



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BHO Proposed Square Footage Reduction... Onerous Restrictions, Amendment 140656.

d.wilson115@aol.com <d.wilson115@aol.com>

Sat, Jan 7, 2017 at 10:02 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, David.ryu@lacity.org, lacityatty@lacity.org

Re: Baseline Hillside Ordinance pending ONEROUS RESTRICTIONS, revisions. item # 140656.

The current staff draft report on-line... proposing to Eliminate new construction bonus, or green construction 20% density bonuses. This would put a financial hardship on the lot owner, and negatively effect property values of existing homes, and lots in the hills.

I am a resident of Laurel Canyon, lived here since the 1980's. I believe this egregious proposal of removing the existing new construction bonus would put a financial hardship on the lot owner, and devalue their property. It would not only devalue the lot, but would also DEVALUE existing homes in the area...such as mine. Reason being...This proposed downsizing of new construction on average sized vacant lots will hurt the value of my home. My home is averaged sized at 2,500 square feet on three levels. Currently my understanding the BHO has a min. allowable to build 1300-1400 sf. on the Canyons steepest smallest lots. Resulting in Small sf.on each level of a three level home.

The current 20% density bonus helps considerably. An additional bedroom perhaps. By removing this bonus...cost per sf. goes up considerably, and the owner builder most likely will end up with a 2 bedroom home on three levels. Doesn't make sense to me??? Who in their right mind builds a small new home with all the costs involved... road improvements, school tax, permit fees, sewer connection fees, all the high taxes and fees paid, and then to limit the owner builder to a two bedroom home???

I live in a single family hillside home, and also own an R1 lot not far from my home in Laurel Canyon. So my concern is two fold.

Currently as the BHO reads, there are guidelines at limiting size, height, and retaining wall heights, and setbacks. New construction is very expensive. With all the fees, taxes, permits, road improvements, fire prevention (Sprinkling systems) cost of materials, it all adds up to much more than purchasing an older home in the area. By taking away this bonus...Cost per s.f. would be excessively high...especially building such a small home.

My desire is that when preparing their final suggestions on revisions, the PLUM committee will take my comments into consideration, and continue to allow the 20% density bonuses. I'm not alone on this..several of my neighbors, LOT owners, and HOMEOWNERS feel the same way. Neighbors in exiting homes don't want a small tiny house built near there home. They would prefer a home built closer to the size square footage of their home. To support the value of their home.

We have neighbors that don't want anything built on the vacant lots. They bought or built their homes years ago, and feel entitled in a way... that they can push the Planning dept. to enact these egregious restrictions to discourage new construction in our area. There are Private Property RIGHTS. If this goes through it will likely be legally challenged in the courts.

Respectfully,

D. Wilson