

Attachment F

Dear CHC,

I am writing to provide public comment on the pending Certificate of Appropriateness for 3435 Gaviota Ave., Long Beach. I received a notice of public hearing in the mail. I am a home owner in Cal Heights. I am strongly opposed to granting the certificate of appropriateness to convert an existing detached garage into an ADU.

First, granting this particular certificate will erode the historical quality and nature of not only that property but the surrounding properties as well. If you have had occasion to drive past that particular address, you will see that the main house on the property is already converted into a two-story building. Two story houses were not common during the time periods that the houses in this neighborhood were built. Granting this certificate will just add insult to injury. It is incumbent that we maintain the historic nature of this particular district and granting the certificate will not do that.

Furthermore, this particular property is not well maintained. There is trash and debris on the front porch. There are cat beds lying everywhere. The lawn is not taken care of. Based on the existing structures that are standing there now, one would be hard pressed to believe that this ADU would be an asset to the neighborhood rather than an eye sore.

Another consideration is that there are already two multi-unit apartment building at the end of Gaviota. The property in question looks like a rental because of the way it is maintained. Adding two additional "units" will simply further congest that particular area. There is very little parking in that area of Gaviota right now as it is.

Finally, I don't believe that the people requesting the certificate actually reside at that address based on a bit of internet research. If they don't, how much do they really care about retaining the historical nature of the neighborhood? Probably not very much.

As a member of the Cal Heights community, please do not approve this certificate.

Amanda Heikkinen

Hello Maryanne,

I am on the Cal Heights Neighborhood Association Board and an architectural/planning professional. I usually review items on the CHC within our district. We have three on this upcoming hearing on Tuesday and the only one that I have concerns with is the proposed ADU on Gaviota. I understand that ADUs are permitted by right due to state law, but there are significant design concerns with this application. Please see my comments below:

- Working for an architecture firm, I reached out to our compliance team and they mentioned that changing the occupancy of the garage to habitable will require the entire structure to be compliant with the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC does not allow any eave projections within two feet of the property line. There is an existing wall with a tight +/- 6-inch eave. The only feasible alternative to meet the CBC without moving the wall would be to tie the eave into the wall and create a parapet. Although physically feasible, a parapet design on the shed portion of the ADU is not compatible with the architectural design of the house (Minimal Traditionalist). The plans should demonstrate compliance with the CBC.
- The plan omits the following items from lot coverage:
 - A solid-covered patio that is attached to the house (seen in a picture in the top row)
 - A shed as shown in the lower left image. It is not clear if this shed would be removed.
 - Lot coverage is defined as anything solid covering and both of these items should be removed or identified in the lot coverage calculation. Without these accessory structures on the plan, one cannot come to the conclusion that the ADU meets objective design standards.
- To help with the design, the required egress windows for the second story bedrooms should be on the east elevation, so smaller windows can be located on the north and south elevations.
- To help balance the visual aspect and break up a large blank wall area, a clerestory window should be added onto the restroom on the north elevation.
- The window in the hallway on the south elevation should be revised to a clerestory to help with privacy issues.

The fact that the plans are not in compliance with the CBC and that the window layout does not meet the required objective privacy standards in the ADU ordinance, the hearing should be continued so that the plans could be revised to demonstrate compliance with these items.

Feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

John Moreland, AICP
CHNA Board Member
562.216.3850