



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Rosanne <artrage@sbcglobal.net>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 12:06 AM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, jose.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org

Dear City Council members,

I am unable to attend your meeting tomorrow to discuss changes to the BMO/BHO Ordinance. Instead I am writing yet another email to voice my support of the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July of this year.

I inherited and live in the house I grew up in in Picfair Village, CD 10. My parents bought the house in 1960 on my dad's GI Bill. The house is now surrounded by McMansions—one on each side and one that has been going up behind for the better part of this year. My backyard, where we planted a beautiful garden has always been a special place. It is now a basin of noise coming from the McMansions that overlook it and from the street. Even with landscaping planted to try to block out those buildings, privacy is minimal.

It is not only the character of our old neighborhoods that is important, but more so the quality of life to long time residents. Our family stayed in the neighborhood when it was rough and blighted by crime. We stayed during the riots. My parents worked to better our neighborhood public schools. Now developers are taking away our privacy, breathing room, sun and quality of life by building oversized developments on the lots.

One more point I'd like to raise. These McMansions build over back yards and are usually landscaped with cement and rocks in the front. We need green space in the city. We need our trees. Every year the earth gets hotter. These buildings (which need tons of energy to cool and heat) are part of the problem.

If you love Los Angeles, please support the City Planning Commission's BMO/BHO Amendments from July 2016 and cut out the developers loopholes.

Thank you,

Rosanne Kleinerman
Picfair Village, CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Reference Council File #14-0656

1 message

Renee Saifer <reeneisaifer@gmail.com>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 6:53 AM

To Members of the City Council and Planning Commission regarding West Laurelwood:

We, Renee and Lorne Saifer, have been residents of West Laurelwood for over 38 years, we would like to better understand the proposed changes to building requirements and how these changes will affect the remodeling of our home.

We will be attending the hearing today and would like to clarify the jurisdiction of the Mullholland Scenic Committee vs the new proposed BHO requirements.

Our Studio City Hillside Area has always been subject to much stricter regulations than the flat lands of Studio City, and we are concerned that any additional reduction in square footage allowances will substantially affect the value of our property.

Thank you for addressing our concerns.

Renee Saifer



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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

1 message

pgarone <pgarone@gmail.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 7:09 AM

Reply-To: pgarone@gmail.com

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

Dear Council President Wesson and Councilman Koretz,

I am a homeowner and live on the 1800 Block of South Bedford Street in Crestview. We are a family of four. Please remain committed to discouraging over development 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. Thank you for your efforts to keep our neighborhoods livable for all.

In the past years developers from outside of the Crestview neighborhood have been tearing down "human sized homes", and replacing them with 4-5 bedroom 2 story monolithic structures that go from property edge to property edge, casting both physical and psychological shadows on the neighboring properties. These developers are not developing homes for themselves or their families but for quick resale - motivated by maximizing short term profits, with little concern for what effect their out-of-proportion structures will have on the quality of life, feel of life, and home values of the adjoining properties. These new homes greatly reduce any sense of privacy for the adjoining properties and drastically change the character of life for their neighbors and for the neighborhood.

Warm Regards,

Patricia Garone
1820 South Bedford Street
LA, CA 90035
COUNCIL DISTRICT 10/5



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE: BMO/BHO amendments

1 message

Karen <kbla1952@yahoo.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 7:37 AM

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

To Whom It May Concern:
RE: Council # 14-0656

My husband and I support the recommendations of Council members Koretz and Ryu regarding the BMO/BHO amendments.

Sincerely, Karen and Jack Beckman, Long time residents of Nichols Canyon.
Sent from my iPad



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO Council file 14-0656

1 message

Maimon Chocron <maimon10@yahoo.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 9:52 AM

Reply-To: Maimon Chocron <maimon10@yahoo.com>

To: Planning Conservation <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, "niall.huffman@lacity.org" <niall.huffman@lacity.org>

Cc: Baila Romm <rommbomm@gmail.com>, Christine Saponara <christine.saponara@lacity.org>, Phyllis Nathanson <phyllis.nathanson@lacity.org>, Shawn Bayliss <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

Sharon,

Please find the attached 25 letters signed by CD 5 and CD 10 residents. These letters include residents' addresses. These are in addition to the 142 letters already sent and posted on the Council portal. The total to date is 167. We are in favor of the latest PLUM amendment (11/29/16) to the BMO draft.

Sharon,

Please take a moment to read the one page letter. We believe our approach is a reasonable compromise.

We are in favor of:

- **Maximum FAR of 0.5 for lots less than 7,500 sq. ft., and 0.45 for lots above 7,500 sq. ft.**
- **Garage exemption up to 400 sq. ft. regardless of location.**
- **150 sq. ft. Exemption for covered patios. 100 sq. ft. Exemption for double height ceilings.**

Please be sure to post all letters and to show this letter and its tally of signatures to the PLUM Committee members.

Please confirm receipt of this email and letters.

We are expecting more signed letters. I will avoid piecemeal as much as possible.

Feel free to contact me with any questions

All the very best,
Steve M. Chocron
CD5 Resident / Homeowner

 BMO part 3.pdf
8903K



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

"CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments"

1 message

Jamie Wolf <jrw@artnet.net>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 9:53 AM

To: councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.price@lacity.org, councilmember.englander@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Cedillo,

I'm addressing this primarily to you, as I'm remembering the thoughtful conversation and exchange of views we had at the celebration for you at Rick Jacobs' home, but I'm a former constituent of Paul Koretz's, from his days as West Hollywood city councilmember, and I hope he may remember the helpful role the West Hollywood Urban Conservation League, which I headed in those days, was able to play in the origination of West Hollywood's award-winning Sunset Boulevard Specific Plan of a couple of decades ago. Our emphasis on a balance between profitable development and the preservation of the particular qualities that give flavor and charm to individual areas of the city is demonstrated today, I think, in the view-corridors and open plazas that characterize the two massive newly-built developments now being finished off on either side of La Cienega and Sunset.

It's easy to imagine the uninterrupted walled-off effect on the South side of Sunset that would have prevailed if there hadn't been the requirements that we put into place back then for "quality of life" components in new construction, and in the same way, it seems to me there needs to be a similar consideration for preserving the varied aspects that are such an important part of all Los Angeles neighborhoods. It's a notable aspect of Los Angeles that its landscape isn't uniform, and it's critical to allow the continuation of a varied streetscape by curtailing the extent to which new construction can overpower the vernacular architecture that's been built up over time. I urge you to take this seriously when you make your decision on these amendments, and to recognize the need for balance and variety that the staff's original recommendations are designed to insure.

Sincerely,

Jamie Wolf, 812 North Foothill Road, Beverly Hills, 90210



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656

1 message

Nancy Hanover <nh.picogsi@gmail.com>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org
Cc: Elizabeth Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:00 AM

Council File #14-0656

To Whom It may Concern:

I would like to go on record to support the BMO as recommended by the City Planning Commission which includes keeping the FAR to .45 and including the front attached garages as part of the sq. footage.

Thank you,
Nancy Hanover-Reyes
Picfair Village
CD 10



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656 Urgent for today's meeting

2 messages

Charla Gardner <charla.sycamoresquare@yahoo.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 9:48 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Julia Duncan <julia.duncan@lacity.org>, Nikki Ezhari <nikki.ezhari@lacity.org>

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to contribute my input regarding the BMO/BHO Code Amendment and would like this information shared with the City Council at today's meeting (12/7/16). I am a home owner, concerned citizen and a member of the Sycamore Square Neighborhood Association Board.

I am strongly opposed to the following recommendations to modify the proposed ordinance by the PLUM Committee:

- Change starting height of R1 encroachment plane from 20 to 22 feet.
- Remove front articulation requirement in the R1 Zone.
- Restore 0.5 Floor Area Ratio for R1 lots smaller than 7,500 square feet.
- Restore full 400 square foot exemption for garages, regardless of location.
- Add a provision exempting projects currently in the process of seeking zoning entitlements from following the ordinance.

These modifications would defeat the whole purpose of the BMO/BHO Code Amendments and simply leave it as it is, without amendment! There is a strong desire in Los Angeles to curb the overdevelopment of R1 lots. Following these PLUM recommendations would not help to protect current home owners from McMansions.

I strongly urge you not to follow these recommendations!

Thank you,
Charla Gardner

Nikki Ezhari <nikki.ezhari@lacity.org>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:20 AM

To: Charla Gardner <charla.sycamoresquare@yahoo.com>

Cc: "Dickinson, Sharon" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, Julia Duncan <julia.duncan@lacity.org>

Charla,

Thank you for taking the time to reach out to Council District 4, your opinions are valued.

DAVID RYU
L.A. CITY COUNCILMEMBER

Nikki Ezhari J.D.
Senior Field Deputy
Los Angeles City Councilmember
David Ryu
Field Office: 323-957-6415
www.davidryu.lacity.org

[Quoted text hidden]



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0646

1 message

Constance Boukidis <constanceellen@sbcglobal.net>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 10:42 AM

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

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

I, Constance Boukidis of Comstock Hills in Westwood support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the CITY OF LOS ANGELES **Planning Commission** which limits FAR in R-1 residential neighborhoods to .45. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. Please be sensitive to citizens trying to preserve the character of their community and do not cater to speculators and builders who harm the value of existing homes while ruining neighborhoods.

After so much community feedback and thoughtful work by City Planning, I was stunned that PLUM increased the FAR and restored the attached garage exemption. I have to wonder what the point was of having hearings across the city over the last few years to come to a consensus of how to amend the BMO/BHO in a reasonable fashion.

PLEASE RETURN THE PROPOSED BMO AMENDMENTS AS APPROVED BY THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION AND COUNT ALL FRONT-FACING ATTACHED GARAGES SF.

Thank you.

Constance Boukidis

Chair, Land Use and Planning Committee

Westwood Neighborhood Council

Comstock Hills HOA



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Comments re: Council File #14-0656 - BMO Amendment

1 message

Amy Aquino <amyaquino@gmail.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 11:00 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, David Ryu <david.ryu@lacity.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

To: Council President Wesson,
Council Member Koretz, and
Council Member Ryu
From: Amy Aquino, N. Curson Ave., 90046 , CD4
Re: Council File #14-0656, BMO Amendment and PLUM recommendation

Thank you so much for your leadership in protecting the integrity of our city, and for taking up for reconsideration of the recommendations from the PLUM committee regarding the amendment of the BMO,

Having attended numerous hearings and seeing the overwhelming support for Councilmember Koretz' original proposal, I was shocked at their reversals regarding the FAR for smaller lots, the front-facing garage exemption, and the by-right grading for R1 hillside lots. An emergency prevents me from attending the meeting in person but I want to add my strong voice to those calling for a return to the original recommendations in these areas.

The value and wisdom of both have been clearly laid out many times before. With regard to the garage, volume is volume, and bulk is bulk; for the community, whether that volume is holding a kitchen, a kid's room or a car, an extra 400 sq feet has a powerful and negative impact.

Worse, when the added 400 sq ft is a front-facing garage, the garage door becomes the primary face of the property, and the driveway and larger curb cut prevents any kind of masking with landscaping, resulting in residential streets that have the look of back alleys, or the backsides of beachfront properties.

Incentivizing a rear garage has the added benefit of encouraging inclusion of a driveway, and therefore a better setback from other houses, and less invasion of light and privacy; The smaller FAR and reduced grading quantities will do this this as well.

As someone whose landmarked 1915 bungalow now faces a transparent glass and steel 2-car garage door on a 4600 sq. foot box, I know the damage that these adjustments can make, as compared with other 3000-4000 sq ft homes that have retained rear garages and additional set-backs. I hope you will stand firm and reverse the PLUM recommendations in these areas, and maintain the integrity and spirit of the amendments by restoring the .45 FAR for lots under 7500', eliminating any exemptions for garages, and reducing the maximum by-right grading quantities for R1 hillside lots to 1,000 cubic yards.

Sincerely,

Amy Aquino



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656

1 message

Sarah Lambert <pluot@me.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 12:45 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Please make sure my concerns are entered into the council's transcripts pertaining to development of land in residential areas of Studio City, and all of LA.

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

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

and

Make sure that Projects currently in the process of seeking zoning entitlements ARE NOT EXEMPT from the ordinance!

**Thank you,
Sarah Lambert
Studio City Resident**



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Fwd: Out of the office Re: R1R2-RG Re-zoning

Michael Houske <mhouske@gmail.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 1:22 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, Elizabeth Carlin <elizabeth.carlin@lacity.org>, Jordan Beroukhim <jordan.beroukhim@lacity.org>, christine.saponara@lacity.org, james.k.williams@lacity.org, niall.huffman@lacity.org, cpc@lacity.org

Opposition of Faircrest Heights and Crestview Residents to R1R2 RG.

Council File #14-0656 & CPC-2016-2112-ZC

Attached are 18 additional letters in opposition to R1R2 RG re-zoning for the Faircrest Heights (16 new letters) and Crestview CD 10 (2 letters) neighborhoods. I have now provided you 108 letters in opposition to R1R2 RG for these neighborhoods - 85 opposition letters from Faircrest Heights residents and 23 opposition letters from Crestview CD 10. Based on these letters, the Planning Commission, Councilman Wesson and the PLUM Committee must be informed that support for R1R2 RG in these neighborhoods is far from unanimous. In fact, once my neighbors were educated on the additional potential restrictions being forced on them by the proposed R1R2 RG re-zoning, almost every single one opposed the proposed R1R2 RG and signed the letter. Given more time to talk and educate the residents of Faircrest Heights and Crestview CD 10 as to the differences between BMO and R1R2 RG, I am certain that I could double, triple or even quadruple the number of resident in opposition to these severe and arbitrary restrictions.

The falsely perceived lack of opposition to the proposed R1R2 RG was not due to support for these additional, arbitrary zoning restrictions, it was based on a lack of knowledge by the residents of Faircrest Heights and Crestview CD 10 as to what was being proposed.

Michael Houske
1739 Alvira Street
Faircrest Heights
(310) 488-1120

Opposition of Faircrest Heights and Crestview Residents to R1R2 RG.

[Quoted text hidden]

18 additional R1R2RG Opposition Letters.pdf

6406K



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

File #14-0656

1 message

Barry Campion <campionbarry@gmail.com>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 2:22 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Neighborhood Conservation Team:

The photo below represents what has been happening on my street (Palms near Lincoln) for the past 2 years; two over scaled houses are being built by same developer which has acted as a kind of domino effect with now 2 more properties for sale. I live next door to the one "in escrow".

The neighbors directly next to the new construction were my good friends and died last summer in a murder/suicide. They were in their eighties and the peace and quiet of their back yard was totally destroyed. The developer has had complete disregard for the neighborhood. We notified Building and Safety to point out violations pertaining to setbacks and other issues which he has had to fix.

I believe the neighbor next to me decided to sell because she couldn't bare to live next to more construction and was unsettled by the death of her neighbors.

It is obvious what is happening in Venice, I believe the only way to save and maintain our neighborhoods is through reasonable building codes that allow for construction within limits. Limits that protect neighbors from the adverse effects on their sense of surrounding space, privacy, access to sunlight etc.

I support the the new ordinance and hope it is not altered too much from its original form. I am sure there are many pressures from developers to weaken the limitations. It seems to me that developers should not be dictating what the future of our neighborhoods will be. After all they don't really care about the neighborhood.

Thank you,

Barry Campion





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Fwd: Opposition to Safran's Development of Thatcher Yard

1 message

Phenh Lam <phenh.lam@lacity.org>
To: sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Wed, Dec 7, 2016 at 6:26 AM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: DFletcherHoppe@aol.com
Date: December 7, 2016 at 12:12:37 AM PST
To: clerk.webfeedback@lacity.org, clerk.nbid@lacity.org
Cc: dfletcherhoppe@aol.com
Subject: **Opposition to Safran's Development of Thatcher Yard**

Diane Fletcher-Hoppe, Ph.D.
950 Oxford Ave.
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292
(310) 305-0129
dfletcherhoppe@aol.com

December 6, 2016

Subject: Opposition to Dense Thatcher Yard Development

To whom it may concern,

I have been a resident and property owner in the Oxford Triangle for 32 years. I live across from Thatcher Yard. Please don't ruin the Oxford Triangle by making it denser and ruining the scale and character of the R1 single family residence neighborhood.

I am against the recommendation of developer Thomas Safran & Assoc. because he is designing 84-152 residential units which will ruin our neighborhood without consulting with us. We are told repeatedly that Oxford Triangle Community discussions will be held and our needs will be considered. The OT Neighborhood is united in wanting R-1 single family residence zoning and what we want is not being considered. Instead a lie is regularly perpetrated that you have, are and will be working with us when you have clearly already decided and chosen something we absolutely do not want.

High density housing at the Thatcher Yard will magnify our current grid-lock at the intersection of Washington and Lincoln. Our Triangle is essentially a cul-de-sac with an open access on one side, Washington Blvd, and no access on two closed sides, Admiralty and Lincoln. The 84-152 new planned units will bring in many hundreds new neighbors and their cars to our little cul-de-sac which already requires 2 and sometimes 3 lights in order to enter or exit. We will be trapped.

The City Council plan is counter-productive in that Thatcher Yard is extremely expensive when they could sell Thatcher Yard for much more money and buy less expensive housing elsewhere.

We are well organized and prepared to fight this through all the legal and political channels. But why should we all be fighting, when you could make much better use of the money and help the deserving by giving them

12/7/2016

City of Los Angeles Mail - Fwd: Opposition to Safran's Development of Thatcher Yard

housing in a less expensive area where more units could be developed and in a community that is much less expensive for them as well?

Respectfully,

Diane Fletcher-Hoppe, Ph.D.