

Hello Hannah,

I hope you have had the opportunity to show my notes on 17925 INDIAN MEADOWS PL RANCH IN GRANADA HILLS to our Councilman. I sat down with Tibor (my husband) and I would like to add a few things.

I had not been able to talk to him enough about the PLANNER'S MISTAKE of labeling the property as vacant empty lot because Tibor was writing a book and he wanted an absolutely neutral look at the problem,

We feel the City should know how a mistake like that could create a catastrophe for other property owners who have their retirement savings in their property.

Our property was rezoned through regular hearings and was recorded in the county recorder's office - still in there today at 17,500 square feet/lots, like the big adjoining Grayhawk subdivision that bought easements from us way back. (They had a somewhat more difficult terrain for construction than ours)

Some knowledgeable architects researched the property and came to us with a reasonable offer - the property was not listed

We went into escrow. We had a smooth and simple deal. Suddenly they begged to get their deposit back. We gave in. They had a point: too many rumors about the zoning that would slow down the construction.

We lost hundreds of thousands of dollars as a direct result of the mistaken zoning. This is not a guess or some wild exaggeration. The facts support us.

Anna Vidal should describe the details of the original mistake, and the step by step results from it. Since she promised to match the recorded official zoning 17,500 per lot in the county recorder's office, she should give a rational explanation why she did not fulfill her promise. And why the new PLAN MAP HAD NOT SHOWN ANY CORRECTION THAT WOULD INDICATE IT- unless we overlooked it. Maybe the City Council and every relevant City department could help to avoid those individual tragedies.

As I said before, the mistakes did not require much time and the administrative corrections should be just as fast when the mistakes are so obvious and correctable. Some others should benefit from this unusual painful experience..

Thank you for your help,

Date: 10/20/2015

Submitted in PLUM Committee

Council File No: 07-0535-62 & 15-1226

Item No. 1

Deputy: Comm from Public

Suzanne W. Zada

MRS. TIBORZADA

Friday, April 25, 2014 AOL: Tiborzada

PLUM Agenda #1
10-20-15

October 20, 2015 – Public comment Plum Committee meeting agenda item 1. Files 07-0535-
S2, 15-1226 re Granada Hills Community plan

Date: 10/20/2015

Submitted in PLUM Committee

Council File No: 07-0535-S2 & 15-1226

Item No. 1
Comm from Public

Submitted by William Kuzmin, Old Granada Hills Homeowner

1 Housekeeping

- a) Original notice November 2012 was misleading compared to report at Feb 21 hearing.
- b) Public Records act request dated September 30 to inspect the GHCP was not complied with. Yesterday I received a message that I could review the file downtown. I had asked to view the file in Van Nuys.
- c) The City Planning Commission determination letter dated October 2, 2015 stating the determination of the CPC is final and cannot be appealed. I did not know the appeal period was still open. The City failed to comply with government code section 10013 (a) G. which states that the notice must be posted marked the next or it is invalid. The post mark on the letter is 3 days later on October 5, 2015. Therefore the CPC determination is not final and subject to appeal. I hereby state that I am appealing the CPC determination.
- d) Exhibit I in the documents accompanying today's meeting has a gross error similar to those made in the report on the Interim Control Ordinance (see court case BS157882 scheduled for January 7, 2016) – It says the maximum floor are ratio for the R1 zoned properties on lots up to 7,499 sq ft are 30% or 1,000 sq ft whichever is greater. The math is wrong. 30% multiplied by 5,000 sq ft (minimum R1 lot size) equals 1,500 sq. ft. Which is correct? 1,000 sq ft or 30 percent?
- 1) Unresolved issues from the CPC meeting on May 23, 2013. All statements made here are substantiated by the City's audio recording of the meeting.
- a) The Department of City Planning said there were 13 revisions to the plan since February. Commissioner Rosen said the CPC did not need to hear them. He denied information to the public by this refusal to hear the revisions. One of those revisions was changing the boundaries of the proposed RFA district from the original boundaries (violation of municipal code regulating overlay districts).
- b) A DCP statement was made promising to give the public time to make comments on the final EIR when it was released for "significant input". We have not been afforded that opportunity to review the 1,466 page EIR.
- c) Commissioner Roshen would not allow a public speaker to pass remaining time to a spouse at the beginning of public comments. The when the supporters of the RFA district spoke, Roshen broke the rules (which he previously stated) allowed them to pass time to each other indicating he engaged in discrimination and a bias towards the supporters. He also allowed one of the supporters to speak for nearly 5 minutes when everyone else only had 2 minutes. This is discrimination and again points to a bias.

- d) The original Draft EIR was combined with the Sylmar area. They should have been separate. It was stated by Granada Hills North Neighborhood Council that the "DEIR is flawed the way it is presented". Commissioner Rosen would not admit the GHNNC letter to be admitted to the record.
- e) Chairman Roschen then speaks to his support of the RFA before commission debate. This is a violation of Roberts rules of Order as it unfairly compromises open fair unbiased discussion.
- f) Commissioner Perlman stated several three times the RFA 20% floor are ratio for the lots over 9,000 was too restrictive and should be a minimum of 30% and/or on a sliding scale corresponding to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance. Roschen ignored the concern and refused to put a formal specific motion to the board to change the ratios. The end motion was that the DCP was to do "thoughtful consideration" of increasing the ratios for the larger properties. The DCP failed to do this.
- g) Commissioner Perlman also asked the DCP why is the RFA need and what they did to determine if the BMO was working effectively. The DCP responded with the excuses that they could not evaluate it because of the down economy. "We are trying to prevent mansionization when the economy picks up which will push OGH past the tipping point". Now that the DCP compiled raw data to justify including Old Granada Hills in the Interim Control Ordinance the BMO can be analyzed after 3 years of a robust real estate market. The city's factual data proves the BMO is working perfectly for Old Granada Hills see the Writ of Mandamus filed on September 16, 2015, case number BS157882. If it ain't broke don't fix it. No RFA is necessary. The DCP gave diversionary non answers to Commisioner Perlman and never answered the "Why" part of his question.
- h) DCP stated during community outreach in 2006/7 the DCP mailed to 1 of every 10 homeowners about the RFA (data unavailable to analyze) and that the zoning changes were legally noticed to everyone in 500 ft yet I did not receive any such notice and there is no proof that said notice exist. Additional the original argument for the zoning changes was that over 500 of the 1211 lots could be subdivided. This was a false representation of the true fact. I brought to the attention of DCP that current codes for driveways and set backs rendered most of the 10,000 plus lots unable to meet the current requirement for a split or subdivision. At the North Valley Planning Commission Meeting in May of 2013 the DCP evidently respected my argument and revised the number to 100 lots that could be subdivided. That's 80% less than the 500 which is call "fraud" in my business.
- i) During the commission discussion, Roschen again refused to hear RFA revisions, denying the public's the right to know what changes were made.
- j) In the conclusion the DCP was to do additional outréach to the affected homeowners to clarify understanding of this complex issue prior to it being heard by City Council. The DCP has not done any addition outreach or made any attempt to contact the OGH owners to fully explain the details. Also, during discussion Roschen said that other issues could be addressed at the Council level.

So I am here to say that for the above reasons I am appealing the decision of the CPC to move the GHCP ahead to City Council and ask for a new CPC hearing on the community and the Old Granada Hills RFA district and accompanying zone changes or just remove both from the proposed plan today!

Also I barely survived the economic downturn as my real estate income decreased by 90 percent and my family survived on my hobby business – Antique and Vintage Music Boxes. I did have a dream of opening a small shop on Chatsworth St. in the specific plan area, but apparently no second hand stores will be allowed. Commissioner Domingo asked “What’s wrong with a second hand store?” three times and did not get a straight answer.

I am sure upon having some time to review the entire final EIR that there will be several errors in discretionary judgments based on the erroneous data in some areas of the EIR.

Over 300 people signed a wet petition since April that were submitted to CPC in May of 2013. Now 172 additional people have signed the Change.org petition – their comments are attached.

Section 2. All lots zoned R1 and RE9 that are within the Old Granada Hills Residential Floor Area District and with the suffix RFA, as described in the map in Section 1 of this ordinance, shall be subject to the following regulations:

- A. **Maximum Residential Floor Area.** For all single-family residentially zoned lots within the RFA district, the maximum residential floor area contained in all buildings and accessory buildings shall not exceed the following:

Lot Size	FAR (% of Lot Size)
Less than 7,500 sq-ft	30% or 1,000 sq-ft, whichever is greater
7,500 to 10,999 sq-ft	25% or 2,250 sq-ft, whichever is greater
11,000 sq-ft or greater	20% or 2,750 sq-ft, whichever is greater

- B. **Additional Bonus.** An additional 20 percent of the maximum residential floor area shall be allowed if any one or more of the methods listed below is utilized.

1. For properties which are not in the "1SS" Single-Story Height District, the maximum envelope height shall be no more than 18 feet; or
2. The required Private Garage is detached and located at the rear of the house, provided that the garage building is no more than 20% the main residential building footprint; or
3. The total residential floor area of each story other than the base floor in a multi-story building does not exceed 75 percent of the base floor area; or
4. The cumulative length of the exterior walls facing the front lot line, equal to a minimum of 25 percent of the building width shall be stepped-back a distance of at least 20 percent of the building depth from a plane parallel to the lot width established at the point of the building closest to the front lot line. When the front lot line is not straight, a line connecting the points where the side lot lines and the front lot line intersect shall be used. When through-lots have two front yards, the step back shall be provided along both front lot lines.

For the purposes of this provision, all exterior walls that intersect a plane parallel to the front lot line at 45 degrees or less shall be considered to be facing the front lot line. The building width shall be the greatest distance between the exterior walls of the building measured parallel to the lot width. The building depth shall be the greatest distance between the exterior walls of the building measured parallel to the lot depth;

Recipient: Los Angeles City Council

Letter: Greetings,

We demand the Los Angeles City Council to rescind Interim Control Ordinance 183497. We demand the removal of the proposed Old Granada Hills Zoning changes and Residential Floor Area (RFA) restrictions in the new Granada Hills Community Plan.

Comments

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Meli Calkins	Granada Hills, CA	2015-07-27	The proposed ordinance is a taking of property rights from the people who own land in Granada Hills. If people don't want the land to be subdivided or over built in THEIR opinion, they can buy the lots that they have concerns over.
John Vizzard	Granada Hills, CA	2015-07-27	I feel this proposed ordinance is unfair to the people who want to expand their houses. They should have the right to go as big as they desire and not be limited by the city as to how much if an addition they want.
Edwin Brotemarkle	Los Angeles, CA	2015-09-18	This ordinance will reduce the value of our properties
Anita Goldbaum	North Hills, CA	2015-09-19	I believe in an open transparent government that is responsive to the people that the elected officials are representing.
Stacey Wheeler	granada hills, CA	2015-09-20	This is not fair to the current owners who purchased houses before this ordinance with certain intentions or thoughts of expanding when they purchased the home.
malia levin	Granada Hills, CA	2015-09-20	I rent and want to own this property!
Fred Rohde	Los Angeles, CA	2015-09-21	I agree and I live in the area and have family in Granada Hills
Tracy Frank	Granada Hills, CA	2015-09-21	I feel this ordinance should be rescinded and property owners be allowed to expanded their homes on a case by case basis.
Anna Cristobal	Los Angeles, CA	2015-09-21	They are my neighbors, I do not want them to be affect it at all.
Charles Tarlow	Los Angeles, CA	2015-09-23	I believe the City Council Council is ignoring the wishes of homeowners in targeted residential areas at the request/influence of a minority of politically active constituents. It happened in my neighborhood. I suspect it is happening in Old Granada Hills. My message to all city councilmen ==> Send a legitimate survey to the home owners in Old Granada Hills with the facts about your proposed ICO asking them what THEY WANT! If you tell the truth and ask the question ... maybe you'll do the right thing. In the meantime, stop the ICO without documented support of the neighborhood !!!
taylor aichel	Granada Hills, CA	2015-09-24	Right to renovate.
Karen Crosby	Northridge, CA	2015-09-25	owners rights should not be restricted without first advising
Oren Karpovsky	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-03	The City of Los Angeles took away the property rights from the homeowners in Old Granada Hills without public notice before or after the Interim Control Ordinance was passed on March 25, 2015.
ABIR TRABOULSI	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-05	I believe that councils such as the one that we presently have their own personal agendas and are not qualified to make decision that affect all property owners
tip whiting	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-10	I live in the affected area this has devastated me and my family and our plans and has cost me tons of money.
Karen Ziegler	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-10	I live in the ICO area and this has a direct impact on me and my family. We have spent thousands on plans, lot surveys, etc. all for not. It is unconstitutional.
Sally Ziegler	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-10	I am elderly and I was going to move in with my daughter and she lives in that area now she cannot add on to the House and I will be forced to stay where I live now or assisted living.
noel o connor	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-10	I Do not Agree With the low percentage of Building Allowed by the new ordinance
Lee Hellinger	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-13	I live in Granada Hills and feel the council will attempt this where I live too.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
melody nahman nahman	Porter Ranch, CA	2015-10-13	My grandkids live on horrace street and they my move because the house i too small after haveing 2 kids
Charlie Nahman	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-13	I have been stopped from adding an addition onto my home due to this ordinance. I have recently had two children and would like to stay in my hom and Granada hills. However, my home is only 1080 sq ft. I propose to add 400 ft , single level on a 10,000 sq ft lot, and am unable to do so because of this ordinance. Ridiculous. My family will have to move, and most likely out of state, because of the need for additional space
vic toroyan	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-13	I live in the affected area and I am also a landlord and own several other properties in the affected area.
Marion Kuzmin	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-14	I did not know about any of the proposed changes to restrict the land use in Granada Hills. It was not on the hearing notice sent out in November of 2013. This is a surprise to me.
Robert Hovis	Lakeview terrace, CA	2015-10-14	Property owner
Tzahi Edri	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-14	I live in the Los Angeles area and I fear that this could come to my neighborhood
carole morrad	Rainham, United Kingdom	2015-10-14	I feel that this ordinance will affect my neighborhood is well
Alex Kahaner	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-14	I'm a developer and u guys need to let us develop
Michael Lovern	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-15	What happened to the democratic process?
Michael Fedalen	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-15	My house is 1000 sf on a 1/4 acre lot. It is unreasonable and has no relation to the stated anti-McMansion goals to limit future expansion to 200 sf. We just had our second child and expected to be able to grow our house with our family. This Ordinance will prevent that and will eventually cause us to leave the neighborhood for one that is more family-friendly.
Desiree Fedalen	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-15	I am the mother of a 2-year old and an infant. This Ordinance is anti-family and is not rationally related to the goal of preventing unsightly over-development. This is our first home, as we are a young family, however bought our home with dreams of expansion to accommodate our growing family. This is vital for us, as our home is only 1,000 sq. ft. If we cannot expand, then we will be forced to move in the coming years as our children grow and our needs for space increase. Thank you for your consideration.
moshe yosef	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-15	My concern is this coming to my area and also as a developer I will avoid old Granada Hills and the aging homes there will become blight.
Gagik Sargsyan	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-15	I am United State citizen
mark thun	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-15	we need a petition to recall mitch Englander as he is worthless. unfortunately I voted for the moron.
Casey Otis	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	Not being allowed to expand more than 20% is ridiculous
Theresa Guerrero	granada hills, CA	2015-10-16	I want the option to upgrade past 20%
Ramin Mazlouni	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	I bought my house which is about 1710 sqft, over 10 years ago. Since then I got married and started a family. I have three children, which are growing. We as a family were planning to add to our house , but this plan has destroyed our dreams. We choose this area to grow our family. I alway thought by buying a big lot, I have a chance to expand. I have paid my dues over ten years to have the opportunity to built my dream house for my family, please let us have a little dream.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Ray Fitzpatrick	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	No ordinance should be passed without the people's consent, greed should not rule the land.
Thomas Ordway	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	When we bought our house in 1974 it was only 1012 sq. ft. We added 800 sq. ft. to accommodate 3 kids and a mother-in-law. Couldn't do that under this new proposal.
Cynthia Kuzmin	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	I oppose the ICO's severe restrictions and, especially that these changes were NOT communicated to the constituents.
Mike Pascoe	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	The restrictions are unfair and I was not given a choice to vote for the current restrictions. We currently have a 16K sf lot with a crappy house on it. The neighborhood would be improved if we could rebuild the 1950 brick home into a larger modern home. This would actually beautify the neighborhood and improve property values.
Jennifer Candoff	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	We have an interest in a home down the street with our daughter that is very tiny and might want to add square footage exceeding 20%.
Boris Khaymenis	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	It's USA ???????
Gerald Jenne	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-16	I strongly disagree with the floor area restrictions currently in force and proposed by the Granada hills plan.
Yasmin Prieto	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-17	This is unfair to all home owners! Not being notified of drastic changes like this is unconstitutional!
Andrea Reichl	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-18	My rights were removed without notice or permission and this ordinance directly effects the resale value of my home.
Rick Ballesteros	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-18	This proposed ordinance is unlawful and unconstitutional.
Mireya Ballesteros	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-18	This proposed ordinance is unlawful and unconstitutional.
Alek Ayrapetyan	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-19	It is pointless and unconstitutional!!!
Tien Brunelle	North Hollywood, CA	2015-10-19	The March 25, 2015 Interim Control Ordinance is too restrictive on home owners!
Victor Ochoa	Sylmar, CA	2015-10-19	Because I am a contractor and would like to preserve peoples property rights.
N A	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-19	I want to keep old granada the way it is
Elsa Alfaro	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-19	This ordinance is too restrictive.
diane maloney	Santa Clarita, CA	2015-10-19	I own a house in old Granada hills . I was left this house in my parents trust and my children grew up there. They are destroying old Granada hills with there mini mansions.
Rodney Haim	Los Angeles, CA	2015-10-19	I care about the development of my city
diane maloney	Santa Clarita, CA	2015-10-19	Please rescind my signature . I want to stop mini mansions from being built . This petition is deceiving . You are destroying the way Granada Hills used to be. I want to stop the destruction not aide builders to destroy for there greed.
Armen Frankyan	North Hollywood, CA	2015-10-19	Because I'm a contractor and home owner and this is not right
Heliodoro Zepeda	Sylmar, CA	2015-10-19	I disagree with this re zoning without notificación
Miladie De Courville	HOUSTON, TX	2015-10-20	Not all changes are good!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Ramona Boren	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-20	I never received a notice about Ordinance 183497. I adamantly oppose this going forward until we have the opportunity to hear the pros and cons. This is wrong of the Mayor, whom I voted for, to demand such a change. Are there special interests involved for this decision by the Mayor? What happened to us having property rights? I want to know how this will affect resale values having a zone change from R-1-1 to RE9 or RE11. Do we not have the right to know? It sounds like a down grade which brings prices lower. Please inform us of all the details. It sure sounds unconstitutional to me. NO TO ANY CHANGE.
Ramona Boren	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-20	This weekend was the first time I heard of this zone change. I OPPOSE this change until I have more information. This is not right.
Roham(Roy) Zokaie	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-20	It is a very unfair decision to me and it will affect the community of the Granada Hills downward.It is not right to do these changes without disclosing it to the whole community.
Hedy Maar	Granada Hills, CA	2015-10-20	I have a 2 bed/ 1 bathroom home which is just over 1000sq ft. and 200 sq ft would not be a sufficient amount of space to add a 3rd bedroom and bathroom to upgrade my home. We bought this house for \$480,000 and with this law, it will never be worth much more than that. This is truly unfair.
Roni Pacheco	Canoga Park, CA	2015-10-20	I am a developer and the contractor and this will severely affect my business and ability to make money

Tip Whiting
11011 White Oak Avenue
Granada Hills, CA 91344
310-880-9556
tip.whiting@lacity.org

October 20, 2015

Item 1

Date: 10/20/2015
Submitted in PLUM Committee
Council File No: 15-1226 #07-0535-52
Item No. 1
Deputy: Comm from Public

Statement of Opposition

I am opposed to the RFA Ordinance for Old Granada Hills. The lots were zoned by the City of Los Angeles Planning Department in the golden era of Los Angeles, years ago by the brilliant visionaries and true architects of The City, proven by the neighborhood of Old Granada Hills itself as a shining example on its own merit, no zoning changes needed.

This ordinance will also lower the city's revenue as tax is charged on square footage; I can't see that as good for this area as the city will receive less money to care for the sidewalks and beautiful trees, etc. I don't think other neighborhoods would like to be footing the bill for the upkeep of the Old Granada Hills neighborhood.

Re zoning the area will provide less housing and what this city really needs is more houses and housing in general. It already has the infrastructure it was planned for years ago, even the on and off ramps at White Oak Avenue to the 118 Freeway are in place, they were just never finished. I can tell you I would love to be able to drive on the freeway at White Oak and the 118. Now to access the freeway I have to drive through the neighborhood either to Balboa or Reseda if there were on ramp at White Oak it would alleviate a lot of traffic in those other areas.