

**From:** noreply@granicusideas.com [mailto:noreply@granicusideas.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2020 11:53 AM  
**To:** DG\_PlanningCommission <DG\_PlanningCommission@hermosabeach.gov>  
**Subject:** New eComment for Planning Commission Virtual Meeting

---

## New eComment for Planning Commission Virtual Meeting

Gabriella Heffernan submitted a new eComment.

Meeting: Planning Commission Virtual Meeting

Item: 8. REPORT 20-0668 PDP 20-6 Precise Development Plan for a three-story attached duplex with an attached Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) located at 24 3rd Street and determination that the project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

eComment: Dear Commissioners: I own 34 3rd Street directly to the east of the permit applicant. I am submitting some observations and questions relative to the pending permit and planning analysis. In reviewing the proposed resolution and its findings, it is immediately apparent that the neighborhood conditions described in the proposed resolution differ markedly from the reality of 3rd Street. The proposed resolution describes "similar residential zoned properties" (to the R3 "triplex" (duplex with JADU) The two largest properties - 18 3rd Street and 17 3rd Street - directly next door and across the street from the subject property-are zoned R1 and not multi-family as intimated in the proposed resolution. The rest are quaint, Old Hermosa in the classic Craftsman/Cape Cod styles, completely dissimilar to the modern style proposed. Importantly, each of the properties are occupied in SFR manner by families, not stuffed with multiple renters as is apparently the design here. In a nutshell, 3d Street is predominantly comprised of duplexes being occupied by SFR family dwellers except for the two largest properties which are both traditional R1 SFR dwellings. 28 3rd Street - "R3 Triplex" (misleading) We don't know how and when 28 3d Street achieved R3 status, but we do know that it a duplex, not a triplex. A third unit was bootlegged into the existing garage and is apparently being used as the vehicle to justify a "JADU" unit in the rear of the permit applicant's property. This was clearly not the original intent of any planners or zoning. If this is the game, why wouldn't everyone just illegally convert their garage in their duplex and then submit plans for a triplex based on the bootlegged converted garage? Our 34 3rd Street Position I expect many of the surrounding neighbors to voice opposition to this plan. From our end, we don't want to interfere with our neighbors' plans to build a new home. And we admire the talented architect who they have engaged. The rendering reflects a classic Tomaro property - which would look amazing in the Hill Section. It seems patently inconsistent with the flavor of the neighborhood and will clearly impose restrictions and impediments to the use and enjoyment of the area. Setback The plans appear to propose

deviation from established setback on the entirety of 3rd Street. If you stand on Hermosa Ave and look towards the beach there is complete congruity in setback on the front, walk street side. We oppose any deviation from the prevailing setback. It will block our view and the view of other neighboring properties and is overreaching Background of 343rd Street I purchased 34 3d Street as an investment in 2017 with the plan of taking it down and building a new structure. It was a productive duplex rental but an aesthetic land survey and preliminary architectural concepts initiated. I am not anti-development, I do it myself and respect a property owner's right to build on his land -responsibly and respecting the prevailing living standards. Not long into my ownership, it became apparent to my family that 3rd Street was a quaint residential walk street with tidy little homes. This prompted a suspension and change of plans to tastefully rehabilitate 34 3rd Street. I bring all this up relative to the proposed MdMansion, the proposed setback deviation, and the bootlegged JADU. I believe the right thing to do is to moderate the proposed plan to make it more consistent with the prevailing living standards. Hermosa does not need multi family on 3rd Street. Parking is already impossible, drug addicts and criminals roam the alleys 24/7 and burglaries are on the rise. A tasteful duplex within the prevailing setback is achievable and more appropriate. What happened to keep Hermosa Hermosa? In the event the Commission disagrees and is inclined to allow this project to move forward as proposed, I alternatively propose that the setback conditions be made global in nature to extend to the affected properties. It is patently unfair to allow one singular property to jut out beyond all the others, hogging the view and impeding the view and serenity of other property owners. If the Planning Commission's vision for 3rd Street walk-street is truly multi-family, I too am going to resurrect .I am confident that each of the 3rd Street neighbors will agree with this assessment. This is not a multi-family, density-laden street; this is a quaint, quiet Hermosa Beach walk street. The pending plans should be modified to reflect the prevailing setback and living standards. We wish the Smiths and their capable architect good luck and hope that a friendly and sensible resolution will be achieved. Respectfully Brian & Gabriela Heffernan 34 3rd Street

**From:** noreply@granicusideas.com [mailto:noreply@granicusideas.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2020 12:00 PM  
**To:** DG\_PlanningCommission <DG\_PlanningCommission@hermosabeach.gov>  
**Subject:** New eComment for Planning Commission Virtual Meeting

---

## New eComment for Planning Commission Virtual Meeting

Kathie Stemig submitted a new eComment.

Meeting: Planning Commission Virtual Meeting

Item: 8. REPORT 20-0668 PDP 20-6 Precise Development Plan for a three-story attached duplex with an attached Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) located at 24 3rd Street and determination that the project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

eComment: Dear Commissioners,, I am writing with concern and opposition to the planned structure at 24 3rd St., 2 doors down from where I live. We live on a beautiful small little street and the structure that is being proposed is as it is being given to you going against the very integrity of our street. While I understand wanting to build a nice New home and I am fully in support of that the plans as submitted our in accurate to such an accommodation. Upon reading the plans there is mention of it not having any impact on "Longfellow". This obviously is an oversight by the architect and a plan plucked from another build however this is concerning to me as that means that they did not accurately assess the site and draw new plans for this site as Long fellow has nothing to do with a property down here. so this oversight to me is concerning and I think that plans need to be looked at more closely and gone over with a fine tooth comb. Also the sewer is crushed and leaking and this is a known problem to the city and until that is resolved no structure should be allowed to be built as this could be a huge liability with raw sewage flowing into two houses. Please take a close look at these plans and the surrounding properties so that adjustments can be made. Respectfully, Kathie Stemig