

Communication from Public

Name: Joseph Roth

Date Submitted: 08/31/2021 05:40 PM

Council File No: 21-0665

Comments for Public Posting: I am submitting comments in support of CF# 21-0665 – Item 4 on today's PLUM Agenda – because it is essential for the planning department and city zoning codes to evolve as potentially new land uses emerge in Los Angeles. The current situation of not having specific guidelines for ghost kitchens is fair neither to the applicant/developer who wants clarity and certainty nor for the community who expects the city to uphold agreed-upon designated zoning and/or development corridors. One of these ghost kitchens is proposed for my neighborhood and – although it could generate as much traffic and parking needs as a Chick-fil-a or In-and-Out – it essentially was permitted as a food manufacturing facility. And this project is no See's Candy factory. Better guidelines, which hopefully would result from this council motion, will eliminate any ambiguities in the code, and reliance on the discretion of individual planners that may be handling ghost kitchens differently throughout the city. I appreciate Councilmembers Koretz & Harris-Dawson's sponsorship of this measure. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments,

Communication from Public

Name: Suzanne Gero

Date Submitted: 08/31/2021 03:46 PM

Council File No: 21-0665

Comments for Public Posting: Regarding Item #4 on 8/31/21: Choosing the location of co-living residential facilities. There may be locations in the city that are suitable for co-living buildings. However, at the outset, it must be stated specifically that they not be located in Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ)s due to incompatibility with the guidelines that have been in place to protect these areas. Thank you for your consideration, Suzanne Gero

Communication from Public

Name: Amy Ludwig

Date Submitted: 08/31/2021 05:01 PM

Council File No: 21-0665

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council: I am writing in regards to Councilmember Koretz's proposed ordinance to define Ghost Kitchens and Co-Living as an enumerated land use in the Los Angeles Municipal Code. I appreciate that new business models evolve in response to consumer demand, and that the Code must be updated to include definitions of associated new land uses. However, definition should not immediately translate to approval. The impact and effect of such new uses must be carefully considered and studied, particularly when selecting the zones where they can be located. For example, in my neighborhood of Garvanza in Highland Park, a developer (who has an history of pressuring low-income tenants out of rent-controlled apartments) is proposing a new co-living project in our HPOZ. Located on a street of single family houses, this building would include 150 bedrooms in 33 units, each priced well above current rents in the area. In addition to placing enormous new demands on our aging water, sewer, and other infrastructure systems, the project includes just 78 parking spaces for 150 tenants. (Not to mention that project's driveway is on an access road to the 110 freeway, guaranteeing a traffic nightmare. Due to a poorly applied TOC exemption, unfortunately, no traffic study is currently required.) Co-living projects, by their nature, bring with them massive increases in housing density, resource use, and rental prices. The tenants they attract are more likely to be transient, not contributing much to the culture around them. I strongly urge you to restrict such developments to commercial areas, rather than allow them to deform the character of established residential neighborhoods. Sincerely, Amy Ludwig