

**Attachment IV Written Comments, received after case report as issued on 12/4/2008**

**John Lum**  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

12/10/2008 11:11 PM

To [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

cc [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Subject Discretionary Review Reform

Dear President Olague and Commissioners Miguel, Antonini, Borde, Lee, Moore and Sugaya:

I am writing a quick note to express my strong support of DR reform. Over the 14 years that I have had my architectural practice, we have had to deal with at least seven Discretionary Reviews, a majority of which were filed due to personal vendettas against clients, misunderstanding of the planning code by the DR applicant, or just plain obstructionism....in essence, DRs that clearly had no merit.

Meanwhile my clients have been held hostage to the process, spending countless hours (as well as dollars) in negotiations and modifications to appease neighbors without any recourse. The current DR process is patently unfair, in that it allows for someone to file a DR without any justification and suffer no recourse. The delays add at least 3-6 months to the process of getting approvals. as well as increase costs substantially.

I believe the concept of a DR hearing officer, similar to a Variance officer, shows that the proposed DR reform can work.

Thanks for your consideration,

John Lum, Architect