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Item Number:
Summary: The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council supports the proposed BMO/BHO ordinance provisions released to the public April 21, 2016 as amended by the Staff Recommended Modifications to the Ordinance included as Appendix B to the Department of City Planning Recommendation Report Dated July 14, 2016, however, we request the following changes and additions to such documents: SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS
We request the following changes and additions to such documents:

1. A budget for enforcement of the ordinance must be included in the final ordinance. Special Studio City RFA requirements are not enforced by the DBS building inspectors and plan check staff and/or engineers, even when complaints are filed. Real enforcement of the building codes and all applicable ordinances must be a priority in our City. Any construction that deviates from approved plans must be required to be brought into compliance.

2. We continue to request the complete elimination of the 400 square foot allowance for attached garages. Garages to the rear of the property include the very important "driveway" which provides the current additional spacing we have between houses in most neighborhoods before "manisonization" occurs.

3. The elimination of all Residential Floor Area bonuses for all R1 Zones in accordance with the Code Amendment Summary Fact Sheet dated July 6, 2016. Page 3 and page 5 of Appendix A: Proposed Ordinance Provisions continue to indicate that there is still one 20 percent bonus per property if the conditions listed in either (a) or b) are met. As we note no revision to that provision in Appendix B, we request that the bonus referred to above be eliminated in the final ordinance.

4. We continue to request the elimination of the provision which states that "Adjustments" of 10 percent can be granted by zoning administrators in private without public oversight as indicated on page 21 of Appendix A Proposed Ordinance Provisions. The city already has a process for variances and a wealth of zoning tools tailored to the needs of individual neighborhoods. Additional "adjustments" should not be permitted. Any requested "change" to the BMO, BHO or RFA Districts must be handled as part of the public hearing process.

5. We continue to request clarity and specificity in the definition of what constitutes an existing structure or remodel. The definition should include clear limits to the extent of demolition allowed such project categories, as well as requirements for how portions of existing structures to remain must be utilized in the new construction. These protections are necessary to prevent new building projects from being disguised as renovation projects or remodel.
6. We request the complete elimination of the exemption which is included in Appendix B General Item 1. There should be no explicit exemption for CUP projects from the BMO and BHO provisions.

7. We request that there be no doubling of the Maximum Grading Quantities as set forth in Appendix A: Proposed Ordinance Provisions on page 25 which would revise Section 23 Paragraph (f) (1). Without further study stakeholders are unable to determine that this provision coupled with other provisions of the Proposed Ordinance Provisions would actually result in a net decrease in maximum allowable grading quantities.

8. We request that the by-right minimum 1,000 square feet of Residential Floor Area for nonconforming hillside lots be reconsidered. Without revision of this provision, a nonconforming 2,500 square foot lot would be allowed an inappropriate 1,000 square feet of Residential Floor Area by-right.

9. We continue to request that the City keep the ordinance as straightforward and enforceable as possible. We specifically request the addition of enforcement provisions including explicit requirements that project design documents clearly demonstrate compliance with all aspects of the ordinance in order to facilitate efficient and timely review by City officials.

We would like to specifically express our support of the following provisions of the proposed ordinance:

10. Elimination of ALL Bonus Options: The bonus options in the Studio City RFA have significantly decreased its effectiveness. This is the type of loophole which turns houses into out of scale buildings.

11. Retention of the various articulation requirements in the final ordinance so that the new home does not have the side and back walls as one long flat wall. This articulation is important to the existing neighboring homes as it gives some design to the side and back walls visible all around.
STUDIO CITY NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
BOARD VOTE FORM
Budget Fiscal Year: 2001-2002
Meeting Date: August 7, 2001
Agenda Item: 4-B

The Studio City Neighborhood Council recommends that the Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council take the following action:

A. Approve the Minutes
B. The Board of the Studio City Neighborhood Council recommends the approval of the Studio City Neighborhood Council Minutes as provided in Appendix A of the Department of City Planning Administrative Report Dated July 31, 2001, however, we request the following changes and modifications:

We continue to request the complex elimination of the 400 square foot allowance for attached garages. Garages to the rear of the property include the very important "dormer" which provides the current additional space to be between houses in most neighborhoods below.

The elimination of all Residential Floor Area Reserve for all R1 Zones in accordance with the Code Amendment Summary Fact Sheet dated July 6, 2001, Page 1 and page 5 of Appendix A. Proposed Ordinance Provisions continue to indicate that there is still a new 20 percent bonus per property if the proposed Ordinance is passed above the 400 square foot allowance that is provided in Appendix B.

We request that the bonus referred to above be eliminated in the final Ordinance.

We continue to request the elimination of the provision which states that "Adjustments" of 10 percent can be gained by zoning administration reduced shared areas as mentioned on page 25 ofproposed Appendix B. We feel the provisions of shared parking, walkways, and access to the sidewalks of rating both referred to in the words of individual neighborhoods are still important adjustments which should not be permitted, any request for "change" in the R300, 400 to all R1 Zones must be handled as part of the public hearing process.

We continue to request that any parking be in the rear of the property including any front parking or any contribution or existing driveways. The definition should include clear limits in the extent of shared driveways with other projects or neighborhoods in such a manner as not to contribute to the rear construction. These parking areas are necessary to prevent new building projects from being designated as non-construction projects.

We propose the complex elimination of the complex which is included in Appendix B General Item 3. There should be an exclusion for non-construction projects other than the studios or R1 Zones between the studios and the R1 Zones.

We request that there be no doubling of the Minimum Lot Size (Quantities as set forth in Appendix B. Proposed Ordinance Provisions on page 21 which would cover Section 22 Paragraph (B) of the proposed ordinance and other paragraph 22 and 23 Paragraphs (E) which would be only in the R1 Zones.

We request that in order to permit development on the previously mentioned area the area be reserved for development in a manner consistent with the original provisions and not used for additional floor area or space.

We request that the City continue the Ordinance as it stands and refrain from the need to consider other Ordinance to make it more equitable.

We specifically request the addition of all residential provisions including capital requirements that this project design does not violate the capacity of the studios and does not allow for any change in the capacity of any other building projects in the same neighborhood or Citywide.

This motion should be filed as a community impact statement to council file CF 10-0678.