



Patrice Lattimore <patrice.lattimore@lacity.org>

Fw: Baseline Hillside Ordinance

David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Jul 26, 2010 at 5:52 PM

To: Patrice.Lattimore@lacity.org

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>**To:** councilmember.reyes@cityoflosangeles.org; councilmember.huizar@cityoflosangeles.org; councilmember.krekorian@cityoflosangeles.org**Cc:** patrice.lattimore@lacity.org**Sent:** Mon, July 26, 2010 12:47:40 PM**Subject:** Baseline Hillside Ordinance

TARZANA PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

We previously submitted a letter of support for the Baseline Hillside ordinance and indicated some concerns with grading provisions, the latitude granted Zoning Administrators, and our concern with several of the bonuses. As we testified last week, other organizations have adequately addressed our concerns with grading and ZA latitude. We have forwarded our concerns about several of the bonus options to Erick Lopez and enumerate them here:

Unless I totally misread the provisions, the Green Building Option 2 and 18 foot Envelope Height Option are not bonuses for decreasing the effects of mansionization at all; they are simply dead giveaways. It appears that any structure could qualify for the Green 2 by simply buying new appliances. Do the stores even sell appliances that are not Energy Star? I understand the desire to encourage energy efficiency, but this simply does not make sense. In a similar vein, I don't understand the thinking behind the 18 Foot Height Option. As I read it, any one story building would qualify. Again, this makes no sense as it does not represent an action to reduce the effects of mansionization. These two bonuses should simply be eliminated.

Our objection to the Cumulative Side Yard and Multiple Story Options is a bit more nuanced. Those options make sense for R1 properties, but simply do not make sense for the larger RA and RE properties that make up a large percentage of the hillside lots in the San Fernando Valley and the West Side. As pointed out in the letter, RA and RE20 properties already require a 10 foot sideyard. What is the rationale in providing those properties with a give-away bonus? Similarly, looking at the proposed FAR for the various slope bands, the Multiple Story Option doesn't seem to make sense as written. All lots in the RA zone, subject to the BHO provisions, are already limited to 20% of lot area as are RE15-40 lots above 45% slope and RE9 lots above 60% slope. How does a bonus make sense in those cases? A simple remedy is possible here to retain the rationale for the bonuses where it makes sense but eliminate them where they are simply giveaways. All that is needed is to insert the words "for those properties that are not otherwise limited to 20% coverage of the lot" in both of those options.

7/27/2010

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fw: Baseline ...

Again, I urge the PLUM to take advantage of this opportunity to correct and strengthen the ordinance. As I understood the discussion at the end of last week's hearing, PLUM is looking for a few changes which would satisfy the concerns expressed at that hearing. Let me be clear, I think everyone agrees that an expeditious passage of the ordinance is the primary concern, but I see this week's hearing as a simple way to make those minor changes. Hopefully, we can all cheer an effective limit on mansionization in the very near term.

Dave Garfinkle

President, Tarzana Property Owners Association

www.tarzanapropertyowners.org
