

From: [Murillo, Jaime](#)
To: [Rodriguez, Clarivel](#); [Lee, Amanda](#)
Subject: Fw: Comments re proposed Cottage Preservation plan and Amendments to LCP
Date: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 7:05:13 PM

From: Denys Oberman <dho@obermanassociates.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2019 4:18:07 PM
To: Murillo, Jaime; Campbell, Jim
Cc: Denys Oberman; Fred Levine
Subject: Comments re proposed Cottage Preservation plan and Amendments to LCP

PLEASE DISTRIBUTE TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE CITY COUNCIL, AND ENTER INTO THE PUBLIC RECORD---

Members of the Planning Commission ,

We are writing to comment on the staff proposal regarding Cottage preservation and the LCP Amendment being presented and heard by the Commission. I am on the Board of the Central Peninsula Community Association, and am also an oceanfront homeowner.

We appreciate the City's deserve to "preserve" more modest Cottage type structures. However, the proposed Amendment , if adopted in current form, actually works counterproductive to the stated intent.

The proposal provides for a Cottage to be expanded to 3000 sq ft. , a full 3-4 bedroom residence. It also provides parking exception for a two unit development. This scale of development creates significant intensification---there can be no legitimate justification to except this type of development and intensity of use from requirement to provide Parking On-site. Units of this size will include 3 or more bedrooms, or, in the case of two units, 6 or more bedrooms.

The City is already capacity-stressed in the multiple neighborhoods with narrow , small lots and already- limited Parking. This is not confined to the Balboa Peninsula—it is also the case in Corona del Mar flower street area, Balboa Island, and other Non-subdivision developed residential areas of the City.

As a City, we are approaching the point of interfering with Life Safety vehicle and resident ingress/egress in many of these areas.

Furthermore, to encourage the development of Housing stock without Parking is to ultimately decrease both the value of these properties, and the character of our residential neighborhoods.

The Parking problem is further compounded by the City's push to increase Visitor traffic, and the demand for visitor type accomodations which include STL. (note- we are in favor of encouraging the City's Visitor-based revenue stream, but not at the expense of our residents or the communities which give this City its brand and long-term traction.)

We are in agreement with the comments of other Penninsular residents. However, we do not agree that mitigation should only be directed to the Balboa Peninsula neighborhoods.

Respectfully, let's call a spade a spade.

Please do not use the "Cottage preservation" concept or intent for the purposes of enabling yet another way around Parking as an integral and essential part of our residential land use development and project approval.

Our General Plan carefully crafted and called out the tenets when it said that, Each Development Project should park itself.

This is already a challenge.

Please do not exacerbate an already-existing challenge.

Do not allow any residential development project increases living area footprint that does not provide a reasonable on-site Parking plan.

The City will have to accommodate its residents somehow if it moves forward with this proposal. This has been a challenge on the plate for many years, and the City has not provided a meaningful solution.

We request that this Proposal not be accepted in its current form or substance, and that the City not take any further action in the name of "Cottages" and "LCP Amendment" until it is adequately thought through.

Thank you,

Denys Oberman and

Fred Levine- Oceanfront resident and Board Member of Central Peninsula Community Association.

Cc: Associations and Residents of the above referenced communities.

.....

NOTE- Please disregard the Confidentiality Notice and preprinted corporate signature below.