

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

2 messages

Jaimie Korody <jkorody@eclip.com>

Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 2:37 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, jose.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org Cc: afine@laconservancy.org

Dear Councilmembers,

I strongly support the City Planning Commission's recommendations for the BMO/BHO and further strengthening the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

Our neighborhoods are being devastated by mansionization - I urge you to preserve them with this important planning policy.

Sincerely,

Jaimie Korody Santa Monica Canyon

Jaimie Korody <jkorody@eclip.com> To: councilmember.bonin@lacity.org Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 2:39 PM

Dear Councilmember Bonin,

I strongly oppose your recent action to recommend the reinstatement of current measures and loopholes to the revised BMO/BHO. We rely upon your support for the quality of our neighborhoods and this is a direct violation of that trust.

Sincerely,

Jaimie Korody 350 East Rustic Road Santa Monica, CA 90402



CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Alisa schlesinger <aqlisa@hotmail.com>

Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 3:28 PM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org", "jose.huizar@lacity.org" <jose.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org" <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org", "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org", "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org", "paul.koretz@lacity.org", "paul.koretz@lacity.org", "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org", "paul.koretz@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "afine@laconservancy.org", "cafine@laconservancy.org", "afine@laconservancy.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "afine@laconservancy.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "afine@laconservancy.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "afine@laconservancy.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "councilme@lacity.org", "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org", "afine@laconservancy.org", "councilme@laconservancy.org,", "councilme@lacity.org,", "coun

Dear Councilmembers,

I'm writing to ask that you: (1) Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations related to the BMO/BHO and (2) Further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count. Your support is critical to maintaining Los Angeles's older and historic neighborhoods for future generations.

Thank you very much,

Alisa Schlesinger



CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

Deni Mosser <dm@mosserdesign.net>

Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 4:34 PM To: "\"Councilmember José Huizar, Chair\"" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, jose.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, Councilmember Mitchell Englander <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, "Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr." <councilmember.price@lacity.org> Cc: paul.koretz@lacity.org, herb.wesson@lacity.org, "Niall Huffman, Planning Assistant" <Neighborhood.Conservation@lacity.org>, "Sharon Dickinson, Office of City Clerk" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, afine@laconservancy.org

December 2, 2016

Dear PLUM Committee members: Councilmember José Huizar. Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson. Councilmember Gilbert A, Cedillo. Councilmember Mitchell Englander, Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr.

I attended (and spoke at) the Nov. 29 PLUM committee meeting on proposed amendments to the Baseline Mansionization and Hillside Ordinances (BMO/BHO),

I respectfully request that you reconsider your decision, and accept the proposed amendments drafted by City Planning staff and recommended by the City Planning Commission.

Los Angeles neighborhoods need your help! Please support the 0.45 floor area ratio for R-1 zone, and count attached garages in total floor area (no exemption).

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Deni Mosser 8971 W. 24th St. Los Angeles, CA 90034 323-438-8111



#14-0656

1 message

Juan Kivotos <Juan@kmpae.com> To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 5:19 PM

Sharon, hi

After reviewing the New BHO ordinance I have come to the conclusion that the City is not just trying to reduce or control the mansionization process in the City

It is clear the intention to stop all or most of the construction in the hillside areas, it is also clear the politization of the planning department falling under the pressure

Of the residences.

I see many lots that even under the current BHO rules became unbuildable, with the new BHO I see many more will get into that category, lots that are 30' or 40' in width

Has no chance to escape the 45 degree encroachment plane over the 20' feet limitation. Just to mention one, I tried is impossible.

the code has become a prescriptive code in which freedom of design will be dictated by it.

All planning had to do was to control FAR, height thru the envelope, and a few mandatory modulation in the front and side to control building mass,

The whole BHO is nothing but an attempt to eliminate development in medium size lots and some large ones.

It is important to mention that the few hillside lots remaining are the most difficult to build due to its topography, in addition the new requirements from BOE

for street improvements and dedication makes even harder for this lots to be developed creating conditions beyond the reasonable.

In addition the New BHO do not address the access to the residences when they are on a downhill case, which make every department impotent to resolve this simple task

Without going thru a variance process in the planning department. Very costly and time consuming indeed

This is, in my opinion an unbelievable change which resolves nothing but complicates matter more.

I can be contacted thru my cell phone 818-281-1508

Sincerely

Juan M Kivotos

Architect



CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Adam Grossman <grossman7@gmail.com>

Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 6:10 PM

To: paul.koretz@lacity.org, neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, Marlea Gemmel <marleagemmel@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Koretz and PLUM Committee Members,

I am writing to support *less* restrictive rather than *more* restrictive residential zoning in Los Angeles.

I've been a homeowner here for a little more than one year, on Olin Street in Castle Heights. I moved to Los Angeles 4.5 years ago to help found a software and analytics company as a spin-off from RAND in Santa Monica and my former employer. My wife and I bought this house with the intent of eventually doing significant remodeling and expansion to accommodate the family we plan to have. After living in this house for less than a year I was shocked and appalled to learn of the impending restrictions on building a modern home on my property that were being proposed by the city in the name of "anti-mansionization".

First off, I object to this nomenclature; it frames the issue in a way that is completely unfair. Who decides what qualifies as a "mansion"? I live in a 2000 sq.ft bungalow next door to a pair of 2 story, 3400 sq.ft homes on lots that are identical to mine at 5000 sq.ft. We saw them when we first viewed our house and we both thought they were positive additions to the street. In fact, we saw those houses as a sign that the neighbourhood was up and coming, increasing our desire to live here. Furthermore, we moved here specifically because we wanted to eventually build a house similar to those of our (now) neighbours. I would be hard-pressed to agree that these houses are mansions and are somehow unreasonable uses of the land.

Therefore I applaud the decision to restore some exemptions to the calculation of residential floor area.

I would, however, go several steps further. It does not seem reasonable to me to directly restrict living space via controlling RFA. There are many tools that can allow additional flexibility to property owners while still respecting neighbours' desire to have houses not dramatically overshadow theirs. For example, it seems that a complete solution would entail nothing more than set-back requirements from all sides of the lot line combined with a building height restriction and a lot coverage maximum. Aside from the virtue of simplicity, this approach also unleashes the considerable creative forces in this city to innovate new styles of home with different layouts, providing more interesting and livable homes than are generally constructed with the current restrictions.

Another important argument is property value, both relative and absolute. If the BMO is passed in anything like its current form, my property will have legislatively been reduced in value compared to my neighbours'. All because I do not yet have the resources to renovate immediately. In fact, under the proposed restrictions of a FAR of 0.45 with essentially zero exemptions I could not expand my house even one square foot! I wouldn't even have the ability to forgo a garage to gain more living space. This removes a huge incentive to spend tens (or hundreds) of thousands of dollars to remodel without adding square footage, since very little of that cost would come back to us later as a higher sale price. I strenuously object to legislatively being made a financial "loser" by a stroke of fate and pen (much as Proposition 13 did with property taxes). You likely would as well if you were in my position.

I also want to address the concept of "neighbourhood character". While I agree such a thing does exist in some places, I disagree that it exists in Castle Heights in any way relevant to "preservation". This is clearly a neighbourhood in transition. Being situated right next to both Beverlywood and Cheviot Hills, we constantly see a reduction in property value compared to those neighbourhoods - partly because the houses are smaller. That is why people have been building larger homes here, to catch up with their neighbours. That is also why Castle Heights is thoroughly eclectic in house design, size, configuration, and every other parameter imaginable. Most of the houses being replaced are old and are being replaced with precisely the kind of home that young growing families want: spacious, light-filled, and modern.

There are certainly neighbourhoods where there is a visual character worth preserving. In my mind, that is precisely the function played by a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone.

Rezoning new, modern construction out of existence is unfair and punitive. I urge you to stand against restrictive zoning

12/5/2016

City of Los Angeles Mail - CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

rules and allow your constituents to use and improve their property as they see fit.

I would be happy to discuss further with any of you.

Sincerely,

Adam Grossman Marlea Gemmel 9131 Olin Street 650-823-3381