

Google Groups

Agenda Item #7 Today

Elizabeth A Pollock

Mar 21, 2017 1:16 PM

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



Post Office Box 661450 – Los Angeles, CA 90066
www.delreyhome.org

Re: Council File 16-1468
Agenda Item # 7 – Accessory Dwelling Units/Proposed Ordinance
PLUM Committee Meeting on March 21, 2017

To the Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

We recognize that the proposed ordinance tracks much of the state's Government Code Section 65852.2, but that does not mean that the state law is correct in how it regulates accessory dwelling units. The Del Rey Residents Association strongly recommends that the following points be addressed in the City's proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit ("ADU") ordinance:

1. The ordinance should enforce a requirement that there be one additional parking space for each bedroom in an ADU, up to a maximum of two spaces. Even if the ADU is within half a mile of a bus stop, it is unrealistic to expect that the additional residents will rely completely on public transportation. If the ADU residents transport tools, goods or passengers, they will have a vehicle that needs to be parked.
2. There needs to be an absolute prohibition on using the ADUS as short term rental properties. STRs generate more revenue for the property owner and the City, but the constant in and out of strangers destroys neighborhood cohesiveness.
3. The City's proposed ordinance gives too little consideration to the effect of additional residents on the need for City infrastructure, especially utilities. All new construction should maximize energy and water conservation and minimize the strain on city resources.
4. There is a complete disregard of the City's need for open space to clean the air and provide respite for residents. To preserve open space, the City

already prohibits paving over front yards for parking. The City needs to enforce open space rules when ADUs are built as well.

Our land use committee prepared and approved this letter, and we would urge you to send the proposed ordinance back to the City Attorney for further revision before forwarding it to the full City Council.

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth A. Pollock
President
Del Rey Residents Association

Google Groups

Fwd: Council File: 16-1468 Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA; Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 21, 2017 1:45 PM

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

From: **Netty Carr** <dishy512@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Tue, Mar 21, 2017 at 12:22 PM
Subject: Re: Council File: 16-1468 Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA; Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org
Cc: Mitch O'farrell <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>, Christine Peters <christine.peters@lacity.org>, amy.ablakat@lacity.org, chris.robertson@lacity.org, Atwater Village Always <atwatervillagealways@gmail.com>, mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

March 21, 2017

Hon. Jose Huizar, Chair, PLUM Committee

Hon. Marqueece Harris-Dawson

Hon. Gilbert A. Cedillo

Hon. Mitchell Englander

Hon. Filipe Fuentes

Office of the City Clerk, c/o Ms. Sharon Dickinson

Attn: PLUM Committee

200 North Spring Street, Room 395, LA, CA 90012

Council File: 16-1468

Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Sent via email to:

sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

cc:

councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, christine.peters@lacity.org, amy.ablakat@lacity.org, chris.robertson@lacity.org, atwatervillagealways@gmail.com

Dear Chairman Huizar and Councilmembers,

I request that the equine keeping areas (K-zone) continue to be excluded under the proposed ordinance regarding accessory dwelling units. Historically, equine-keeping areas have been excluded from this type of "accessory dwelling units" development.

Specifically, the equestrian district in Atwater Village should be excluded from the proposed ordinance because it has already been identified as "The Atwater Village Equestrian Historic District" by SurveyLA. It is described therein as "an equestrian community ... [s]ituated along the Los Angeles River," with "access to riverside trails as well as sweeping views of Griffith Park to the west." "The Atwater Village Equestrian Historic District is significant as an excellent example of equestrian-related development in Atwater Village, and as one of the last remaining equestrian communities in Los Angeles."

I understand the dire need for increased affordable housing in Los Angeles. However, this must be done with careful consideration of why certain properties, like equestrian-keeping areas, have historically been exempted from such development

3/22/2017

Fwd: Council File: 16-1468 Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA; Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) - Google Groups

Sincerely,

Netty Carr
Atwater Village resident
3758 Glenfeliz Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90039
323-913-2999

Google Groups

Fwd: Council File: 16-1468 Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Sharon Dickinson

Posted in group: Clerk-PLUM-Committee

From: kelly blanpied <kelly@kelyblanpied.com>
 Date: Tue, Mar 21, 2017 at 1:05 PM
 Subject: RE: Council File: 16-1468 Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)
 To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org
 Cc: councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, christine.peters@lacity.org, amy.ablakat@lacity.org, chris.roberson@lacity.org, Jackie Sloan <atwatervillagealways@gmail.com>

March 21, 2017

Hon. Jose Huizar, Chair, PLUM Committee

Hon. Marqueece Harris-Dawson

Hon. Gilbert A. Cedillo

Hon. Mitchell Englander

Hon. Filipe Fuentes

Office of the City Clerk, c/o Ms. Sharon Dickinson

Attn: PLUM Committee

200 North Spring Street, Room 395, LA, CA 90012

Council File: 16-1468

Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Sent via email to:

sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

cc:

councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, christine.peters@lacity.org, amy.ablakat@lacity.org, chris.roberson@lacity.org, atwatervillagealways@gmail.com

Dear Chairman Huizar and Councilmembers,

As a non equestrian resident surrounded by horses, horse arenas, and bridle trails, I am concerned about the vitality of the Atwater Village Equestrian Historic District.

I request that the equine keeping areas (K-zone) continue to be excluded under the proposed ordinance regarding accessory dwelling units. Historically, equine-keeping areas have been excluded from this type of "accessory dwelling units" development.

Specifically, the equestrian district in Atwater Village should be excluded from the proposed ordinance because it has already been identified as "Atwater Village Equestrian Historic District" by SurveyLA. It is described therein as "an equestrian community ... [s]ituated along the Los Angeles River," with "access to riverside trails as well as sweeping views of Griffith Park to the west." "The Atwater Village Equestrian Historic District is a significant and historic area, and as one of the last remaining equestrian-related developments in Atwater Village, and as one of the last remaining equestrian-related developments in Los Angeles."

As a social worker I am a strong advocate for affordable housing, and so therefore I understand the dire need for increased affordable housing in Los Angeles. However, it must be done with careful consideration of why certain properties, like equestrian-keeping areas, have historically been exempted from such development.

Sincerely,

Kelly Blanpied, resident
 4001 Verdant Street
 LA, CA, 90039

--
 Kelly Blanpied
 4001 Verdant Street
 Los Angeles, CA 90039
 LA, CA 90039

818.631.4011
kclfbampicd.com

"Life is either a daring adventure or nothing. To keep our faces toward change and behave like free spirits in the presence of fate is strength undefeatable."

- Helen Keller

The importance of education in this world is not that it is a ladder to climb, but that it is a light to hold. Education and not, as some people think, a passport to success. Education is the only way to change the world, and it is the only way to change the world for the better. Education is the only way to change the world for the better. Education is the only way to change the world for the better.

Google Groups

Fwd: Council File: 16-1468; Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA, Accessory Dwelling Units

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 21, 2017 1:45 PM

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

From: <Gggilbertent@aol.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 21, 2017 at 1:19 PM

Subject: Council File: 16-1468; Case Number: CPC-2016-4345-CA, Accessory Dwelling Units

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: christine.peters@lacity.org, chris.robertson@lacity.org, amy.ablakat@lacity.org

March 21, 2016

Honorable Jose Huizar, Chair
PLUM COMMITTEEDear Councilmember Huizar and
Committee Members:

As a resident and business owner in Atwater Village who is well aware of the need for additional affordable housing, I am writing to request that the Equine-keeping Areas ("K" Overlay zones) remain excluded from the building of any Accessory Dwelling Units.

Such areas have traditionally been exempted from any such development and should remain so.

In fact, the Atwater Village Equestrian area has already been identified as "The Atwater Village Equestrian Historic District" by SurveyLA and is described as "an equestrian community (s)ituated along the Los Angeles River" . The preservation of such a rare and special place within Los Angeles is essential and does not lend itself to the type of housing which would be provided by the building of Accessory Dwelling Units.

Other "K" Overlay zones are also important to their local communities and must retain the prohibition of Accessory Dwelling Units.

Please, in considering this important issue, recognize the importance of the "K" Overlay zones and maintain their exclusion.

Sincerely,

GENE GILBERT
4024 Verdant Street
Los Angeles, California 90039

Google Groups

PLUM COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM #4 March 21, 2017 Council File 16-1468 (CPC-2016-4345-CA) Accessory Dwelling Units

Watts, Larry

Mar 21, 2017 1:51 PM

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

Re: Council File 16-1468 –Accessory Dwelling Units

Please forward this message to the Honorable Chairman and Members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

The proposed ordinance accompanying the Los Angeles City Planning Commission (LAPC) report, dated December 22, 2016, relative to an ordinance amending Sections 12.03 and 12.22 and repealing portions of Section 12.24 of Chapter 1 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code for the purpose of regulating Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and complying with State law (AB 2299) actually goes beyond the requirements of AB 2299. Current law reflected in LAMC Sec. 13.24. W prohibits ADU's in equine keeping zones. AB 2299 does not require the city to change it law prohibiting ADU's in equine keeping zones. The proposed ordinance would allow ADU to be constructed as a matter of right within equine keeping zones. The proposed ordinance does so by allowing ADU's as a matter of right in "all zones wherein residential are permitted by right. "

I urge PLUM to not adopt the draft ordinance in its current format. Instead, PLUM should direct LAPC to follow the process set forth in last year's City Council motion 19A- the Planning Dept. should conduct a "comprehensive, open, transparent review and process" before adopting and ADU ordinance that goes beyond AB 2299 requirements.

Thank you.

Larry Watts

T. Larry Watts | Senior Counsel | Seyfarth Shaw LLP
2029 Century Park East | Suite 3500 | Los Angeles, California 90067-3021
Direct: +1-310-201-5287 | Mobile: +1-310-864-6475 | Fax: +1-310-282-6987
lwatts@seyfarth.com | www.seyfarth.com

**SEYFARTH
SHAW**

The information contained in this transmission is attorney privileged and/or confidential information intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

Google Groups

Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance

Chris Loomis

Mar 21, 2017 2:41 PM

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

Re: Council File 16-1468 Proposed ADU Ordinance

Dear Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee Members,

I strongly believe that Assembly Bill No. 2299 should be left to work as is without the added hillside and size restrictions.

I am a property owner in Northeast Los Angeles in Council District 1 where homes sizes are generally modest, where many lots are considered hillside even though the topography is slight, where many so called hillside lots are on streets that follow the city grid, and where affordable housing options are desperately needed.

Excluding ADU's from hillside areas is arbitrary and thus discriminatory when in fact many so called hillside lots in my community are well suited for ADU's. Because many of the houses in my community are modest in size the proposed limit on ADU's to 50% of the existing house size unfairly hurts us in a way that people in wealthier neighborhoods where houses are larger aren't hurt. Lot size and the existing zoning code limits on allowable density should be used to determine maximum ADU size.

Thank you.

Chris Loomis

Google Groups

Public Comment for Agenda Item #7 (16-1468)--March 21st, 2017 (Accessory Dwelling Units / ADUs)

Alejandro Dobie-Gonzalez

Mar 21, 2017 4:01 PM

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

Dear Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee,

I am writing to provide public comment to Agenda Item #7 (16-1468) that will be on the agenda for March 21st, 2017 regarding the proposed amendments to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). ADUs should be a type of housing that are affordable and inclusive to families and as a tool to increase the housing stock within communities without a large construction cost.

As a community organizer in the city of Los Angeles it is clear that in conjunction to affordable housing developments and protection to rent stabilized units and other various strategies--the reform of ADU requirements is necessary in order to increase the amount of affordable housing stock within the city.

Without reform to regulations that currently prohibit the development of types of ADUs such as the 640 sq. ft. maximum--it is difficult for housing units to be added onto the housing market that are affordable to build as well as promote family living within them.

In the community of South Central Los Angeles--many adult children have no other option than to remain in their parents' homes due to the rising housing costs. This overcrowding within housing is not uncommon for many working class communities in the city of Los Angeles. With less restrictions to the development of ADUs that promote multi-generational living (such as 2 bedroom units) families can have other alternatives to housing that still allow for them to remain in their neighborhoods where their networks are located including housing, work, and schools.

Many existing ADUs are limited in size--therefore allowing landlords to restrict families to live in their properties and advertising them as "singles" or "bachelor pads." With an increase in family inclusiveness through larger caps of allowable space raised to 900-1200 square feet (2 bedroom units) it makes it easier for families to qualify to live in these units and not be denied the right to housing on the basis of unit size.

Thank You,
Alejandro

--
Alejandro Dobie-Gonzalez
Community Organizer
SAJE-Strategic Actions for a Just Economy



152 West 32nd Street
Los Angeles, CA 90007

T: 213.745.9961 **ext.** 204

F: 213.745.9969

Google Groups

ADUs

Nate Bolt

Mar 21, 2017 6:30 PM

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

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). I own a 2,000 sq ft duplex in Los Feliz and want to build an ADU. I believe that we need more ADUs (or backyard homes) in the City. The proposed ordinance falls short because:

- * Homeowners of small primary homes are PUNISHED while homeowners of larger homes are REWARDED.
- * Low to moderate income and non-white homeowners in Los Angeles tend to own homes smaller than 2400 sf, and so would be denied the right to build an ADU of 1200 sf. This raises serious equity issues and may be a civil rights or fair housing violation
- * It does not reflect the spirit of the CA State Law that has been in effect this year.

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

Sincerely,
Nate Bolt
Founder, Ethnio

Google Groups

Fwd: PLUM March 21, 2017, Agenda Item 7 / Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) – CF 16-1468

Sharon Dickinson

Mar 22, 2017 8:14 AM

Posted in group: **Clerk-PLUM-Committee**From: **Barbara Broide** <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 21, 2017 at 2:53 PM

Subject: PLUM March 21, 2017, Agenda Item 7 / Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) – CF 16-1468

To: Sharon Dickinson - PLUM <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Cc: Paul Koretz - cd 5 <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, Shawn Bayliss - CD 5 Planning <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>,

Faisal Alserri <faisal.alserrri@lacity.org>, "jack.sriipoona@lacity.org" <jack.sriipoona@lacity.org>,

Councilmember Wesson <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>

I regret that I am unable to attend today's PLUM Committee meeting to represent the Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. HOA Board. Our comments are attached. Please share them with the Committee and enter them into the Council File.

Thank you,

Barbara Broide

RE: PLUM March 21, 2017, Agenda Item 7

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) – CF 16-1468

Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd
Homeowner's Association
Incorporated November 8, 1971
P. O. Box 64213
Los Angeles, CA 90064-0213

March 21, 2017

Los Angeles City Council
Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM)
Los Angeles City Council
Councilmember Jose Huizar – Chair, Marqueece Harris-Dawson-Vice Chair
Councilmembers Mitchell Englander, Gilbert Cedillo – Members
VIA EMAIL: Sharon.dickinson@lacity.org,

RE: PLUM March 21, 2017, Agenda Item 7
Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) – CF 16-1468

Dear Chair Huizar, Vice Chair Harris-Dawson, and Honorable PLUM Members:

We are deeply concerned and troubled that the wishes of the City Council as stated during its earlier consideration of the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) have been ignored. We have understood that the City must take action to bring the LA ADU ordinance into compliance with the State's recently adopted legislative measure. However, the Council should take action to approve only the limited ADU Ordinance revisions that would embrace the specific AB 2299 mandated changes. It should remove all non-mandated changes proposed by the Planning Department. Instead, the Council should once again instruct the Department that, if, in the future, it wishes to propose non-mandated changes, the Department should do so only in strict compliance with the specified Motion 19A process –with a "comprehensive, open and transparent review and customized alternatives.

The City Planning Commission in December 2016 recommended approval of the Planning Department's proposed Ordinance revisions that would change (and substantially weaken) the City's existing accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance, LAMC Sections 12.24.W.43 and 12.24.W.44. The proposed revised Ordinance will be heard at the PLUM Committee today.

Because state law demands that local governments must approve all ADUs that meet their local ADU standards without any public hearings and without any discretion to impose mitigation measures, the only opportunity in the land use approval process where localities can minimize the impacts of ADU development will occur if and when they draft and approve their local ADU ordinance.

As proposed, the Department's ADU draft Ordinance would substantially weaken the City's current standards that have been designed to protect surrounding neighborhoods from the potential negative impacts of oversized, poorly located ADU development. Ostensibly, the Department's proposed Ordinance revisions respond to AB 2299, which, on a statewide basis, mandates certain limited new ADU requirements relating to

parking, setbacks, passageways and approval procedures. But, when the Department addressed the required AB 2299 changes, however, it did not confine its proposed revisions only to the changes that AB 2299 demands. Instead, in proposing its extensive recommended new revisions *beyond those mandated by AB 2299*, the Planning Department utterly failed to conduct the "comprehensive, open, transparent review and process" that this past summer's City Council Motion 19A instructed the Department to undertake before proposing changes to the City's current adopted ADU standards. Nor has the Department prepared customized alternatives that take into account the widely diverse neighborhoods of the City Council's 15 different council districts.

Significant changes have been proposed related to the **definition of a "Hillside Area"** that would reduce the size of protected Hillside Areas by 30 percent. There would not appear to be a good reason to create a new Hillside Area definition from the one defined under the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance.

The current ADU Ordinance requires that, to qualify for ADU development, a lot must have an area at least 50% larger than the **minimum lot area** for the applicable zone. The Department would entirely delete this requirement. The proposed minimum lot size change is a significant change which deserves additional community discussion and analysis of impacts across different communities.

Of all the proposed changes, the recommendation to permit an ADU of up to 1,200 square feet is the issue that seems to attract the most opposition from those who have learned about the ordinance. **Maximum Floor Area** as currently defined is limited to 640 square feet (Section 12.24.W.43(a)(1)). The proposed sliding scale approach where ADUs can be the greater of 640 SF or 50% of the floor area of the primary residence up to 1,200 square feet will result in some very oversized ADU projects for some neighborhoods. Other municipalities in the LA Basin have not been so generous. LA should seek to be in line with other cities so that we do not become a magnet for speculators and real estate interests interested in further monetizing the single family home market for financial gain at the expense of affordable housing. Where is the economic analysis of potential impacts of allowing for the growth of ADUs that are clearly in excess of size to be considered an accessory dwelling unit.

Los Angeles is a city of growing density that does not have the infrastructure to support such growth in all locations. Nowhere is this more evident than on its **substandard streets**. From a public safety point of view, there is no rationale presented that supports additional density on substandard streets in R1 neighborhoods as a blanket policy. The added requirements under AB 2299 that eliminates parking requirements for ADUs located within a half miles of transit will have significant negative impacts if located on substandard streets which often have very limited (if any) street parking. This will denigrate the quality of life in the area.

As we have expressed in our comments related to short term rentals, it is critical to protect housing stock from being lost to the operation of short term rentals. There is not point in allowing for ADUs to be built to address the housing shortage if, in fact, they are used as short term rentals competing with our city's hospitality industry. It is therefore important that the City adopt restrictions related to owner residence in the primary residence and the limiting of days of short term rentals allowed. The Department's proposed revised ADU Ordinance would guarantee that ADU owners can rent out their

second units. A city-wide opening of the gates to ADUs to be used as short term rentals will seriously compromise the quality of life and safety of our residential communities.

While we do not have **Equine-keeping Areas** in our community, the proposed elimination of the prohibition of ADUs in special zones permitting horse keeping in Section 12.24.W(g) should be carefully discussed and evaluated by those living in those areas. As has been the case in areas of the state where development has encroached to agricultural lands, eventually, the agricultural uses are pushed out because of complaints from nearby residents. Those who seek to develop and rent out ADUs in an equine-keeping area may threaten continued equine uses. Further, the lots in those areas are usually larger lots and they will attract those who seek to develop ADUs for their ability to build larger units. This also relates to the proposed deletion of Section 12.24.W.44, covering large lots in RA, RS and R1 zones.

We do not understand why the state mandated revisions were not made and an outreach effort undertaken to consider the additional issues noted above and any others raised by those participating in the outreach process. The City Council can easily revise the pending proposed Ordinance to restore the current protective ADU standards that the Planning Department would delete or substantially change, while also including the limited AB 2299 mandated changes. The Planning Department should again be instructed to undertake the "comprehensive, open, transparent review and process" called for by Motion 19A before proposing any non-AB 2299 mandated changes to the current ADU standards.

Sincerely,

Barbara Broide
President

cc: CD 5: Councilmember Paul Koretz, Planning Deputy Shawn Bayliss, Faisal Alserri;
Deputy Jack Sripoona
Council President Herb Wesson

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Partho Kalyani

Mar 21, 2017 9:20 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,
Partho Kalyani
CA
Parthokalyani@gmail.com

Google Groups

Save our backyard homes!

Joshua Blumenkopf

Mar 22, 2017 10:23 AM

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,
Joshua Blumenkopf
215 S Madison Ave Pasadena, CA 91101-2874
jblumenkopf@gmail.com