



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

(CF 14-0656) Fwd: Base Line Hillside Ord. I'm not in favor of the Proposed Amendments. Eliminating 20% Density bonus.

1 message

Planning Conservation <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>
To: Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 13, 2016 at 10:57 AM

Sharon,

Another email on CF 14-0656.

Thanks,
Niall Huffman
Department of City Planning | Code Studies Division
niall.huffman@lacity.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Patrick T** <ptla90046@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Oct 13, 2016 at 8:39 AM
Subject: Base Line Hillside Ord. I'm not in favor of the Proposed Amendments. Eliminating 20% Density bonus.
To: Neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org

Attention PLUM department,
RE: 140656

Regarding: proposed amendment to the Base Line Hillside Ordinance, Mansionization Ordinance.

I'm a resident of Los Angeles, and have lived in the Hollywood Hills for 29 years. I've lived in several different homes, and own land near my current residence.

The draft proposal on-line... Has numerous proposed changes, all limiting and reducing the size of additions, and new construction. Square footage, lot coverage, and even the allowable square footage, and height of outdoor covered patios/balconies. These staff recommendations I realize are from the input of some people in the neighborhoods. It's funny how the complainers voice always seems to rise above the folks that are in favor of, or tolerant, or comfortable with the status quo.

The part of the staff recommendations that stands out to me more than any of the other numerous restrictions, is the proposal

of "Eliminating all bonuses in the R1 single family residential zone." Including 20% new construction bonus, or 20% green construction, (which helps meet our city wide carbon goal)
Additional financial burden on new construction (housing crisis), and wiping out an incentive to build green?

Over the past 22 some years. The BHO through several changes, has dramatically scaled back the allowable size/massing of new construction, or additions to existing homes in the hills. Neighbors that added on or built new in years past didn't have near the hurdles, and hoops to jump through to improve, or build their homes as people do today. Today a typical neighboring hillside vacant parcel is limited by the BHO to only build a 1,300 square foot home. quite small considering ALL, the neighboring homes are larger. And at that size, quite expensive (per square foot) to build. The current 20% new build density bonus, would allow an additional 260 sf.to be built. Or if it was green construction... ending up with a 1,560 s.f. home. still small by comparison to the surrounding homes on the same size lots. Considering our housing crisis, don't we want and need more bedrooms, instead of fewer?

The proposed removal of these bonuses is constricting the size yet again of square footage one can build on their land. This will have unintended consequences as well. If this is passed in it's current form, the value of these undeveloped lots will be negatively affected by this. Also the value of the finished home will be less than if it were a conforming 2,200

s.f. home. less property tax dollars. And finally what family, with children would be comfortable in a 1,300 s.f. on multi-levels?

I feel this is an over reach by our planning department. PLEASE, reconsider this 20% density bonus for new construction in the hills and canyons.

Respectively,

Patrick T.
323-654-5292



Neighborhood Conservation Team
Department of City Planning
HPOZ | Community Planning | Code Studies
preservation.lacity.org/neighborhoodconservation



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

14-0656

(CF 14-0656) Fwd: Baseline Hillside Ord. 4166776. Proposed Amendment. I'm AGAINST Removal of 20% Density bonus for nu constr.

1 message

Planning Conservation <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>
To: Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 13, 2016 at 10:34 AM

Sharon,

This email came to our Neighborhood Conservation account regarding CF 14-0656. Would you kindly add it to the file?
Thank you.

Niall Huffman
Department of City Planning | Code Studies Division
niall.huffman@lacity.org

----- Forwarded message -----

From: . <emilie80002016@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 12, 2016 at 6:17 PM
Subject: Baseline Hillside Ord. 4166776. Proposed Amendment. I'm AGAINST Removal of 20% Density bonus for nu constr.
To: neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org

Please forward this email to the PLUM committee.

I'm a property owner in Laurel Canyon, I live with my husband, and our teenage son in a 2700 square feet home, built in the mid 1960's. We also have a vacant lot nearby where we intend to build our dream home.

We were only recently made aware of the proposed amendment to remove the new construction, and green construction bonus from the current BHO.

We are against this proposed amendment to the BHO. We're in David Ryu's district. The part of the amendment which removes the 20% bonus of allowable, square footage for new construction and green construction in all single family zoned property in the city.

The current proposed language "Eliminating all density bonuses for R1 zones" This would **UNREASONABLY** reduce the allowable sf. of new construction for an R1 lot such as ours. A 5,000-6,000 sf. downhill lot with the slope band analysis calculation... limits us to build a 1,350-1,400 sf. home. With the density bonus we'd be granted an additional 270 square feet, totaling a 1,620 square feet home. this additional s.f. helps make the build more economically realistic. Costs are so high to build, and spreading that cost over more sf. definitely helps. At 1,350 sf. on three levels is not only very costly, it's also not very desirable.

The surrounding homes are larger, 1,700-3,500 sf range, some larger. It only makes sense that the neighbors would want the new home to support their values, and be similar in size.

The proposed elimination of the bonus, would put a financial hardship on us.. making it MUCH MORE costly per/sf. to build our home.

This proposal is too aggressive and I feel was drafted more for the homes on flat lots into the city. Since the 1980's, planning, and building and safety have made revisions to the code reducing the size of what we can build on our lot. Every few years reducing it more and more...this has gone too far.

If this proposal is adopted it will certainly devalue our property and take away our right to build a reasonably sized home on land we've owned for years.

We understand there is a small group of no-growth neighbors that are pushing this proposal. We would like to remain anonymous due to the tension and attitude of some of the no-growth people we know.

Please direct the PLUM committee to reevaluate, and remove this part of the amendment. It's an overreach by government. Please, it's the right thing to do.

Sincerely,
Concerned long time resident of Laurel Canyon.



Neighborhood Conservation Team
Department of City Planning
HPOZ | Community Planning | Code Studies
preservation.lacity.org/neighborhoodconservation