

An appeal is hereby made to Your Honorable Body from the decision of the

- ☐ Site Plan Review Committee
☐ Zoning Administrator
☐ Planning Commission
☒ Cultural Heritage Commission

Which was taken on the _____ day of _____, 20____.

Project Address: 1215 E Hellman St LB CA 90813

We, your appellant(s), hereby respectfully request that Your Honorable Body **reject** the decision and ☐ Approve / ☐ Deny the application or permit in question.

ALL INFORMATION BELOW IS REQUIRED

Reasons for Appeal: See Attached

No such code amended or mention of vinyl exists for use as a fence in a historic district

Appellant name(s): Jose & Delia Uller

Organization (if representing) _____

Address: 1215 E Hellman St LB CA 90813

City LB State CA ZIP 90813 Phone 562 233 3750

Signature(s) [Signature] Date 7-1-19

- A separate appeal form is required for each appellant party, except for appellants from the same address, or an appellant representing an organization.
- Appeals must be filed within 10 days after the decision is made (LBMC 21.21.502).
- You must have established *aggrieved* status by presenting oral or written testimony at the hearing where the decision was rendered; otherwise, you may not appeal the decision.
- See reverse of this form for the statutory provisions on the appeal process.

BELOW THIS LINE FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Attention Cultural Heritage,

My name is Jose V. Ulloa. My wife and I are the original founders of the Craftsman Historic District. My wife is the designer of our Craftsman neighborhood logo.

FYI - 30 yrs ago the City gave up on our neighborhood because decay crime and neglect had taken its hold. We moved into this house with the intention of living a normal life not creating a Historic District. The basic necessities taken for granted in other areas of the city were short lived.

We were robbed the first month we move in with a drug deal gone wrong in front of our house. We asked for city help but our political officials where inept and the police nowhere to be found. So we organized the neighborhood by taking it back one street at a time. All the services you see in our Community Development Office where created by us before the city took over including the historic office.

We met many times with Ruth Ann Leir who documented our district with pictures and guidelines. We were promised a once a month drive by to maintain the character of the historic neighborhood. Today those pictures can't be found as a baseline to guide homeowners. Now I understand we have added to the original rules revised guidelines for the rear of homes. That was not the original intent of our historic undertaking. This opens up a can of worms.

Having sat in many organizing historic district meetings the goal was to maintain the historic façade of the Craftsman neighborhood with those areas that can only be seen by the public.

It was never our intention to document the backyards of each house otherwise we would have taken pics 30 yrs ago. The new revised guide lines implies that the rear of every house not seen by the public should be documented and subject to permits.

Most neighbors in the last 30 yrs have an understanding to maintain original features of their home front & rear because it adds value. Something our group has worked hard for. Its an over reach or intrusion of privacy with these new guidelines when there is no baseline to start from.

Now the question who is going to document rear view features of every home in the neighborhood to make sure they are in compliance?

Much less who will deny a replacement fence that no one will ever see? There is no justification for that other than it should be sound. A citation was issued by CE 60 days ago. Bordering neighbors have agreed to the style and features of replacement which only marks the division of properties. We are dumbfounded why its taken so long!

Guidelines reviewed/cited by planning state that I am violating a code which does not exist. Vinyl is not listed or amended into the guidelines of sections.

How can I get a DENIAL of a violation that does not exist? What was cited by a code inspector was a "deteriorating fence rotted out by too much rain the beginning of this year." It was never noted it had historic characteristics that complemented either house.

We must agree that modern vinyl the shape it is molded does look good when installed right A steel reinforced vinyl fence will last longer than most dog eared fences. There are currently 8 home owners in our district with plain front yard views who have installed this type of fencing who did not apply or where not cited by code enforcement.

As my wife and I get older a steel reinforced vinyl craftsman mold fence will save us a lot of money lasting more than 7 years. This is why I have appealed this decision not because I want vinyl. What is so ironic is that the Vinyl Fence will be covered in IVY as the original fence which has deteriorated. Most neighbors will never know in the district its there because it will be covered by Ivy and can't be seen just walking by.

I agree that finding section 2.63.08 historic features should be replaced with similar materials.

A Home Depot dog eared fence no one has seen for 7yrs which I have replaced twice is not a historic feature. It was never attached to the exterior of either house on which it borders nor has craftsman features other than its wood. There are many chain link fences in backyards with Ivy growing upon it. Should these homeowners be subject to a code violation and asked to take it down and replace with wood.

Now the complaint I have heard is if the petition is granted anyone can now install a vinyl fence. Well the cat is out of the bag which should have been addressed years ago by our historic officer monthly drive thru of our historic district 3 blocks. Now they must be addressed individually with goal it be sight unseen.

What is so ironic my fence is not in the front yard it cannot be seen unless you walk towards the back of my property or google maps. What scares me is the over reach by public officials who have added more guidelines to historic homes by covering the rear of historic properties. Neighbors have done a good job being vigilant as to a rash of absentee landlords who have tried to get away with it on weekends. Who will document rear structures so any deviations can be cited?

My petition clearly states from the very beginning even though this fence will cost me twice as much it will be covered by ivy. The Vinyl shape craftsman reinforced steel will last me at least 15yrs or more than wood.

Vinyl will be a substructure not a prominent historic feature to maintain privacy between neighbors which after a year will be covered by ivy naturally. What we have here is a subjective point of view of denial by a public official. Who I believe by implying into the code historic characteristics which do not exist on a dog ear fence to be replaced. Implying since its not made of wood vinyl a material not found in the guidelines is not acceptable. You cannot be denied for a material that was not registered in the code. Much less a backyard fence that will never be seen by public view. This fence has no historic link or characteristics to both properties other than a division of properties.

In closing this is a plain old fence that will last for a long time covered by ivy just like the one I am replacing. Thus I am maintaining the character of a Craftsman Home by using Ivy as my focal point not Vinyl.

I hope that Planning has presented the original pictures taken and submitted for your review with my application so you can make the best decision to agree with my appeal.

Sincerely

Jose V Ulloa