

Communication from Public

Name: J. Ross
Date Submitted: 10/05/2023 10:33 AM
Council File No: 23-0954

Comments for Public Posting: I support this appeal, and oppose the WLA APC's decision to grand the Adjustment/Exception because it is not reasonable. The Adjustment completely eliminates both the front yard and the back yard (technically a 2nd front yard). The developer claimed that he was harmed by the fact that 90% of the site would be a front yard with a 15 ft front setback. He doesn't acknowledge that R3 backyards are also 15 ft setbacks, so he would have had these same setbacks even if the site didn't have 2 front yards. Instead of a compromise of allowing a reduced setback on only 1 side, the WLA APC granted all setback reductions. Now, 100% of the site is a 5 ft side setback. How is that better than 90% of the site being required front and back 15 ft setbacks. Why didn't you compromise and allow 50% front/rear setback and 50% side setback, like every other parcel in LA? Why is 100% site setback "needed" when no community benefit is provided? Why didn't the Planning Dept and the WLA APC vote to compromise and protect the neighbors, instead of granting the developer 100% of what he wanted? Your job is to protect the neighbors, not grant 100% of requests when there is no hardship. Adjustments and Variances should be granted only when needed. For example, if a pond or slope prevents construction on a portion of a site, the building can be taller on the developable portion of the site. Or, if a setback is reduce on a portion of the site, then the setback . It's about trade-offs and fair decisions, not granting 100% of what a developer wants simply to make more money. The developer completely understood the development restrictions, and bought that land at risk. Those are not grounds for "hardship". A flat, triangular shaped lot is not a hardship either. 2-3 smaller units can be built with the existing zoning. The developer wants huge units to make the most money, that's why he claims a "hardship". He can easily make them smaller. Also, the city is surrendering 4,000 sf to the developer for free, and we the community are getting nothing in return. With land worth \$20,000,000 per acre in this area of West LA, that 4,000 sf is worth \$2,000,000. The land could be sold to the developer for that high amount, and the \$2,000,000 would be a big contribution to reduce our city's big deficit. You should propose that the developer request an affordable housing incentive, and covenant one of the houses to a low-income household -- that way, our community and city would

at least get something in exchange.