





## Vernice Hankins

---

**From:** David Auch <dwauch@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2019 10:37 PM  
**To:** Ted Winterer; Terry O'Day; Council Mailbox  
**Cc:** councilmtgitems; Steve Mizokami; Scott Flax  
**Subject:** Beef with the new historic 4th Street District

I am disappointed that the council is moving forward with the new 4th Street historic district. My Gosh - the landmark commission couldn't even support this! The properties are of questionable, arguable historic merit.

I'm suspicious that this is social engineering, pitting one socio economic group against another. While I feel greatly for the tenants who are there, the property owner bought this under one set of rules, and now you are changing the rules. I feel like you may be doing this to preserve the below market rents of the tenants involved. While that could be an admirable goal, you should be honest about what you are doing, and try to do it through appropriate means.

If you support low income housing, it should be through zoning code, long term planning, building low income units, and encouraging property owners to develop new smaller units that are more affordable, etc. If you support renters, then also make it more expensive for landlords to displace them through city laws. Heck - I could see a tenant, under certain circumstances, getting \$100k to move out. This would better reflect the value to property owner and the cost of relocation. That would really help the tenants and still provide an opportunity for owners. But what you are doing here is wrong to me.

Or perhaps you just don't want change. It is unfathomable to me that the city is doing this because of the architectural merit of these properties. I've read the report, and lived next to these buildings for almost thirty years. Virtually any home in the city could be similarly romanticized, but to raise these properties to the level of a historic district is just wrong. Heck, you might as well make the entire city a historic district. Ocean Park is a unique community that I love and have worked to make better, but unique does not mean archaic or rigid or just old for old sake. I love the craziness and diversity, but it should not be unfair.

Sure, the buyers may have more money than other people, but that does not make them bad people or bad neighbors, and they should not be treated unfairly as a result. Heck - even the application asks if the property owners were involved in the application. Only one properties owners was behind this effort.

Given the very questionable nature of the architecture, I would only support this effort if a supermajority or even unanimity of the property owners wanted it. If not, I think this is wrong, and what you are doing here is unfair.

David Auch  
2532 5th Street