



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUBJECT: BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Laura <lamcmail@gmail.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 10:03 AM

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

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.

Laura McCreary
Picfair Village
CD 10

Lookout Mountain Alliance

July 11, 2016

City Planning Commission

C/o City Hall

Public Works Board Room 350

200 N. Spring Street

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: CPC -2015-3484 –CA – CEQA: ENV 2015-4197-ND

Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for your service to our City and your input regarding these Amendments to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance(BHO) and the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance(BMO) as they apply to single family dwellings City-wide. The Lookout Mountain Alliance supported the First draft of the proposed amendments as sensible additions to the BHO enacted in 2011. Furthermore, we supported and continue to support the recommendations of the Hillside Federation in their letters to the Department of City Planning on 5/11/16 and 9/10/2016. We continue to support Councilmember Paul Koretz and David Ryu in their letter regarding the Second draft of these Amendments dated May 4,2016 to Director of City Planning Vince Bertoni.

Unfortunately, the Staff report still does not address the issues that plague our older hillside communities and the concerns of stakeholders with respect to what we refer to as 'slot lots' – lots that are comprised of square footage under 5000 sq. ft. which is the City standard for 'conforming lots'. The inclusion of a guarantee of 1000 sq. feet in the BHO and now still in the Staff report, has produced development that is not only incompatible with the "neighborhood character" in our hillside areas but has resulted in an increase density; reduction of open space; impacts to wildlife connectivity and perhaps most importantly, negatively impact Infrastructure, as we have seen in our community over the past year. What would be considered 'Small lot sub-division' type structures are popping up all over our hillsides where an actual Small Lot Subdivision would not be allowed by CODE in any R-1 neighborhood? You will see a photo today of what was allowed to be built "BY RIGHT" on Wonderland Avenue in Laurel Canyon which illustrates our point. While we understand that property owners have a right to develop their property, the City has standards and code provisions that are in place that can limit what is built but has mechanisms in place to allow for deviations or exceptions to the Code. We would like to have the 1000 sq. ft. guarantee removed from the BHO amendments but if necessary, something less than 1000 sq. feet. It seems reasonable to eliminate a Guarantee on such small lots that could be tied together to produce (1) 5000 sq. ft. lots where a property owner/owner/builder/applicant could still build their dream home (1) 5,00 square ft. parcel that could have less of a negative impact and still provide for a reasonably sized home under the BHO. Provision could be made for an Applicant to seek an Adjustment or a Variance if necessary. In 2011 when the BHO was enacted, no one thought a 1000 sq. ft. home in the hillsides was economically feasible for a developer but that has changed over the past 5 years. It is feasible to buy these types of slot lots at a reduced rate and build (3) homes at the same time and sell them for a profit. However, the result has been negative impacts to public safety; increased density; loss of wildlife corridors and connectivity; loss of neighborhood character and street and infrastructure failures costing millions of taxpayer dollars for repairs and environmental impacts that will negatively affect the neighborhoods forever.

Lookout Mountain Alliance

Re: Grading: In your 'FACT SHEET', the following is mentioned: "create a grading exemption for piles and caissons". Can Staff please clarify and explain this new addition; where it came from and what does it mean?

Re: Grading Table: Please clarify the nexus by which the Staff Report's table has allowed for an increase of BY RIGHT grading? The point and intent of the original BHO was that the land would dictate what would be built. How does 2000 cubic yards of BY RIGHT grading address that issue and help to close the grading loophole? 2000 cubic yards represents over 200 trucks traversing the hillsides, many on substandard roadways that have weight restrictions of 6000 pounds and that's just for starters. How does adjusting the formula for maximum grading allowed from 500 cubic yards plus the numeric value equal to 5% of the lot size in cubic yards to "1000 cubic yards plus the numeric value equal to 10% of the lot size in cubic yards help to alleviate the negative impacts of grading hillsides - some of which are 100% slope? Once again, how does this benefit the hillsides and environment as it appears the math doesn't work in favor of the land which was the spirit and intent and PROMISE of the BHO when it was signed in 2011? What about the 1000 cubic yard limit for a Haul Route hearing? How will that work if BY RIGHT grading is changed to 2000 cubic yards?

In context, grading means more than just cubic yards of earth moved or exported... it means loss of wildlife connectivity; loss of open space; loss of community character in neighborhoods and huge negative impacts to public safety. Just last week, the folks in Glassell Park had a concrete truck that fell over in a hillside- the second in a few months. We all know what happened on Loma Vista but at least the City of Beverly Hills has done something about this, albeit court mandated. We know about the recent street collapses on Sunset Plaza Drive and Appian Way which has cost the City millions and counting to fix and repair. Where there is grading - there are 10 wheel or bigger trucks; where there is grading - there are hillsides and environments being changed; where there is grading on these substandard hillside streets- public safety is at stake; where there is grading, whether it be export/import or 'compaction' the impacts are there without mitigations.

While we appreciate the Departments outreach and willingness to work with the various communities and Council offices over the past several months and understand that there will never be a 100% consensus, this Staff Report with respect to the BHO has not fulfilled the mandate as directed by Councilman Koretz; not addressed the issues mentioned in the letter from Councilmembers Ryu and Koretz as to some of the loopholes in the BHO which was the task assigned. We do support the positive changes in the Staff report regarding bringing the FAR of 0.45 to all lots, regardless of size but it appears that with respect to BHO issues, we have a ways to go.

We urge the City Planning Commissioners to review carefully and listen to the hillside representatives from all over the City who have labored over years and the political winds of change to make the promise of the BHO and the BMO come to fruition. We have faith that this can be done and must be done.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Sidlow, Steven Poster/The Lookout Mountain Alliance – Laurel Canyon
Dietrich Nelson/ The Nichols Canyon Neighborhood Association



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Re: BMO/BHO Code Amendment at PLUM Committee Tuesday 11/29/16

Karen Mitri <Karen.M@protohomes.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 11:25 AM

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

Good Morning Sharon,

I hope you had a wonderful Thanksgiving Holiday. I would like to voice some concerns regarding the BMO/BHO Code Amendment.

First, the garage area exemption being determined by the location is unfair for lots not located on an alley. This punishes lots with only front yard access, condemning them to either having a smaller livable home or losing their front and side yard to driveway. If the point of this ordinance is to create a more beautiful and sustainable community, it is not done by adding more concrete to our yards. Also, garages are used mainly for storage these days. This encourages builders to build smaller garages, limiting the amount of storage/parking, which will mainly result in residence parking cars on their driveway and on the street, rather than their garage. Again, the result is not a beautiful community, but a yard littered with cars, and miscellaneous items that would have been stored in the garage. The 400 sf exemption should be regardless of garage location.

Second, the side yard requirements don't seem to take narrow lots into consideration. A two story home longer than 45' on a 30'-40' wide lot will have less than 50% of its lot width to build due to the requirement to set back 5' in addition to the required side setbacks. The additional 5' setback should be more of a percentage of the lot width than a fixed 5' dimension.

Finally, with the introduction of the encroachment plane it is important to know what is allowed to project into this setback: awnings, architectural ornamentation, eaves, parapets, balconies, etc. These elements all create architectural variation and aesthetics as well as provide a more environmentally sustainable design. Limiting these projections hinders the designers ability to control solar heat gain and provide more comfortable living environments and limiting the dependence on conditioned spaces. Allowing these projections will save energy and create healthier living conditions.

I understand the need to limit the ability of big box homes, but limiting everything has an opposite effect. Garages should always have 400sf exemption, there should be exemptions for side yard requirements depending on the lot width, and architectural projections should be allowed into the encroachment plane.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to see what the committee concludes.

Best,

Karen Bechara Mitri

Architectural Director



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Nava Teleki <nava@halev.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 7:56 AM

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

Cc: nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, 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 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.

Nava Teleki
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Nava Teleki <nava@alphabethouse.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 7:57 AM

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

Cc: nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, 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 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.

Ronnie Serr
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Jennifer Meislohn <meisterjj@yahoo.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 11:37 AM

Reply-To: Jennifer Meislohn <meisterjj@yahoo.com>

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 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.

Jennifer Meislohn
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Edward Miller <edward_miller22@yahoo.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 11:45 AM

Reply-To: Edward Miller <edward_miller22@yahoo.com>

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 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.

Edward Miller
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Eric <hagieeric@aol.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 1:08 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, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org

Dear PLUM Members,

There have been great improvements on the amendments! THANK YOU FOR YOUR DILIGENCE! 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.

Thank you for listening to the people, not the lobbyists!

Eric Newton
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Zoning - I support R1V New - Please take note!

Barbara Barnes <bameswife@verizon.net>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 1:15 PM

Attn: Sharon Dickinson:
RE: **Council File #14-0656**

This letter is to again state that I support the more realistic option of **R1V New for my Mar Vista home & neighborhood. (Los Angeles, CA 90066).**

I request that my comments and support be included in the November 29 hearing.

I thank you for your help in this important matter.

Happy Holidays!
Sincerely,

Barbara Lennon Barnes
resident at: 3222 Grandview Bl, Los Angeles, CA 90066... since 1977....almost 40 years in this home...and Lifetime West LA resident!



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

Roxann Smith <roxann14@gmail.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 2:41 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>, councilmember.englander@lacity.org <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org <councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org>, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org <councilmember.bonin@lacity.org>, erika.pulst@lacity.org <erika.pulst@lacity.org>, lauraine.braithwaite@lacity.org <lauraine.braithwaite@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.englander@lacity.org>, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org
Cc: 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 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.

Thank you.

Roxann Smith
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656

Thomas Lavin <Thomas@thomaslavin.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 2:48 PM

To: "Vince.Bertoni@lacity.org" <Vince.Bertoni@lacity.org>, "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Bertoni & Ms. Dickinson:

As a 5 year resident of Nichols Canyon and a third generation Los Angeleno, I urge you support reverting the objectives of City

Council motion 14-0656 for all of the reasons outlined in Mr. Charley Mims letter, dated May 11, 2016, of which you are in receipt.

The hills of Los Angeles are internationally recognized as the iconic representation of Los Angeles (with the ocean). They are beautiful; more importantly they are home and refuge to indigenous flora and fauna that is under siege from draught, increased traffic, and overbuilding. It is our duty as responsible citizens to protect these lands for the nature, which it supports, and for future generations who will enjoy the beauty.

I urge you support reverting the objectives of City Council motion 14-0656

Thank you,

Thomas Lavin

7535 Lolina Lane

Los Angeles, CA 90046

323.882.6117



THOMAS LAVIN

310 278 2456 • Showroom Tel

ThomasLavin.com





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

TIME SENSITIVE: MANSIONIZATION Council File 14-0656

Paula Waxman <pwmw100@yahoo.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 3:51 PM

Reply-To: Paula Waxman <pwmw100@yahoo.com>

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

Re: Council File 14-0656

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

We are writing to you with regard to the Mansionization that is going on in the community of Beverlywood.

Beverlywood was originally designed and zoned as a neighborhood for middle class homes. Therefore the lots and homes were of modest size and there was a modest amount of viewable green space as you drove down the street. Most of the original homes in this neighborhood were built in the 50's, so I understand the need to improve and/or rebuild them. However, we are dismayed and puzzled by the current trend of building large homes on such small lots. These are our concerns:

1. They cause a radical reduction in available street parking. With each new large home, some with four to six bedrooms, the design takes another cut out of the sidewalk to accommodate side-by-side garages, usually built in the front of the house with bedrooms above. This reduces available parking by one space. While at the same time, these mansions necessitate daily staff coming in to work who park on the street. The mansion at the end of our cul-de-sac has three staff daily (two nannies and a house keeper) plus the usual weekly gardeners and pool maintenance people. Soon their children will be driving, taking up more street parking spaces. Currently we have 5 mansions out of 15 homes on our block alone and two more mansions are in the works. There is almost no parking on the cul-de-sac during trash and street cleaning days so it is hard to imagine how this type of growth is sustainable.
2. The huge size is often unnecessary. The new home that was built next to our 2400 square foot house is double the size of ours. The home it replaced was 1800 square feet. The master bedroom of the mansion has a walk-in closet that is the size of our smallest bedroom. In addition, the large entry has exceedingly high ceilings which also is unnecessary and a waste of space. Contrary to the large family argument, only two adults and one child live in this home. When every other industrialized country is learning to live with less, this trend to more space per capita is greedy and environmentally retrograde.
3. These large homes turn over fast. Our neighborhood used to be very stable. Folks would raise their children until grown and live in the houses 30 to 50 years...until death. Now, when the last child leaves, the parents no longer need a big house, so they sell. This has happened to two of the earliest mansions built on the block. We used to be a close knit block but sadly, those bonds have loosened.
4. Because the structure is taking up so much of the lot, it has reduced back yards forcing small children to play in the streets and that has become a danger especially in light of the parking density and increased comings and goings of workers and residents.

We hope you will keep in mind the original design of this neighborhood when you consider extending a variance to primarily builders investing in my community. Financially, we have nothing to gain by our position. But community, quality of life, and the environment are more important to us. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call us.

Sincerely,

Mark and Paula Waxman
9725 Cresta Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90035
(310) 559-2552



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO Amendments CF no. 14-0656

Carol Eisner <carol@eisnerpr.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 4:08 PM

To: neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org, vince.bertoni@lacity.org, kevin.keller@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, craig.weber@lacity.org, tom.rothmann@lacity.org, Christine.saponara@lacity.org, Carol@eisnerpr.com, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org, nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: christine.saponara@lacity.org, Elizabeth Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>, Chris Klatman <cklatman@gmail.com>

I live in the 1800 block of Crestview in CD10. Can you help we longtime homeowners stop the mansionizers who ruin charm and character of our iconic diverse affordable LA neighborhood? We raised two kids and sent them to public schools including Hamilton HS and Cal Berkeley and we hope they can afford to return to our neighborhood! We are opposed to giant houses, whose bonuses are nothing more than giveaways to the builders and make our neighborhood UNAFFORDABLE!!! How will the next generation afford our homes if you allow unfettered building bonuses?

We hope to obtain new zone R1R2-RG. But in the meantime our whole city needs the following limits and improvements:

- * 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!

- * 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.

The original Motion was fair and reasonable to start with, and the current draft of amendments makes further concessions. It's 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. DONT give veto power to a vocal minority concentrated in a few pockets of resistance especially in Crestview who wish to build as if it were a religious freedom...this is America with beautiful neighborhoods not the West Bank!

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

Carol Eisner

1817 Sherbourne Dr.

Los Angeles, CA 90035

Crestview

Carol Eisner
 (310) 839-1400
 Eisner Public Relations
 (310) 413-3991 Mobile/Text

11/29/2016

City of Los Angeles Mail - BMO Amendments CF no. 14-0656

Carol@eisnerpr.com

P.O. Box 27404
Los Angeles, CA 90027
www.hillsidefederation.org



PRESIDENT
Charley Mims
CHAIRMAN
Marian Dodge
VICE PRESIDENTS
Mark Stratton
John Given
SECRETARIES
Carol Sidlow
John Given
TREASURER
Don Andres

Beachwood Canyon Neighborhood
Bel-Air Association
Bel Air Knolls Property Owners
Bel Air Skycrest Property Owners
Benedict Canyon Association
Brentwood Hills Homeowners
Brentwood Residents Coalition
Cahuenga Pass Property Owners
Canyon Back Alliance
CASM-SFV
Crests Neighborhood Assn.
Franklin Ave./Hollywood Bl. West
Franklin Hills Residents Assn.
Highlands Owners Assn.
Hollywood Dell Civic Assn.
Hollywood Heights Assn.
Hollywoodland Homeowners
Holmby Hills Homeowners Assn.
Kagel Canyon Civic Assn.
Lake Hollywood HOA
Laurel Canyon Assn.
Lookout Mountain Alliance
Los Feliz Improvement Assn.
Mt. Olympus Property Owners
Mt. Washington Homeowners All.
Nichols Canyon Assn.
N. Beverly Dr./Franklin Canyon
Oak Forest Canyon Assn.
Oaks Homeowners Assn.
Outpost Estates Homeowners
Rancho Verdugo Estates
Residents of Beverly Glen
Roscomare Valley Assn.
Save Coldwater Canyon!
Save Sunset Blvd.
Shadow Hills Property Owners
Sherman Oaks HO Assn.
Silver Lake Heritage Trust
Studio City Residents Assn.
Sunset Hills Homeowners Assn.
Tarzana Property Owners Assn.
Torreyson Flynn Assn.
Upper Mandeville Canyon
Upper Nichols Canyon NA
Whitley Heights Civic Assn.

CHAIRS EMERITI
Shirley Cohen
Jerome C. Daniel
Patricia Bell Hearst
Alan Kishbaugh
Gordon Murley
Steve Twining
CHAIRS IN MEMORIAM
Brian Moore
Polly Ward

Vince Bertoni
Director of Planning
Department of City Planning
200 North Spring Street, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

May 11, 2016

**Re: Baseline Hillside Ordinance Amendments
CPC-2015-3484-CA
CPC-2015-4197-EAF**

Dear Mr. Bertoni:

The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Inc, founded in 1952, represents 45 resident and homeowner associations with approximately 250,000 constituents spanning the Santa Monica Mountains. At its meeting on May 4, 2016, the Federation voted to support the letter from Councilmembers Paul Koretz and David Ryu. The Councilmembers' letter requested that proposed amendments to the Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) revert to the original goal of protecting neighborhoods. With respect to hillside areas, these requests include:

- Removal of increased 'by right' grading allowances;
- Reducing FAR for R-1 lots below 7500 square feet to 0.45;
- Elimination of the guaranteed 1,000 sq. ft. minimum residential floor area in designated Hillside areas; and
- Seeking additional community input on FAR exemptions and basement exemptions.

As addressed in the Hillside Federation's January 9, 2016 comment letter on then-proposed BHO amendments, the spirit and intent of the Baseline Hillside Ordinance is to use natural hillside terrain to determine the appropriate scope of development on hillside parcels. The Federation's letter requested the closure of the loopholes in the original BHO, which came to light only after its adoption in 2011. The originally proposed BHO

amendments, drafted after a long series of public hearings/meetings, helped to close those loopholes. The Hillside Federation's January letter also urged the City to:

1. Map all hillsides with a 1:1 or greater slope in hillside areas; and
2. Prohibit development of 1:1 or greater slopes unless a Zoning Administrator's Determination is obtained.

As you know, since the passage of the BHO in 2011, hillside communities in the City of Los Angeles have experienced a dramatic increase in development. Engineering and construction techniques not contemplated when the BHO was first adopted have resulted in many unintended consequences. For example, the recent trend of expansive 'habitable basements' in hillside area (many twice the square footage of the above-ground home) cause enormous harm. The massive amounts of grading for such projects causes substantial degradation of natural terrain in hillside areas. Corresponding negative impacts include the loss of open space, negative environmental impacts including substantial loss of wildlife connectivity, negative impacts to public safety of our hillside communities, failure of infrastructure that is unable to support the increase in volume and scale of development, and destruction of neighborhood character.

One need only look to recent development applications such as the 82,000 square foot single family residence previously proposed at 10101 Angelo View Drive (see attached Hillside Federation letter of June 22, 2015) to understand the urgent need to close BHO loopholes and adopt more stringent regulations to protect the steepest, most prominent slopes in our hillsides.

The Hillside Federation urges the Department of City Planning to follow the recommendation of the May 4, 2016 letter from Councilmembers Koretz and Ryu to revert to the objectives of City Council motion 14-0656, and to include the Hillside Federation's request to map and further regulate development of slopes of 1:1 or greater. Adopting these recommendations will strengthen the Baseline Hillside Ordinance, allowing it to live up to its original spirit and intent.

Sincerely,

Charley Mims
Charley Mims

Cc:

Honorable Mayor Eric Garcetti

Honorable Councilmembers: Council President Herb Wesson, Paul Koretz, David Ryu,
Jose Huizar, Mitch Englander, Gilbert Cedillo, Mike Bonin, Paul Krekorian

Dept. of City Planning: Tom Rothman, Nicholas Maricich, Phyllis Nathanson, Erick Lopez

Marquez Knolls Property Owners Association

November 28, 2016

City Council Planning & Land Use Management Committee
c/o Sharon Dickinson
Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Via E-mail

**Re: Council File#14-0656
Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) Code Amendment; Proposed ReZoning
Code Amendment to Modify Single Family Zone Regulation**

Dear City Council Planning and Land Use Management Committee:

Marquez Knolls Property Owners Association (MKPOA) represents approximately 1,250 homes in Marquez Knolls, a community within Pacific Palisades north of Sunset Boulevard between Palisades Drive and Bienvenida Avenue. MKPOA is one of the largest homeowners association's in Pacific Palisades.

MKPOA respects the rights of property owners and the right to develop. MKPOA is not opposed to development per se, but, rather, is opposed to development that alters the character of our unique neighborhood and community. This is in keeping with the overriding mission of MKPOA to promote and encourage the preservation of the beauty and healthful environment of the residential areas within the boundaries of Marquez Knolls.

By way of history, Marquez Knolls was originally developed by the Lachman family. They began their development of Marquez Knolls in the 1950s with construction concluding in the 1970s. The homes were developed to enhance each homeowner's privilege of open-air space as views whether it is of ocean, hillside or city lights. The Marquez Knolls development consists of flatlands and terraced hillsides and is divided into the following three zoning sections: (1) R1, coastal hillside (2) R1, coastal flatlands (3) RE, coastal hillside.

With regard to the area designated as R1, coastal hillside, MKPOA applauds the efforts that have been taken by the Department of City Planning to restrict mansionization with amendments to the BHO that not only limit FAR but also set forth tighter building restrictions. This is in line with the mission of MKPOA to preserve the intent of the original developers of Marquez Knolls.

Notwithstanding the monumental effects of the amendments to the BHO, MKPOA still has concerns about the increase in grading and hauling. Due to slope instability as documented by a prior landslide as well as the fact that Marquez Knolls has limited ingress and egress, an increase in grading and hauling in the Marquez Knolls area remains of grave concern.

In reference to the Department of City Planning Recommendation Report submitted to City Planning Commission at the meeting on November 10, 2016 ("Report"), MKPOA would like to commend both the Department of City Planning and the Neighborhood Conservation Team on taking extraordinary measures to hold community meetings and elicit the thoughts and comments of anyone possibly affected by either amendments to either the mansionization ordinances or rezoning. The needs and concerns of our residents were heard and are, for the most part, reflected in the Report.

Not to overshadow these efforts but more as a measure to bring forth awareness, MKPOA does have a concern about the content of the Report. Apparently the body of the Report does not clarify that there are only certain portions of Pacific Palisades that will be affected by the Ordinance amending Section 12.04 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code ("LAMCC"). The portions of Pacific Palisades affected by the Ordinance are designated in a map that is attached to the draft Ordinance (Exhibit P"). Marquez Knolls is not included in this map and, thus, the Ordinance amending Section 12.04 of LAMCC does not apply to Marquez Knolls. In abundance of caution and as a means to alleviate any potential confusion, MKPOA respectfully requests wording in the Ordinance be clear and concise to delineate the portions of Pacific Palisades where the Ordinance will apply.

Lastly, not included in the Report but of importance to MKPOA is the rezoning of the R1, coastal flatlands and the RE15, coastal hillside regions of Marquez Knolls. The R1, coastal flatlands section stands out as having the most recent and significant rash of over-size building. Smaller, original homes are over shadowed by the newly constructed out-of-scale homes. The looming affect is clearly apparent. Concerns abound regarding the height that a resident will have to build just to compete for open air space and privacy.

As pertaining to the RE15, coastal hillside regions of Marquez Knolls, Officers of the Board of MKPOA relayed to the Neighborhood Conservation Team that recent data studies support that this area was seemingly misclassified. A significant number of parcels do not meet the parcel size requirements of RE15 and many parcels are composed of unusable steep slopes. Thus, rezoning based on topography remains crucial in this area to protect views and eliminate over-building and excessive grading on already fragile hillsides.

In closing, MKPOA would like to thank you for your kind consideration and efforts to preserve our community.

Respectfully submitted,

Christy Dennis
President, MKPOA

Cheryl Zomber
Vice-President, MKPOA
CC&Rs & Zoning



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

MO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

LYNN EASLEY <lynneasley@mac.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 4:57 PM

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

Lynn Easley

Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

FILE # 14-0656

Laura Rae-Yates <lradiates@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 5:39 PM

We are writing to say we support Councilman Ryu and Koretz's recommendations about File # 14-0656.

Thank you,
Mort Yates and Laura Rae-Yates



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO Amendments, Council File 14-0656

Shellicruz@aol.com <Shellicruz@aol.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 8:11 PM

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

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org, nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, 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.
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.

With thanks for your support on this very important issue.

Rochelle Koretz
Picfair Village
CD 10

SUBJECT: BMO/BHO Amendments, CF no. 14-0656

The last time LA tackled mansionization, speculators called the shots. But after the Sea Breeze scandal, 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 the 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. It's 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.

Thank you,

Kristen Tostado

335 South Orange Drive



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BHO / PLUM committee mtg

Lee Clay <leeclay@mac.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 9:49 PM

To: zina.cheng@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: Carol <csidlow0264@aol.com>, Steven Poster <stevenasc@aol.com>

Dear Sharon and Zina -

Wanted to take a minute to write to you because I am not able to be there in person tomorrow due to childcare issues, but wanted to voice my opinion about the current loopholes in the 2011 BHO.

I am in full support of the issues raised by The Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations in its May 11 letter (attached below). Our communities which are largely hillside with failing infrastructure are being overbuilt and residents are often subjected to dangerous conditions as a result.

As you know, since the passage of the BHO in 2011, hillside communities in the City of Los Angeles have experienced a dramatic increase in development. Engineering and construction techniques not contemplated when the BHO was first adopted have resulted in many unintended consequences. For example, the recent trend of expansive 'habitable basements' in hillside area (many twice the square footage of the above-ground home) cause enormous harm. The massive amounts of grading for such projects causes substantial degradation of natural terrain in hillside areas. Corresponding negative impacts include the loss of open space, negative environmental impacts including substantial loss of wildlife connectivity, negative impacts to public safety of our hillside communities, failure of infrastructure that is unable to support the increase in volume and scale of development, and destruction of neighborhood character.

I am asking that the BHO revert to the original goal of protecting neighborhoods and request the following:

- 1) Removal of increased 'by right' grading allowances;
- 2) Reducing FAR for R-1 lots below 7500 square feet to 0.45;
- 3) Elimination of the guaranteed 1,000 sq. ft. minimum residential floor area in designated Hillside areas; and
- 4) Seeking additional community input on FAR exemptions and basement exemptions.
- 5) Map all hillsides with a 1:1 or greater slope in hillside areas; and
- 6) Prohibit development of 1:1 or greater slopes unless a Zoning Administrator's determination is obtained.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to this matter.

Best,

Lee Clay
8926 Wonderland Ave.
LA, CA 90046

 16 5-11 HF BHO ltr (3).pdf

133K



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUBJECT: BMO AMENDMENTS COUNCIL FILE 14-0656

nshanover . <nshanover@gmail.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 10:18 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 <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 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.

Nancy Hanover-Reyes
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO AMENDMENTS CF no. 14-0656

MegLiberman <megliberman@gmail.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 10:57 PM

To: mayor.garcetti@lacity.org, nicholas.maricich@lacity.org, vince.bertoni@lacity.org, kevin.keller@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, craig.weber@lacity.org, tom.rothmann@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@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

SUBJECT: BMO/BHO Amendments, CF no. 14-0656

The last time LA tackled mansionization, speculators called the shots. But after the Sea Breeze scandal, 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 the 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. It's 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.

Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue affecting the city we all love.

Meg Libeman



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO Amendments, CF no. 14-0656

pmessina98@aol.com <pmessina98@aol.com>

Mon, Nov 28, 2016 at 11:11 PM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org, david.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.martinez@lacity.org, councilmember.fuentes@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@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, vince.bertoni@lacity.org, kevin.keller@lacity.org, ken.bernstein@lacity.org, craig.weber@lacity.org, tom.rothmann@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

SUBJECT: BMO/BHO Amendments, CF no. 14-0656

The last time LA tackled mansionization, speculators called the shots. But after the Sea Breeze scandal, 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 the 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. It's 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.