



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656**

---

John Donovan &lt;jjdonovan019@gmail.com&gt;

Sun, Nov 27, 2016 at 11:11 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, Herb Wesson &lt;councilmember.wesson@lacity.org&gt;, Council Member Koretz &lt;paul.koretz@lacity.org&gt;

SUBJECT: BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Dear PLUM Members,

There have been great improvements on the amendments, but there are still some major concerns.

1. COUNT ALL FRONT-FACING ATTACHED GARAGE SPACE. Bulk is bulk and it should ALL be counted. CPC made a compromise and it goes too far.
2. LOSE ALL BONUSES!

When you hear that "one size does not fit all", that is true. The Baseline must set meaningful limits, not find the lowest common denominator.

Your decisions on this matter will shape the future of our neighborhoods. Let's get it right this time and serve the needs of our communities, not the interests of speculators.

John Donovan  
Picfair Village  
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

---

## BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

---

Debbie & John <debnjohn@sbcglobal.net>

Sun, Nov 27, 2016 at 11:06 PM

To: "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, "councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org" <councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org>, "councilmember.price@lacity.org" <councilmember.price@lacity.org>, "councilmember.englander@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, "councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Cc: "nicholas.maricich@lacity.org" <nicholas.maricich@lacity.org>, Herb Wesson <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, Council Member Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>

Dear PLUM Members,

There have been great improvements on the amendments, but there are still some major concerns.

1. COUNT ALL FRONT-FACING ATTACHED GARAGE SPACE. Bulk is bulk and it should ALL be counted. CPC made a compromise and it goes too far.
2. LOSE ALL BONUSSES!

When you hear that "one size does not fit all", that is true. The Baseline must set meaningful limits, not find the lowest common denominator.

Your decisions on this matter will shape the future of our neighborhoods. Let's get it right this time and serve the needs of our communities, not the interests of speculators.

Debbie Gaughan  
Picfair Village  
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

## Council File #14-0656

---

Justin Elterman &lt;eltermail@gmail.com&gt;

Sun, Nov 27, 2016 at 8:28 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: Tricia Keane &lt;tricia.keane@lacity.org&gt;, mike@mikebonin.com, Councilmember Bonin &lt;councilmember.bonin@lacity.org&gt;, Christine Saponara &lt;christine.saponara@lacity.org&gt;

Sharon,

I am writing today against the BMO set to go before the Planning Commission on Tuesday, as well as, to point out a number of issues with it.

- The .45 FAR, the maximum FAR reserved for smaller lot sizes - after which it decreases as lot size increases, is far too restrictive. This prohibits constructing a reasonably sized home for a reasonably size family.
- The 20' height at which the 45 degree encroachment plane starts is far too short. Many of the classic homes (that we should be trying to preserve in Los Angeles) have crawl spaces underneath them. The 20' height does not account for these crawl spaces and makes it far too difficult to add a reasonable second story to a home with classic roofing styles.
- Many of the classic old homes in my area, Mar Vista, do not have the 5' of setback on the side yards that modern building codes require. This coupled with the encroachment plane would hinder construction of homes in the classic styles that this ordinance is trying to preserve. In its current form Victorian style homes and other classic building styles simply couldn't be built - because they have roofs with pitches over 45 degrees. This would push construction to modern - boxy style homes with flat roofs.
- Garages are mandated under building code. The Minimum Required Parking is 2 covered parkings spaces per single family residence (22.52.1180). The proposed building code amendments penalizes the home owner if that legally mandated garage [or covered parking] space is any larger then the minimum required 200 sq. ft. per vehicle. That penalty is in counting that extra garage space as livable space against the total livable square footage that can be constructed on a lot. Garages are **NOT livable space** and it should be possible to build a reasonably sized two car garage with space to spare for lawnmowers, bicycles, fishing poles and other items a family would own without it "encroaching" on their livable space. I recommend increasing the exemption for read garages to 500 square feet.
- Similarly the proposed building code amendments require an articulated front facade for single family homes. Within the same set of amendments there's a penalty to the home owner, again by subtracting the square footage for a front porch which that doesn't have a lattice style roof. I live in a 1924 Craftsman style Bungalow with a covered porch and a railing on three sides. This is quintessential California architecture. Why would the Planning Commission put forward a building code amendment that discourages the very character it is trying to preserve? I recommend reducing the 200 square foot exemption for porches to 100 square feet instead of eliminating the exemption.

- I've noticed a number of two story single family homes currently under construction in my area that are well above 1.00 FAR when you count both stories. A single story of these homes take up the majority of their lots. They clearly do not follow any R1 single family home building code that have been in place since 2008. **It is my sense that these are the homes that are presenting the issues this ordinance is trying to remedy.** They represent one of the two things:

- 1) Building codes in LA are not being properly enforced.
- 2) Their lots are not zoned R1.

Either way the BMO does not address either of these problems. If these lots are not zoned R1, it seems more effective to amend the building codes for their lot classifications instead of passing changes to building codes that govern R1 lots.

I understand that the ICO expires in March of next year, and that City Hall thinks there's a need to amend the building codes that had been in place prior to the ICO. This process of amending the building code seems very rushed with a lot of potential negative, unintended consequences. The recommendations of the Department of City Planning needed more thought with additional public comment and outreach before being presented to the Planning Board. It is my hope that you will not pass these proposed recommendations and send the BMO back to the Department of City Planning for improvement and refinement.

In their current form these amendments will stifle the growth of our neighborhoods, restrict the growth of our real estate values, and ultimately leave residents like myself no option but to bring forth litigation against the city.

11/29/2016

City of Los Angeles Mail - Council File #14-0656

Sincerely,

Justin Elterman



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

**Council file #14-0656 : I support R1V New for Mar Vista**

---

**KENT ALVES** <Khalves@msn.com>

Sun, Nov 27, 2016 at 11:19 AM

To: "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

Cc: KENT ALVES &lt;khalves@msn.com&gt;

**PLUM Committee:**

**I strongly support the R1V New zone option for Mar Vista.** Other Mar Vista stakeholders that I have spoken to in my neighborhood also feel it is the right option by a significant majority. The MVCC Board also voted to support R1V New.

The other CPC alternative options that are more restrictive for the building % footprint (such as the R1V2 option) are overly restrictive and do not reflect what I want for my neighborhood at all. Also, these overly restrictive options will result in deterioration of our property values, and for some it will be significant.

Kent Alves

40 year Mar Vista resident - Hilltop neighbors Assoc. area.



Sharon Dickinson &lt;sharon.dickinson@lacity.org&gt;

---

## BMO/BHO Amendments, CF no. 14-0656

---

Shelley Wagers &lt;shelley@wagersmail.net&gt;

Sun, Nov 27, 2016 at 12:20 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, ken.bemstein@lacity.org, vince.bertoni@lacity.org, kevin.keller@lacity.org, tom.rothmann@lacity.org, craig.weber@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, shawn.bayliss@lacity.org  
 Cc: Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

### **The last time LA tackled mansionization, speculators called the shots. But after Sea Breeze, city officials need to show that they put the community first.**

By a very wide margin, city residents and homeowners have called for amendments that reflect the original Council Motion. Councilmembers Koretz and Ryu, the LA Conservancy, and dozens of neighborhood councils and homeowner and resident associations also stressed the need for strong, enforceable ordinances.

The latest draft makes big improvements, especially in R1 zones that make up most of the city's single-family properties. But it has major flaws:

- Attached garages. The Planning Commission's compromise goes too far. It counts only half the square footage of those at the front.

All attached garages add bulk. But garages attached at the front also clash with the look and feel of many LA neighborhoods and lose the buffer of a driveway.

Square footage is square footage, and it should all count. At an absolute minimum, count *all* front-facing attached garage space.

- Grading and hauling. Allowances are excessive. The Hillside Federation recommendations would cut them down to size.

- Bonuses. In RA/RS/RE zones, bonuses add 20% more bulk. Get rid of them.

### **Above all, do not try to split the difference between reasonable and ridiculous.**

The original Motion was fair and reasonable to start with, and the current draft of amendments makes further concessions. Time to hold the line.

You will hear that "one size does not fit all." True. That's why the city is developing zoning options for individual neighborhoods. We cannot give veto power to a vocal minority concentrated in a few pockets of resistance.

### **The baseline must set meaningful limits not find the lowest common denominator.**

### **Mansionization decreases affordable housing and reduces the city's sustainability.**

- It replaces affordable homes with pricey showplaces, and it puts short-term speculation ahead of stable long-term property values.
- It destroys mature street trees, increases runoff, and turns houses into debris.
- It guzzles energy and overloads local utilities.
- It degrades livability, and violates neighborhood character.
- And it has gone on far too long.

### **It's time to serve the needs of our communities, not the interests of speculators.**