



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Second Units

1 message

Brenda Schoettel <jerybren@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Sep 12, 2016 at 3:42 PM

Council File No. 14-0057-S8

CPC File No: CPC-2016-1245-CA

Ms.Dickson,

It is my strong opinion that any new law controlling second units should take into account the characteristics of different neighborhoods. Neighborhoods, such as Atwater Village, that has smaller average lot sizes should not be forced to have rules applied for areas with larger lot sizes.

Small second units are already common in Atwater Village and new one will not represent a change in neighborhood character.

The blanket prohibition against buildings on lots smaller than 7500 SF unfairly prevents homeowners from building for extended family and elderly family members. Also, existing second buildings on a lot should also be allowed to be used as a second residence and not be classified as a accessory building or recreation room.

Housing currently being built are not affordable to people on fixed income. Allowing second units on lots under 7500 SF could help in more affordable housing.

In your vote please consider the individual characteristics of each neighborhood.

Thank you,

Brenda Schoettel
3330 N. Sunnynook Drive
Los Angeles, California 90039



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

(no subject)

1 message

Brenda Schoettel <jerybren@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org
Cc: etta.armstrong@la.city.org

Mon, Sep 12, 2016 at 4:35 PM

Council File No. 14-0057-S8**CPC File No: CPC-2016-1245-CA**

It is my strong opinion that any new law controlling second units should take into account the characteristics of different neighborhoods

Neighborhoods such as, Atwater Village, that have smaller lot sizes should not be forced to have to rules applied for areas with larger lot sizes.

Small second units are already common in Atwater Village and new ones will not represent a change in the neighborhood character.

The blanket prohibition against buildings on lots smaller than 7500 SF unfairly prevents homeowners from building second units for extended family

and elderly family members. Also, second buildings currently on a lot, and if they qualify, should be able to be considered as a second house and not

have to be classified as a accessory unit or recreation room.

Housing currently being built is not affordable to people on fixed income and low income. Allowing second units on lots under 7500 SF could help in

much needed affordable housing.

In your vote please consider in the individual characteristics of each neighborhood.

Thank you,

Brenda Schoettel
3330 N. Sunnynook Dr.
Los Angeles, Ca. 90039

Dr. Carrie Sutkin, 2438 Gatewood Street, Los Angeles, CA 90031 (323) 868-5383

DATE: Monday September 12, 2016

To: Councilmembers: Mitch O'Farrell, Gil Cedillo, Jose Huizar, David Ryu, Bob Blumenfield, Mitch Englander, Joe Bizcaino, Curren Price, Paul Koretz, Marquise Harris-Dawson, Felipe Fuentes, Nury Martinez, Mike Bonin, and Council President Herb Wesson.

RE: Council File No. 14-0057-S8 CPC File No: CPC-2016-1245-CA

Please reconsider the action taken last week on second units, which will have detrimental effect on my neighborhood and most of the others around me in Silverlake, Echo Park, Lincoln Heights, Glassell Park, Atwater Village, Cypress Park, Elysian Valley, Chinatown and Boyle Heights. Subsections **12.24.W.43** and **12.24.W.44** of the municipal code should be repealed.

As things stand, homeowners in Northeast Los Angeles will be prohibited from building any second units at all Subsections **12.24.W.43** and **12.24.W.44** contain restrictions on lot size that will prevent virtually all R1 homeowners in our neighborhoods from building second units (of any size). The blanket prohibition against building on lots smaller than 7500 SF unfairly prevents homeowners in Elysian Valley and in urban neighborhoods in the older parts of town, from building needed housing for elderly parents, or extended family. There are very few (if any) R1 lots of 7500 SF or larger in Elysian Valley.

Second units are not a threat to neighborhood integrity

Small second units are already common in Elysian Valley and they don't represent a change in neighborhood character. Homeowners who have room and can meet zoning and building requirements should be permitted to build.

The grandfather provision doesn't apply to enough people

Grandfathering only the units that already are built or are in plan check ignores homeowners who have tried to obtain permits since the DBS stopped issuing them. It is unfair to penalize homeowners who suddenly found that the ZA Memorandum was no longer being applied, and who already have spent time and money preparing to build. I would like to convert the studio next to my garage as a second unit, if the city adopts new standards that would permit a lot just less than 5,000 square feet to do so. I live next to the LA River, and I have easements in my back yard for DWP and Street Lights, and the north side, for the bike path.

The city council should approve the repeal recommended by the Planning Commission.

The current ordinance should be repealed. Any new law controlling second units should take into account the characteristics of different neighborhoods. Neighborhoods with smaller average lot sizes shouldn't be forced to apply rules meant for areas with larger lot sizes.