



Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Fwd: Zoning - I support R1V New - Please take note!

1 message

Barbara Barnes <barneswife@verizon.net>
To: zina.cheng@lacity.org

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 1:19 PM

Dear Ms Cheng:

I got an "Auto-reply" just now re: my email - sent today- that Ms Dickinson is out of the office until Nov 29... Her reply states that you should be contacted in her absence. Please do send me a "REPLY" that my email (below) **will be considered by her in time for the Nov 29 hearing as mentioned.**

Thank you,
Sincerelty

Barbara Lennon Barnes

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Barnes <barneswife@verizon.net>
To: Sharon.Dickinson <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>
Sent: Mon, Nov 28, 2016 1:15 pm
Subject: Zoning - I support R1V New - Please take note!

Attn: Sharon Dickinson:
RE: **Council File #14-0656**

This letter is to again state that I support the more realistic option of **R1V New for my Mar Vista home & neighborhood. (Los Angeles, CA 90066).**

I request that my comments and support be included in the November 29 hearing.

I thank you for your help in this important matter.

Happy Holidays!
Sincerely,

Barbara Lennon Barnes
resident at: 3222 Grandview Bl, Los Angeles, CA 90066... since 1977....almost 40 years in this home...and Lifetime West LA resident!



Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Re: Council File#14-0656

2 messages

Christyadennis@aol.com <Christyadennis@aol.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 2:13 PM

To: Christyadennis@aol.com, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org

Cc: drczomber@gmail.com

Resending to Zina Cheng in Sharon Dickinson's absence.

Good afternoon Sharon,

Attached below please find a letter to be submitted to the Planning & Land Use Management Committee for the BMO/BHO Code Amendment meeting scheduled for November 29, 2016.

Marquez Knolls Property Owners Association (MKPOA)



MKPOA.BHO.PLUMItr.11.28.16(FINAL).doc

39K

Christyadennis@aol.com <Christyadennis@aol.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 2:40 PM

To: Christyadennis@aol.com, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, zina.cheng@lacity.org

Cc: drczomber@gmail.com

Zina Cheng:

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and confirm it will be distributed to members of PLUM in advance of tomorrow's BHO/BMO hearing.

Christy Dennis
MKPOA

[Quoted text hidden]



MKPOA.BHO.PLUMItr.11.28.16(FINAL).doc

39K

Marquez Knolls Property Owners Association

November 28, 2016

City Council Planning & Land Use Management Committee
c/o Sharon Dickinson
Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Via E-mail

**Re: Council File#14-0656
Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) Code Amendment; Proposed ReZoning
Code Amendment to Modify Single Family Zone Regulation**

Dear City Council Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

Marquez Knolls Property Owners Association (MKPOA) represents approximately 1,250 homes in Marquez Knolls, a community within Pacific Palisades north of Sunset Boulevard between Palisades Drive and Bienveneda Avenue. MKPOA is one of the largest homeowners association's in Pacific Palisades.

MKPOA respects the rights of property owners and the right to develop. MKPOA is not opposed to development per se, but, rather, is opposed to development that alters the character of our unique neighborhood and community. This is in keeping with the overriding mission of MKPOA to promote and encourage the preservation of the beauty and healthful environment of the residential areas within the boundaries of Marquez Knolls.

By way of history, Marquez Knolls was originally developed by the Lachman family. They began their development of Marquez Knolls in the 1950s with construction concluding in the 1970s. The homes were developed to enhance each homeowner's privilege of open-air space as views whether it is of ocean, hillside or city lights. The Marquez Knolls development consists of flatlands and terraced hillsides and is divided into the following three zoning sections: (1) R1, coastal hillside (2) R1, coastal flatlands (3) RE, coastal hillside.

With regard to the area designated as R1, coastal hillside, MKPOA applauds the efforts that have been taken by the Department of City Planning to restrict mansionization with amendments to the BHO that not only limit FAR but also set forth tighter building

restrictions. This is in line with the mission of MKPOA to preserve the intent of the original developers of Marquez Knolls.

Notwithstanding the monumental effects of the amendments to the BHO, MKPOA still has concerns about the increase in grading and hauling. Due to slope instability as documented by a prior landslide as well as the fact that Marquez Knolls has limited ingress and egress, an increase in grading and hauling in the Marquez Knolls area remains of grave concern.

In reference to the Department of City Planning Recommendation Report submitted to City Planning Commission at the meeting on November 10, 2016 ("Report"), MKPOA would like to commend both the Department of City Planning and the Neighborhood Conservation Team on taking extraordinary measures to hold community meetings and elicit the thoughts and comments of anyone possibly affected by either amendments to either the mansionization ordinances or rezoning. The needs and concerns of our residents were heard and are, for the most part, reflected in the Report.

Not to overshadow these efforts but more as a measure to bring forth awareness, MKPOA does have a concern about the content of the Report. Apparently the body of the Report does not clarify that there are only certain portions of Pacific Palisades that will be affected by the Ordinance amending Section 12.04 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMCC"). The portions of Pacific Palisades affected by the Ordinance are designated in a map that is attached to the draft Ordinance (Exhibit P"). Marquez Knolls is not included in this map and, thus, the Ordinance amending Section 12.04 of LAMCC does not apply to Marquez Knolls. In abundance of caution and as a means to alleviate any potential confusion, MKPOA respectfully requests wording in the Ordinance be clear and concise to delineate the portions of Pacific Palisades where the Ordinance will apply.

Lastly, not included in the Report but of importance to MKPOA is the rezoning of the R1, coastal flatlands and the RE15, coastal hillside regions of Marquez Knolls. The R1, coastal flatlands section stands out as having the most recent and significant rash of over-size building. Smaller, original homes are over shadowed by the newly constructed out-of-scale homes. The looming affect is clearly apparent. Concerns abound regarding the height that a resident will have to build just to compete for open air space and privacy.

As pertaining to the RE15, coastal hillside regions of Marquez Knolls, Officers of the Board of MKPOA relayed to the Neighborhood Conservation Team that recent data studies support that this area was seemingly misclassified. A significant number of parcels do not meet the parcel size requirements of RE15 and many parcels are composed of unusable steep slopes. Thus, rezoning based on topography remains

crucial in this area to protect views and eliminate over-building and excessive grading on already fragile hillsides.

In closing, MKPOA would like to thank you for your kind consideration and efforts to preserve our community.

Respectfully submitted,

Christy Dennis
President, MKPOA

Cheryl Zomber
Vice-President, MKPOA
CC&Rs & Zoning



Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

Fwd: Letter from the Lookout Mountain Alliance regarding CF 14-0656

csidlow0264@aol.com <csidlow0264@aol.com>
To: zina.cheng@lacity.org

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 4:26 PM

Were you able to open this?

-----Original Message-----

From: csidlow0264 <csidlow0264@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>
Cc: stevenasc <stevenasc@aol.com>
Sent: Mon, Nov 28, 2016 11:15 am
Subject: Letter from the Lookout Mountain Alliance regarding CF 14-0656

Dear Sharon,

This was originally sent to the CPC but wanted it to go into the PLUM file for tomorrow's hearing re BHO/BMO Amendments.

Thank you.

Carol Sidlow
Steven Poster
The Lookout Mountain Alliance

 **LMA letter - BHO Amendments.pdf**
76K

Lookout Mountain Alliance

July 11, 2016

City Planning Commission

C/o City Hall

Public Works Board Room 350

200 N. Spring Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: CPC -2015-3484 –CA – CEQA: ENV 2015-4197-ND

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for your service to our City and your input regarding these Amendments to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance(BHO) and the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance(BMO) as they apply to single family dwellings City-wide. The Lookout Mountain Alliance supported the First draft of the proposed amendments as sensible additions to the BHO enacted in 2011. Furthermore, we supported and continue to support the recommendations of the Hillside Federation in their letters to the Department of City Planning on 5/11/16 and 9/10/2016. We continue to support Councilmember Paul Koretz and David Ryu in their letter regarding the Second draft of these Amendments dated May 4,2016 to Director of City Planning Vince Bertoni.

Unfortunately, the Staff report still does not address the issues that plague our older hillside communities and the concerns of stakeholders with respect to what we refer to as 'slot lots' – lots that are comprised of square footage under 5000 sq. ft. which is the City standard for 'conforming lots'. The inclusion of a guarantee of 1000 sq. feet in the BHO and now still in the Staff report, has produced development that is not only incompatible with the "neighborhood character" in our hillside areas but has resulted in an increase density; reduction of open space; impacts to wildlife connectivity and perhaps most importantly, negatively impact infrastructure, as we have seen in our community over the past year. What would be considered 'Small lot sub-division' type structures are popping up all over our hillsides where an actual Small Lot Subdivision would not be allowed by CODE in any R-1 neighborhood? You will see a photo today of what was allowed to be built "BY RIGHT" on Wonderland Avenue in Laurel Canyon which illustrates our point. While we understand that property owners have a right to develop their property, the City has standards and code provisions that are in place that can limit what is built but has mechanisms in place to allow for deviations or exceptions to the Code. We would like to have the 1000 sq. ft. guarantee removed from the BHO amendments but if necessary, something less than 1000 sq. feet. It seems reasonable to eliminate a Guarantee on such small lots that could be tied together to produce (1) 5000 sq. ft. lots where a property owner/owner/builder/applicant could still build their dream home (1) 5,00 square ft. parcel that could have less of a negative impact and still provide for a reasonably sized home under the BHO. Provision could be made for an Applicant to seek an Adjustment or a Variance if necessary. In 2011 when the BHO was enacted, no one thought a 1000 sq. ft. home in the hillsides was economically feasible for a developer but that has changed over the past 5 years. It is feasible to buy these types of slot lots at a reduced rate and build (3) homes at the same time and sell them for a profit. However, the result has been negative impacts to public safety; increased density; loss of wildlife corridors and connectivity; loss of neighborhood character and street and infrastructure failures costing millions of taxpayer dollars for repairs and environmental impacts that will negatively affect the neighborhoods forever.

Lookout Mountain Alliance

Re: Grading: In your 'FACT SHEET', the following is mentioned: "create a grading exemption for piles and caissons". Can Staff please clarify and explain this new addition; where it came from and what does it mean?

Re: Grading Table: Please clarify the nexus by which the Staff Report's table has allowed for an increase of BY RIGHT grading? The point and intent of the original BHO was that the land would dictate what would be built. How does 2000 cubic yards of BY RIGHT grading address that issue and help to close the grading loophole? 2000 cubic yards represents over 200 trucks traversing the hillsides, many on substandard roadways that have weight restrictions of 6000 pounds and that's just for starters. How does adjusting the formula for maximum grading allowed from 500 cubic yards plus the numeric value equal to 5% of the lot size in cubic yards to "1000 cubic yards plus the numeric value equal to 10% of the lot size in cubic yards help to alleviate the negative impacts of grading hillsides - some of which are 100% slope? Once again, how does this benefit the hillsides and environment as it appears the math doesn't work in favor of the land which was the spirit and intent and PROMISE of the BHO when it was signed in 2011? What about the 1000 cubic yard limit for a Haul Route hearing? How will that work if BY RIGHT grading is changed to 2000 cubic yards?

In context, grading means more than just cubic yards of earth moved or exported... it means loss of wildlife connectivity; loss of open space; loss of community character in neighborhoods and huge negative impacts to public safety. Just last week, the folks in Glassell Park had a concrete truck that fell over in a hillside- the second in a few months. We all know what happened on Loma Vista but at least the City of Beverly Hills has done something about this, albeit court mandated. We know about the recent street collapses on Sunset Plaza Drive and Appian Way which has cost the City millions and counting to fix and repair. Where there is grading - there are 10 wheel or bigger trucks; where there is grading - there are hillsides and environments being changed; where there is grading on these substandard hillside streets- public safety is at stake; where there is grading, whether it be export/import or 'compaction' the impacts are there without mitigations.

While we appreciate the Departments outreach and willingness to work with the various communities and Council offices over the past several months and understand that there will never be a 100% consensus, this Staff Report with respect to the BHO has not fulfilled the mandate as directed by Councilman Koretz; not addressed the issues mentioned in the letter from Councilmembers Ryu and Koretz as to some of the loopholes in the BHO which was the task assigned. We do support the positive changes in the Staff report regarding bringing the FAR of 0.45 to all lots, regardless of size but it appears that with respect to BHO issues, we have a ways to go.

We urge the City Planning Commissioners to review carefully and listen to the hillside representatives from all over the City who have labored over years and the political winds of change to make the promise of the BHO and the BMO come to fruition. We have faith that this can be done and must be done.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Sidlow, Steven Poster/The Lookout Mountain Alliance – Laurel Canyon
Dietrich Nelson/ The Nichols Canyon Neighborhood Association



Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>

File # 14-0656

1 message

Laura Rae-Yates <lradiates@aol.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 5:48 PM

To: zina.cheng@lacity.org

I heard there was to be a meeting about File # 14-0656 tomorrow Tuesday Nov. 29th at City Hall.. We wanted it to be known that we support Councilman Ryu and Councilman Koretz' recommendations about this. We were told to send our thoughts about this to Sharon Dickinson and we did. We got an auto email back saying she was out of town and to contact you. Kindly pass our views on so it will be known for the meeting.

Thank you for your help,

Mort Yates and Laura Rae-Yates