

Date: 1/18/17
Submitted in PLUM Committee
Council File No: 14-0656
Item: No 2
Communication
from public

DONALD LOZE

December 6, 2016

Case No. CPC-2015-3484-CA

Dear Council members:

Enclosed is an amplified supplement to my remarks of May 16 and thereafter at the hearings that took place with regard to the proposed HMO/BMO

My comments are those of a committed and concerned citizen of the City who hopes to contribute a legacy of future citizenship to those who follow and care for the Santa Monica Mountains.

My residency in the Santa Monica Mountains exceeds 40 years at the same address in Benedict Canyon and as a concerned citizen I have served on the Board of the Benedict Canyon Association since 1970 and as elected representative to the Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council for the last 15 Years. Over that time I have participated as a volunteer addressing land-use issues that concern my community and the City with hope that those efforts will be a positive contribution to our lives here. Therefore, my remarks reflect serious consideration and experience with the matters at hand, but with full respect for those planners whose input to these proposed ordinances are inconsistent with my thoughts.

Donald Loze

Case No. CPC-2015-3484-CA

BMO BHO May 16, 2016 and thereafter

TITLE OF THE ORDINANCE

The Title if this proposed legislation is a misnomer and misleading. The basic concept is to limit over building. Calling an ordinance "Mansionization" only dismisses the purpose of this and all prior legislation designed to enhance protection of the Santa Monica Mountains and to inhibit destruction of neighborhoods. The ordinance should be renamed The Anti-Mansionization Ordinance. (AMO)

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Legislative history is relevant

The Planning Department ignores the legislative history of this important planning regulation. In this instant, the legislative history begins with of the initial Hillside Ordinance. The City Attorney at that time, James Hahn, (subsequently Mayor) declared that the most valuable asset in Los Angeles as the Santa Monica Mountains. The mountains are for enjoyment and pleasure of everyone and are to be preserved. Zev

Yaroslavsky at the passage of the Hillside Ordinance declared " this is the end of Mansionization." The underlying concept was to downzone the hills.

Contrary that original legislation and ignoring the General Plan as required by A.B. 283, and related The Community Plans, and the Specific Plans the Planning Department is creating a mutation independent of its roots. This iteration is to plug loopholes, not to expand matters that otherwise could limit abuse. The Focus seems to be on small properties while expanding opportunities for large scale projects. If this is an attempt to increase tax revenues by encouraging large projects, or whatever undisclosed reason, that policy is destructive of the individual communities that form the core of the City's life.

INADAQUATE OUTREACH

Simply take note of the alleged outreach. Four public meetings that mix hillside and flatland issues, with hearing locations outside of the Hillside Areas and public comment limited to 30 second per speaker -- that is is fully inadequate

The Ordinance aims to make "one size" fits all" regulation and the Planning Department dictates the result. A subsequent hearing at the Planning Commission essentially changed four words in the Staff Report, disregarding public comments and written follow up.

EXPORT INFRASTRUCTURE DESTRUCTION

The concept of **grading and export** is an example. The initial proposal of the Hillside Ordinance was to limit grading export to 250 cu.yds. That was in response to a very limited number of hillside speakers whose savings were acquiring small lots in Laurel Canyon and only wanted the availability of a pad for a " habitable dwelling". Eventually, that limitation morphed mysteriously to a 1000 cu yds limitation. What is the meaning of the quantity? Hauling trucks carry approximately 10 cu.yds each. Therefore, 1000 cu yds. perceives 200 truck trips to a site-- that is one trip up and back, only for dirt. The trucker knows that each cubic yard of dirt in the ground gets fluffed to a cubic yard plus 25 % for hauling making the truck trips required for 1000 cu yd to be 250. That limit ignores and fails to regulate the result of the next fleet of construction vehicles bearing building materials--- lumber, cement, steel, sand, stone and brick and construction workers vehicles. Would any of you want sucha convoy rumbling past your ffront door daily?

Noteworthy is the fact that hillside roads are replete with signs limiting vehicles to 6000 pounds. Most hillside roads are substandard and built on roadbeds for 1930-1940 vintage vehicles. Practice, the exception to the sighage , is construction vehicles breaking the 6000 pound barrier. Each of a full loaded cement truck exceeds 50,000 pounds and the combined consequence of all these activities destroy the infrastructure--the main and accessory roads and leave the cost to the City and in turn to the taxpayers.

Beyond the 1000cu yd limit for R1 projects, the department seeks to increase the amount of grading-input and export elsewhere. Therefore, the larger the project the adverse consequence of the hauling is compounded. The result ignores the basic premise of addressing out of scale development in the hillside areas and fails to protect the Santa

Monica Mountains. This opens the barn door to more hauling and destructive traffic on substandard streets and already clogged main arteries. How does the Planning Department take upon itself the task of creating substantial environmental disruption?

The result creates City a profit center for developers, contractors, truckers and material providers. However, to the best of anyone's knowledge there's never been a cost-benefit analysis to the City by the Planning Department's approach. No Fiscal Impact Statement has been prepared or Submitted PLUM REPORT (Wednesday December 7, 2016 e "Fiscal Impact Statement": None submitted by the Los Angeles City Planning Commission. Neither the City Administrative Officer nor the Chief Legislative Analyst has completed an analysis of this report)

HEIGHT LIMITATIONS IN THE HILLSIDE AREA

The current provisions for building mass, maximum FAR and Grading fail to adequately proscribe cumulative building height in connection with Slope Bands and create consistency with prior legislative history.

DISTRUCTION OF NEIGHBORHOR PLANNING

The proposed ordinance fails to distinguish the great diversity of neighborhoods and environments in the City. The General Plan, Community Plan and Specific plans are the vehicles for this process. This ordinance is stop gap.

COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS OVERLAY DISCTRICTS>

Los Angeles is a series of diverse neighborhoods. Individual Community designation signs dot the traffic arteries across the City; but in this Ordinance all are ignored. Absolutely needed are overlay districts. To accomplish that goal creation of new ICO's is needed over an appropriate and adequate time to allow full input and a decision making process for all neighborhoods effected by the Ordinance. There are now over 90 Neighborhood Councils capable of organizing and creating appropriate input before this proposed Ordinance is enacted or immediately after.

INADEQUATE COORDINATION AMONG DEPARTMENTS

Omitted from the Ordinance are links to interrelated regulations current and needed. No enforcement worthy of the task exists.

Lack of coordination of destructive construction vehicles is rampant. No Department knows what the other is imposing or tracking, or not . The proposed Ordinance must not stand alone without integration with DOT, Public Works and Building and Safety.

COST OF REPAIR.

Homeowners should not bear the burden of the continuing destruction by others..

Bonding and Schedule of Performance

The Bonding requirement of \$50,000 must be increased to the cost of actual repairs to City right of ways and imputed neighborhood adverse impacts. The Mitigated Negative Declarations of developers are inadequate and not enforced. After grading and hauling is properly reduced, bonding must be increased to cover the collateral costs to neighborhoods, their streets, access roads and other public services associated with each project. That bonding must be increased to actual projected costs and be tied to a

schedule of performance. Before a building permit is issued, in addition to bonding, a schedule of performance should be required to ensure completion and the certificate of occupancy

Vehicle Fees

Vehicles of over 6000 pounds should be charged a license fee designated to supplement the costs parallel to the more appropriate construction bond. Trip fees should supplement those to provide for correlated infrastructure replacement. DOT and Building and Safety Departments should always know what vehicles are moving and under what permits. Haul Routes need input and direction from Street Services before any determination. All properties along a proposed haul route must be noticed in advance for an opportunity to address the decision making body. The adverse impact of all activity needs to be primary consideration.

ELIMINATE THE BASEMENT EXCEPTION

The Basement exception is now the last hair on the tail of the dog that is wagging the entire kennel. The basement exception should be prohibited in the hills which are to be protected.

ORIGINAL PLANNING

Seemingly ignored is the original plan of the City plan to protect single-family dwellings and neighborhoods. That plan perceived high rise nodes across the City connected by rapid transit systems. Metrorail is slowly being built and in the interim the preservation and integrity of the neighborhoods must be maintained so that the overall plan can be implemented.

Respectfully

Donald Loze
DONALD LOZE

2037 Benedict Canyon Drive
Beverly Hills, California 90210
310 278 3461 310 274 9736 fax
310 402 4488 cell
BezoarLtd@aol.com

Date: 1/18/17

Submitted in PLUM Committee

Council File No: 14-0656

Item No. 2
Comem from Public

The following ~~OBJECTIVE~~ technical comments apply to R1 Parcels affected by the proposed BHO amendments before you today.

- 1) **Restore** the full 400 square foot exemption for garages, regardless of location for sloping hillside lots.
 - *It is not technically possible to put the required 2 car covered parking anywhere but the front of the home on the majority of hillside sites.*
- 2) **Raise** the starting height of the encroachment plane on sloping lots to 24'-0" so as to allow for a properly designed 2-story hillside home with minimal grading.
 - *20'-0" is too low to provide contiguous floors or accommodate the deeper structural beams required on sloping lots!*
- 3) **Restore** the understructure grading exemption to 100% of the total understructure excavation for hillside lots regardless of street designation or lot type.
 - *Hillside structural seismic codes require deepened foundations regardless of building mass.*
 - *Having stories partially below-grade is beneficial in reducing the building's visual mass.*
 - *Required parking, or required driveways and access stairways, many of which are partially or completely below-grade on upslope lots by technical necessity should be exempt.*
- 4) Increase the height of the proposed Side Yard Plane Break height from 14'-0" to 20'-0" on sloping hillside lots and eliminate the Side Yard Plane Break on hillside lots of substandard width.
 - *Because of the sloping terrain, 14'-0" is not high enough to accommodate a continuous and usable habitable story for a dwelling and should be increased to 20'-0" for hillsides with slopes $\geq 2:1$.*
- 5) **DO NOT** Reduce the guaranteed minimum Residential Floor Area from 1,000 to 800 square feet for hillside lots.

If the 400 SF required parking is not exempted then an 800 SF house would only have 400 SF of habitable space- smaller than a 1 bedroom apt!
- 6) Retain all existing exemptions for substandard lots and Hillside streets.

Trust your architect and your city planner to craft the best BMO/ BHO that more adeptly and OBJECTIVELY solves the SUBJECTIVE constituent concerns you are hoping to address.

KIYOHARA MOFFITT

Los Angeles City Council PLUM Committee
RE: BMO/BHO Amendments

January 17, 2017

Dear Honorable City Council Members:

As an architect I worked with the AIA to assist the city in revising the BMO/BHO so that it would actually make a positive difference. The problem is that when your recommendations went before the full council last month they voted to ignore crucial changes. As written, the BMO/BHO that just came out of the City Attorney's office is going to cause tremendous loss of revenue to the city (property tax), lawsuits from property owners, and new construction that lacks exactly the kind of design quality and character that neighborhoods want.

It is NOT POSSIBLE to build two stories in 20ft on a dead flat lot (which hardly exists in LA) with a raised floor foundation (typical for most homes, and a requirement in many neighborhoods because of methane zoning), typical second floor framing (14"), ceiling/roof framing, even with 8ft ceiling heights (which isn't typical for first floors, especially with the need to soffit for ducting). You had rightly increased that number to 22ft, which is still very difficult, but at least it is possible. However, the Council nixed that. Even with this slope formula of 22ft, the city will end up with rows of houses designed like wedding cakes.

Having a solid cover over your front door, to keep the rain off of you when you are opening your door, will now mean that the outside area below this (essentially your "welcome mat") is counted as square footage. And a covered front porch or a covered rear patio or covered upstairs rear patio, will all count as square footage. However, property is not assessed that way. It is not square footage that will count when you go to sell your property, or get a loan. So property owners who want to incorporate these mostly lovely articulations to their homes will be losing value to their property, and most will be forced to eliminate all articulation of this sort in order to get the needed square footage. The allowable floor area is already being reduced. Then on top of that you are further reducing the amount of usable space by counting porches and requiring two parking spaces but counting half of that. The assessor does not count garage space as living space.

By forcing property owners to place a garage in the rear of the property because it won't be counted as living space, is ridiculous here in Los Angeles. Older homes have tiny garages from the 20's and 30's. When you build a two car garage today, it takes up a huge amount of space, much more than those old existing ones, and it cannot be right on the property lines, practically speaking. So most of the outdoor space is eliminated. In sunny California, you are taking away outdoor space when you make it impractical to build an attached garage. And we all know that parks are scarce here. Where will the children play? Yet we all know that a detached garage is not going to end up used as a garage. They seldom are. So that's ironic.

Longtime property owners who have attended these hearings and who pushed to have these restrictions made, might be upset about the big ugly house next door. But they clearly don't realize how much their own property will now be devalued---not because of the house next door, but because of this regulation and how little they or their heirs will be able to do on their property. And the restrictions only foster more poor design. It's usually the developers who cause the ruckus amongst homeowners. They will continue to maximize where they can and will certainly not take square footage and create lovely porches or patios.

As an architect with 40 years of experience, I could talk all day about the aesthetic loss for Los Angeles because of these regulations. When you make it economically impractical to gracefully articulate house forms by taking away features that historically have been prized (e.g.: craftsman bungalow front porches), the city is going to physically suffer. Please try and temper these amendments so we can avoid the above citywide problems.

Thank you for your attention,



Gina G. Moffitt, AIA, LEED AP

Date: 1/18/17

Submitted in PLUM Committee

Council File No: _____

Item No: 2

ARCHITECTURE • INTERIOR DESIGN • SPACE PLANNING
620 Moulton Ave. #106 L.A., CA 90031 (323) 227-5647 www.kiyoharamoffitt.com

PUBLIC



2212 Veteran Avenue

Lot Size: 6750 sf

Residential Floor Area: 2877 sf (5 bedrooms, 3 baths)

Garage Area: 380 sf

Under R1V2 Allowable Floor Area:

2902.50 sf, which is less than 2877 sf plus the 180 sf of non-expected garage that total 3057 sf



Date: 01/18/2017

Submitted in PLUM Committee

Council File No: 14-0656

Item No. 2

Comm. from Public

10558 Lauriston Avenue

Lot Size: 5385 sf

**Residential Floor Area: 2687
sf (5 bedrooms, 3 baths)**

**Under R1V2 Allowable Floor
Area: 2423.25 sf, which
less than 2687 sf**





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Fw: PLUM HEARING 11/18/17 ITEM NOS. 2 AND 3 14-0656 and 16-0460

1 message

Constance Boukidis <constanceellen@sbcglobal.net>
Reply-To: Constance Boukidis <constanceellen@sbcglobal.net>
To: "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 12:03 PM

I support all of the amendments as set forth in your Agenda, Items 2 and 3, Case File Nos. 14-0656 and 16-0460. More specifically, I support the amended BMO as well as the revised zoning for Lower Council District 5 in its Neighborhood Conservation Ordinance from R-1 to R1V2.

I would encourage the committee to go further and count all square footage of front-facing attached garages as floor space.

Thank you for all of your hard work.

Constance Boukidis
Chair
Land Use and Planning Committees
Comstock Hills HOA
Westwood Neighborhood Council
310-766-5030



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE-Council File 14-0656 - BHO/BMO Amendments

1 message

Bill Gregory <billgregory@arcelab.com>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 11:45 AM

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>

Cc: "mike.bonin@lacity.org" <mike.bonin@lacity.org>, "jose.huizar@lacity.org" <jose.huizar@lacity.org>, will wright <will@aialosangeles.org>

Dear Sharon Dickinson, Planning Committee, and City Council Members:

I am writing to you to bring to your attention to some of the concerns I have regarding the proposed amendments to the BMO/BHO - Council File - 14-0656. I am a sole proprietor architect having studied and practiced in the City of Los Angeles for the past 35 years and I have several projects that will be affected by the proposed amendments to the BMO/BHO as well as concerns regarding future projects. As such, I wish to bring to your attention some issues that I have regarding the most recent proposed modifications. In addition, the AIA has sent to you their concerns in a letter regarding the proposed amendments and there appears to be no one listening to us. We as architects, are the sole professionals who on a daily basis wrestle with the zoning code in trying to develop responsible designs that address public safety, community character, and client aspirations and yet as such while having participated within the public review process there appears to be no or minimal integration of our concerns. There may be differences of opinion as to what good design is or should be, ie; acceptable architectural styles (boxy/not boxy), but that is not something that should be legislated in this creative city we call Los Angeles that champions itself as the leader of the world in creative residential design. Planners do not design houses - architects do - so you would think that an audience of architects and their concerns would make sense and be listened to and incorporated. While we have met with the city planning staff several times the proposed amendments are then changed at the whim of a council member who has no professional knowledge of the design process, the code implications, and the difficulties that go with them. It is like making medical procedure regulations without the acceptance of the medical profession. We as architects are finally coming out of a 6 year slump and finally starting to be able to work again, hiring again, etc. and you want to now make it tougher on us. At the City planning level, you not recently laid off planning staff and early retired many more due to the recession and yet with these new regulations you have been and will continue to need to increase staffing up at a much higher level than you were. If the economy slows again and it will it is just a matter of when, what will happen then?

There are several issues/concerns:

1. BHO - Parking Exemptions - Hillside properties can typically only build their garages in the front yard area directly accessed from the street due to the slope conditions of the lot and the allowed maximum driveway slopes. Therefore, the proposed amendment penalizes almost all hillside property owners by not allowing the same amount of garage area to be exempted from being counted at RFA as if located in the rear of the property. This is not a fair requirement.
2. BHO - Guaranteed Minimum RFA - The proposed reduction of the guaranteed minimum size from 1000RFA to 800RFA is too small for any reasonable house to be constructed. It should have actually been increased to 1200RFA or 1400RFA for a reasonable family sized house. In addition, the disallowing of the 200sf exemption for a front yard located garage will then reduce the allowable size from the absurdly small 800RFA to 600RFA. 600RFA = What are you thinking? Most hillside properties that are going to fall under this issue will also have to widen the street and so there are costs associated with this type of lot that allowing only such a small house will preclude the owners from enjoying their property in a similar manner as their neighbors currently do. This basically makes these lots un-buildable and therefore unfair to the property owner - and for what? They are per code to be well engineered and with soils reports showing that they are to be built on bedrock, etc. making them safe structurally, they are to be safe fire code wise - since they will be sprinklered and set back from the property lines per code, so what is the issue that makes you want to make these lots un-buildable. This is not a fair requirement.

3. BHO - Encroachment Plane - The application of an encroachment plane on hillside lots does not make any sense. Most hillside lot projects are tough enough to design with the current regulations. Now, with this added regulation, it will be even more difficult. Let's say you have a 40' wide hillside lot and you have a house that steps up or down the lot. The house will typically be at least three stories high (but within the 28'-33' allowed) for a garage at one level and the rest of the house at another two levels so you will be above the 20' height limit very easily. Then, at the 20' limit you project up and over at a 45 degree angle (encroachment plane) - the result will be that no 3rd floor is possible given the amount of floor area remaining. The lot width of 40' minus 5' on each side for required setbacks = 30' wide house - then you project up and over 10' on each side so you have a footprint of 10' of width of house at the third floor which makes no sense. As such, this requirement should not apply to the hillside properties. Most hillside properties get their light from the down slope face not the sides of the property.

4. BHO - Concerns over Construction if the Hills - If the neighbors in the hillside areas don't want construction in their neighborhoods or are afraid of fires, then they shouldn't have moved there in the first place. There are plenty of places to live that are not in the hills and that are considered "safer". So this is a choice that they consciously made. The roads didn't get smaller after they moved in. The vacant lots didn't just show up after they moved in. The risk of fire didn't just show up. In addition, someone at sometime built the house they at this minute are quite comfortably living in on a daily basis and therefore they should understand and accept the fact that others have the right to do the same thing. There is something in our American culture called FAIRNESS and it doesn't appear that that concept is either understood or just not being applied.

5. BMO - Parking Exemptions - To apply an RFA penalty to properties for having a front yard located garage does not make any sense. All of my clients want a front yard located garage and a two car wide driveway, however, a 25% of width of lot maximum which will not allow a two car wide driveway on most properties. The rear garage option utilizes too much of the total property area for the driveway (25% of lot area in many properties) and turning area and then there are the SAFETY issues. On many of my projects where there is an existing house and garage in the rear, the owners typically do not use it as a garage for parking (it is used as storage/game room area, etc.) and therefore they park in the front portion of the driveway next to the street or on the street and use the rest of the side and rear portion of the driveway as a terrace or patio. The issue is safety. Very few people want to back down a 9' wide x 100' long driveway to get to the street. They fear backing over a child, running into the side of the house or fence, hitting a utility box, gas meter, damaging their car, etc. One can make the driveway much wider and with a turnaround area by the garage to address some of this but then that uses up even more lot area for the car. This idea of a preference for a rear garage comes from the in-vogue current New Urbanism Planning Theory that states/promotes the idea that rear garages make better neighborhoods than front garages. There are no facts to support this - it is simply an aesthetic issue with various groups not liking the sight of a garage door. In fact, however, front garages make better and safer communities as this is where you see and communicate with your neighbors coming and going to their car. With rear garages, if they actually use them as garages, you only see a car come in and go out so there is no human interaction which equals a less safe community.

6. More Regulations = Less Jobs! More regulations that reduce allowable building area or make projects more difficult or that kill projects at the start mean less projects = less of an economic driver that the construction industry will be for the area = less jobs for your community and it's constituents.

Thanks,

Bill Gregory, AIA

Arcelab Inc. Architects

7480 S. Osage Ave. (New Address)

Los Angeles, CA 90045

Cell - 310-507-5434

Fax - 310-910-0483

Web Site - www.arcelab.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Kate Wolf <kaylameloni@gmail.com>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 1:28 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org

Dear PLUM Committee Members,

I'm unfortunately unable to attend the meeting this afternoon, but I still I wanted to take the time to urge you to close loopholes for garages in your vote today.

Please make garages count and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count. I also urge you to support the City Planning Commission's recommendations and current draft ordinance.

We've come very far on this issue and I want to thank you all. Let's not start making allowances now. Time to settle this, the right and responsible way, for good.

Many thanks again,
Kate Wolf
5031 Meridian St.
Los Angeles, CA
90042



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Carol Henning <carolhen@sbcglobal.net>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 12:31 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Huizar:

We met when the Sierra Club Angeles Chapter endorsed you for reelection to the L.A. City Council.

I am writing to ask you, as a member of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee, to support counting all 400 square feet of the garage space, 200 sq. ft. of which are now exempted in the current draft amendment, from allowable floor space in new or rebuilt houses covered by the rewritten Baseline Mansionization and Hillside Ordinances.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carol Henning



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

2 messages

g7ontario@yahoo.ca <g7ontario@yahoo.ca>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 12:20 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Council Members, et al...

I've an LA native and member of the LA Conservancy. I'd like to share my perspective with you and support the Conservancy's requests, as featured below.

I've lived in LA for 37 of my 55 years. In that time, we've lost a great deal of our charm and character. I believe in positive change and appreciate historic, as well as modern architecture. What I don't appreciate is the destruction of historic buildings/neighborhoods for financial gain, when restoration and/or stewardship is possible.

I understand how business works and I appreciate making money but I also appreciate living in a city with heart. The Mansonization movement is tricky, because the homes aren't unattractive, they just don't fit in. I've seen this in other cities, as well (Denver, in particular). There's an essence to neighborhoods, which represents who we are. As LA develops, we're losing that.

We have an opportunity to live in both worlds. All I ask is that we preserve our historically cohesive neighborhoods and neighborhoods who unanimously oppose these dwellings. When this trend ends, and they always do, they'll be replaced with something else. Why not put money into reimagining strip malls? There are a number of ways to make money that could improve and beautify our city.

- Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations and current draft ordinance; and
- Make garages count and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joyann Troutman

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone

g7ontario@yahoo.ca <g7ontario@yahoo.ca>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 12:22 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

[Quoted text hidden]



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Lindse Fletcher <lindsefletcher@gmail.com>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 3:34 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org

Hello,

As a resident of Los Angeles I am writing to urge the Plum Committee to Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations and current draft ordinance. In addition I urge you to make garages count and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

Thank you,
Lindse Fletcher
6036 Romaine Street, Los Angeles, 90038



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF14-0656 BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Mary Mallory <marymallory0@gmail.com>

Wed, Jan 18, 2017 at 8:51 AM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org,
councilmember.price@lacity.org

Cc: neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org

Dear Councilmembers:

Please add an amendment to the proposed Baseline Mansionization Ordinance to include all 400 square feet front home garages in the allowable floor space of these oversize homes. These structures also contribute to the out-of-scale development of mega homes that dwarf those surrounding homes in their communities and neighborhoods, destroying all neighborhood character and feel. They are also part of the overall square footage of the homes, as they would be included in any home insurance policy taken out by homeowners. Please make these garages and their square footage count in the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mary Mallory