



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Building sf restrictions

1 message

Randy Heinrich <wrheinrich@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 19, 2017 at 8:28 PM

Reply-To: wrheinrich@gmail.com

To: shawn.bayliss@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

I oppose the restrictions for the CD 5 area. I understand the need to limit the huge houses that take up most of the buildable area of a lot, and then go 2 stories. But the proposed restrictions make it so families cannot build a livable house with normal size bedrooms and a family room. For larger families, a 3500 sf house is reasonable and is not exceedingly large, which would be a .7 or .75 building to lot ratio. It would provide for a small footprint 2 story or a large footprint 1 story, either of which would be acceptable to not have an overbuilt look.

Someone told me there was going to be a 200 sf restriction for garages. If true, that is ridiculous! You can barely fit one car in a garage that size. It seems forever that the building department has required 2 car covered parking. Even when the original tracts were built they had at least 400 sf. 200 sf doesn't even allow for a small work bench, storage, or over size vehicles. Some families have a car for a youth driver, a spare car, or a specialty (classic?) car for fun. 200 sf would realistically only allow a 10' wide garage. With an 8' door, that only allows for one foot on either side of the door which is not enough for a sheer panel. Thus you would have to go with steel columns and beam, with a grade beam foundation. That type of construction just at least doubled the price of the garage. A 600sf garage would not be way out of character for the neighborhood. If it were up to me I would allow the garage to have a second story for a family room or storage area (that didn't count as residence square footage). Putting a 200 sf limit (neither would 400 sf) on the garage would not allow for any storage and with the house so small there's no room for storage in the house either. With families you have bikes plus all kind of things for the kids. For couples with no kids they still have stuff that has to be stored. You are essentially ensuring self storage places business, and even with that it is not convenient because they are not open 24/7. More self storage businesses in the neighborhoods is worse than allowing everyone to have a little bigger garage. Do we want people to park large vehicles on the street. Many people would need the 200 sf for storage, putting both cars out on the street. We have also had a rash of car break-ins in the area and putting more cars out on the street just increases that possibility. In addition, much of the area is permit parking on the street so we have to pay to park a car(s) that would normally be out of the weather and protected from thieves. Many people parked their cars on Exposition, but when the train started they made that no parking from 2 AM to 4 AM taking away the possibility of parking there overnight, and a lot of the surrounding area is permit parking.

This all adds up to the proposal for the area to be over restrictive. These restrictions would decrease the number of buyers that would be interested in the area. That of course would decrease property values. These restrictions are not reasonable. I strongly oppose all these restrictions, and believe they go way too far. I believe that some restrictions may be necessary, but taking the restrictions to the extreme is a swing way too far in the other direction. Lets be reasonable.

William R. Heinrich
Rancho Park Resident