



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

1 message

Nancy Knupfer <nknupferlaw@icloud.com>

Fri. Feb 20. 2015 at 4:34 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. Council Member Koretz <Paul.Koretz@lacity.org>.
councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org. councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org. councilmember.labonge@lacity.org.
councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org. councilmember.parks@lacity.org.
councilmember.price@lacity.org. councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org.
councilmember.englander@lacity.org. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org.
councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org.
councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. michael.logrande@lacity.org.
tom.rothmann@lacity.org. erick.lopez@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers. City Planning and Land Use staff:

The proposed ICO falls far short of it stated purpose. to protect the BEVERLYWOOD area from mansionization. We deserve and demand **the same protection** being offered Faircrest Heights by ICO model G.

The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful permanent reform.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Knupfer
1933 S. Crest Drive
Los Angeles. CA 90034



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

ICO Council File 14-0656 Proposed ICO Is Inadequate

1 message

Ron Friedman <friedman.ron@ca.rr.com>

Fri, Feb 20, 2015 at 2:47 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org. councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org.
councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org.
councilmember.parks@lacity.org. councilmember.price@lacity.org. councilmember.wesson@lacity.org.
councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org.
councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember.

The proposed CD5 ICO falls far short of its stated purpose, to protect Beverlywood from mansionization. We deserve and demand the same protection being offered Faircrest Heights by ICO model G.

The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Sincerely,

Ronald Friedman



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council File 14-0656

1 message

Barbara Edwards <greyhound@sbcglobal.net>

Fri. Feb 20. 2015 at 4:54 PM

Reply-To: Barbara Edwards <greyhound@sbcglobal.net>

To: "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Barbara Edwards



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656 - stopping mansionization

1 message

Shelley Wagers <shelley@wagersmail.net>

Fri, Feb 20, 2015 at 7:49 PM

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

Cc: Councilmember Paul Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. etta.armstrong@lacity.org. Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. sharon.gin@lacity.org

Council File 14-0656

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Re: ICO Documents & Update

1 message

Dena Siegel <denasiegel@yahoo.com>

Fri. Feb 20. 2015 at 8:09 PM

Reply-To: Dena Siegel <denasiegel@yahoo.com>

To: Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>

Cc: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

Dear Mr Bayliss,

Thank you for sending along the proposed ICO. Unfortunately, the model for Beverlywood severely falls short and will not protect Beverlywood from mansionization. Residents of Beverlywood deserve the same protection that Faircrest Heights is offered by ICO model G.

I hope you will do what you can to amend the wording to further protect the historic mid-century neighborhood of Beverlywood.

Thank you,

Dena Siegel
2130 Hillsboro Ave

On Friday, February 13, 2015 5:18 PM. Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org> wrote:

All,

I wanted to send you an update as it relates to the Interim Control Ordinances we have been working on. Attached is the document that contains both the language of the ICO and the maps. Please review at your leisure. The maps for our Lower Council District 5 ICO are a bit tough to read. The area is displayed in the main map. with the borders shown in the following maps. The additional maps are also included that highlight both our other ICO areas. and those of the other Council Districts.

Also, we appear to be headed to PLUM on Tuesday February 24th. The hearings typically start at approx. 2:30PM. With the large amount of interest. combined with a likely long agenda. the PLUM Chair has the option to limit the speaking time.

I am sure we will be in further contact. but I wanted you to have the latest info.

Thank You All very much.

Shawn Bayliss

Director of Planning & Land Use

Office of Councilmember Paul Koretz

(213) 473-7005; Fax: (213) 978-2250
Email: Shawn.Bayliss@lacity.org

For more Council District 5 news, please sign up at <http://cd5.lacity.org/NEWSLETTERSIGNUP/index.htm>.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic mail message and any attachments hereto are intended solely for the review of the designated recipient(s) and originate from the office of Los Angeles City Councilmember Paul Koretz (the "Councilmember"). This message and any attachments may not be used, reviewed, copied, published, disseminated, redistributed, or forwarded without the express written permission of the Councilmember or his Chief of Staff. The information in this electronic mail message and any attachments is confidential and may be privileged. If you are not a designated recipient of this communication or if you have received this communication in error, please contact the sender by reply mail, then destroy any and all copies of this message and attachments and delete them from your system.



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council File 14-0656

1 message

rosanne18@aol.com <rosanne18@aol.com>

Fri. Feb 20. 2015 at 10:59 PM

Cc: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Subj: Council File 14-0656

I am moved to write to you about this matter of utmost importance for our neighborhoods.

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Sincerely.

Rosanne Keynan

homeowner and property owner CD 4 and CD 5
and concerned about all Los Angeles residential neighborhoods

To : Los Angeles City Council

Subj: Council File 14-0656

I am a long time resident of Beverlywood. I've owned the home at 9117 Monte Mar Drive for over 40 years. I am adversely affected by the building of oversized and out of place mansions being built in the area. They block views, reduce green space and adversely affect the character of the neighborhood.

Several years ago I gathered a petition from the people on my street. We presented it to Councilman Koretz but it had no effect.

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes, but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Please include Beverlywood in any mansionization restrictions! My family votes in every local election.

Sincerely,

David Belson, PhD
9117 Monte Mar Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90035
310 916 8995



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

1 message

harold@tominlaw.com <harold@tominlaw.com>

Sat, Feb 21, 2015 at 9:34 AM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org. councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org.
councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. councilmember.martinez@lacity.org.
councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org. councilmember.parks@lacity.org. councilmember.price@lacity.org.
councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org.
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org.
councilmember.englander@lacity.org. michael.logrande@lacity.org. tom.rothmann@lacity.org. erick.lopez@lacity.org

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible Councilman Koretz's proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and in a fully transparent process.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This e-mail and its attachment(s). if any. are a private and confidential attorney communication protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product privilege. They are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above. If you are not an intended recipient. you have received this e-mail in error. in which case. please notify the sender and delete the message. Further. you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited, if you received this email in error.

Harold J. Tomin.
A Law Corporation
146 S. Fuller Ave.
Los Angeles. CA 90036-2810
Tel. 323.939.4997
FAX 323.939.4997



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Considine, Traci <tconsidine@conet.ucla.edu>

Sat. Feb 21. 2015 at 1:29 PM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>, "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>, "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>, "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>, "stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add

400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.

- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Traci Considine

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

McMansionization and Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs)

1 message

Toby horn <thorn626@gmail.com>

Sat. Feb 21. 2015 at 2:29 PM

To: "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>. "councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org>. "councilmember.labonge@lacity.org" <councilmember.labonge@lacity.org>. "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>. "councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org" <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>. "councilmember.parks@lacity.org" <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>. "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>. "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>. "councilmember.english@lacity.org" <councilmember.english@lacity.org>. "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>. "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org" <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>. "michael.logrande@lacity.org" <michael.logrande@lacity.org>. "tom.rothmann@lacity.org" <tom.rothmann@lacity.org>. "erick.lopez@lacity.org" <erick.lopez@lacity.org>
Cc: "Letters@latimes.com" <Letters@latimes.com>

Los Angeles has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. You and the city must move forward on Councilman Koretz's proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and in a fully transparent process.

Please. please expedite!!

Toby Horn
Miracle Mile
thorn626@gmail.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Re: Council File 14-0656

1 message

Edward Lehman <edwardlehman@yahoo.com>

Sat. Feb 21. 2015 at 2:46 PM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>.

"sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>.

"elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>. "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>. "stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single

family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

Ed Lehman
1807 S. Hayworth Av

Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



February 21, 2015

Planning and Land Use Management Committee
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
L.A., CA 90012

**Re: Council File 14-0656
Mansionization ICO proposals**

Dear PLUM Committee Chair Jose Huizar and Members Cedillo and Englander:

Oversized, out-of-scale development continues to wreak havoc throughout Los Angeles due to loopholes in the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance and the Baseline Hillside Ordinance. While the Planning Department's proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) may be of value, they are, as the name says, only temporary. And many affected neighborhoods will still be left without the benefit of even this temporary protection for what is, in fact, a long-term and very wide-ranging crisis in our city.

Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners' Association strongly supports Councilmember Koretz's proposal for permanently closing the loopholes in the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance **and** the Baseline Hillside Ordinance. We urge the City to move forward on this permanent solution with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dohrmann, President
Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners' Association

cc: Councilmember Mike Bonin
Michael LoGrande, Director, LA City Planning
Tom Rothmann, Senior City Planner
Erick Lopez, City Planner



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Dr. Susan Shapiro <drsushap@alumni.uchicago.edu>

Sat, Feb 21, 2015 at 3:08 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly. to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked. short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations. expansions. and new construction that can accommodate modern family life. while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

Dr. Susan Shapiro

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10

Susan Shapiro, PhD, MS, MS, RDN, FAND, CAMS-I

Licensed Psychologist /Registered Dietitian Nutritionist/Disordered Eating Specialist

Certified Anger Management Specialist I

Providing Psychotherapy, Medical Nutrition Therapy & Treatment for Eating Disorders

269 S. Beverly Drive., #812

Beverly Hills, CA 90212

310.659.7800

drsushap@alumni.uchicago.edu

<http://Therapists.PsychologyToday.com/rms/58071>

Disclaimer: Information that is sent via email is not HIPAA compliant or considered confidential or secure. As such. please avoid the use of identifying student/client information when communicating with me. If you wish to email me in a more secure manner. please advise and I will provide the necessary information.



Faircrest Heights Bev Grove ICO vs BMO.pdf

49K

**PRESS PAUSE on Mansionization:
Faircrest Heights Interim Control Ordinance (ICO)
modeled on the Beverly Grove RFA**



What the citywide Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) currently allows

Figures below are based on a 6,000 square foot lot.

- Base floor area ratio (FAR): 50% of lot size 3,000 sq ft
- 20% bonus for "green" building, articulated exterior walls, etc. 600 sq ft
- Attached garage not included in floor area calculation 400 sq ft
- Porches, patios, balconies, etc. not included in floor area calculation 250 sq ft
- Double-height entryways not included in floor area calculation 100 sq ft
- **Maximum total floor area (this example): more than 72% of lot size 4,350 sq ft**

What an ICO based on the Beverly Grove RFA Formula would allow

Figures below are based on a 6,000 square foot lot.

- Base floor area ratio (FAR): 42% of lot size 2,520 sq ft
- Bonus for detached garage: 6% of lot size 360 sq ft
- Additional 2% bonus for construction that incorporates a detached garage and meets one of the following conditions: 120 sq ft
 - Articulate exterior walls or
 - Make second floor 25% smaller than ground floor or
 - Reduce height to 20% below maximum allowed or
 - Make both side yard setbacks at least 2 feet wider than minimum required
- **Maximum total floor area (this example): 50% of lot size 3,000 sq ft**

The Beverly Grove Model is sensible, smart, and successful. As a temporary solution, an ICO modeled on the Beverly Grove RFA will allow reasonable development and stop mansionization. Without it, developers will build houses *almost 50% bigger*.

To sign our online petition, click [here](#).

To order a No More McMansions lawn sign (\$5): email stopmansionization@yahoo.com

For general info: see www.NoMoreMcMansionsInLosAngeles.org



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Frank Considine <frankconsidine@me.com>

Sat, Feb 21, 2015 at 4:57 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands

of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Frank Considine
Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Faircrest Heights Bev Grove ICO vs BMO.pdf
48K

**PRESS PAUSE on Mansionization:
Faircrest Heights Interim Control Ordinance (ICO)
modeled on the Beverly Grove RFA**



What the citywide Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) currently allows

Figures below are based on a 6,000 square foot lot.

- Base floor area ratio (FAR): 50% of lot size 3,000 sq ft
- 20% bonus for "green" building, articulated exterior walls, etc. 600 sq ft
- Attached garage not included in floor area calculation 400 sq ft
- Porches, patios, balconies, etc. not included in floor area calculation 250 sq ft
- Double-height entryways not included in floor area calculation 100 sq ft
- **Maximum total floor area (this example): more than 72% of lot size** **4,350 sq ft**

What an ICO based on the Beverly Grove RFA Formula would allow

Figures below are based on a 6,000 square foot lot.

- Base floor area ratio (FAR): 42% of lot size 2,520 sq ft
- Bonus for detached garage: 6% of lot size 360 sq ft
- Additional 2% bonus for construction that incorporates a detached garage and meets one of the following conditions: 120 sq ft
 - Articulate exterior walls or
 - Make second floor 25% smaller than ground floor or
 - Reduce height to 20% below maximum allowed or
 - Make both side yard setbacks at least 2 feet wider than minimum required
- **Maximum total floor area (this example): 50% of lot size** **3,000 sq ft**

The Beverly Grove Model is sensible, smart, and successful. As a temporary solution, an ICO modeled on the Beverly Grove RFA will allow reasonable development and stop mansionization. Without it, developers will build houses *almost 50% bigger*.

To sign our online petition, click [here](#).

To order a No More McMansions lawn sign (\$5): email stopmansionization@yahoo.com

For general info: see www.NoMoreMcMansionsInLosAngeles.org



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)1 message

Monika Hummer <monikahummer@ca.rr.com>

Sat, Feb 21, 2015 at 5:01 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

- 1) **Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**
- 2) **Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**
 - Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
 - Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
 - Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.

- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Monika Hummer

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council File 14-0656

1 message

Sanford Jacoby <sjacoby@anderson.ucla.edu>
Reply-To: sjacoby@anderson.ucla.edu
To: sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Sat. Feb 21. 2015 at 5:41 PM

Hello,

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes, but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

We in Rancho Park are not part of any ICO. Yet we are suffering -- SUFFERING! -- from a spate of McMansions that are monstrosities.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Hurry. We are hurting. Please do something for us now.

Sincerely yours,

Sanford Jacoby
Rancho Park



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subject: PLUM meeting re mansionization on 2/24/15

1 message

Carole Sack <caroles57@att.net>

Sat. Feb 21. 2015 at 6:02 PM

Reply-To: Carole Sack <caroles57@att.net>

To: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Cc: "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Councilman Paul Koretz proposed 9 months ago a simple, effective and permanent fix for a citywide mansionization Order. I strongly urge you to immediately implement his proposed amendments to the BMO. I live in the Beverly Grove area of Los Angeles. After years of struggle, we were able to have an Ordinance enacted to stop the greedy builders and architects from further destroying the beauty of our neighborhood. Unfortunately, way too many of our houses were torn down and quickly replaced by ugly, oversized monstrosities. Now these people are moving into other areas of our city and are doing the same thing. Please do what you can to speedily and permanently stop this from happening.

Thank you.

Carole Sackley

6647 Drexel Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90048



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

dana pehrson <pixiepunum@mac.com>

Sat. Feb 21. 2015 at 8:02 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. Liz Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

Dana Pehrson
Faircrest Heights
CD10
pixiepunum@mac.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Lorraine Kirsten <lokirsten@hotmail.com>

Sat, Feb 21, 2015 at 10:08 PM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>, "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>, "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>, "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>, "stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

"stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Kirsten

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council File 14-0656

1 message

Jeff Marsh <jeffmarsh5@ca.rr.com>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 9:35 AM

To: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org.
councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org.
michael.logrande@lacity.org. alan.bell@lacity.org. tom.rothmann@lacity.org. erick.lopez@lacity.org

Subj: Council File 14-0656

The city has developed an ICO to help protect my neighborhood (Lower Council District 5) from mansionization. Good as far as it goes, but the ICO is a short-term fix for a long-term problem.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Mark Langlois <markslanglois@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 9:44 AM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>. "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>. "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>

Re: [Council File 14-0656](#)

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

- 1) **Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**
- 2) **Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**
 - Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
 - Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
 - Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
 - Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished and replaced with behemoth buildings in those 18 months.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments.

Sincerely,

Mark Langlois & Aaron Reza
Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

William Higgins <whiggs@mac.com>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 9:58 AM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org.
sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org.
andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.damell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org.
shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands

of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

William Higgins
Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: ADOPT THE FAIRCREST HEIGHTS ICO and AMEND THE BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Yvonne Smith <yesmith98@ca.rr.com>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 11:50 AM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: "-" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly. to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked. short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations. expansions. and new construction that can accommodate modern family life. while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

NAME.

Yvonne E. Smith

Of

Neighbors United/Faircrest Heights

Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Dean Pertion <daperton@pacbell.net>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 12:25 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has proved completely inadequate at achieving the intended goal of establishing sensible redevelopment. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from

being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Dean A. Perton, Architect

1604 Hi Point Street
Los Angeles, CA 90035
323.528.8760

Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Emily Woodward <emwoodward@pacbell.net>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 1:04 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee,

The Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has proved completely inadequate at achieving the intended goal of establishing sensible redevelopment. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide and also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but ICOs are only temporary and protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

- 1) **Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**
- 2) **Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**
 - Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
 - Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
 - Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
 - Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could and should be discussed and adopted quickly to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,
Emily Woodward

2/23/2015

City of Los Angeles Mail - STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1604 Hi Point Street
Los Angeles, CA 90035
323.528.3173

Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Beth Marlis <bethnic@me.com>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 1:05 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear Esteemed Members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed, and requires significant and immediate restructuring. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

Therefore, I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with out of scale McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while

respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

An 18 month timeframe to amend the BMO is unacceptable for Los Angeles. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe. I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Beth Marlis
Faircrest Heights Resident
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Kathleen Clark <katclarkfoto@aol.com>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 1:54 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, sharon.gin@lacity.org, Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org, elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org, andrew.westall@lacity.org, john.darnell@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, joan.pelico@lacity.org, shawn.bayliss@lacity.org, mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, yvonne.farrow@lacity.org
Cc: stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear Esteemed Members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed, and requires significant and immediate restructuring. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

Therefore, I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with out of scale McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

An 18 month timeframe to amend the BMO is unacceptable for Los Angeles. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Clark
Faircrest Heights Resident
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council File 14-0656 - Baseline Mansionization Ordinance

1 message

Fred Larian <fredlarian@sbcglobal.net>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 2:12 PM

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org.
councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org. councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. councilmember.koretz@lacity.org.
councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org. councilmember.parks@lacity.org.
councilmember.price@lacity.org. councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org.
councilmember.englander@lacity.org. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org.
councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Cc: shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org.
alan.bell@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers.

Do you disagree with Mr. Richard Blumenbtrg's letter included in the attached article? If so, on what basis? Isn't it true that the County Assessor's office assesses property values largely based on square footage? Wouldn't smaller houses result in lower assessed values, thus lower revenues for the city? Shouldn't our wonderful city enact incentives for attracting investments to rebuild the old and dilapidated houses? Don't the draft ordinances overreach or do they strike a balance between competing interests?

Please carefully evaluate the negative impact these ordinances will have, including on the very homeowners who are asking you to approve them.

Thank you.

Fred Larian

 SKMBT_42315021715150.pdf
141K

Proposed Ordinance to Slash Property Values?

By FRANCES SHARPE

Editor-in-Chief 2-12-15
Pacifiades Post

A proposed interim ordinance limiting "mansionization" in the city of Los Angeles could substantially reduce the allowable size of new construction homes in Pacific Palisades.

"This could greatly impact home values in the Palisades, and it could happen within a matter of weeks," said Pacific Palisades architect Richard Blumenberg, who is president of the Pacific Palisades Civic League.

In November 2014, the City Council voted 15-0 on an interim ordinance tightening the existing limits on mansionization in nine L.A. communities. The Palisades was not one of the nine neighborhoods.

Now Councilmember Paul Koretz, who authored the ordinance, is seeking to have it implemented as a citywide interim control, Blumenberg said.

The ordinance would eliminate exemptions in the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO), which went into effect in 2008.

The motion states: "The backbone of our city's single-family neighborhoods are modest-sized

lots, with modest-sized homes. These neighborhoods are integral to the city's history, as they have provided a consistent presence for our families and economic growth. And despite its good intentions, the BMO has shown to have vulnerabilities that threaten the cohesion of our single-family neighborhoods."

Koretz's motion seeks to reduce the allowable area of a home to a maximum of 45-50 percent of the lot size, regardless of the lot size.

The proposed changes would have the greatest impact on smaller lots of 5,000-6,000 square feet.

This is the typical size of many of the original lots in the Palisades, particularly in the Alphabet Streets, Via Mesa, Via Bluffs and El Medio Bluffs, according to Blumenberg.

As an example, Blumenberg said that if the interim ordinance passes, the maximum allowable area on a 5,000-square-foot lot would be 2,100 square feet plus a 400-square-foot garage.

On that same lot, current Palisades guidelines allow for a maximum area of 3,000 square feet plus a 400-square-foot garage.

In a letter to Councilmember

(Continued on page 5)

Anti-Mansionization Interim Ordinance to Slash Palisades Property Values?

(Continued from page 1)

Mike Bonin strongly opposing the proposed interim ordinance, Blumenberg wrote that this is "too small for the families that want to move into our area." (See Blumenberg's full letter in the Letters to the Editor on page 2.)

The 900-square-foot difference would also greatly decrease a home's potential value.

Consider that the average price per square foot of a home in the Palisades in January 2015 was \$936, per Coldwell Banker realtor Michael Edlen.

This could mean a difference of \$842,000 in a 5,000-square-foot lot's potential value.

On behalf of the PPCL, Blumenberg is asking Bonin to vote no on the interim ordinance or to exempt the Palisades if it is passed.

As an interim ordinance, it would be in effect for a specific period of time — several months most likely — while the Council drafts a more permanent set of rules.

He said the PPCL will be discussing the ordinance in detail at its meeting on Monday, Feb. 23 at 7 p.m. at Thuxte Hall in the Community United Methodist Church, 801 Via de la Paz.

CURRENT GUIDELINES

5,000-square-foot lot

Maximum Allowable Area:

3,400 (including 400-square-foot garage)

Average Price Per Square Foot:

\$936

Total Potential Value:

\$3,182,400

INTERIM ORDINANCE

5,000-square-foot lot

Maximum Allowable Area:

2,500 (including 400-square-foot garage)

Average Price Per Square Foot:

\$936

Total Potential Value:

\$2,340,000



CURRENT GUIDELINES



NEW ORDINANCE

Average price per square foot data per Michael Edlen.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

2-12-15

The Palisades Post invites letters to the editor. The editors retain the right to delete portions considered libelous and to shorten letters that are too long. Letters in the Palisades Post do not necessarily reflect the newspaper's opinion. Letters must include name, email address and phone number.

A Letter to Councilmember Bonin Regarding a Proposed Interim Anti-Mansionization Ordinance

As the president of the Pacific Palisades Civic League (PPCL), which approves designs for approximately 4,000 properties in Tract 9300, we strongly oppose the proposed Interim Ordinance, which would limit the area to a maximum of 45 percent or 50 percent of the lot and eliminate many of the exemptions (including the garage) for the allowable area calculation. This would result in an allowable area of 2,100 square feet (plus a 400 square-foot garage) for our 5,000 square-foot lots, which is too small for the families that would want to move into our area.

Everyone's property values would be decimated and there would be an unfair balance between those who have larger houses and those who cannot live them in the future.

After many public meetings and workshops, we developed our guidelines in the 1990s to combat the over-building that was occurring in our area. Our guidelines allowed a maximum area of 2,000 square feet plus 28 percent of the lot area. The resulting house size for a 5,000 square-foot lot was 3,000 square feet plus a 400 square-foot garage. We reduced massing by requiring that the second floor be no more than 40 percent of the maximum area and required additional setbacks for the second floor. Building height was limited to an envelope of 22 feet at the setback line sloping up to a maximum height of 28 feet. The implementation of our guidelines has resulted in appropri-

ately sized dwellings in our area for the last 25 years.

The only projects we have difficulty getting comply with our guidelines are those in a Coast zone, which the City chose not to include in the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO). The City should be working on getting those properties in the Coastal Zone but not those on the water, included under the jurisdiction of the BHO and BMO.

I worked closely with Erick Lopez of Planis when the City was developing the BMO. Some of our guidelines were incorporated into the final ordinance. I would be more than happy to join any committee that is working to implement changes to the BMO and BHO.

The proposed Interim ordinance is a rush to something, without proper analysis or thought of consequences, to combat the current out-of-control building activity. The building area is not the cause of the impact of these over-sized dwellings. This is due to the 33- or 36-foot high massing which is allowed at the setback line, without any relief to the neighboring properties.

We ask that you do not vote for these proposed changes, and if you do, then to exclude Tract 93 from these requirements.

Richard Blumenberg, A
President, Pacific Palisades Civic League

Proposed Ordinance to Slash Property Values?

By FRANCES SHARPE

Editor in Chief 2-12-15
Palisades Post

A proposed interim ordinance in the city of Los Angeles could substantially reduce the allowable size of new construction homes in Pacific Palisades.

"This could greatly impact home values in the Palisades, and it could happen within a matter of weeks," said Palisades architect Richard Blumenberg, who is president of the Pacific Palisades Civic League.

In November 2014, the City Council voted 15-0 on an interim ordinance tightening the existing limits on mansionization in nine L.A. communities. The Palisades was not one of the nine neighborhoods.

Now Councilmember Paul Koretz, who authored the ordinance, is seeking to have it implemented as a citywide interim control, Blumenberg said.

The ordinance would eliminate exemptions in the Base-line Mansionization Ordinance (BMO), which went into effect in 2008.

The motion states, "The backbone of our city's single-family neighborhoods are modest-sized

lots, with modest-sized homes. These neighborhoods are integral to the city's history, as they have provided a consistent presence for our families and economic growth. And despite its good intentions, the BMO has shown to have vulnerabilities that threaten the cohesion of our single-family neighborhoods."

Koretz's motion seeks to reduce the allowable area of a home to a maximum of 45-50 percent of the lot size, regardless of the lot size.

The proposed change would have the greatest impact on smaller lots of 5,000-6,000 square feet.

This is the typical size of many of the original lots in the Palisades, particularly in the Alphabet Streets, Via Mesa, Via Bluffs and El Medio Bluffs, according to Blumenberg.

As an example, Blumenberg said that if the interim ordinance passes, the maximum allowable area on a 5,000-square-foot lot would be 2,100 square feet plus a 400-square-foot garage.

On that same lot, current Palisades guidelines allow for a maximum area of 3,000 square feet plus a 400-square-foot garage.

In a letter to Councilmember (Continued on page 5)

Anti-Mansionization Interim Ordinance to Slash Palisades Property Values?

(Continued from page 1)

Mike Bonin strongly opposing the proposed interim ordinance, Blumenberg wrote that this is "too small for the families that want to move into our area." (See Blumenberg's full letter in the Letters to the Editor on page 2.)

The 900-square-foot difference would also greatly decrease a home's potential value.

Consider that the average price per square foot of a home in the Palisades in January 2015 was \$936, per Coldwell Banker realtor Michael Eden.

This could mean a difference of \$842,000 in a 5,000-square-foot lot's potential value.

On behalf of the PPCL, Blumenberg is asking Bonin to vote no on the interim ordinance or to exempt the Palisades if it is passed.

As an interim ordinance, it would be in effect for a specific period of time — several months most likely — while the Council drafts a more permanent set of rules.

He said the PPCL will be discussing the ordinance in detail at its meeting on Monday, Feb. 23 at 7 p.m. at Tauke Hall in the Community United Methodist Church, 801 Yiu de la Paz.

CURRENT GUIDELINES

5,000-square-foot lot

Maximum Allowable Area:

3,400 (including 400 square-foot garage)

Average Price Per Square Foot:

\$936

Total Potential Value:

\$3,182,400



CURRENT GUIDELINES

INTERIM ORDINANCE

5,000-square-foot lot

Maximum Allowable Area:

2,500 (including 400 square-foot garage)

Average Price Per Square Foot:

\$936

Total Potential Value:

\$2,340,000



NEW ORDINANCE

Average price per square foot data per Michael Eden.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

2-12-15

The Palisades Post invites letters to the editor. The editors retain the right to delete portions considered libelous and to shorten letters that are too long. Letters in the Palisades Post do not necessarily reflect the newspaper's opinion. Letters must include name, email address and phone number.

A Letter to Councilmember Bonin Regarding a Proposed Interim Anti-Mansionization Ordinance

As the president of the Pacific Palisades Civic League (PPCL), which approves designs for approximately 4,000 properties in Tract 9300, we strongly oppose the proposed Interim Ordinance, which would limit the area to a maximum of 45 percent or 50 percent of the lot and eliminate many of the exemptions (including the garage) for the allowable area calculation. This would result in an allowable area of 2,100 square feet (plus a 400 square-foot garage) for our 5,000 square-foot lots, which is too small for the families that would want to move into our area.

Everyone's property values would be decimated and there would be an unfair balance between those who have larger houses and those who cannot have them in the future.

After many public meetings and workshops, we developed our guidelines in the 1990s to combat the over-building that was occurring in our area. Our guidelines allowed a maximum area of 2,000 square feet plus 28 percent of the lot area. The resulting house size for a 5,000 square-foot lot was 3,000 square feet plus a 400 square-foot garage. We reduced massing by requiring that the second floor be no more than 40 percent of the maximum area and required additional setbacks for the second floor. Building height was limited to an envelope of 22 feet at the setback line sloping up to a maximum height of 28 feet. The implementation of our guidelines has resulted in appropri-

ately sized dwellings in our area for the last 25 years.

The only projects we have difficulty getting comply with our guidelines are those in a Coast zone, which the City chose not to include in the Base-line Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO). The City should be working on getting those properties in the Coastal Zone but not those on the water, included under the jurisdiction of the BHO and BMO.

I worked closely with Erick Lopez of Planni when the City was developing the BMO. Some of our guidelines were incorporated into the final Ordinance. I would be more than happy to join any committee that is working to implement changes to the BMO and BHO.

The proposed Interim ordinance is a rush to something, without proper analysis or thought of consequences, to combat the current out-of-scale building activity. The building area is not the cause the impact of these over-sized dwellings. This is due to the 33- or 36-foot high massing which is allowed be at the setback line, without any relief in the neighboring properties.

We ask that you do not vote for these proposed changes, and if you do, then to exclude Tract 93 from these requirements.

Richard Blumenberg, A
President, Pacific Palisades Civic League



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

PLUM HEARING 2/24/15 2:30 PM ICO COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

1 message

Carol Spencer <cc_neighborhood@earthlink.net>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 4:47 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org. councilmember.blumenfeld@lacity.org. councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org. councilmember.parks@lacity.org. councilmember.price@lacity.org. councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org
Cc: etta.armstrong@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

February 23, 2015

Honorable Council Members and Planning Staff:

Pervasive mansionization has been taking place across our city. The bonuses in the original Baseline Mansionization Ordinance that were given to promote better design while helping out the environment resulted in nothing more than massive structures that tower over their neighbors to the detriment of established communities.

For this reason, the Board of Directors of Comstock Hills Homeowners Association embraces the Koretz ICO Model D designed for Lower Council District 5. This model will help protect my neighborhood, Comstock Hills, just north of Century City, from this unfettered mansionization. We support our placement under the umbrella of Model D in this ICO and urge you to pass the proposed Interim Control Ordinance that will be in place for 24 months.

We further support Councilman Koretz's efforts to achieve a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to this problem. We urge you to move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process. We seek a permanent citywide ordinance that will come into effect as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,

Caroline Spencer, VP Comstock Hills Homeowners Assn
10316 Wilkins Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90024
310-201-4911



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council file 14-0656

1 message

David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 5:01 PM

Reply-To: David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

To: Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Please distribute the attached letter to the PLUM Committee and post it as a
Communication from the Public.

David Garfinkle

BMO Revision, Council File 14-0656.pdf
107K

February 21, 2015

Councilman Huizar
Councilman Englander
Councilman Cedillo

Subject: **Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Revisions**
Council File 14-0656

I was one of the citizen stakeholders most involved in the development of the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance. I recognized at the time that there were potential shortfalls in the ordinance; those shortfalls have become more critical in recent months. Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process. The Planning Department has issued a report outlining the required corrections to the ordinance. The estimated time of 18 months to formalize the ordinance revisions makes no sense. Working with the City Attorney's office, the revised ordinance should be ready for City Council review in a matter of a few months.

Instead, the City has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. That may provide some protection for specific neighborhoods, but the ICOs are a short-term, neighborhood-specific, fix for a long-term citywide problem. The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform. **Approve these interim steps, but charge the Planning Department with providing an expedited revision to the ordinance.**

David Garfinkle

For identification purposes only:

President, Tarzana Property Owners Association

Chairman, Tarzana Neighborhood Council Land Use Committee

Chairman, Melody Acres Neighborhood Association

cc. Councilman Blumenfield
Cesar D. Diaz



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

TPOA Letter for PLUM, Council File 14-0656

1 message

David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 5:20 PM

Reply-To: David R Garfinkle <drgarfinkle@sbcglobal.net>

To: Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Please distribute the attached letter from the Tarzana Property Owners Association to the PLUM Committee and post it as a Communication from the Public.

David Garfinkle

President. Tarzana Property Owners Association



TPOA PLUM Committee Mansionization letter.docx

15K

Tarzana Property Owners Association

February 21, 2015

Councilman Huizar
Councilman Englander
Councilman Cedillo

Subject: **Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Revisions**
Council File 14-0656

The Tarzana Property Owners Association recognizes that there are significant shortfalls in the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance; those shortfalls have become more critical in recent months. Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward and expedite his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO as a high priority item. The Planning Department has issued a report outlining the required corrections to the ordinance. The estimated time of 18 months to formalize the ordinance revisions is unacceptable given the urgency of the situation. Working with the City Attorney's office, the revised ordinance should be ready for City Council review in a matter of a few months.

Instead, the City has developed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. That may provide some protection for specific neighborhoods, but the ICOs are a short-term, neighborhood-specific, fix for a long-term citywide problem. The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform. The Tarzana Property Owners Association urges the PLUM **to approve these interim steps, but to charge the Planning Department with providing an expedited revision to the ordinance.**

David Garfinkle
President, Tarzana Property Owners Association

cc. Councilman Blumenfield
Cesar D. Diaz



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Stop Oversized Homes

1 message

UKBlue <UKBlue@prodigy.net>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 5:51 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org. councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. constanceellen@sbcglobal.net. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org

Subj: Council File 14-0656

Pervasive mansionization has taken place across our City. The bonuses in the original Baseline Mansionization Ordinance that were meant to promote better design and help the environment have led to massive structures that tower over their neighbors to the detriment of established communities. For this reason, the Board of Directors of Comstock Hills Homeowners Association embraces the Koretz ICO **Model D** designed for Lower Council District 5. It is a reasonable fit for our neighborhood just north of Century City, and it will **close the loopholes** that have allowed these oversized structures to be built. We urge you to pass the proposed Interim Control Ordinance that will be in place for 24 months.

We also support Councilmember Koretz's efforts to achieve a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to this problem. We urge you to move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Very truly yours,

Janie & Paul Marlowe

1417 Warnall Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90024

Comstock Hills Homeowners' Association Member



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

1 message

ROCHELLE VENTURA <rdventura@aol.com>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 9:58 PM

To: councilmember.englisher@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Englisher:

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

I would appreciate your support and efforts to expedite the adoption of the amendments to the BMO proposed by Councilmember Koretz as quickly as possible to protect the many lovely residential neighborhoods in the City of Los Angeles.

Thank you.

ROCHELLE VENTURA

phone: 323.930.0217

rdventura@aol.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

1 message

ROCHELLE VENTURA <rdventura@aol.com>

Sun, Feb 22, 2015 at 9:58 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.gin@lacity.org, etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Huizar:

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes, but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

I would appreciate your support and efforts to expedite the adoption of the amendments to the BMO proposed by Councilmember Koretz as quickly as possible to protect the many lovely residential neighborhoods in the City of Los Angeles.

Thank you.

ROCHELLE VENTURA

phone: 323.930.0217

rdventura@aol.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

1 message

ROCHELLE VENTURA <rdventura@aol.com>

Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 9:58 PM

To: councilmember.english@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember English:

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

I would appreciate your support and efforts to expedite the adoption of the amendments to the BMO proposed by Councilmember Koretz as quickly as possible to protect the many lovely residential neighborhoods in the City of Los Angeles.

Thank you.

ROCHELLE VENTURA

phone: 323.930.0217

rdventura@aol.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Written testimony for Feb. 24, 2015, PLUM meeting on CF 14-0656 (Mansionization)

1 message

Richard Platkin <rhplatkin@gmail.com>

Mon. Feb 23, 2015 at 12:26 AM

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: michael.logrande@lacity.org. Council Member Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>.

councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>. Erick Lopez <erick.lopez@lacity.org>. tom.rothmann@lacity.org. Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "Darnell. John" <john.darnell@lacity.org>

February 22, 2015

To: Los Angeles City Council Planning and Land Use Committee**From:** Richard Platkin. Beverly Wilshire Homes Association6400 W. 5th Street. Los Angeles. CA 90048-4710

Tel. 213-308-6354. rhplatkin@gmail.com

Subject: Council File 14-0656 (Mansionization)

Proposed Actions: The Los Angeles City Council should finally, completely, and unambiguously implement Councilmember Paul Koretz's adopted Council Motion (attached as *Koretz Amendment Motion 04-0656*) to remove the exceptions and bonuses from the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) that permit mansionization. To comply with the intent and specifics of Councilmember Koretz's motion, two immediate actions are necessary:

First, remove any ICO categories that retain the BMO's exceptions and bonuses. To do this, the draft ICO ordinance(s) should be revised as follows:

These communities in ICO categories B (South Hollywood, LaBrea- Hancock, Miracle Mile, and Larchmont Heights) and E (Beverlywood, Inner Council District 5, and Fairfax Area) retain the exception and bonus loopholes that Councilmember Koretz's Council Motion intended to eliminate from the BMO. To remedy this error, these communities should be added to either Category D (Lower Council District 5.

Kentwood. and Mar Vista/East Venice) or Category G (Faircrest Heights).

Second, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance should be immediately cleaned-up according to the specifics spelled out in the original City Council motion. This means removing the BMO's exceptions and bonuses since the Beverly Wilshire Homes Association has previously submitted rigorous documentation demonstrating that these provisions permit the over-sized and out-of-character houses that the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance was intended to prevent.

Reasons: As a professional city planner, member of the Beverly Wilshire Homes Association board, and advocate for compatible development for the past decade, I submit these seven reasons that underscore the importance of my two recommended actions:


1. The adopted Los Angeles General Plan, including the General Plan Framework Element and relevant Community Plans, and the City Planning Commission's approved Do Real Planning policy statement all explicitly oppose mansionization, including permitting McMansions through exceptions and bonuses that undermine anti-mansionization ordinances. These anti-mansionization policies are compiled in the attached document (*Rights of Homeowners Opposed to McMansions*).
2. The Beverly Wilshire Homes Association has already submitted a strikeout version of the amended Baseline Mansionization Ordinance aligned with Councilmember Koretz's motion. This strikeout version is attached to this memo (*Baseline Mansionization Ordinance Final with proposed amendments to stop mansionization*). It demonstrates that cleaning up this defective ordinance is simple and straightforward.
3. The Beverly Wilshire Homes has already submitted a related discussion document identifying the planning and environmental issues affected by Baseline Mansionization Ordinance's amendments. This document is also attached to this memo (*BMO Amendment Issues Memo for CD 5*).
4. The Department of City Planning's 18-month work program for amending the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance is unjustified. Based on published research conducted by the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times, it will allow the teardown of *several thousand* single-family homes. Furthermore, the reasons that City Planning offers for this prolonged work program are not credible: legal, environmental, and Neighborhood Council reviews. First, the City Attorney has already extensively reviewed the BMO and the ICO. Removing the BMO's loopholes simplifies these existing legal reviews. Second, as already documented in the Categorical Exemption for the ICO, single-family homes are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), both individually and cumulatively. Third, the Department of City Planning does not send draft ordinances to Neighborhood Councils for their review.
5. The Interim Control Ordinances that the PLUM Committee is considering leave most Los Angeles neighborhoods unprotected from mansionization. This is because the ICO's only cover about 11 percent of the city's single-family homes. It also because seven of the 20 ICO communities will continue to be mansionized because their ICOs


retain self-defeating exceptions and bonuses.


6. The Department of City Planning's proposal to address Councilmember Koretz's motion to remove the BMO's loopholes through re-CODE LA will allow the extensive mansionization of LA's residential neighborhood to continue for many years. First, re-CODE LA was never mentioned in the original Council motion. Second, re-CODE LA is a five-year program, while the amendments to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance could and should be prepared and adopted in a period of months, not years. Third, the final re-CODE LA work product is unknown, and there is no guarantee that it would simply and effectively stop the mansionization of LA's neighborhoods.
7. By retaining some of the BMO's exceptions and bonuses, the proposed ICO will perpetuate a uniquely damaging feature of the BMO. It is the only land use process in Los Angeles that adds square footage to a project through a totally secret, non-appealable Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety ministerial review and approval process, rather than through an open and appealable discretionary approval process managed by the Department of City Planning.

Richard (Dick) Platkin, AICP
rhplatkin@gmail.com
Tel. 213-308-6354

5 attachments

 **Koretz BMO Amendment motion 14-0656_mot_05-16-14.pdf**
593K

 **Rights of Homeowners opposed to McMansions.pdf**
436K

 **Baseline_Mansionalization_Ordinance_Final with proposed amendments to stop mansionization 0913.pdf**
475K

 **BMO amendment issues memo for CD 5 (2).pdf**
138K

 **Platkin mansionization memo for PLUM Feb 22 2015 PDF.pdf**
66K



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

ICO's, Council File 14-0656

1 message

Maureen Gilman <msgilrmb5@mac.com>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 6:52 AM

To: etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Subj: Council File 14-0656

The proposed ICO falls far short of its stated purpose, to protect Beverlywood from mansionization. We deserve and demand the same protection being offered Faircrest Heights.

The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Maureen Gilman
2027 Castle Heights Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90034
310-839-3788



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Leif Pehrson <konceptz@mac.com>

Mon, Feb 23, 2015 at 7:37 AM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>. "councilmember.english@lacity.org" <councilmember.english@lacity.org>
 Cc: "council-member.wesson@lacity.org" <council-member.wesson@lacity.org>. "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>. "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>. "andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>. "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>. "paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>. "shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>. "yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>. "stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

- 1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Leif Pehrson

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council File 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:50 AM

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

From: **Barbara Edwards** <greyhound@sbcglobal.net>
Date: Fri. Feb 20. 2015 at 4:53 PM
Subject: Council File 14-0656
To: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes. but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago. Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple. effective. and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Barbara Edwards

Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org



To : Los Angeles City Council

Subj: Council File 14-0656

I am a long time resident of Beverlywood. I've owned the home at 9117 Monte Mar Drive for over 40 years. I am adversely affected by the building of oversized and out of place mansions being built in the area. They block views, reduce green space and adversely affect the character of the neighborhood.

Several years ago I gathered a petition from the people on my street. We presented it to Councilman Koretz but it had no effect.

The city has developed ICOs to help protect some neighborhoods from mansionization. Good as far as it goes, but the ICOs are a short-term neighborhood-specific fix for a long-term citywide problem.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Please include Beverlywood in any mansionization restrictions! My family votes in every local election.

Sincerely,

David Belson, PhD
9117 Monte Mar Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90035
310 916 8995



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Holmby Westwood's Board of Directors and residents urge you to support Item 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:53 AM

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

From: **Gary Reuben** <greuben@pacbell.net>

Date: Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 5:20 PM

Subject: Holmby Westwood's Board of Directors and residents urge you to support Item 14-0656

To: "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. Council Member Krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>. "councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>. "Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org" <Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org>. "councilmember.parks@lacity.org" <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>. "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>. Englander Mitch <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "erick.lopez@lacity.org" <erick.lopez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>. "councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org" <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>. "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>. "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>. "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org" <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>. Michael LoGrande <michael.logrande@lacity.org>. Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>. "tom.rothmann@lacity.org" <tom.rothmann@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
Cc: Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee Members. Los Angeles City Councilmembers. and Planning Department Officials;

The residents of Holmby Westwood have worked tirelessly for the past 7 years to establish a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone in our community. thereby preserving our historic identity and our property values. In the meantime. we have seen the loss of many gracious homes replaced by huge boxlike structures which tower over their 2 story neighbors and which stick out like "sore thumbs". The motion (Item 14-0656) to be heard by PLUM (allowing a moratorium on demolition and new construction in 5 proposed HPOZs including Holmby Westwood) on Tuesday. February 25th is the first ray of hope that we will be able to reach our goal - design review of all new construction. exterior additions and remodels as seen from the street. Our concerns are massing. scale and compatibility within a community meticulously planned and established in 1926. Our community has been and is now home to some of the most prominent residents of Los Angeles who care deeply about maintaining the charm and dignity of their neighborhoods.

Please help us preserve the character that drew our residents to want to spend their lives in Holmby Westwood. Please support the motion 14-0656 on Tuesday at the Planning and Land Use Management hearing and also when the motion goes to City Council for its approval. Our community is counting on you to help us establish our HPOZ.

Thank you all.

Susan Reuben
Vice President. Holmby Westwood Property Owners Association

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:54 AM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Oved Fattal** <ofattal1@gmail.com>

Date: Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 8:34 PM

Subject: Opposed to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org

Dear Ms Sharon Gin.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance which is on the February 24. 2015 agenda for the Planning and Land Use Meeting. In particular, I am very troubled by the rapid expansion of the ordinance from 5 to 15 areas across in many parts of the city over a scant 3 month period of time without adequate time for public input or comments. While I realize that there are concerns regarding overbuilding in residential areas in some sections of the city. I also recognize a myriad of benefits which come from increasing the quality and value of residential housing as it affects the schools, roads, and other city services which directly benefit my quality of life. Such an important decision should only be considered after an appropriate period of public deliberation.

Sincerely,

Oved Fattal, M.D.

10446 Wilkins Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90024

Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:54 AM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Kevin Singer** <kevin@receivershipspecialists.com>

Date: Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 9:48 PM

Subject: Interim Control Ordinance

To: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Dear Ms Sharon Gin,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance which is on the February 24, 2015 agenda for the Planning and Land Use Meeting. In particular, I am very troubled by the rapid expansion of the ordinance from 5 to 15 areas across in many parts of the city over a scant 3 month period of time without adequate time for public input or comments. While I realize that there are concerns regarding overbuilding in residential areas in some sections of the city, I also recognize a myriad of benefits which come from increasing the quality and value of residential housing as it affects the schools, roads, and other city services which directly benefit my quality of life. Such an important decision should only be considered after an appropriate period of public deliberation.

Sincerely,

Kevin Singer

10320 Almayo Ave. #4

Los Angeles CA 90064

The information contained in this e-mail message may be privileged, confidential, and protected from disclosure. This information may not be shared with other people or posted in an electronic format for anyone else to read. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you think that you have received this e-mail message in error, please e-mail the sender

Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Anti-Mansionization Interim Control Ordinance (Item No. 14-0656)

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:55 AM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Diane Gross** <gross.diane@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 11:11 PM

Subject: Anti-Mansionization Interim Control Ordinance (Item No. 14-0656)

To: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Dear Sharon Gin.

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) which is on the February 24, 2015 agenda for the Planning and Land Use Meeting. As a longtime resident and owner of a single family residence in Lower Council District 5. I have tried to follow information concerning proposed changes to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance. including information received from our local tract association and neighborhood council. I was mystified to learn that the ICO (which I read and reviewed in December) that originally included only 5 areas was suddenly changed in the February 2015 report to include my area among the 10 additional areas added. In an effort to learn more about this proposed ICO. I searched the internet. the website for the Department of Planning. and the website for the City of Los Angeles. and could only find the proposed ordinance after receiving the file number from Paul Koretz's field deputy. For such a significant change to your constituents' property values. I would expect that this proposed Ordinance would be more publicly accessible. Additionally. I cannot find the time of the PLUM on February 24 on the City Planning website. Was notice of this meeting ever posted and if so. please send me the posting and the date of the posting so that I can ensure that due process was been followed?

This ICO represents a significant and important change affecting the value of my property and ultimately the quality of my daughters' public schools and other city services which we rely on in our daily life. Such an important decision deserves time and public consideration. not a hastily added amendment to an ordinance occurring over just a 2 month period. I am also disturbed that this ICO could be in effect for a long two years. while the City figures out a more permanent zoning plan.

Moreover. I am deeply troubled by how the restrictions are so varied across the city and even within the boundaries of council district 5. Specifically areas such as garages. covered breezeways. and other bonuses to the building allowance are treated differently across the district. I am completely at a loss to understand this differential treatment among neighboring communities. As an owner of a relatively small lot (6250 sq. ft). there are great impacts in limiting the size of building on my property. With this ICO and the fact that

garages are now counted as residential floor area. the City is unreasonably taking my property.

In conclusion. I am urging the Planning and Land Use Management Committee to vote against this proposed Interim Control Ordinance as it stands and allow 60 days for public comment and consideration so that this Ordinance can be redrafted thoughtfully after digesting input from your constituents on how to address zoning in Lower Council District 5.

Regards.
Diane Gross

Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Opposition to Anti-Mansionization Interim Control Ordinance No. 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:55 AM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Loryn Arkow** <lorynarkow@gmail.com>

Date: Sun. Feb 22. 2015 at 11:35 PM

Subject: Opposition to Anti-Mansionization Interim Control Ordinance No. 14-0656

To: Sharon.Gin@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Gin,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance which is on the February 24, 2015 agenda for the Planning and Land Use Meeting. In particular, I am troubled by the rapid expansion of the ordinance from 5 to 15 areas across many parts of the city over a scant 3 month period of time without adequate time for public input or comments. While I realize that there are concerns regarding overbuilding in residential areas in some sections of the city, I also recognize a myriad of benefits which come from increasing the quality and value of residential housing as it affects the schools, roads, and other city services which directly benefit my quality of life. Such an important decision should only be considered after an appropriate period of public deliberation.

Sincerely,
Loryn Arkow

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 7:55 AM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Maureen Gilman** <msgilrmb5@mac.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 6:50 AM

Subject: ICO's

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org

Subj: Council File 14-0656

The proposed ICO falls far short of its stated purpose, to protect Beverlywood from mansionization. We deserve and demand the same protection being offered Faircrest Heights.

The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Sincerely,

Maureen and Bruce Gilman
2027 Castle Heights Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90034

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Holmby Westwood's Board of Directors and residents urge you to support Item 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
 To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 8:59 AM

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

From: **Jerry Gallop** <jerrygallop@gmail.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 8:55 AM

Subject: Holmby Westwood's Board of Directors and residents urge you to support Item 14-0656

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. Council Member Krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>. councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org. Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. councilmember.parks@lacity.org. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. Englander Mitch <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. erick.lopez@lacity.org. councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org. councilmember.price@lacity.org. councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org. councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org. Michael LoGrande <michael.logrande@lacity.org>. Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>. tom.rothmann@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. "Cc: Shawn Bayliss" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>
 Cc: Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee Members. Los Angeles City Councilmembers. and Planning Department Officials;

The residents of Holmby Westwood have worked tirelessly for the past 7 years to establish a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone in our community. thereby preserving our historic identity and our property values. In the meantime. we have seen the loss of many gracious homes replaced by huge boxlike structures which tower over their 2 story neighbors and which stick out like "sore thumbs". The motion (Item 14-0656) to be heard by PLUM (allowing a moratorium on demolition and new construction in 5 proposed HPOZs including Holmby Westwood) on Tuesday. February 25th is the first ray of hope that we will be able to reach our goal - design review of all new construction. exterior additions and remodels as seen from the street. Our concerns are massing. scale and compatibility within a community meticulously planned and established in 1926. Our community has been and is now home to some of the most prominent residents of Los Angeles who care deeply about maintaining the charm and dignity of their neighborhoods.

Please help us preserve the character that drew our residents to want to spend their lives in Holmby Westwood. Please support the motion 14-0656 on Tuesday at the Planning and Land Use Management hearing and also when the motion goes to City Council for its approval. Our community is counting on you to help us establish our HPOZ.

Thank you all.

Gerald and Lois Gallop

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Richard Lindstrom <rw12@yahoo.com>

Mon, Feb 23, 2015 at 9:03 AM

Reply-To: Richard Lindstrom <rw12@yahoo.com>

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>. "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>. "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>. "stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly. to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked. short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations. expansions. and new construction that can accommodate modern family life. while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

Richard Lindstrom
Faircrest Heights/Neighbors United
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

CD5 - Please Do Not Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance in a Haphazard Fashion

1 message

Philippe Phaneuf <philippe_phaneuf@post.harvard.edu>

Mon, Oct 13, 2014 at 9:01 AM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. etta.armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

RE: Council File 14-0656

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

I live in what is referred to in the Beverly Grove North neighborhood. (We need a new name by the way!)

Two things:

1. Please Do Not Cripple the Redevelopment and Improvement of Our Neighborhood by Imposing a Temporary Moratorium on Residential Demolition and Construction:

Although I am not a fan of many of the new modern homes that are going up in the area, we can't ignore the fact that the housing stock in this area north of Beverly is in many cases dilapidated beyond repair. Many of these homes have been rentals and have not been maintained, are an eyesore and do not merit any preservation effort. This is to be distinguished from areas like Beverly Grove and Carthay that were well maintained for decades. Our area is different ... It's very close to Melrose, Kings and Fairfax with apartment complexes all around and many homes are ripe for redevelopment.

I do, however, agree that we need some reasonable controls over the bulk of some of the residences that are going up, and I therefore do not object to the discussions regarding placing reasonable limits on the square footage of homes. However, we need to be very careful because the best way to maximize square footage is to build a box, and I do worry that a perverse result of any further restrictions on square footage will result in more boxes as opposed to more nuanced architecture.

In any event, the worst outcome would be to place a moratorium on demolition in our neighborhood without it applying city-wide. It will cripple the ongoing upgrading of the housing stock in our area ... perhaps permanently. Also, although there are a core of vocal proponents, most of my neighbors don't even know this is going on and haven't formulated an opinion. We generally aren't that disturbed by the work and welcome the improvements, although not always the design. And perhaps we would agree that limits, etc. might apply, but this should be done after careful analysis of the implications of restrictions on development and not as a knee jerk reaction. ***Therefore, please permit City Planning to complete its analysis and assessment, and do not impose temporary restrictions on our neighborhood.***

2. Please Pay Attention to the Tone of the Debate Over These Issues:

As a side note. I've been dismayed by the "us" vs. "them" tone of much of the debate about this issue that I've witnessed — many of the most vocal proponents of restrictions on development use a nativist tone and in public forums refer disparagingly to new neighbors who move into the neighborhood. Obviously everyone is entitled to their opinion. but I think it's important for elected officials and city administrators to have a keen ear for this type of thing to maintain harmony between old and new residence of a neighborhood. Zoning changes should not be about trying to keep a certain type of person out of neighborhoods. and that's what one could conclude from some of these discussions.

Very truly yours.

Philippe A. Phaneuf

Philippe A. Phaneuf (CD5)
610 N Crescent Heights Blvd.
Los Angeles. CA 90048



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

1 message

Wendy Klappholz <wklappholz@outlook.com>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 9:25 AM

To: "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

The proposed ICO falls far short of its stated purpose, to protect Beverlywood from mansionization. We deserve and demand the same protection being offered Beverly Grove RFA, by ICO model G.

The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Wendy & Steve Klappholz
9338 Monte Mar Dr.
LA 90035



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Council file # 14-0656

1 message

Sandy Bacola <sandrabacola@gmail.com>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 10:16 AM

To: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Dear Ladies.

The City of Los Angeles has developed an ICO to help protect my neighborhood from Mansionization. It is a good as far as it goes. however the ICO is a very short term fix for a long term problem that has assaulted my neighborhood for several years. Nine months ago our City Council member Paul Koretz proposed a simple.effective. And permanent City wide problem. The City must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to The BMO with all possible SPEED and a FULLY transparent Process. We have personally lost 50 % of our Views and 50% of our backyard privacy.

Thank-you.
Mr. & Mrs. Simon Bacola
6517 Maryland Drive.
Los Angeles. Ca. 90048
323-931-3985

Sent from my iPad



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

Armstrong, Faye <farmstrong@rpa.com>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 10:23 AM

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>. "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>. "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>. "stopmansionization@yahoo.com"

<stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee,

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) **Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**

2) **Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.

- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Julia Faye Armstrong

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10

FAYE ARMSTRONG
producer

RPA ADVERTISING
2525 colorado ave. santa monica ca 90404
T 310-633-6357
farmstrong@rpa.com

This email may contain information that is confidential or is otherwise the property of RPA or its clients. Any use of this information for purposes other than that for which it was intended, including forwarding the information to unauthorized parties or using the ideas or materials contained in this email, may violate U.S. or foreign laws, and is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please let the sender know and delete the message immediately.



Stop Mansionization_ICO.pdf

42K

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee,

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

- 1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**
- 2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**
 - Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
 - Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
 - Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
 - Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate

modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Julia Faye Armstrong
Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

STOP MANSIONIZATION: Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

shelly josias <shellyjosias@yahoo.com>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 11:36 AM

Reply-To: shelly josias <shellyjosias@yahoo.com>

To: "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>.

"Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org" <Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org" <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>. "elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org" <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>.

"andrew.westall@lacity.org" <andrew.westall@lacity.org>. "john.darnell@lacity.org" <john.darnell@lacity.org>.

"paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>. "joan.pelico@lacity.org" <joan.pelico@lacity.org>.

"shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>. "mayor.garcetti@lacity.org" <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>.

"yvonne.farrow@lacity.org" <yvonne.farrow@lacity.org>. "stopmansionization@yahoo.com" <stopmansionization@yahoo.com>

Re: Council File 14-0656

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO, and Amend the BMO

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee,

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

- 1) **Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.**
- 2) **Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.**
 - Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
 - Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
 - Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
 - Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly, to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked, short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations, expansions, and new construction that can accommodate modern family life, while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

There is absolutely no legitimate reason that it should take 18 months to amend the BMO. Thousands of single family homes could be demolished - and hundreds of neighborhoods destroyed - during this timeframe.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments, to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely,

Shelly Josias
Faircrest Heights
Council District 10



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and Amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656)

1 message

H. Chow <hsuwei.chow@gmail.com>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:24 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org. Etta.Armstrong@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org. elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org. andrew.westall@lacity.org. john.darnell@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. joan.pelico@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org. yvonne.farrow@lacity.org. stopmansionization@yahoo.com

Dear members of the Planning & Land Use Management Committee.

Thank you for taking the time to review my concerns for a community that I'm truly grateful to be a part of. While all property owners reserve the right to build homes as they desire, there should also be a way for property owners to still have large homes **without** completely stamping out another neighbor's lovely views. In an effort to respect the rights of all the residents involved, please adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO and amend the BMO (Council File 14-0656).

As you know, the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) has failed miserably. Last May, Councilmember Koretz made a smart and sensible motion to amend the BMO, which would bring much-needed relief to constituents citywide, and would also relieve city agencies from the burdens associated with implementing and enforcing a patchwork of overlays.

We appreciate that City Planning has proposed Interim Control Ordinances (ICOs) for a handful of neighborhoods, but realize that a) ICOs are only temporary, and b) protection for a select few neighborhoods will only place bigger targets on unprotected areas.

I urge you to:

1) Adopt the Faircrest Heights ICO (CD10) with an urgency clause.

2) Amend the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ASAP.

- Decrease the base floor area ratio for R-1 lots.
- Eliminate the pointless 'green' building bonus.
- Eliminate the attached garage exemption and count this square footage. Attached garages add 400 square feet of bloat and eliminate driveways that provide an essential buffer between lots.
- Eliminate the other self-defeating design bonuses for items like double-height entryways and balconies, which add hundreds of square feet of uncounted bulk and still leave us with McMansions that loom over neighbors' homes.

These changes could be discussed and adopted quickly. to protect our treasured neighborhoods from being ravaged by unchecked. short-term real estate speculation and reckless development. They will allow renovations. expansions. and new construction that can accommodate modern family life. while respecting the scale and character of established neighborhoods.

I thank you in advance for expediting the adoption of the ICOs and the BMO amendments. to provide our great city with desperately-needed relief from the destructive impacts of mansionization.

Sincerely.

Hsu Wei Chow

Faircrest Heights

Council District 10

Attachments area

Preview attachment Faircrest Heights Bev Grove ICO vs BMO.pdf

—

HC



Faircrest Heights Bev Grove ICO vs BMO.pdf

48K

**PRESS PAUSE on Mansionization:
Faircrest Heights Interim Control Ordinance (ICO)
modeled on the Beverly Grove RFA**



What the citywide Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) currently allows

Figures below are based on a 6,000 square foot lot.

- Base floor area ratio (FAR): 50% of lot size 3,000 sq ft
- 20% bonus for "green" building, articulated exterior walls, etc. 600 sq ft
- Attached garage not included in floor area calculation 400 sq ft
- Porches, patios, balconies, etc. not included in floor area calculation 250 sq ft
- Double-height entryways not included in floor area calculation 100 sq ft
- **Maximum total floor area (this example): more than 72% of lot size 4,350 sq ft**

What an ICO based on the Beverly Grove RFA Formula would allow

Figures below are based on a 6,000 square foot lot.

- Base floor area ratio (FAR): 42% of lot size 2,520 sq ft
- Bonus for detached garage: 6% of lot size 360 sq ft
- Additional 2% bonus for construction that incorporates a detached garage and meets one of the following conditions: 120 sq ft
 - Articulate exterior walls or
 - Make second floor 25% smaller than ground floor or
 - Reduce height to 20% below maximum allowed or
 - Make both side yard setbacks at least 2 feet wider than minimum required
- **Maximum total floor area (this example): 50% of lot size 3,000 sq ft**

The Beverly Grove Model is sensible, smart, and successful. As a temporary solution, an ICO modeled on the Beverly Grove RFA will allow reasonable development and stop mansionization. Without it, developers will build houses *almost 50% bigger*.

To sign our online petition, click [here](#).

To order a No More McMansions lawn sign (\$5): email stopmansionization@yahoo.com

For general info: see www.NoMoreMcMansionsInLosAngeles.org



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council File 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:33 PM

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

From: <karenanncoburn@aol.com>
Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 9:46 AM
Subject: Council File 14-0656
To: sharon.gin@lacity.org
Cc: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org

Attached please find my letter requesting that Bevelywood receive the full protection of the ICO under consideration by the PLUM committee tomorrow.

Thank you.

Karen Coburn Antholis
9716 Homer Street
Los Angeles. CA 90035

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org



 PLUM.pdf
81K

Dear Members of the City Council Planning & Land Use Management Committee,

The proposed ICO falls far short of its stated purpose, to protect Beverlywood from mansionization. We deserve and demand the same protection being given to other, threatened neighborhoods in Council District 5.

The delays and shortcomings of the ICO process underscore the vital importance of meaningful, permanent reform.

Nine months ago, Councilmember Koretz proposed a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to the problem. The city must move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Thank you,

Karen Coburn Antholis
9716 Horner Street,
Los Angeles, CA 90035



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:33 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **S. Partiyeli** <spartiyeli@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 9:10 AM

Subject: Lower Council District 5 - PLUM Moratorium

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

Dear Ms. Gin.

I would like it to be a matter of public record that I disagree and absolutely do not support PLUM's Anti-Masionization moratorium policy in Lower Council District 5.

I believe this unilateral decision by the council members is a violation of my rights as a homeowner. No studies have been done nor has there been any fiscal or community impact statement submitted. Therefore, in my opinion there is no concrete foundation or evidence to support this policy.

Shirine Partiyeli

Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Holmby Westwood's Board of Directors and residents urge you to support Item 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:34 PM

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

From: **Ellen Turner** <elturner50@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 10:22 AM
Subject: Holmby Westwood's Board of Directors and residents urge you to support Item 14-0656
To: "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. Council Member Krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>. "councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>. "Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org" <Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org>. "councilmember.parks@lacity.org" <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>. "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>. Englander Mitch <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "erick.lopez@lacity.org" <erick.lopez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>. "councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org" <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>. "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>. "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>. "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org" <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>. Michael LoGrande <michael.logrande@lacity.org>. Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>. "tom.rothmann@lacity.org" <tom.rothmann@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
Cc: Bayliss Shawn <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee Members. Los Angeles City Councilmembers. and Planning Department Officials:

The residents of Holmby Westwood have worked tirelessly for the past 7 years to establish a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone in our community. thereby preserving our historic identity and our property values. In the meantime. we have seen the loss of many gracious homes replaced by huge boxlike structures which tower over their 2 story neighbors and which stick out like "sore thumbs". The motion (Item 14-0656) to be heard by PLUM (allowing a moratorium on demolition and new construction in 5 proposed HPOZs including Holmby Westwood) on Tuesday. February 25th is the first ray of hope that we will be able to reach our goal - design review of all new construction. exterior additions and remodels as seen from the street. Our concerns are massing. scale and compatibility within a community meticulously planned and established in 1926. Our community has been and is now home to some of the most prominent residents of Los Angeles who care deeply about maintaining the charm and dignity of their neighborhoods.

Please help us preserve the character that drew our residents to want to spend their lives in Holmby Westwood. Please support the motion 14-0656 on Tuesday at the Planning and Land Use Management hearing and also when the motion goes to City Council for its

approval. Our community is counting on you to help us establish our HPOZ.

Thank you all.

Ellen Turner

Board Member. Holmby/Westwood Homeowner's Association

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:34 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Fred Partiyeli** <fpartiyeli@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 9:14 AM

Subject: Zoning. Lower district 5

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

Dear Ms. Gin.

I would like it to be a matter of public record that I disagree and absolutely do not support PLUM's Anti-Masionization moratorium policy in Lower Council District 5.

I believe this unilateral decision by the council members is a violation of my rights as a homeowner. No studies have been done nor has there been any fiscal or community impact statement submitted. Therefore. in my opinion there is no concrete foundation or evidence to support this policy.

Sincerely yours.

Fred Partiyeli

--
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
 To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb :

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

From: **Alexis Rappaport** <rapproyce@gmail.com>
 Date: Mon. Feb 23, 2015 at 10:38 AM
 Subject: Fwd: thoughts about the ICO draft for Neighborhood Conservation Initiative Areas
 To: sharon.gin@lacity.org
 Cc: Shawn.Bayliss@lacity.org

Hi Sharon.

I understand you are collecting public comments about the ICO. I sent this to Shawn Bayliss on Friday and am forwarding it to you now. I have not heard back from anyone yet and am very ordinance is apparently so close to being passed with no public awareness of the details. As stated below I am 100% philosophically in agreement that the city needs to do something, but very unevenly applied across neighborhoods and so severe in some neighborhoods that it will not even allow much of what is reasonable / positive building while in effect.

Please confirm you received this and what options I have for public comment before the ordinance is voted on. If I have misunderstood how the ordinance applies, please clarify that as well. Thanks.

Alexis Rappaport

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alexis Rappaport <rapproyce@gmail.com>
Subject: thoughts about the ICO draft for Neighborhood Conservation Initiative Areas
Date: February 20, 2015 at 4:42:52 PM PST
To: Shawn.Bayliss@lacity.org
Cc: jesus.d.orozco@lacity.org

Dear Shawn.

I am resident of District 5 and a design professional with 30+ years of experience. Most of career was spent doing very large commercial workplace design projects nationally and internationally. Several years ago I became a LEED AP and I am now focused on 'green' residential renovation projects. All my projects reuse as much of the existing structure as possible to reduce waste, are sensitive to the character and scale of the neighborhood they inhabit, are planned to be super efficient, eliminating wasted space that requires extra energy for heating and cooling and are as energy and water efficient as possible. The details of the City's new ICO for Neighborhood Conservation Initiative Areas recently came to my attention. After an in depth review, while I 100% support the changes in policy the city is pursuing to stop oversized residences that destroy neighborhoods, **some of the details of the current ordinance go too far**, particularly in view of the length of time it will be in effect.

In Paragraph #4, the change of the definition of allowable area to include garages, areas with over-in-height ceilings and covered patios is an extreme hardship for homeowners on many lots. As an example, on a 6,000sf lot, if the garage and covered patio area that would have been discounted area, now becomes a part of the allowable residential floor area, you are potentially removing 650sf of the 3000sf currently allowed, or 21%. The ordinance is therefore not just removing the option for bonus area, but reducing allowable area as currently defined to 30% instead of 50%. That makes using many of the mid-sized to smaller lots, for what I would consider a very reasonably sized, contextually appropriate house, impossible. The images below are of a house I completed last year. It has been praised in the community for enhancing the street, is super efficient in its use of space and very energy efficient. The lot is 5385.4sf and the house is 2687sf under the old definition of allowable area, not including the garage. It is a lovely, contextually appropriate 5 bedroom 3 bath house with a nice yard on a small lot with a small building footprint. Though it has an undersized non-compliant grandfathered garage that we kept, it would still not have been able to be built under this ordinance. This does not seem reasonable. It should further be noted that even in areas that are not classified 'hillside', there are many sites that slope significantly which makes them inherently less efficient to plan on, i.e. they require an extra story. This type of condition inherently further increases the impact of the severity of this allowable area change. I have two projects currently on the boards that are like this. I've already looked at the impact of the proposed ordinance on these projects. It will radically alter the feasibility of building anything in one case and if we go ahead anyway, it will make it impossible to reuse much of the existing structure and foundation, which I had as always planned to do, to minimize waste. It would also eliminate the possibility to include any upstairs patios which will significantly diminish the beauty of the building's massing by making it boxier and bulkier in feel, precisely what you are trying to avoid.

I am also puzzled by the inconsistent treatment of different neighborhoods, with seeming leniency in some as opposed to others. As an example, in the two parts of my District, Lower and Inner District 5 are governed by two different Paragraphs, #4 and #5. Paragraph #5 both doesn't include garage area as added allowable area, only accessory and over-in-height ceilings and still allows for a 15% bonus option. These restrictions will create radically different outcomes which seems quite unfair and not consistent with what I assume are the city's objectives. I am also quite alarmed by the lack of public discourse on the final terms and details of the ordinance when it apparently is so close to being passed. I checked on the internet and there is no apparent press coverage since the fall when the initial mandate was approved.

To reiterate, I wholeheartedly support the city's efforts to stop residential projects that are too big, both to preserve the character of neighborhoods and in the interest of fostering more sustainable building practices. I hope however you will consider the facts I have offered about specific impacts of the ordinance as it is currently written and at least amend the inclusion of garages and covered patios as part of allowable area calculation wherever that applies OR allow a 15 or 20% bonus based on the appropriate massing, like the 75% rule, if garages and/or covered porches, accessory buildings and over-in height ceilings are included in allowable area. As it is written currently, the ordinance applies very strict limitations in some neighborhoods and less strict restrictions in other areas and where most restrictive, it's excessive. Two years is a long time for the residents this affects who are trying to do responsible and sensitive projects. Many will become impossible during the freeze, which is an unnecessary and frankly, unacceptable hardship for them.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Thanks.

Alexis Rappaport





Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074

2/23/2015

City of Los Angeles Mail - 14-0656

Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: PLUM Council File 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Mon, Feb 23, 2015 at 12:36 PM

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

From: **J Reichmann** <jreichmann@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Mon, Feb 23, 2015 at 11:01 AM

Subject: PLUM Council File 14-0656

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillos@lacity.org

Cc: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Please find attached comments for the record re Council File 14-0656 dealing with the Mansionization Issue and my preference for inclusion in the Koretz proposed ICU. Plan D.

Jan Reichmann, Pres.
Comstock Hills Homeowners Association

--
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org



 March 27.pdf
125K



February 23, 2015

To: Sharon.Gin@lacity.org,
Councilmember.cedillos@lacity.org
Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org
Councilmember.englander@lacity.org
Councilmember.koretz@lacity.org
Councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Re: Mansionization Council File 14-0656

The Baseline Mansionization Ordinance was intended to improve the aesthetics of our neighborhoods while helping the environment. But instead, it has created a monster feasting on bonuses and loopholes to create outsized mansions and giant boxes that have no concern for the impact on its neighboring homes.

Comstock Hills is a community of approx.. 300 homes just north of Century City. We strongly support Councilmember Koretz's ICO Model D designated for Lower Council District 5 and urge you to pass the Interim Control Ordinance that will be in place for 24 months.

We strongly support the Koretz efforts to achieve a simple, effective and permanent citywide fix to this problem as quickly as possible while amending the BMO in a transparent process. Without urgent action, the crisis will build.

Very truly yours,
Jan Reichmann, President
Comstock Hills Homeowners Association
1429 Comstock Ave. Los Angeles, Ca. 90024
jreichmann@comstockhills.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Fw: [CHHOABoard] PLUM Council File 14-0656 [1 Attachment]

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:36 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **J Reichmann** <jreichmann@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 11:10 AM

Subject: Fw: [CHHOABoard] PLUM Council File 14-0656 [1 Attachment]

To: "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Note: the March 27 date has no significance. The document is attached to it. Please open.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "'J Reichmann' jreichmann@sbcglobal.net [CHHOABoard]" <CHHOABoard-noreply@yahoogroups.com>**To:** sharon.gin@lacity.org; councilmember.cedillos@lacity.org**Cc:** councilmember.huizar@lacity.org; councilmember.englander@lacity.org;
councilmember.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.bonin@lacity.org**Sent:** Monday, February 23. 2015 11:01 AM**Subject:** [CHHOABoard] PLUM Council File 14-0656 [1 Attachment]

[Attachment(s) from J Reichmann included below]

Please find attached comments for the record re Council File 14-0656 dealing with the Mansionization Issue
and my preference for inclusion in the Koretz proposed ICU. Plan D.

Jan Reichmann. Pres.

Comstock Hills Homeowners Association

Attachment(s) from J Reichmann | View attachments on the web

1 of 1 File(s)

March 27.pdf

Posted by: "J Reichmann" <jreichmann@sbcglobal.net>

[Reply via web post](#) • [Reply to sender](#) • [Reply to group](#) • [Start a New Topic](#) • [Messages in this topic \(1\)](#)

VISIT YOUR GROUP

YAHOO! GROUPS

[Privacy](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#)

--
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





February 23, 2015

To: Sharon.Gin@lacity.org,
Councilmember.cedillos@lacity.org
Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org
Councilmember.englander@lacity.org
Councilmember.koretz@lacity.org
Councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Re: Mansionization Council File 14-0656

The Baseline Mansionization Ordinance was intended to improve the aesthetics of our neighborhoods while helping the environment. But instead, it has created a monster feasting on bonuses and loopholes to create outsized mansions and giant boxes that have no concern for the impact on its neighboring homes.

Comstock Hills is a community of approx.. 300 homes just north of Century City. We strongly support Councilmember Koretz's ICO Model D designated for Lower Council District 5 and urge you to pass the Interim Control Ordinance that will be in place for 24 months.

We strongly support the Koretz efforts to achieve a simple, effective and permanent citywide fix to this problem as quickly as possible while amending the BMO in a transparent process. Without urgent action, the crisis will build.

Very truly yours,
Jan Reichmann, President
Comstock Hills Homeowners Association
1429 Comstock Ave. Los Angeles, Ca. 90024
jreichmann@comstockhills.com



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:36 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Cynthia Burstein Waldman** <cwaldman@pacbell.net>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 11:13 AM

Subject: Anti-Mansionization proposal that is pending

To: shawn.bayliss@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Gin@lacity.org

To Whom it May Concern:

I wanted to register my opposition to the proposal that is currently pending. The homeowners in my area have had NO notice about this issue. In fact, the documents that are being circulated in advance of tomorrow's hearing are very misleading and confusing. I had no idea that my area was even impacted until I heard outcry on the issue from neighbors.

Furthermore, there has been no analysis of the economic impact on the homeowners and on the school district. It is my understanding that the school district, which is already struggling, will have a huge reduction in funding if this ordinance is passed.

At a minimum, vote on these limitations must be postponed until there can be a full public hearing on the impact of these proposed regulations.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Burstein Waldman, Esq.

10342 Ilona Ave.

Los Angeles, CA 90064

(310) 553-3033 home

(310) 553-3003 fax

(310) 850-4876 cell

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: PLEASE SUPPORT 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:37 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Sandy Brown** <sandy10778@yahoo.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 11:44 AM

Subject: PLEASE SUPPORT 14-0656

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>. councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org. Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. "councilmember.parks@lacity.org councilmember.parks@lacity.org" <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>. councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. Englander Mitch <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. Lopez Erick <erick.lopez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>. councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org. councilmember.price@lacity.org. Wesson Councilmember Herb Herb Councilmember <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org. "Councilmember.Huizar" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. Buscaino Councilmember <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>. LoGrande Michael <michael.logrande@lacity.org>. Bernstein Ken <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>. tom.rothmann@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org

Cc: Bayliss Shawn <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee Members. Los Angeles City Councilmembers. and Planning Department Officials;

The residents of Holmby Westwood have worked tirelessly for the past 7 years to establish a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone in our community. thereby preserving our historic identity and our property values. In the meantime. we have seen the loss of many gracious homes replaced by huge boxlike structures which tower over their 2 story neighbors and which stick out like "sore thumbs". The motion (Item 14-0656) to be heard by PLUM (allowing a moratorium on demolition and new construction in 5 proposed HPOZs including Holmby Westwood) on Tuesday. February 25th is the first ray of hope that we will be able to reach our goal - design review of all new construction. exterior additions and remodels as seen from the street. Our concerns are massing. scale and compatibility within a community meticulously planned and established in 1926. Our community has been and is now home to some of the most prominent residents of Los Angeles who care deeply about maintaining the charm and dignity of their neighborhoods.

Please help us preserve the character that drew our residents to want to spend their lives in Holmby Westwood. Please support the motion 14-0656 on Tuesday at the Planning and Land Use Management hearing and also when the motion goes to City Council for its approval. Our community is counting on you to help us establish our HPOZ.

Thank you all.

Sandy Brown
President. Holmby Westwood Property Owners Association

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk

2/23/2015

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: PLEASE SUPPORT 14-0656

213.978.1074

Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:37 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **bamfam5** <bamfam5@mac.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 11:49 AM

Subject: Land Use Management Committee Members Support Requested

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org. councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org. councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org. Councilmember.labonge@lacity.org. councilmember.parks@lacity.org.

councilmember.bonin@lacity.org. councilmember.englander@lacity.org. erick.lopez@lacity.org.

councilmember.koretz@lacity.org. councilmember.martinez@lacity.org. councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org.

councilmember.price@lacity.org. councilmember.wesson@lacity.org. councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org.

councilmember.huizar@lacity.org. councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org. michael.logrande@lacity.org.

ken.bernstein@lacity.org. tom.rothmann@lacity.org. sharon.gin@lacity.org

Dear Planning and Land Use Management Committee Members. Los Angeles City Councilmembers. and Planning Department Officials;

The residents of Holmby Westwood have worked tirelessly for the past 7 years to establish a Historic Preservation Overlay Zone in our community. thereby preserving our historic identity and our property values. In the meantime. we have seen the loss of many gracious homes replaced by huge boxlike structures which tower over their 2 story neighbors and which stick out like "sore thumbs". The motion (Item 14-0656) to be heard by PLUM (allowing a moratorium on demolition and new construction in 5 proposed HPOZs including Holmby Westwood) on Tuesday. February 25th is the first ray of hope that we will be able to reach our goal - design review of all new construction. exterior additions and remodels as seen from the street. Our concerns are massing. scale and compatibility within a community meticulously planned and established in 1926. Our community has been and is now home to some of the most prominent residents of Los Angeles who care deeply about maintaining the charm and dignity of their neighborhoods.

Please help us preserve the character that drew our residents to want to spend their lives in Holmby Westwood. Please support the motion 14-0656 on Tuesday at the Planning and Land Use Management hearing and also when the motion goes to City Council for its approval. Our community is counting on you to help us establish our HPOZ.

Thank you all.

Polly W. Bamberger

Board Member. Holmby Westwood Property Owners Association

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:37 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Constituent in Lower Council District 5** <mail@changemail.org>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:17 PM

Subject: New petition to you: Remove Lower Council District 5. Kentwood. and Mar Vista/East Venice (which includes 90064. 90024. 90025. 90066. 90045. 90291) from the Proposed Interim Control Ordinance which will further restrict construction on residential lots within our community.

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org

change.org New petition

Petitioning Councilman Paul Koretz, District 5 and Councilman Mike Bonin, District 11 – Constituent in Lower Council District 5 started a petition on Change.org and listed you as a decision maker. Learn more about Constituent in Lower Council District 5's petition and how you can respond.

Petitioning Councilman Paul Koretz. District 5 and Councilman Mike Bonin. District 11: Remove Lower Council District 5. Kentwood. and Mar Vista/East Venice (which includes 90064. 90024. 90025. 90066. 90045. 90291) from the Proposed Interim Control Ordinance which will further restrict construction on residential lots within our community.

Petition by Constituent in Lower Council District 5 · Started Feb 23. 2015

Councilmen Paul Koretz and Mike Bonin are under the impression that most people want stricter limits on the size of new or remodeled homes because that is what is... [Read more](#)

[View the petition](#)

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. View the petition

Learn about the petition and its supporters. You will receive updates as new supporters sign the petition so you can see who is signing and why.

2. Respond to the petition

Post a response to let the petition supporters know you're listening. say whether you agree with their call to action. or ask them for more information.

3. Continue the dialogue

Read the comments posted by petition supporters and continue the dialogue so that others can see you're an engaged leader who is willing to participate in open discussion.

CHANGE.ORG FOR DECISION MAKERS

On Change.org. decision makers like you connect directly with people around the world to resolve issues. Learn more

This notification was sent to sharon.gin@lacity.org. the address listed as the decision maker contact by the petition starter. If this is incorrect. please post a response to let the petition starter know.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993. San Francisco. CA 94104-5401. USA

Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Fwd: Opposition to Anti-Mansionization Interim Control Ordinance No. 14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:38 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Ariella Silver** <ariellasilver@gmail.com>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:22 PM

Subject: Opposition to Anti-Mansionization Interim Control Ordinance No. 14-0656

To: Sharon.Gin@lacity.org. paul.koretz@lacity.org. shawn.bayliss@lacity.org. mayor.garcetti@lacity.org

Dear City Members.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance which is on the February 24, 2015 agenda for the Planning and Land Use Meeting. In particular, I am troubled by the rapid expansion of the ordinance from 5 to 15 areas across many parts of the city over a scant 3 month period of time without adequate time for public input or comments. While I realize that there are concerns regarding overbuilding in residential areas in some sections of the city, I also recognize a myriad of benefits which come from increasing the quality and value of residential housing as it affects the schools, roads, and other city services which directly benefit my quality of life. Such an important decision should only be considered after an appropriate period of public deliberation.

Sincerely,
Ariella Silver

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:38 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: <mail@changemail.org>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:26 PM

Subject: 5 more people signed "Petitioning Councilman Paul Koretz. District 5 and Councilman Mike Bonin. District 11: Remove Lower Council District 5. Kentwood. and Mar Vista/East Venice (which includes 90064. 90024. 90025. 90066. 90045. 90291) from the Proposed Interim Control Ordinance which will further restrict construction on residential lots within our community."

To: sharon.gin@lacity.org

change.org New signatures

Petitioning Councilman Paul Koretz, District 5 and Councilman Mike Bonin, District 11 – This petition addressed to you on Change.org has new activity. See progress and respond to the campaign's supporters.

Petitioning Councilman Paul Koretz. District 5 and Councilman Mike Bonin. District 11: Remove Lower Council District 5. Kentwood. and Mar Vista/East Venice (which includes 90064. 90024. 90025. 90066. 90045. 90291) from the Proposed Interim Control Ordinance which will further restrict construction on residential lots within our community.

Petition by Constituent in Lower Council District 5 · 5 supporters

**5 more people signed
in the last 8 hours**

[View petition activity](#)

RECENT SUPPORTERS

**Oved Fattal**

Los Angeles. CA · Feb 23. 2015

Oppose these new restrictions

**Terri Lubaroff**

Los Angeles. CA · Feb 23. 2015

I do not agree with any zoning ordinance that restricts the size of a house to a percentage of lot size. I also vehemently disagree that mandatory covered parking, breezeways and patios should be counted in square footage. Please REPEAL the anti-mansionazation ordinance and definitely do not support any further restrictions. Our property value has already been negatively affected due to the EXPO line across the street. Don't do anything else that will make it hard for us to sell or expand as we meet the needs of our growing family. Thank you.

**Robert Kahn**

Los Angeles. CA · Feb 23. 2015

It needs further study and vetting and does not appear to be fair to those that may already be in process.

**Mitchell Gross**

Los Angeles. CA · Feb 23. 2015

I wan to preserve the value of my home and our quality of life.

**allison samek**

Beverly Hills. CA · Feb 23. 2015

[View all 5 supporters](#)

CHANGE.ORG FOR DECISION MAKERS

On Change.org, decision makers like you connect directly with people around the world to resolve issues. Respond to let the people petitioning you know you're listening. say whether you agree with their call to action. or ask

them for more information. [Learn more.](#)

This notification was sent to sharon.gin@lacity.org. the address listed as the decision maker contact by the petition starter. If this is incorrect. please [post a response](#) to let the petition starter know.

Change.org · 548 Market St #29993. San Francisco. CA 94104-5401. USA

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

14-0656

1 message

Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:38 PM

To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

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

From: **Mitchell Gross** <mitchell.gross@sbcglobal.net>

Date: Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 12:34 PM

Subject: Fw: Opposition to Proposed ICO regarding residential zoning restrictions

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

Cc: Diane Gross <gross.diane@sbcglobal.net>

Dear Ms. Gin.

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) which is on the February 24, 2015 agenda for the Planning and Land Use Meeting. As longtime residents and owners of a single family residence in your district, we have tried to follow information concerning proposed changes to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance, including information received from our local tract association and neighborhood council. We were mystified to learn that the ICO (which we read and reviewed in December) that originally included only 5 areas was suddenly changed in the February 2015 report to include our area among the 10 additional areas added. In an effort to learn more about this proposed ICO, we searched the internet, the website for the Department of Planning, and the website for the City of Los Angeles, and could only find the proposed ordinance after receiving the file number from your field deputy. For such a significant change to your constituents' property values, we would expect that this proposed Ordinance would be more publicly accessible. Additionally, we cannot find the time of the PLUM on February 24 on the City Planning website.

This ICO represents a significant and important change affecting the value of our property and ultimately the quality of our daughters' public schools and other city services which we rely on in our daily life. Such an important decision deserves time and public consideration, not a hastily added amendment to an ordinance occurring over just a 2 month period. We are also disturbed that this ICO could be in effect for a long two years, while the City figures out a more permanent zoning plan.

Moreover, we are deeply troubled by how the restrictions are so varied across the city and even within the boundaries of council district 5. Specifically areas such as garages, covered breezeways, and other bonuses to the building allowance are treated differently across the district. We are completely at a loss to understand this differential treatment among neighboring communities. As owners of a relatively small lot (6250 sq. ft), there are great impacts in limiting the size of building on our property. With this ICO and the fact that garages are now counted as residential floor area, the City is unreasonably taking our property.

In conclusion, we are urging you to vote against this proposed Interim Control Ordinance as it stands and allow 60 days for public comment and consideration so that this Ordinance can be redrafted thoughtfully after digesting input from your constituents on how to address zoning in our area.

Regards,

Diane and Mitchell Gross
10376 Keswick Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90064

—
Sharon Gin
City of Los Angeles
Office of the City Clerk
213.978.1074
Sharon.Gin@lacity.org





Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

PLUM HEARING 2/24/15 2:30 PM ICO COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

1 message

Constance Boukidis <constanceellen@sbcglobal.net>

Mon. Feb 23. 2015 at 1:37 PM

Reply-To: Constance Boukidis <constanceellen@sbcglobal.net>

To: "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>. "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>. "councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org" <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>. "councilmember.labonge@lacity.org" <councilmember.labonge@lacity.org>. "councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>. "councilmember.martinez@lacity.org" <councilmember.martinez@lacity.org>. "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org" <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>. "councilmember.parks@lacity.org" <councilmember.parks@lacity.org>. "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>. "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>. "councilmember.bonin@lacity.org" <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>. "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>. "councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org" <councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org>. "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>. "councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org" <councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org>. "sharon.gin@lacity.org" <sharon.gin@lacity.org>. "etta.armstrong@lacity.org" <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Subj: Council File 14-0656

Councilmembers and Planning Staff:

Pervasive mansionization has taken place across our City. The bonuses in the original Baseline Mansionization Ordinance that were meant to promote better design while helping the environment resulted in nothing more than massive structures that tower over their neighbors to the detriment of established communities. For this reason, the Board of Directors of Comstock Hills Homeowners Association embraces the Koretz ICO **Model D** designed for Lower Council District 5. It is a reasonable fit for our neighborhood just north of Century City and will close the loopholes that have allowed these oversized structures to be built. I urge you to pass the proposed Interim Control Ordinance that will be in place for 24 months.

I also support Councilmember Koretz's efforts to achieve a simple, effective, and permanent citywide fix to this problem. I urge you to move forward on his sensible proposed amendments to the BMO with all possible speed and a fully transparent process.

Very truly yours,

Constance Boukidis

Second Vice President

Chair, Land Use and Planning Committee

Comstock Hills Homeowners Association