

**From:** Michal Frawley [mailto:michaelfrawley5@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 08, 2014 7:22 AM  
**To:** Emma Howard; David McDonald  
**Subject:** Signifecant Ecological Area Ordinance objection

To the Regional Planning Commission

From Michael Frawley

Owner of APN 2058-012-053

.

Re Significant Ecological Area Ordinance

I am objecting to the current language in the ordinance.

The restriction that no more than 10 per cent of the property may be disturbed will require the home owner to give up the majority of his property. The North Area plan Regional Planning stated that the homeowner would have a clear understanding of what he could do on his property. Since the Significant Ecological Area has been under consideration since 2000 this conflict must have been considered. For example, a homeowner who has 10 acers will only be allowed to disturb one acer or 44,000 square feet. If the home owner has a 1600 square foot hone or wants to build one of that size, the Fire Dept. will require fuel modification that will result in a 181,440 square feet of disturbed area. Any changes to an existing house will change the fuel modification area. The result is that both the current and future homeowner will be unreasonably and adversely affected.

This result would exist if the homeowner had 20 acers or even 40 acers. In this discussion I have not included the access driveway or even the effect of a stand-alone garage on the fuel modification requirements. In our Triunfo Lobo community there are many two acre homeowners. If this rule was to be enforced they could do nothing on their property. In the city neighborhoods, which have two acre lots within LA County, there is no such 10 per cent restriction. In some areas there is a residential foot print restriction of 40 per cent of the lot. Yet these communities generate hazardous materials which flow into our neighborhoods. To promote ecological balance, Regional Planning needs to promote mitigation methods that allow the property owner reasonable use of his property and still enhance the ecological diversity and stability of our natural habitat. For example why not promote tree planting of sycamores or

California Oaks or any other tree that will do well in our ecosystem. I would like Regional Planning to consider this mitigation and come and discuss it with our community.