



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO hearing andn comments CF no. 14-0656

1 message

Karen Gilman <gilperson2@gmail.com>

Tue, May 17, 2016 at 4:23 PM

To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org

Cc: David.Ryu@lacity.org, Julia Duncan <julia.duncan@lacity.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Tom Rothmann <tom.rothmann@lacity.org>, Ken Bernstein <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>, craig.weber@lacity.org, nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, niall.huffman@lacity.org, phyllis.nathanson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, Councilmember Mitchell Englander <Councilmember.Englander@lacity.org>, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

May 17, 2016

From: Karen and Michael Gilman

4041 Elmwood Ave.

Los ANgeles, CA 90004

CD 4 and GWNC stakeholders

We appreciate the work that has come so far in amending the BMO/BHO but we are alarmed that, while we have made some gains, there is some backsliding and loss of protections.

Please insist on a meaningful baseline!

Please eliminate bonuses.

Please eliminate loopholes.

Please keep restrictions about placement of garages (not in front; ok in back of house.)

Please keep patios, porches and balconies OUT of the square footage calculations!

Please maintain rear and side setbacks!

We are concerned about the "encroachment planes" and "side articulation" vocabulary as these phrases make the ordinance harder to understand and easier to abuse.

We live in an ICO neighborhood that is concurrently embarking on HPOZ efforts. We need every measure possible in place to protect the charm and neighborhood quality of our Larchmont Heights/aka Larchmont Village neighborhood!

Thank you very much for taking into account our concerns.

Sincerely,

Karen and Michael Gilman

4941 Elmwood Ave.

Los Angeles, CA 90004

Previous letter from our GWNC:

February 14, 2016

Hagu Solomon-Cary

Los Angeles City Planning Dept.

Hagu.solomon-cary@lacity.org

The Honorable David Ryu, Councilmember, District 4

David.Ryu@lacity.org

Renee Weitzer

Renee.weitzer@lacity.org

Julia Duncan Julia.duncan@lacity.org

Re: Citywide Mansionization Ordinances, Council File CF-14-0656, BMO/BHO Amendments

Proposed resolution by the Land Use Committee as recommended for passage by the Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council:

The Greater Wilshire Neighborhood Council would like to acknowledge the progress made so far in drafting amendments to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance. We endorse measures to reform and strengthen these ordinances. We appreciate the City Council motion by Councilmember Koretz, adopted by City Council in May, 2014 to close the loopholes.

1. We support:

- a. Reforming and strengthening the BMO/BHO Ordinances
- b. Closing the loopholes that presently undermine the Ordinances
- c. Reducing the base FAR
- d. Including attached garages when calculating floor area (except where hillside topography is an issue)
- e. Counting uncovered patios, breezeways, and balconies as floor space
- f. Basing the "proportional stories" bonus on the net footprint of the first floor, excluding any uncounted floor space.
- g. Eliminating of the bonuses of 20% of base FAR previously granted for "green" building materials, "articulated" walls, and proportional stories.

2. We object to granting of additional bonuses to applicants by the Planning Department outside of the BMO language. We oppose discretionary 10 percent "adjustments" made by zoning administrators, NOT because they're never appropriate, but because we support open and transparent public hearings, opportunities for public comment, and timely notification of requests and proposals. Bonuses should be subject to public review by the Planning Dept.

3. We would like to add our great concern and desire for City Planning and the City Council to craft language that takes into account the specific needs of specific neighborhoods, particularly in the area of FAR formulas, footprint of the single family residences in question, and context of the neighborhood.

4. Our previous understanding of the BMO/BHO amendments led us to believe as follows (from our February 2016 GWNC written comments:) In this way, the GWNC finds the BMO ordinance amendments may offer the protections our Greater Wilshire neighborhoods need, particularly those with time-limited ICO status and those with no protective status, to maximize the neighborly environment while at the same time allowing for reasonable growth.

5. We encourage the City to move forward to approve thoughtfully amended BMO/BHO ordinances.

Cc: Councilmember Paul Koretz Paul.Koretz@lacity.org

Council President Herb Wesson Councilmember.wesson@lacity.org



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

The Forgotten Impact of Mansionization

1 message

Sidney Higgins <kittycontracosta@yahoo.com>

Tue, May 17, 2016 at 5:54 PM

Reply-To: Sidney Higgins <kittycontracosta@yahoo.com>

To: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "vince.bertoni@lacity.org" <vince.bertoni@lacity.org>, "tom.rothmann@lacity.org" <tom.rothmann@lacity.org>, "ken.bernstein@lacity.org" <ken.bernstein@lacity.org>, "craig.weber@lacity.org" <craig.weber@lacity.org>, "nicholas.maricich@lacity.org" <nicholas.maricich@lacity.org>, "phyllis.nathanson@lacity.org" <phyllis.nathanson@lacity.org>, "niall.huffman@lacity.org" <niall.huffman@lacity.org>, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org" <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org" <councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org" <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>

Cc: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Julia Duncan <julia.duncan@lacity.org>, "shelley@wagersmail.net" <shelley@wagersmail.net>

At the Van Nuys Mansionization meeting last night I was horrified to see how big a house footprint is still allowable under the proposed changes, and here's why:

For several years the Los Angeles Natural History Museum has been collecting specimens and data about what else lives in in the city among all of us. Los Angeles is a big part of one of the world's Biodiversity Hotspots, which is California. The museum studies have revealed many new species - found guess where? - IN PEOPLE'S URBAN GARDENS. Mansionization (and the ubiquitous small-lot developments) involves clearing away an old garden or lot, killing off most every living thing there, followed by covering up the majority of the land with house and cement. The contemporary reality of urban biodiversity is never considered in this process. The extirpation of any number of organisms, be they mammals, insects, reptiles, or birds previously present in Los Angeles is the logical result. And how many creatures are eliminated by insensitive building standards before they have been discovered?

If we want Los Angeles to be a truly progressive, 21st century city, we must reverse the old paradigm of thoughtlessly destroying other organisms in favor of our own excessive building practices. It is entirely possible to build, and live within and around, biological vitality of all kinds, but not if we take away more and more garden space. This is especially true because the city of LA does not compensate this loss of land with more parks or community gardens.

Los Angeles is a garden city, and should remain so. Covering the land with oversized houses and other living spaces essentially sterilizes our environment. We should be very proud of the biodiversity present in Los Angeles, and strive to maintain it. Please incorporate biodiversity standards into building regulations. This is the outdoor aspect of green building practices.

Thank you,

Sidney Higgins, Silverlake