

OVER 100 Community Stake Holders SAY "NO!" & OPPOSE 6500 Olympic Place HPOZ South Carthay Second-Story Addition Project

Lisa Kaye <lk@lisakaye.com>

Feb 3, 2020 4:12 PM

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

Attachments available until Mar 4, 2020

February 3, 2020

Los Angeles Department of City Planning

City Clerk

Room 395

City Hall, 200 North Spring Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

And online to www.LACouncilComment.com

Re: 6500 Olympic Place-DIR 2019-3828-COA-1A. ENV-2019-3829-CE

Dear City Council Board Members, PLUM Committee and Concerned Stakeholders:

I would like to introduce myself, Lisa Kaye, PICO NC, Area Representative South Carthay CD 5 and South Carthay resident for over 20 years. As recently elected Area Representative and as a member of the South Carthay Neighborhood Association Board for the past five years, I have the best interests of our community at heart. I have heard it all from why can't I paint my house the color I want from can I install solar panels on my roof? When I ran for this post, I did so knowing that my main position in my campaign was the preservation of our community and that meant upholding the Historic Preservation Overlay plan adopted on December 9, 2010. As you are aware, South Carthay has a long preservation history and is one of the oldest established HPOZ in Los Angeles. Our plan and guidelines, although among some of the strictest, has successfully over the years, afforded our community the ability to fairly and uniformly decide on what does and what does not conform to the preservation plan.

With all due respect Councilman Koretz's interpretation of the proposed changes to the proposed second-story addition to 6500 Olympic Place is ill-informed. Most importantly, and I believe a major reason why the Councilman has put this matter before the PLUM Committee for consideration, is the impression that Ms. Gowey has somehow gained "strong neighborhood support" based on the signatures and letters she has submitted to the file as Exhibit 2, and as stated in Councilman Koretz letter to the committee(s) dated April 4, 2019.

Let me help you set the record straight with these supported new facts.

Ms. Gowey claims since 2016 she has received 78 letters and signatures in support for her development project: Upon further investigation and review we have found the following **discrepancies**.

1- At least 15 or more signatures on the original list in support of her petition are illegible and are unable to be verified as to their legitimacy:

http://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2020/20-0062_misc_4_01-22-2020.pdf;

2- There are at least 5 neighbors with duplicate signatures, one who is since deceased, and the other has moved from the area. Of those remaining 3 signatures, **ALL** have since rescinded their support (see attached Opposition Petition list). At least two neighbors were listed as "neutral" when in fact they are vehemently opposed to the project and have signed the attached Opposition Petition as well.

3- There are at least 10 individuals who have since moved out of the area or sold the property since 2016;

4- To date, we currently have over 24 neighbors who have **RESCINDED** their signature and initial support due to a misrepresentation of the scope of the project and what it would mean to the existing HPOZ. Some honestly did not recall that they signed the original petition request from Ms. Gowey back in 2016 and feel "duped".

As of today, we have collected over **106 signatures** from the community in **THREE** days! These individual signatures represent our neighbors who **STRONGLY OPPOSE** Ms. Gowey's petition for a second story addition. Given we had less than a week to respond to the upcoming hearing, we would have likely gotten more signatures in **OPPOSITION** of this petition had we been given more time. This brings Ms. Gowey's 2016 unverified list of supporters to less than 30- hardly classifies as strong support.. ***This is a significant decrease from the number that Mr. Koretz has relied on to inform his decision in requesting the PLUM Committee reverse the appeal based on "strong neighborhood support."***

You should be aware that as a part of my community outreach, the prevailing theme among neighbors opposition to this project is not to deny Ms. Gowey more "living space", but centers around the feeling that, ***"Why can she get her denial reversed when the HPOZ board pushes back when I want to change my garage door or windows?"***

One of the primary reasons people seek out homes within an HPOZ community is the

protection the designation provides. By reversing this decision, we are taking the gloves off, pitting one neighbor against the other in the fight for what is, or what is not sanctioned under the guidelines. What is good for one should not be at the sacrifice of others in the community.

Either we adopt and abide by our HPOZ guidelines or we don't. Either we work within the framework of the HPOZ offering flexibility where it makes sense, or we don't.

Cutting favors for one person to the detriment of the entire community is not the intent of our preservation plan, nor is it the way we should administer our approval and appeals process. This precedent, if set, will have an adverse impact on our community, *as a whole*.

How will you say "Yes" to a second story request from one neighbor who has financial resources to fight the appeals process and "No" to someone who does not? How do you say it's "Ok" to paint your house white to one and not to another? How do you tell someone they need to change their windows because it does not comply with HPOZ guidelines and allow others to do what they want? This inconsistency and prejudice will reinforce a subjective and bias process by which our community will likely revolt!. The reversal of this appeal will have a detrimental impact on the preservation of South Carthay's HPOZ plan and on our ability as a community, to maintain consistency in the midst of threats from SB 50, SB 330 and developers looking to "make good" on single-family communities. **Do not open the door to this threat to our community by allowing ONE stakeholder to adversely impact the communities adopted HPOZ plan for their own personal self-interests.**

Given the overwhelming majority of our key stakeholders who strongly oppose this project, I respectfully request the PLUM committee members uphold the denial of her application and to **NOT VOTE TO REVERSE** the decision of the Central Los Angeles Planning Commission and HPOZ board respectively.

For the record, I submit this response and supporting letters and Neighborhood Opposition Petition with **106 OPPOSITION** signatures and request that the attached PDF files to be submitted to the official record.

Many thanks for your consideration,

Lisa Kaye

Area Representative South Carthay, PICO NC, CD-5

Land-Use Committee Board Member

Area Resident Stake Holder

1137 South La Jolla Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90035

213-305-1898 mobile

[Click to Download](#)

6500 Opposition Letters 2020.pdf
15.3 MB

[Click to Download](#)

6500 Opposition Petition.pdf
5.1 MB

[Click to Download](#)

6500 Olympic Place Petition Appeal 2020.pdf
93 KB