

[REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 27, 2021 4:52 PM

To: PlanningComments <PlanningComments@southpasadenaca.gov>; Margaret Lin <mclin@southpasadenaca.gov>

Subject: September second meeting, Item 1

Margaret, I am pretty annoyed that my public comments have not been published. It happened a ton under Joanna and happened last week at CHC. Please make sure this is published in a timely manner.

There are ~4800 Single Family Homes in South Pasadena and about ~2800 SFHs that South Pasadena considers historic and this new ordinance would apply to. A lot of the ~2,000 non-historic homes are in Los Altos and do not have the topography for an ADU to be built. This ordinance will apply to the vast majority of the homes where an ADU could possibly be built.

If this ordinance is passed how it is currently written, you will not be able to get an RHNA number over safe harbor because you guys are increasing the restrictions on ADU building. I could probably even convince HCD to give you a number below the safe harbor after this ordinance is passed combined with the last one.

The HCD ADU division wrote to Elizabeth Bar-El on the last ADU ordinance and said it enacted excessive limitations. I'm sure they will feel the same about this one and that communication is sent directly over to the Housing Element department and used to determine what they will allow for ADU numbers.

I personally believe you should make two changes to the ordinance. ADUs should be allowed above garages, and eliminate the requirement that the ADU be 50% hidden from the line of sight. Only with those changes do you have any chance to get anything above safe harbor. I also believe those changes should be made regardless if you actually want ADUs to be built.

Throughout this entire process Joanna and Placeworks have told you that I don't know what I am talking about. They also said you would get 1,000 ADUs and I said you would be lucky to get 300. The actual safe harbor number is 82. So believe me or don't, you should know by now the things I said would happen have happened.

On a related note, the ordinance has not been published as I write this. But I do not believe the "50% hidden behind the primary home" is an objective design standard.

From what point is the observer standing???? If the back is wider than the front, does it still count if the back is 50% hidden but the front is 40% hidden??

The simple fact that I can ask those questions and there is no firm answer means it is not an objective design standard.

--

[REDACTED]
Neuroradiologist by night
Crime fighter by day