



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

---

## CF-14-0656 (COUNT ATTACHED GARAGES ) and CF 16-1460

1 message

---

**Edward Miller** <edward\_miller22@yahoo.com>

Sat, Jan 14, 2017 at 7:19 AM

Reply-To: Edward Miller <edward\_miller22@yahoo.com>

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org>, "Councilmember.Cedillo@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Cedillo@lacity.org>, "Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org>, "Councilmember.Harris-Dawson@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Harris-Dawson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>  
Cc: Elizabeth Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>, "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

RE: CF 14-0656

Work on the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Amendment has been long. The final piece of the puzzle that will help ensure neighborhoods keep their scale and character intact is to COUNT FRONT FACING ATTACHED GARAGES. We can't compromise on this!

RE: CF 16-1460

It is critical to the character of all neighborhoods that they are able to choose the new variation of the R1 Zone that applies to their area, especially with the addition of an RG Rear Detached Garage Supplemental Use District. Please support this.

While this only covers R1 Zones, we need to protect our R2 zones as well, and I hope that the city begins its work on that soon.

Thank you,  
Edward Miller  
COUNCIL DISTRICT 10



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Council File 14-0656 / opposition to reduction in FAR for Castle Heights / request for R1VNew**

1 message

---

**Zev Shechtman** <zshechtman@gmail.com>

Sat, Jan 14, 2017 at 7:41 AM

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" &lt;Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org&gt;, "paul.koretz@lacity.org" &lt;paul.koretz@lacity.org&gt;

Cc: Zina.Cheng@lacity.org, Clerk.CPS@lacity.org, lacityatty@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Dickinson and Councilman Koretz,

I am following up on my email of 9/29/16 and respectfully request that this correspondence be made part of the record concerning this matter including, without limitation, at the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) meeting on 1/18/17.

I am a resident and homeowner in Castle Heights, which is in Council District 5. The proposed changes would drastically limit our building options, hurt the value of our property and, as to Floor Area Ratio (FAR) reductions, provide no clear benefit to anyone. I believe a reduction to lower than 50% of the lot size is arbitrary, capricious and highly prejudicial to homeowners.

I own and live in a 1,430 square foot home on a 5,000 square foot lot. It would be reasonable to build at least a 2,500 square foot house on my property. This possibility was priced into the value of the property when I purchased it. Neighbors have built homes that size over the years. The next neighborhood over, Beverlywood, is going to receive different treatment (R1VNew) allowing homes of 55% of the lot size. I request just the same, fair treatment for our home and our neighborhood: Castle Heights.

We respectfully request that R1VNew apply to the Castle Heights neighborhood.

Please confirm your receipt of this email.

I look forward to an opportunity to discuss this matter with you further.

Very truly yours,

Zev Shechtman  
Castle Heights  
Lower Council District 5

---

On Thursday, September 29, 2016, Zev Shechtman <zshechtman@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Councilman Koretz and Ms. Dickinson,

I'm a resident of the 5th Council District whose property will be impacted by the Council's decision on the proposed new home building restrictions. I understand that the opponents of development have been very vocal. But I don't

understand the rationale for forcing people with a 5,000 square foot lot, like mine, to build a house that is less than 50% of the lot size. While 250 (i.e., 5%) square feet could make a meaningful difference to my enjoyment of my property, what is the rationale on the other side for preventing such construction? Also, can someone from the City explain what is wrong with the existing ordinances and why this drastic change is even necessary?

In sum, I oppose the amendment and believe that clearer explanation (in plain English) is needed.

Sincerely,

Zev Shechtman  
District resident and homeowner



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

---

## Code amendments for Bel Air

1 message

---

**Brian Webber** <brianwebber1@yahoo.com>

Sat, Jan 14, 2017 at 1:06 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Regarding below - as a Bel Air resident I do not support the below amendments. In my view they represent the views of a few vocal bel air association board members and do not reflect the view of the broader community. Many do not wish to restrict further development but view development as nice improvements to aging structures and a nice source of economic growth (particularly jobs) for our community. I do fully support enforcing existing LA building codes which sufficiently protect from out of control development

Thanks for your consideration.

Brian Webber

- Baseline Mansionization/Baseline Hillside Ordinance Code amendment (BMO/BHO): Council File 14-0656
- R1 Variation Zones Code Amendment: Council File 16-1460

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**CF-14-0656 (COUNT ATTACHED GARAGES ) and CF 16-1460**

1 message

**Sharon Montrose** <sharonmontrose@mac.com>

Sat, Jan 14, 2017 at 1:41 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org, Councilmember.Cedillo@lacity.org,  
Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org, Councilmember.Harris-Dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org  
Cc: Elizabeth Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

RE: CF 14-0656

Work on the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Amendment has been long. The final piece of the puzzle that will help ensure neighborhoods keep their scale and character intact is to COUNT FRONT FACING ATTACHED GARAGES. We can't compromise on this!

RE: CF 16-1460

It is critical to the character of all neighborhoods that they are able to choose the new variation of the R1 Zone that applies to their area, especially with the addition of an RG Rear Detached Garage Supplemental Use District. Please support this.

While this only covers R1 Zones, we need to protect our R2 zones as well and I hope that the city begins its work on that soon.

Thank you,

Sharon Montrose  
Wilshire Vista  
COUNCIL DISTRICT 10



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**CF-14-0656 (COUNT ATTACHED GARAGES ) and CF 16-1460**

1 message

---

**michelle2112@mac.com** <michelle2112@mac.com>

Sat, Jan 14, 2017 at 1:43 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Huizar@lacity.org, Councilmember.Cedillo@lacity.org, Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org, Councilmember.Harris-Dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee,

RE: CF 14-0656

Work on the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Amendment has been long. The final piece of the puzzle that will help ensure neighborhoods keep their scale and character intact is to COUNT FRONT FACING ATTACHED GARAGES. We can't compromise on this!

RE: CF 16-1460

It is critical to the character of all neighborhoods that they are able to choose the new variation of the R1 Zone that applies to their area, especially with the addition of an RG Rear Detached Garage Supplemental Use District. Please support this.

While this only covers R1 Zones, we need to protect our R2 zones as well and I hope that the city begins its work on that soon.

Michelle Starr  
Wilshire Vista  
COUNCIL DISTRICT 10