



January 18, 2018

Ms. Anita Juhola-Garcia
Planner
Long Beach Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

**RE: OPPOSITION to Local Coastal Development Permit and Standards Variance
5719 E. Seaside Walk, Long Beach, CA 90803, Case #1711-28**

Dear Anita,

The Board of the PBPG voted to unanimously oppose the request for a variance at 5719 East Sea Side Walk which would allow a two car tandem garage instead of a two car side by side garage.

In every survey we have done, which includes of ALL residents of the Peninsula, over 80% of the people ask that, as their representatives, we oppose requests for parking variances.

We all understand that on our small lots, it can be challenging to build everything we want.

We feel, that as many other people on the Peninsula have done, the owners of 5719 East Seaside Walk should move their garage face 24 feet toward Seaside Walk and build a side-by-side 2 car garage.

Tandem parking on the Peninsula instead of side-by-side parking has not been allowed for decades, we continue to support that requirement.

Thank you for your time and effort,

Merle Asper
President
Peninsula Beach Preservation Group (PBPG)
www.lbpeninsula.org

Anita Juhola-Garcia

From: Sharon Kemmer <sharonkemmer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2018 1:40 PM
To: Anita Juhola-Garcia
Subject: code exception to allow a tandem two-car garage at 5719 E. Seaside Walk

Hearing Officer
333 West Ocean Blvd. 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90803

Dear Hearing Officer,

My understanding of the building code is that exceptions are granted because of a unique condition such that one resident can not use his property in the same way that other residents are able to use theirs. I agree with the existence of such a process, as some people do have unique situations and hence face a building hardship relative to others.

This is not the case with the property at 5719 E. Seaside Walk. Their situation is analogous to ours, at 6009 E. Seaside Walk, and to scores of others in the neighborhood. The rest of us are all set-back 20 or 25 feet in the alley to give a turning radius into our garages. Our home was permitted in 1927, and we have a 25 foot set-back in front of our garages with two additional stories built on top of these garages. When properties build into the set-backs, into the space beyond the height limits, when they do not provide for adequate and easily accessible garage space, it impacts the neighbors and the neighborhood.

When we have guests, we often encourage them to tandem park in front of our garages to the rear of our property. This only affects our property and leaves street space for other residents in a parking impacted neighborhood. The only drawback is that the car in the interior spot is hard to access and other cars have to move to allow it to leave -- my experience is that it is understandable why tandem parking is not a routine arrangement. Several of my neighbors have extensive parking in supersized garages -- the garage at 2 60th Place, for example, has two tandem spaces and one single space in his very large garage, allowing him to park 5 cars in his garage. Interestingly, he usually parks on the street and/or in front of his curb cut (a long space, as it is three garage spaces wide). Even with convenient garage space, many of my neighbors and neighboring apartment buildings rarely use their garages, except perhaps for storage of household items.

Parking is one of the few issues that really impacts my neighbors; people try to save space for themselves; they leave people and/or items in the street to hold open a spot; they call parking enforcement for minor infractions; Peninsula parking is a hot-button issue. You should never grant code exceptions for parking unless these exceptions help the parking in the neighborhood, not further impact it.. Most of us occupy small lots in a crowded, parking impacted neighborhood. If you grant an exception to one, it should be granted to all, thus effectively changing the code itself.

The code hopefully exists for a reason. And therefore it should be generally enforced. The existing tandem garage at 5719 is legal only with the existing home -- demolish it and all its nonstandard features should go with it. These nonstandard parking situations should not be grandfathered into a vacant lot. This particular owner had lots of options when he bought the property, as he bought the vacant lot to the east, with street access, as well as bought this interior lot. His options were obvious; not surprisingly, the previous owner used the other lot for parking and had cars towed if they blocked the curb cut on the vacant lot. Tandem parking is frequently unused and should not be unnecessarily allowed.

August Cigliano
6009 E. Seaside Walk

Gaede Family
633 Van Buren
Port Townsend, WA 98368

January 20, 2018

Long Beach Development Services
Hearing Officer
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Re: Application Number: 1711-28 (LCDP17-021, SV17-006)
Application Date: 11/30/17
Project Location: 5719 E. Seaside Walk, Long Beach, CA
Project Applicant: Mark Wheeler

Planning Commission Members:

Attached is a copy of "Notice of Public Hearing" in regards to a request for a code exception to allow an attached 432-square-foot tandem two-car garage, of which we are opposed.

We own a multi-family apartment dwelling at 5711 E. Seaside Walk, located next to this property. We are taking issue to approval of the variance for the following reasons:

1. The proposed garage negatively affects the rental value of our apartments. The current tandem garage, which is built on the lot line, has blocked natural light into our apartments. Two of the units are looking out at a stucco wall. The addition of the planned third story next door only exacerbates the lighting problem.

2. The walkway along our building is currently so narrow you cannot bring anything large in from our parking access in the alleyway. The proposed garage does nothing to correct this problem.

3. Emergency access to our apartments is impeded by the current location of the neighboring garage.

4. Staging for new construction next door is a concern. While we have not seen the proposed staging plan, the current plans only designate a small area which is being created for a utility easement. Parking in our garages is actively used, cannot be impeded and any time.

We feel there are probably other garage design solutions that would eliminate the need for building the garage on the lot line. An attached side-by-side two-car garage could be accomplished by reconsidering the "Pool/Beach Room" location.

Thank you for allowing the opportunity to voice our opinion.

Linda Gaede