

Iris Chi

From: Janet Lammon <llummox62@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:35 PM
To: DRP SEA
Subject: SEA Ordinance public comment for the RPC hearing

To Whom it may concern,

The travesty of the SEA Ordinance is in the property value reduction without any compensation for lack of use of the land owned, bought and paid for by the principle owners. The tax structure remains the same without reduction for maintenance of the SEA Ordinance. This appears to be prime fodder for law suits (TORTS) based on the RICO laws and constitutional laws regarding property. Backing into public land and parks thru taking private citizen's land would also seem to be un- American.

Sincerely troubled by this over reach of Government,

Janet Lammon

Iris Chi

From: Stephen Maxwell <sm1001ms@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2019 4:41 PM
To: DRP SEA
Subject: Re: SEA Landowner Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello,

I am providing comments on the version of the draft Ordinance provided here: <http://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/SEA-Ordinance-Public-hearing-Draft-1-28-2019.pdf> and the version of the implementation guide described here: <http://planning.lacounty.gov/site/sea/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/SEA-IG-Public-Hearing-Draft-1-28-2019.pdf>.

You had added an exemption P to address my concern that I wanted to be able to plant SEA native trees on my parcel within an SEA for aesthetic reasons or to replace naturally senescent trees that had provided aesthetic value, without requiring a permit or enforcement action prohibiting me from this sensible, reasonable improvement. As proposed, I read it as enabling of a different purpose, which is the removal or alteration of trees that had already already planted, perhaps before the time the Ordinance was adopted, although it's unclear. The implementation guide states that these trees "may be removed or altered without an SEA or Protected Tree permit." There is no mention about establishing the trees in the first place. I think the confusion stems from the language in the Ordinance itself, which contains no verb, in contrast to most other exemption terms:

"P. Introduced trees which qualify for protection under the definition of SEA Protected Tree, but which can be demonstrated to have been planted by a person for the purposes of affecting the architecture, climate, or aesthetics of a given place and are, therefore, considered landscape features. Documentation of the planting must be provided. Trees planted as mitigation do not qualify as introduced."

The following would be a much clearer wording, if you keep a single exemption:

"P. **Introduction of** trees which qualify for protection under the definition of SEA Protected Tree, but which can be demonstrated to have been planted by a person for the purposes of affecting the architecture, climate, or aesthetics of a given place and are, therefore, considered landscape features, **or subsequent removal or other alteration of only those trees that qualify as introduced. Removal or other alteration of an introduced tree shall require documentation of the introduction.** Trees planted as mitigation do not qualify as introduced."

The way you had it worded, planting SEA Native Trees was not clearly exempt, only the removal or alteration of trees that you had earlier introduced. Also, I don't need to provide you documentation when I introduce a tree, only when I try to remove or alter it later, because you need to know whether I planted it in the first place for aesthetic reasons or whether it was established naturally.

Stephen