b, which limits ADU on standard sized streets.

Proposal D:

"Detached Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be located between the existing single-family dwelling unit and the street adjoining the front yard unless 1) attached to an existing or proposed garage, 2) part of the conversion of an existing garage, or 3) located at the prevailing front setback of the street"

MÁS

DATE

Monday, March 20th, 2017

RE

Item # 7 (16-1468)
Accessory Dwelling Units

Argument D:

Los Angeles has many lots where the garage sits in the front half of the lot or where the SFD is set back on the property. Since the proposed ordinance revision will allow for both the conversion of existing garages to ADU and the addition of ADUs over garages, it seems unnecessarily restricting to prohibit garages in the front half of the lot from being used in the same way. In addition, if the ADU is maintaining the setback of its neighbors - the character of the street is further promoted.

Thank you for your consideration and for ensuring ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Timme
Co-Executive Director



OFFICE

3051 N. Coolidge Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90039

PHONE

+1 323 244 3630

EMAIL

info@mas.la

WEBSITE

www.mas.la

Google Groups

In Support of ADUs

Arnoldo Ulloa

Mar 20, 2017 7:58 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Members of the PLUM Committee:

I am a resident of Boyle Heights and support the position of **LA-Más** on the issue of Accessory Dwelling Units. I grew up in and currently live in an ADU property and understand their importance in improving housing affordability, increasing density, and making our communities vibrant. ADUs will advance our existing momentum toward making our city more cosmopolitan by enabling us to make better use of existing space while providing some relief from the oversuburbanization of our city.

Thank you,
-Arnoldo Ulloa

Copied Letter From LA Mas Below:

I am writing to provide public comment to Item # 7 (16-1468) on the agenda for Tuesday, March 21st for the proposed amendments to Accessory Dwell Units (ADUs).

On behalf of LA-Más, a non-profit urban design organization that helps lower income and underserved communities shape their growth, our comments are based on our experience working on the City's ADU Pilot Project with the Mayor's Innovation Team and Council District 1 over the past year and a half. We are based in northeast Los Angeles and work across the city where we have heard from many homeowners who believe that local ADU policy needs to better reflect CA state law, and who want ADUs in their own backyards.

We understand that there has been a proliferation of out of context ADUs in the valley and west side. However, designing a one size fits all local policy in response to those concerns does not address the different needs across the city, especially homeowners of standard size lots and small primary homes.

In the spirit of proactively crafting a policy that works across the city, we strongly suggest not starting from a 640 sq. ft. maximum, a number from a 1985 ordinance. The city has significantly changed since then and we need to make sure our policy does the same. We believe that the recently adopted R1 Variation Zone is a great strategy in that direction.

The suggestions below are grounded in our belief that ADUs should allow for two-bedroom units because that promotes economic feasibility, multi-generational living, and greater housing affordability. Furthermore, our suggestions is based on the City's ADU Pilot Project, which would NOT BE ALLOWED under proposed rules, despite securing the support of the local Neighborhood Council and the approval of the one of the most strict Historic Preservation Overlay Zones in the City.

Specifically, we recommend the following considerations:

Proposal A:

"Detached Accessory Dwelling Units are allowed a maximum size of the larger of: 900 square feet or less than the total floor area, excluding garages, of the existing single-family dwelling unit, up to a

maximum of 1200 square feet. Detached Accessory Dwelling Units cannot be greater than two stories.”

Argument A:

The lower limit of 640 square feet is arbitrary to a 1980s ordinance and will not allow for two-bedroom ADUs, which are necessary to accommodate a parent/child, senior/caregiver, etc. As architects, we believe a modest two-bedroom ADU abiding by ADA standards can be designed for 900 square feet.

The fifty percent of floor area rule punishes property owners who have small SFD and disregards the reality that some smaller SFD are on standard sized lots. This current 50% approach rewards property owners with larger SFD to be able to have larger ADUs. If the goal is to limit out of context development, a two story cap addresses concerns raised in the San Fernando Valley.

Proposal B:

“An Accessory Dwelling Unit is permitted only on a parcel that contains an existing single- family dwelling unit **or where a new single-family dwelling unit is proposed.**”

Argument B:

Limiting ADUs to lots that ‘contain existing SFDs’ restrict ADUs from being planned with new SFDs. There are cost savings in designing/permitting/constructing a SFD and ADU at once. Also, the best time to address parking requirements is in the planning stage for a new SFD. Sec. 5 of Exhibit A (the Urgency Clause) acknowledges that “the City is currently in the midst of a housing crisis, with the supply of affordable options unable to support the demand for housing in the City.”

Proposal C:

Remove the transit clause and request Department of City Planning to provide an overlay in which hillside properties are within ½ mile to transit – to prove (or disprove) the ability for hillside properties to meet the transit requirement.

Argument C:

With hillside properties making up 28% of single-family lots in Los Angeles and with the likelihood that many hillside properties are not serviced by transit, this requirement will unnecessarily limit the number of possible ADU sites in the City. In addition, parking will likely be provided for the ADU in the driveway and if the issue is more cars in narrow hillside roads – the issue is addressed in subclause b, which limits ADU on standard sized streets.

Proposal D:

“Detached Accessory Dwelling Units shall not be located between the existing single-family dwelling unit and the street adjoining the front yard **unless 1) attached to an existing or proposed garage, 2) part of the conversion of an existing garage, or 3) located at the prevailing front setback of the street**”

Argument D:

Los Angeles has many lots where the garage sits in the front half of the lot or where the SFD is set back on the property. Since the proposed ordinance revision will allow for both the conversion of existing garages to ADU and the addition of ADUs over garages, it seems unnecessarily restricting to prohibit garages in the front half of the lot from being used in the same way. In addition, if the ADU is maintaining the setback of its neighbors – the character of the street is further promoted.

Thank you for your consideration and for ensuring ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Timme
Co-Executive Director

Google Groups

Council File 16-1468 Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Alex Wolff

Mar 20, 2017 8:34 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee Members,

I live in the neighborhood of Garvanza in Council District 14.

I think the goal of AB 2299 to make it easier for people to build Accessory Dwelling Units is right for Los Angeles.

The draft City of LA Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance puts up unnecessary restrictions and is wrong for Los Angeles.

Thank you.

Alex Wolff

Google Groups

In support of larger ADU's

Brian Mallman

Mar 20, 2017 11:25 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Hello, My name is Brian Mallman. I am a resident of council district 1. I am writing because I believe the current limit of 640sqft for accessory dwellings should be reevaluated. As a person who is considering building an ADU on my property I feel that 640sqft is too small to allow for a 2-bedroom living space. A 2-bedroom space is necessary to accommodate a small family or an elderly parent and caregiver. I believe that increasing the size to 1200sqft would allow for dwellings to be built that are more suitable to our most vulnerable residents.

Thank you,

Brian Mallman

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

clerk.plumcommittee@lacity.org)

Dear Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee:

I am writing to provide public comment to Item # 7 (16-1468) on the agenda for Tuesday, March 21st for the proposed amendments to Accessory Dwell Units (ADUs).

For the past 25 years I have been observing, researching, and documenting the ways in which Latinos are transforming the suburban environment to fit their economic, social, cultural and housing needs. I am one of the few nationally recognized experts on this topic and has written and lectured extensively on how culture and immigration are transforming the American and landscape.

LA's Latino population need for shelter drives a majority of our garage conversions, which is not about design, economics, or policy but their cultural practices. From LA to Riverside, from San Fernando to Long Beach Latinos live in garages. Growing up in ELA, the garages where the boys slept or it was the male pad.

Many Latinos come from homes in Latin American where there are indoor courtyards or rooms with open up to the sky. Many rooms in these homes are attached to each other in a progressive pattern of growth that is sometimes random.

A detached garage for a Latino might be seen as part of living quarters to house while most American see it as a separated structure. There is rich pattern language of garage and homes in Latino "housecapes." I am always fascinated how Latino ADUs are they are imagined, designed and the enduring communal social patterns they created..

Much like the front yard plaza Latino are retrofitting the configuration the their home spaces.

Thank you for considering the needs of working class Latinos in their quest to create community. I strongly suggest the City consider amending the proposed ordinance: To ensure policy works for all parts of LA.

James Rojas
Latino Urban Forum

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Leonora Yetter

Mar 20, 2017 9:16 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,
Leonora Yetter
Santa Monica, CA 90403
leonorasc@gmail.com

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Andrew May

Mar 20, 2017 10:33 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,

Andrew May

1901 N New Hampshire Ave Los Angeles, CA 90027-1818

andymay@yahoo.com

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Brent Gaisford

Mar 20, 2017 10:33 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,

Brent Gaisford

3236 Hutchison Ave Los Angeles, CA 90034-3211

brentgaisford@gmail.com

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Shane Phillips

Mar 20, 2017 10:49 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,

Shane Phillips

215 W 6th St Apt 902 Los Angeles, CA 90014-1924

shanedphillips@gmail.com

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Andy Freeland

Mar 20, 2017 10:57 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,

Andy Freeland

645 W 9th St Apt 233 Los Angeles, CA 90015-1642

andy@andyfreeland.net

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

John Gregorchuk

Mar 20, 2017 11:18 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

--

If you want to limit the size of ADUs in comparison to the original home, base it off of the potential Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) instead of the existing size so lower income families are not penalized for have a smaller original homes.

--

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,
John Gregorchuk
1935 W 36th Pl Los Angeles, CA 90018-4331
jmgregorchuk@gmail.com

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Allison Wong

Mar 20, 2017 11:23 PM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

Housing policy on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) must be inclusive and progressive, especially given the new CA state law that established an exciting new framework at the beginning of the year.

The City of Los Angeles should have an ADU policy that works across the diverse neighborhoods of the city - not just the communities with larger lots that are dealing with ADUs designed out of context. The City Planning Committee made suggestions that enabled ADUs on hillside properties adjacent to standard streets and near public transit possible. Although that's a step in the right direction, the proposed policy unnecessarily limits the size of ADUs. For many homeowners, a one-size fits all approach may not work, and two-bedroom ADUs mean:

Economic feasibility: The baseline cost of construction for any home is sizable, making a small one-bedroom 640 sq. ft. ADU economically unfeasible for many. In addition, the ability to take out a loan for a one-bedroom studio is difficult to finance.

Multi-generational living: Two bedrooms make it possible for seniors to remain in their homes and have space for a caregiver, for families to live together and relieve overcrowding, and for recent graduates to move back with parents (on their property, but maybe not under the same roof!)

Greater housing affordability: Extra revenue to help support a mortgage or protect a family for unexpected job losses means that more people can afford to buy a house and less homes will be foreclosed.

Overall, there should be support for ADU diversity that ranges from tiny homes to modest two bedrooms. Thank you for making sure ADUs can become a housing type that is affordable, inclusive, and feasible!

Sincerely,
Allison Wong
646 W 9th St Apt 233 Los Angeles, CA 90015-1416
purple.hippopotami@gmail.com