

BMO/BHO Ordinance Changes Council File #14-0656

2 messages

Gina Moffitt <gina@kiyoharamoffitt.com> To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Council Members:

I just read the Modifications that were made the PLUM committee recommendations to the above ordinances at today's council meeting. I literally screamed when I read them. It is NOT POSSIBLE to have an encroachment plane starting at 20ft. I am an architect with over 30 years experience designing houses in Los Angeles. The math doesn't work. Most homes are on a raised foundation. That means there has to be an 18" high crawl space below the framing. Assuming a dead flat site, (which rarely exists here) and a minimum of 10" floor joists, there is 30" from grade to the first floor. You have to allow at least a 9ft ceiling for the first floor—and usually the second floor framing needs to be higher just to allow for ductwork serving the first floor.

Floor to floor height would therefore be a bare minimum of 10'-2". Then just a minimum 8ft ceiling height upstairs and ceiling framing, that brings you up to 21'-8" with no roof material added to that. It is just not practical or realistic to expect a two story residence to have an encroachment plane of 20ft, which is precisely why the PLUM committee wisely adjusted it to 22ft. —which is in itself very tight. But at least it is possible to build a house using that number. As an architect and member of the AIA, I and my colleagues have had meetings with planners and council members to explain the issues. The PLUM amendment with regards to this encroachment plane was an informed one.

PLEASE reconsider this modification.

Also, the requirement to exempt only 200sf of attached garages is a costly mistake.

Unless garages are no longer a requirement for single family dwellings, it cannot be counted as residential floor area. It is not assessed as habitable space, cannot legally be used as habitable space, and in so restricting the square footage of the house in ADDITION TO already reducing the percentage of lot area to .45, you are grossly reducing the value of property. It is a double hit on ordinary single family lots.

It is unfair to property owners who own older homes and need to upgrade or rebuild and yet their neighbors have already built without these restrictions. It will reduce taxes and Undoubtedly cause many lawsuits.

PLEASE reconsider this modification.

Thank you, Gina G. Moffitt, AIA, LEED AP Klyohara Moffitt

Gina G. Moffitt, AIA, LEED AP



620 Moulton Avenue, Studio 106 Los Angeles, CA 90031 T: 323-227-5647



RevisedBMO/BHO (Baseline Mansionization/Base Hillside Ordinance).

2 messages

Andrea & Michael Sher <ma.sher27@gmail.com>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Hi.

Re: Reference Council File #14-0656.

We live at 4019 Goodland Ave in the same small geographic area of Studio City as Harvard-Westlake School and are very concerned that the Ordinance contains language that could exempt institutions like Harvard-Westlake,

which operate under a CUP (conditional use permit), from the BHO, and thus will dangerously threaten our hillside neighborhoods and open space land by opening them to large developments,

such as Harvard-Westlake's proposed parking structure and bridge over Coldwater Canyon.

Schools and other institutions need to follow the same rules as everyone else when it comes to development in residential areas.

Please make sure that the Ordinance clarifies that conditionally permitted uses ARE subjected to the provisions of the BMO and BHO.

Also please make sure that Projects currently in the process of seeking zoning entitlements ARE NOT EXEMPT from the ordinance.

We are Homeowners and Ratepayers and implore and request that Council member Paul Kerkorian and Council President Herb Wesson make sure that the Baseline Hillside Ordinance truly protects our hillsides.

Please help us stop this drastic change in the Municipal code and help us protect and preserve open space land and our precious wildlife habitat in the Coldwater Canyon Area.

There are many more reasons, including traffic in this particular area, which is already almost near gridlock, that would make the parking structure and bridge over Coldwater Canyon a disaster for this area.

We were unable to attend today's meeting DownTown and ask that you please include our written comments in the records.

Many thanks,

Michael and Andrea Sher.



BMO/BHO Ordinance Changes Council File #14-0656

Gina Moffitt <gina@kiyoharamoffitt.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:01 PM

Council Members:

I just read the Modifications that were made the PLUM committee recommendations to the above ordinances at today's council meeting. I literally screamed when I read them. It is NOT POSSIBLE to have an encroachment plane starting at 20ft. I am an architect with over 30 years experience designing houses in Los Angeles. The math doesn't work. Most homes are on a raised foundation. That means there has to be an 18" high crawl space below the framing. Assuming a dead flat site, (which rarely exists here) and a minimum of 10" floor joists, there is 30" from grade to the first floor. You have to allow at least a 9ft ceiling for the first floor—and usually the second floor framing needs to be higher just to allow for ductwork serving the first floor.

Floor to floor height would therefore be a bare minimum of 10'-2". Then just a minimum 8ft ceiling height upstairs and ceiling framing, that brings you up to 21'-8" with no roof material added to that. It is just not practical or realistic to expect a two story residence to have an encroachment plane of 20ft, which is precisely why the PLUM committee wisely adjusted it to 22ft. —which is in itself very tight. But at least it is possible to build a house using that number. As an architect and member of the AIA, I and my colleagues have had meetings with planners and council members to explain the issues. The PLUM amendment with regards to this encroachment plane was an informed one.

PLEASE reconsider this modification.

Also, the requirement to exempt only 200sf of attached garages is a costly mistake.

Unless garages are no longer a requirement for single family dwellings, it cannot be counted as residential floor area. It is not assessed as habitable space, cannot legally be used as habitable space, and in so restricting the square footage of the house in ADDITION TO already reducing the percentage of lot area to .45, you are grossly reducing the value of property. It is a double hit on ordinary single family lots.

It is unfair to property owners who own older homes and need to upgrade or rebuild and yet their neighbors have already built without these restrictions. It will reduce taxes and Undoubtedly cause many lawsuits.

PLEASE reconsider this modification.

Thank you, Gina G. Moffitt, AIA, LEED AP Klyohara Moffitt

Gina G. Moffitt, AIA, LEED AP



620 Moulton Avenue, Studio 106 Los Angeles, CA 90031 T: 323-227-5647



RevisedBMO/BHO (Baseline Mansionization/Base Hillside Ordinance).

Andrea & Michael Sher <ma.sher27@gmail.com> To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:53 PM

Hi.

Re: Reference Council File #14-0656.

We live at 4019 Goodland Ave in the same small geographic area of Studio City as Harvard-Westlake School and are very concerned that the Ordinance contains language that could exempt institutions like Harvard-Westlake,

which operate under a CUP (conditional use permit), from the BHO, and thus will dangerously threaten our hillside neighborhoods and open space land by opening them to large developments,

such as Harvard-Westlake's proposed parking structure and bridge over Coldwater Canyon.

Schools and other institutions need to follow the same rules as everyone else when it comes to development in residential areas.

Please make sure that the Ordinance clarifies that conditionally permitted uses ARE subjected to the provisions of the BMO and BHO.

Also please make sure that Projects currently in the process of seeking zoning entitlements ARE <u>NOT</u> EXEMPT from the ordinance.

We are Homeowners and Ratepayers and implore and request that Council member Paul Kerkorian and Council President Herb Wesson make sure that the Baseline Hillside Ordinance truly protects our hillsides.

Please help us stop this drastic change in the Municipal code and help us protect and preserve open space land and our precious wildlife habitat in the Coldwater Canyon Area.

There are many more reasons, including traffic in this particular area, which is already almost near gridlock, that would make the parking structure and bridge over Coldwater Canyon a disaster for this area.

We were unable to attend today's meeting DownTown and ask that you please include our written comments in the records.

Many thanks,

Michael and Andrea Sher.



Support 45% FAR and Count Garages - CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

mags90035@yahoo.com <mags90035@yahoo.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 11:29 PM

Reply-To: "mags90035@yahoo.com" <mags90035@yahoo.com>
To: Herb Wesson <herb.wesson@lacity.org>, Council Member Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, Liz Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson.Dickinson@lacity.org>

TO: Council President Wesson and Councilman Koretz

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilman Koretz,

I am a homeowner in Crestview who was stunned and disappointed by PLUM's decision at the end of a long afternoon last week to reject the distinguished Planning Commission's recommendations for 45% FAR and the garage exemptions without any discussion. At today's December 7's City Council meeting, I am hopeful that you will steer Council in the right direction and remain committed to discourage overdevelopment of our neighborhoods and especially, in Crestview. I strongly support R1R2-RG (Rear Garage). Please support 45% FAR and count all front-facing attached garages, and give rear garages 200 sq. ft exemption. I look forward to your distinguished leadership and guardianship.

Sincerely,

Margaret Roiphe 1721 South Garth Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90035 Council District 5