



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

**Fw: R1 Variation Zones Code Amendment and Zone Changes at PLUM Committee
Tuesday 2/14/17**

1 message

marianne wisner <wisner_marianne@hotmail.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 9:01 AM

To: "shannon.ryan@lacity.org" <shannon.ryan@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Cc: reuben and blanche rosloff <reublanche@aol.com>, "CPC@lacity.org" <CPC@lacity.org>

Dear Sharon and Shannon,

Our home has lost value because the house across the street expanded its footprint and added a second story, resulting in the reduction of our ocean view, a view which we had enjoyed for the past six years. Our concern is that the current proposed restrictions developed by the city Planning Commission would prevent us, or a future owner, from adding a full second story to recapture the lost view. We continue to request that the ordinances affecting the Marquez Knolls neighborhood of Pacific Palisades remain as they were when we purchased our house in 2010.

I tried to make sense of Section 14 that amends Section 12.23 of the LAMC, since I understand that our house is arguably in the Coastal Zone, and it will take me a while to do it. There are double-negatives and references to a variety of pre-existing regulations, zones, definitions, and the LAMC that I have not had the time to read and digest. Shannon - perhaps you can help me better understand the applicability of these proposed ordinances to our home?

Many of the homes in our neighborhood (lower Marquez Knolls in Pacific Palisades) have added second floors, so the character of the neighborhood changed in the last 10-20 years. Any stated goal of this proposed modification to maintain the "look" of the neighborhood could not be achieved in our neighborhood by ending the ability to add an entire second floor or restrict the building's footprint below that permitted in 2010. That horse left the barn many years ago. Instead, implementation of any zoning modification that further restricts building size will likely maintain a hodgepodge look to the neighborhood – relatively recently remodeled large two-story homes sitting next to smaller 1950's era single floor ranch style homes. The upper Marquez Knolls neighborhood has CC&Rs that will continue to limit the height and footprint of those homes, so the originally proposed BMO/BHO restrictions likely would have little or no effect and the neighborhood would remain generally single story homes.

When we purchased our home our realtor told us, and City Planning confirmed, that we could add a second floor to our home. That ability to add a second floor was a significant factor in our decision to purchase the home. It would be unfair to restrict our ability to add a second story addition to our current single story home when we relied on the City's representation that we could add a second floor and many of the neighbors have already added, or are in the process of adding, additional floors to their homes.

If the City Council restricts the building envelope from what it was in 2010, consideration and relief should be included for homeowners like us, who have been harmed by construction previously allowed under

ordinances then in effect and would be further limited by construction restrictions in the future. Please do not shrink the building envelope pertaining to hillside homes in effect in 2010.

Sincerely,

Marianne Wisner

From: reublanche@aol.com <reublanche@aol.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 12, 2017 4:02 PM

To: wisner_marianne@hotmail.com

Subject: Fwd: R1 Variation Zones Code Amendment and Zone Changes at PLUM Committee Tuesday 2/14/17

Hi Marianne,

I have the sense that there is a lot of info in this e-mail and its references. Have you had a chance to look into it? I'd appreciate anything you could flag for me.

reuben

—Original Message—

From: Planning Conservation <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>

To: Neima Solomon <neimala@aol.com>; Nelson Meacham <nelsonmeacham@me.com>; NENC

<NENC@empowerla.org>; Neville Graham <sales@westsideland.com>; New Sacks Email

<sacks@sacksconsulting.net>; NHENC <NHENC@empowerla.org>; NHNENC <NHNENC@empowerla.org>;

NHWNC <NHWNC@empowerla.org>; nick.keres <nick.keres@gmail.com>; nick.keros <nick.keros@gmail.com>;

nickgreif4palms <nickgreif4palms@palmsla.org>; Nicki Simpson <nickisimpson@rocketmail.com>;

nicksplanningservices <nicksplanningservices@gmail.com>; Nicky Rheinstein <celebucat@gmail.com>; Nicolas Greif

<Nick.Greid@palmsla.org>; Nicole Flessati <Nicole.Flessati@westhillsnc.org>; Nicole Howard

<nicole@gibsonintl.com>; nicole <nicole@vantagedesigngroup.com>; Niki Smart <nikismart@gmail.com>; nittyo

<nittyo@gmail.com>; nknupfewlaw <nknupfewlaw@icloud.com>; nmerwitzer <nmerwitzer@gmail.com>; nminer

<nminer@babanc.org>; Noah Muhlstein <noah.muhlstein@lacity.org>; noahstangby <noahstangby@outlook.com>;

NoHoWestNC <NoHoWestNC@empowerla.org>; Nolasco Reyes <nolireyes48@gmail.com>; Nora and Douglas

MacLellan <dougthora@aol.com>; nora.green <nora.green@verizon.net>; nora <nora@hndzpm.com>; noramdoyle

<noramdoyle@gmail.com>; Norman Carter <dsicarte@sbcglobal.net>; nrahemtulla <nrahemtulla@yahoo.com>;

nsbeidleman <nsbeidleman@aol.com>; nshanover . <nshanover@gmail.com>; NSNC <NSNC@empowerla.org>;

Nubia Alvarado <camaralalina@yahoo.com>; Nurit Greenger <nurit.nuritg@gmail.com>; nutmeganltd

<nutmeganltd@earthlink.net>; NWNC <NWNC@empowerla.org>; nwoohiro <nwoohiro@yahoo.com>; NWSPNC

<NWSPNC@empowerla.org>; nyla <nyla@discoverhollywood.com>; O'Connells <poconnellhome@sbcglobal.net>;

O'Rourke Sean <seanorourke@pmc.org>; ocha <ocha@pacbell.net>; odiselin <odiselin@yahoo.com>; ohadvi

<ohadvi@yahoo.com>; oknj581 <oknj581@aol.com>; Olaechea Marcy <marcyrolaechea@gmail.com>; Olive Reed

<oreedmac@sbcglobal.net>; Olivia Tillman <oliviatill@att.net>; Olivia Vasquez <olivia.vasquez@att.net>;

olivierschreiber <olivierschreiber@yahoo.com>; Olsen Rory <roryolsengcpnc@gmail.com>; Omar Mejorado

<omarmejorado@yahoo.com>; omer <omer@triwestdev.com>; onejivarod <onejivarod@gmail.com>; OPNC

<OPNC@empowerla.org>; oreet8 <oreet8@gmail.com>; Orlando Cagampang <hope_ory@yahoo.com>; Orrin Feldman

<ofeldman@pacbell.net>; Ortha Scott <srs101@sbcglobal.net>; Oscar Rodriguez <blueartint2@aol.com>; Oscar vecer

<Oscar.vecer@yahoo.com>; otto <otto@olhpc.com>; Ouellette Scott <souellette@studiocitync.org>; Owen Foley

<foley.o@gmail.com>; Owen Smith <osmith1930@sbcglobal.net>; ownershiplistingservice <ownershiplistingservice@

hotmail.com>; P Victoria Gore <pvgore@gmail.com>; pacmva <pacmva@sbcglobal.net>; PalmsNC

<PalmsNC@empowerla.org>; paloma perez <paloma.perez@lacity.org>; Pam Bentz <pbentz@mbmg-media.com>;

Pam Dunne <pdianedunne@hotmail.com>; Pamela Gibberman <pgibberman@gmail.com>; Pamela Nemeth

<nemeth.pamela@gmail.com>; Pamela Whittenbury <devakaur@yahoo.com>; Paolina Milana

<paolinamilana8@gmail.com>; paprikash <paprikash@earthlink.net>; Paredes Daniel <dparedes.evrnc@gmail.com>;

paronoff <paronoff@sbcglobal.net>; paseomhasec <paseomhasec@gmail.com>; Patel Malena

<parliamentarian@hhwnc.org>; Patel Steve <s.patel@nenc-la.org>; patip91090 <patip91090@ca.rr.com>; patraj218

<patraj218@yahoo.com>; Patricia Carroll <ridgewoodwiltonstandrewssquare@greaterwilshire.org>; Patricia DeVito

<pdevito@roadrunner.com>; Patricia Diefenderfer <patricia.diefenderfer@lacity.org>; Patricia Rau

<Pat.Rau@sylmarnc.org>; Patricia Savage <patricia.savage@gmail.com>; Patricia Valladolid <pvll87@gmail.com>; patriciamace <patriciamace@ca.rr.com>; Patrick Gilhooly <pgilhooly@clovercompany.com>; Patrick Pittelli <bedfordfalls06@gmail.com>; Patrick Wilson <pwilson@fastlanetrans.com>; Patrick Winters <pwinters@nadelarc.com>; Patrick Wood <eric2patrick@yahoo.com>; patrick <patrick@droffco.com>; pattobias <pattobias@msn.com>; Patty Rubin <pattyrubin219@yahoo.com>; patty <patty@pattydetroit.com>; Paul Bowers <paulagb1@yahoo.com>; Paul Crane <paul@paulcranere.com>; Paul Dougherty <paulrdougherty@gmail.com>; Paul Elmi <elmoid@gmail.com>; Paul George <georgep5980@gmail.com>; Paul Hatfield <phinnoho@aol.com>; Paul Morrow <paultopaia@aol.com>; Paul Murray <treasurer@harborcitync.com>; Paul Nassif <drnassif@spaldingplasticsurgery.com>; Paul Shepherd <SuccessNow@roadrunner.com>; Paul <Paul@laciuraconsultants.com>; paul <paul@valleyvillageha.com>; Paula Caruthers <pymail@aol.com>; Paulette <pldauber@verizon.net>; Paulo Cova <pcovar91@gmail.com>; paulo <paulo@studiobydesign.org>; pavementpictures1 <pavementpictures1@gmail.com>; Payam afighom <payamafighom@gmail.com>; pb <pb@pbcapital.us>; PB&M <braeniac@ca.rr.com>; pclaca <pclaca@gmail.com>; PCNC <PCNC@empowerla.org>; pcomwall <pcomwall@bhhsca.com>; Peggy <Peggy.Muldrow-Peppers@ftr.com>; Peggy Hsu <peggy@idgrouplive.com>; peggy.muldrowpeppers <peggy.muldrowpeppers@verizon.com>; Penelope & Thomas James <thjpej@yahoo.com>; penelopemeyer <penelopemeyer@sbcglobal.net>; Penny Flinn <penny@pccla.com>; Penny Jacobs <pennywatch@aol.com>; penny <penny@pennynegrin.com>; Pepe Ramon Robles <peperobles410@yahoo.com>; peretzian <peretzian@gmail.com>; Perkins Debra <dperkins.nhwn.com>; Perla Iliana Lagunas <perlita.northhills@gmail.com>; perry parks <pparks3@ca.rr.com>; Perry Schroeder <perry@pschroeder.net>; persioo <persioo@netscape.net>; Peter Brandt <petebrandt@aol.com>; peter cohen <petecohen51@gmail.com>; PETER GREENWALD <petergreenwald@me.com>; peter kim <pkim32@gmail.com>; Peter Lasky <plasky@northridgewest.org>; Peter Merlin <plmerlin1118@gmail.com>; Peter Molnar <divinla@verizon.net>; Peter Perez <peterperez68@yahoo.com>; peter <peter@drpetermiao.com>; peter <peter@edmunds.com>; peterprods <peterprods@aol.com>; petru26 <petru26@aol.com>; pgiffin1 <pgiffin1@gmail.com>; Phil Mason <mason.editor@gmail.com>; Phil Silver <phil91401@adelphia.net>; Philip Bennett <philip.bennett@lacity.org>; Philip Leers <pleers@gmail.com>; Philipp R. <phil.reker@gmail.com>; phillip <phillip@kaainoa.com>; phjth <phjth@hotmail.com>; picfairvillage <picfairvillage@piconc.com>; Pickel Cyndy <mpickel@socal.rr.com>; PICO <PICO@empowerla.org>; Pieter Severynen <pietersev100@gmail.com>; pinepointdrive <pinepointdrive@aol.com>; Pinkkaire <Pinkkaire@aol.com>; pintar <pintar@ca.rr.com>; pl.sylviaaieb <pl.sylviaaieb@yahoo.com>; Planning Conservation <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>; PlotkinDi <PlotkinDi@aol.com>; PLUC <PLUC@ncwpdr.org>; pmedicina <pmedicina@coldwellbanker.com>; pmessina98 <pmessina98@aol.com>; PMHCC <PMHCC@empowerla.org>; PMP LLC <permitmyproperty@gmail.com>; PNC <PNC@empowerla.org>; Pope Patrick <patrickpope@pnc.org>; Popowich JJ <jpopowich@winnetkanc.com>; posbo <posbo@osbornearchitects.com>; Potter Joan <joan.potter@highlandparknc.com>; pouya <pouya@archilo.com>; ppa9027 <ppa9027@verizon.net>; ppaeozr <ppaeozr@verizon.net>; president <president@benedictcanyonassociation.org>; president <president@greaterwilshire.org>; president <president@piconc.com>; president <president@wowhoa.org>; PRNC <PRNC@empowerla.org>; Protect Picfair Village <protectpicfairvillage@gmail.com>; pshtum <pshtum@sbcglobal.net>; publicadvocate <publicadvocate@msn.com>; PUNC <PUNC@empowerla.org>; pwood <pwood@newbreedgirl.com>; pwyllie <pwylle@lamericausa.com>; quangtran59 <quangtran59@gmail.com>; Quinn Tang <quinn.tang@dlanc.com>; R <rommycz@att.net>; r_aronson <r_aronson@ureach.com>; R. mayorga <raulmayorga72@gmail.com>; R&S&I&T Willens <willens349scitrus@gmail.com>; r4grls <r4grls@sbcglobal.net>; rabbimirlyam <rabbimirlyam@gmail.com>; Finfer, Rachel <RFinfer@manatt.com>; Rachel Mass <rachelmass2@yahoo.com>; Radomir Luza <radluza@sbcglobal.net>; Rafael Martinez <rafael.leoncio.martinez@gmail.com>; rainer <rainer@standke.com>; Ramsawack Sarah <sramsayack@mac.com>; Randall Boyd <randallboyd@hotmail.com>; randy auerbach <randy@solly.org>; Randy Stein <rstein@steingroup.net>; Randy Traweek <rtraweek@roadrunner.com>; Randy Waller <randy@wsncla.org>; randysommer <randysommer@sbcglobal.net>; Rani Sanders <rani.sanders@gmail.com>; rasselchi <rasselchi@gmail.com>; Ray Pollok <rpollok@ghnnc.org>; ray <ray@darrencardona.com>; raybishop <raybishop@earthlink.net>; Raymond Klein <rklein908@gmail.com>; Raymond R. Moser <mrrm2193@aol.com>; Raymond Regalado <rreg55@hotmail.com>; rb1225 <rb1225@aol.com>; rbaia <rbaia@aol.com>; REBECCARIA <REBECCARIA@lawa.org>; rbwenby <rbwenby@gmail.com>; rcakerblom <rcakerblom@aol.com>; rdiskin <rdiskin@earthlink.net>; rdstapley <rdstapley@gmail.com>; rdventura <rdventura@aol.com>; rebeccaanncox <rebeccaanncox@gmail.com>; Ree Whitford <reewit@sbcglobal.net>; reedea <reedea@ca.rr.com>; regau <regau@gmail.com>; Renee Saifer <ReneeSaifer@gmail.com>; Renee Weitzer <renee.weitzer@lacity.org>; results <results@carrollssells.com>; Reuben Caldwell <reuben.caldwell@lacity.org>; Reuben Garcia <reubeng8@yahoo.com>; Reuben Roslooff <reublanche@aol.com>; Reza Akef <reza@metrocapital.build>; reza.akef <reza.akef@gmail.com>; rharaczka <rharaczka@gmail.com>; Rhonda Geller Seibel <rhondarch@live.com>

Sent: Fri, Feb 10, 2017 3:21 pm

Subject: R1 Variation Zones Code Amendment and Zone Changes at PLUM Committee Tuesday 2/14/17

Dear Stakeholder,

On Tuesday, February 14, 2017, the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee of the City Council will review:

1. **R1 Variation Zones Code Amendment (CF 16-1460)** that would add more tailored subsets of the R1 Zone to the Code, and
2. **Neighborhood Conservation Zone Changes (CF 16-1470)** that would apply the R1 Variation Zones to a number of single-family neighborhoods.

The meeting is scheduled to begin at 2:30 p.m. in the Edward R. Roybal Board of Public Works Session Room (Room 350) of Los Angeles City Hall, 200 N Spring St, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

The agenda is posted online here: http://ens.lacity.org/clk/committeeagend/clkcommitteeagend26109508_02142017.html. You may also access the agenda on the City Calendar posted online here: <https://www.lacity.org/city-government/calendar>. Please scroll to February 14 and click on "Planning and Land Use Management Committee Meeting" to view or download the agenda.

Public Meeting Calendar | City of Los Angeles

www.lacity.org

The City of L.A. has integrated the City's Calendar with Alexa, a digital assistant developed and made popular by the Amazon.

The files for these items can be found on the City Clerk's website.

R1 Variation Zones: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=16-1460>

16-1460 (CFMS) - cityclerk.lacity.org

cityclerk.lacity.org

Date Activity ; 01/18/2017: Planning and Land Use Management Committee continued item to/for a date to be determined, City Attorney to write draft ordinance.

Neighborhood Conservation Zone Changes: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=16-1470>

16-1470 (CFMS) - cityclerk.lacity.org

cityclerk.lacity.org

Date Activity ; 12/28/2016: Los Angeles City Planning Commission document(s) referred to Planning and Land Use Management Committee. 12/26/2016

To access the proposed Zone Change Ordinances (including maps) for each community please use the link above and refer to the section titled "Online Documents" on the right hand side of the webpage. Click on the link that says "Revised report from City Planning with revised draft ordinances with correct signature pages" and scroll through the pages to find the Zone Change Ordinance for your community. Please note that the names of the zones have changed, however the proposed standards have remained the same (see the letter in CF 16-1460 for more detail).

Comments and questions:

All comments should be addressed directly to the PLUM Committee and/or the City Council. Should you wish to submit written comments, please e-mail them to Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org.

For comments pertaining to the R1 Variation Zones Code Amendment, please include Council File 16-1460 in the subject line. For comments pertaining to the Neighborhood Conservation Zone Changes, please include Council File 16-1470 in the subject line.

For R1 Variation Zones related questions, please contact Shannon Ryan, Shannon.Ryan@lacity.org 213-978-3304.

For Neighborhood Conservation Zone Change related questions, please contact Giselle Corella, Giselle.Corella@lacity.org 213-978-1357 or Christine Saponara, Christine.Saponara@lacity.org 213-978-1363.

Thank you for your continued interest.

Sincerely,

**Neighborhood Conservation Team****Department of City Planning****HPOZ | Community Planning | Code Studies**preservation.lacity.org/neighborhoodconservation



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

I support the carve-out for Pacific Palisades with the proposed R1V1 & R1H1 zone variations.

1 message

Lisa Robins <robinsartstudio@verizon.net>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 11:46 AM

To: Shannon.Ryan@lacity.org, mike.bonin@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, tricia.keane@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Ryan, Mr. Bonin, and Ms. Keane:

I own a home in the Alphabet Streets of Pacific Palisades. I support the carve-out for Pacific Palisades with the proposed R1V1 & R1H1 zone variations. I think this will produce an allowable area that that will be similar to the PPCL Guidelines which the Palisades has been applying for over 25 years. I support the encroachment plane of 22 ft. and the 50% lot coverage requirement (which matches our guidelines).

I do not like the other proposed Amendments. The reduction of area for the R1 properties to 45% across the board, and the elimination of the bonus and exemptions will effectively reduce allowable areas by **25 percent**. The larger houses will be more valuable, and smaller houses will lose value. Most of our neighborhood has already rebuilt according to the PPCL Guidelines and to stop the few remaining properties from doing the same would be unfair. We would loose a tremendous amount of the value in our homes.

Additionally I support Planning's decision to eliminate the requirement for articulation of the front façade for R1 properties. Covered porches on the first floor help to reduce the mass of two-story structures. The elimination of this exemption will result in boxier designs.

The additional step-back of 5 ft.(for 10 ft. length minimum length), in addition to the minimum side setback, if the length of a building is longer than 45 feet is too excessive. The PPCL Guidelines require an additional 2 ft. setback on the second floor (where it has the most impact).

Once again **I support the carve-out for Pacific Palisades with the proposed R1V1 & R1H1 zone variations**. To restrict the few homes in the alphabet streets that have not already rebuilt would be unfair. The drastic reduction in allowable square footage could easily translate to hundreds of thousands of dollars in reduced value overnight for properties that have not rebuilt yet.

Sincerely,

Lisa Robins

Alphabet Street Street Homeowner

PREVIOUS letter about the proposed "anti-mansionization" ordinance for your consideration:

I'm writing with respect to the proposed "anti-mansionization" ordinance. The word "mansionization" brings up a lot of emotion, and it is easy to jump to quick conclusions. Even if you favor more restrictions, not every proposal is the right proposal for Pacific Palisades. I think it is important to look closely at the facts and understand what this would and wouldn't do. I can't speak for the rest of the city, but I don't believe Mr. Koretz's proposal is the right answer for Pacific Palisades for the following reasons:

- Measure is extreme: For Pacific Palisades, the proposal would most dramatically affect the smaller lots such as the Alphabet Streets. The proposal would reduce the allowable square footage on lots between 5,000 and 7,500 sq. ft. by approximately 40%. It would limit max square footage on a 5,000 sq. ft. lot to less than 1,850 sq. ft. For perspective, the current national average is 2,700 sq. ft. Virtually all homes built in the Alphabet streets over the past 20-30 years would exceed this ordinance.
- Measure will not accomplish intended goals in Pacific Palisades: The scale of houses in Pacific Palisades has already been established by the construction that has occurred over the last several decades. This measure will not significantly change the look of the neighborhood, but will only penalize those homeowners that have not already rebuilt – primarily those on smaller lots. The measure will not address issues associated with views and would actually allow a taller structure than is permitted by current local guidelines.
- Measure will unfairly penalize a subset of homeowners: While benefits are unlikely in Pacific Palisades, it will have a real effect on real people. Property values reflect the lot potential based on the construction that has been occurring for past several decades. **The drastic reduction in allowable square footage could easily translate to hundreds of thousands of dollars in reduced value overnight for properties that have not rebuilt yet.** This may cause people to become “under water” on mortgages or jeopardize retirement plans. If such a penalty is going to be placed on a minority of homeowners, I think there needs to be a very clear and very substantial benefit to the larger community. There is little evidence to show that is the case for Pacific Palisades.
- Transfers control away from local Pacific Palisades organization to the City of Los Angeles: This sweeping city-wide ordinance is not focused on the unique needs of Pacific Palisades. If modifications to building regulations are desired, it is much better to address this in the context of a local organization with participation of citizens directly familiar with the issues. We already have such an organization, and I believe it is a far better vehicle for achieving our collective objectives.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

PLUM - Beverlywood Restrictions

1 message

Gabriel Glazer <gig613@yahoo.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 11:38 AM

Reply-To: Gabriel Glazer <gig613@yahoo.com>

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

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

I understand that the PLUM committee is in the process of discussing new zoning proposals for Beverlywood. As a home owner in Beverlywood, I would like the committee to know that I **strongly oppose more restrictive square footage and design limitations**. The proposed square footage restriction will be a burden on my family (we have four children and require more space than the proposed zone would allow) and Beverlywood already has its own design requirements. I also understand that the PLUM committee has recently been asked to consider making the square footage restriction even more restrictive, by eliminating any allowance for attached garages. **It is entirely unfair to force homeowners to build homes with garages, but to deduct that space from the total allowed square footage.**

Finally, and importantly, I understand that some people may be pushing to have these zoning proposals adopted and made effective immediately, without affording home owners a reasonable time to adjust to the new zones. That is both entirely unnecessary and certain to cause me and many others great hardship. My family has been in the process of planning a new home for a while now, at considerable effort and expense. **It would be disastrous for us personally if these new zones were made effective immediately, without allowing a reasonable time to complete our efforts.**

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Gabriel Glazer
1900 S. Crest Drive



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

FW: Los Angeles Lower Council District 5 - Neighborhood Conservation Ordinance - City Planning Case CPC -2016-2112-ZC / Environment Case ENV -2016-2111-ND.

Ian Strano <istrano@naicapital.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 11:42 AM

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

Cc: "rgalperson@gmail.com" <rgalperson@gmail.com>, "shawn.bayliss@lacity.org" <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>

Sharon –

Please include this correspondence in The City files.

Thank you,

Ian.

Ian Strano | Executive Vice President

11835 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 700E, West LA, CA 90064

istrano@naicapital.com | Lic # 00991977

Direct 310-806-6108

Office 310-440-8500 | Fax 818-905-2425

Bio | vCard | Research

naicapital.com | NAI Global | 6,700+ Professionals | 375+ Offices | 380M+ SF Property Managed



If this email is with regards to a transaction, information and/or opinions expressed herein have been provided by a principal or principals in the transaction, their representative or representatives or other third party sources. No warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information and/or opinions or capability of the individual providing such information and/or opinions is intended. Such information and/or opinions should be independently investigated and evaluated and may not be a basis for liability of NAI Capital, Inc. or its agents. CA BRE Lic No. 01990696

From: Ian Strano [mailto:istrano@naicapital.com]

Sent: Thursday, September 22, 2016 8:17 PM

To: 'christine.saponara@lacity.org' <christine.saponara@lacity.org>

Cc: 'paul.koretz@lacity.org' <paul.koretz@lacity.org>; 'joan.pelico@lacity.org' <joan.pelico@lacity.org>; 'mayor.garcetti@lacity.org' <mayor.garcetti@lacity.org>; 'marc.duvoisin@latimes.com' <marc.duvoisin@latimes.com>; 'lawrence.ingrassia@latimes.com' <lawrence.ingrassia@latimes.com>; 'mtoledo@labusinessjournal.com' <mtoledo@labusinessjournal.com>; 'jdiamond@labusinessjournal.com' <jdiamond@labusinessjournal.com>

Subject: Los Angeles Lower Council District 5 - Neighborhood Conservation Ordinance - City Planning Case CPC -2016-2112-ZC / Environment Case ENV -2016-2111-ND.

Importance: High

Christine,

I own a home located on Selby Ave, Los Angeles, 90064 which is in the 5th Council District. My council person is Paul Koretz and I attended the public hearing earlier this week September 20, 2016 at The Henry Medina Building in West Los Angeles.

I have the following comments to share with you :

1. Any change to the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) of a property is in fact a form of Down-Zoning. This is defined as the use of police power to reduce development density on a property. I understand this is a controversial subject and argue that Down-Zoning violates a property owners rights, robs them of equity and compromises the long term value of a property – I have spent more than 28 years in the commercial real estate business, and I'm an advisor to many of the largest commercial real estate developers and landlords in Los Angeles. I know the topic well.
2. Many home owners don't fully understand what The City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning is even proposing for the future and also don't fully understand the possible negative financial impact on their property values (And it is possible). Once they learn of this possibility, many in fact are no longer against larger homes being built. Yes, a complete change of heart. The once "complainer" now becomes silent.
3. The various zoning options being proposed are far too difficult to understand. The handouts and display boards made no sense to many home owners. Indeed, far too many details for the average home owner to understand. Ask the elderly to explain what all of this means. In short, The Department of City Planning hasn't done a good job in explaining a very complex matter to a wide age group of home owners. This is not acceptable.
4. Property owners were also not aware that public hearings had occurred in the past and prior to Tuesdays meeting. A speaker from your Dept. stated at the hearing they had "also called home owners about the meetings". Really ? I never received such a call and neither did my neighbors.
5. People need to stop blaming the "spec" home builder. Many, many, many "owner user" families have undertaken the building process on their own. No "spec" builder involved. Are you now saying "owner user" families are the "bad guys" as well ?
6. For the past 8-9 yrs. "cheap" money has been available to property owners and developers - Low mortgage rates will rise, and with this new construction will slow nationally. This will quieten down the "complainers". Real estate markets should adjust to market conditions. Again, as interest rates rise, and they soon will, new home building will slow down. And, when interest rates rise higher, all building will come to a screeching stop. It always does. Government should not be involved in further influencing a real estate market.
7. The need to reduce FAR is not the problem. The problem is poor architecture. This can be improved and corrected by your Dept. without the need to reduce the square footage of a project. Other cities have accomplished this, why can't your Dept. do this as well ?
8. The United States economy is heading towards a recession, which could be severe (Bill Gross from Janus Fund has previously stated that the next recession will be at least 50% of the great recession of 2009. That's quite an ugly prediction).Property values will either hold or move downwards. So, in addition to the "market value" of a property dropping by "market conditions", the FAR value reduction (And again its possible) means that the home owner gets hit TWICE with a property value reduction. That's not fair and further many, many property owners have no clue this is all possible. Explain this to a "complainer" and see how quickly they quieten down.
9. One of the speakers from your Dept. mentioned on Tuesday that "Bel Air would be dealt with separately". Really ? That's because high profile mega billionaires like Eli Broad, Rick Caruso, Haim Saban and others will laugh at this notion and in turn will all be given preferential treatment – That's not right. Americans already don't trust Government because of matters just like this. Everyone should know what the facts are and BEFORE having to accept any further changes to the FAR of their properties. So, before you think of adjusting the FAR on the homes in the area where I live, all home owners in my area should know exactly what all other home owners in Los Angeles are being asked to accept, including the home owners in Pacific Palisades, Brentwood, Bel Air and every other part of Los Angeles including the residential area around Sawtelle Blvd and Olympic Blvd in West Los Angeles (Often referred to as "Japan Town"), where you allow two large mansions to be built on a single lot and adjacent to small residential homes. What's with that ?
10. Because of what is being proposed and the lack of understanding by the "common" home owner, this entire matter belongs on the November election ballot – Let home owners understand the truth, the advantages, disadvantages and possible risks to home values. If November is too soon, then building permits for all homes in Los Angeles should be stopped and no longer issued until a formal vote has taken place – Full disclosure, lay out the facts accurately, let the people decide. Other cities have done this on similar issues, and so can The City of Los Angeles.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Ian Strano.

Ian Strano

Executive Vice President

BRE# 00991977

istrano@naicapital.com

NAI Capital

11835 West Olympic Boulevard, Suite 700-E

Los Angeles, CA 90064

www.naicapital.com

Direct: (310) 806-6108

Fax: (310) 440-8525





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

FW: opposition to proposed 45% FAR - CD 5.

Ian Strano <istrano@naicapital.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 11:44 AM

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

I had your email address incorrect. Please see below and place in The City files on this topic.

Ian Strano | Executive Vice President

11835 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 700E, West LA, CA 90064
istrano@naicapital.com | Lic # 00991977

Direct 310-806-6108

Office 310-440-8500 | Fax 818-905-2425

Bio | vCard | Research

naicapital.com | NAI Global | 6,700+ Professionals | 375+ Offices | 380M+ SF Property Managed



If this email is with regards to a transaction, information and/or opinions expressed herein have been provided by a principal or principals in the transaction, their representative or representatives or other third party sources. No warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the information and/or opinions or capability of the individual providing such information and/or opinions is intended. Such information and/or opinions should be independently investigated and evaluated and may not be a basis for liability of NAI Capital, Inc. or its agents. CA BRE Lic No. 01990696

From: Ian Strano**Sent:** Tuesday, February 14, 2017 11:32 AM**To:** 'sharon.dickson@lacity.org' <sharon.dickson@lacity.org>**Cc:** 'rgalperson@gmail.com' <rgalperson@gmail.com>; 'shawn.bayliss@lacity.org' <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>; 'paul.koretz@lacity.org' <paul.koretz@lacity.org>**Subject:** FW: opposition to proposed 45% FAR - CD 5.**Importance:** High

Sharon –

Please place a copy of the below email in your City files. What is going on between Paul Koretz, Shawn Bayliss and Barbara Broide is disgracefull.

Shawn Bayliss told me on the phone yesterday that only 7 people in my area (Rancho Park) object to the 45% FAR. This is not true.

Thank you,

Ian.

From: Ian Strano

Sent: Monday, February 13, 2017 9:04 PM

To: 'bbroide@hotmail.com' <bbroide@hotmail.com>

Cc: 'shawn.bayliss@lacity.org' <shawn.bayliss@lacity.org>; 'paul.koretz@lacity.org' <paul.koretz@lacity.org>; 'joan.pelico@lacity.org' <joan.pelico@lacity.org>; 'Robert Silverman' <robert@magnorealtygroup.com>; 'christine.sapanora@lacity.org' <christine.sapanora@lacity.org>; 'Fredric A. Rollman' <FRollman@dkrlaw.com>

Subject: opposition to proposed 45% FAR - CD 5.

Importance: High

Dear Barbara,

This is not the first time I have exchanged emails with you on this subject. I understand that you are the President of The Westwood South of Santa Monica Homeowners Association. Your position is purely voluntary, homeowners in this area are not bound to your association through a deed restriction or CC&R's ,and therefore not every homeowner has joined the Association. For example, I and many, many, many other homeowners in this area have chosen NOT to be part of your group, because we strongly disagree with your "policies" and approach.

-

I have reviewed several letters you have written to various parties on the 45% FAR for lower CD 5 (one is attached). You may be The President of The Homeowners Association to some homeowners, however, you are NOT the voice for thousands of other homeowners in this area.

In both written correspondence and vocally, you claim to have the support of over 3,500 homeowners in this area. This is not true. 3,500 homeowners do not agree with your position on this 45% FAR matter. Where are the signatures you have in this regard ? Let's see them. Send them over. You have also communicated with the Los Angeles Police Dept. that you "are the leader" and speak on behalf of "all the homeowners" in the area. Again, this is not true.

In your capacity as President, you have never once called a meeting or vote to see where all homeowners truly stand on the 45% FAR. Similarly, you have never once called a meeting to discuss the increased crime in this area (Other people have done it).

Homeowners in Beverlywood are tied to their homeowners association's through a deed restriction and CC&R's. Cheviot Hills is the same. As previously stated, Rancho Park does not have any of this and therefore the homeowners are not well organized to understand your's and Paul Koretz's desire to see much smaller homes built in this area.

No matter how you view this subject, reducing the buildable size of a home on a property is nothing more than Down Zoning. This violates a property owners rights robs them of the equity in their homes and compromises the long term value of a property. In past emails with you, you disagree that the property value will drop. Here is an example:

- 2347 Selby Ave is in escrow for \$3,100,000. This is new construction and contains over 4,000 sf of space. 5 bedrooms and 5.5 bathrooms.
- 2353 Selby Ave is also new construction and located immediately adjacent to 2347 Selby (Side by side). The home will be on the market for sale in the next 2 weeks. The 2353 Selby home contains less square footage than the adjacent home. If one walks the house it's obviously clear that the living conditions are "tight" for a family of 4-5 to live in (More like an apartment).

Very likely the home at 2353 Selby Ave will sell for less than the home at 2347 Selby Ave. This information will be public once both homes have closed escrow (60-90 days). Your point of view is that the homes will sell for the same price. If the homes don't sell for the same price, it will be very easy for homeowners to calculate monetary damages caused by your decision. Same thing applies to Paul Koretz. You are both exposed to possible litigation, which will not be difficult to prove.

The path that you and Paul Koretz are taking will be severely damaging to a property owner in this area both today and in the future. I was informed over the weekend that Cheviot Hills and Beverlywood will be receiving up to 55% FAR because they have been "more vocal" in opposing this subject. This is outrageous ! We are all in this together and we should ALL receive the same rights.

A 45% FAR in reality is more like a 42% FAR because you and Paul Koretz want the garage area included. The max buildable square footage will be approx. 2,800 sf and over 1,000 sf smaller than what will be permitted in Beverlywood and Cheviot. How foolish of you and Paul to think that this will not impact the value of a property.

I'm a sophisticated user of the legal system. Please be advised of the following; If you (And Paul Koretz) continue on this path to grant homeowners in my immediate area (I live at 2373 Selby Ave) less favorable buildable rights than Beverlywood and Cheviot Hills, and/or, newly built homes start selling for less money than new homes under the "old" ordinance, I will instruct my attorneys to proceed with litigation, which I will personally fund. What you and Paul are doing is very wrong.

One last thing, kindly back of your position that you are the voice for ALL or 3,500 homeowners in Rancho Park because you ARE NOT. You DO NOT speak for me plus many, many, many other homeowners I have contacted.

I will mail this correspondence to you as well.

Govern yourself accordingly.

Ian Strano.



14-0656_pc_12-7-16.pdf

90K



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Re zoning meeting today

1 message

Toni O'Neill <toni.mckillop@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 10:22 AM

To: shawn.bayliss@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Hi Shawn,

I won't be able to attend today's meeting but would like mine and my husband's opinion noted.

We both feel that the proposed 45% for new homes is too restrictive, especially with the reduction of the garage allowance and inclusion of covered patios, etc..

We live on a lot that is almost 6000 sq ft (in Rancho Park) and were hoping to start building a new house this year.

Removing the allowances for the garage and patio would leave us with less than 2000 sq ft for our new home. Not enough for a family of five with an at home business and a large dog! This new zoning would definitely mean that my family and I would have to move this year.

Have a good day, Toni

Antoinette O'Neill and Randall McKillop
10747 Ashby Ave, LA, CA 90064



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

proposed building ordinance changes

1 message

reublanche@aol.com <reublanche@aol.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 10:25 AM

To: shannon.ryan@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: marianne.wisner@gmail.com

Dear Shannon and Sharon,

We have lived in our home, a modest 1500 square feet structure at 16641 Linda Terrace, for almost fifty years (since 1968). During that entire time, until last year, we enjoyed an unobstructed ocean view over the neighbor's rooftop at 16640 Linda Terrace. Last year the neighbor died and their house came on the market. The house was bought by a developer who replaced it with a structure which blocks all of my view except for a 'peek' at the sides.

Our street is a cul de sac with nineteen homes, of which four have already been 'mansionized' and two others have received permission to rebuild. In addition, two large multi story houses on Lachman Lane face the entrance to our cul de sac. In effect, the assertion that the neighborhood has a 'small town' ambience is not supported by the facts and the proposed new building restrictions will punish owners like myself in support of an imaginary ambience. I hope you will communicate the unfairness of this situation to the decision makers in our city.

Sincerely,

reuben rosloff



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File 16-1460

Jeremy Ives <jivesca@gmail.com>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 8:01 AM

Dear Honorable Members of PLUM Committee,

I understand that the committee is going to be discussing the new Neighborhood Conservation Zones and new R1 Zones for certain neighborhoods.

I am a realtor that specializes in the Beverlywood area and live in Beverlywood which is part of these new zones. Our neighborhood has had a very lively debate about which new zones we should be part of. There have been many meetings and conversations with Councilman Koretz's office discussing these new zones. The Councilman has negotiated a compromise after many months of conversations. The compromise for our neighborhood is the new zone R1V2, 55-45%. Part of these conversations were about the garage exemption. Beverlywood primarily has garages in the front of the house and that is the design the neighborhood prefers. We discussed with Councilman Koretz that we would prefer the full 400 sq ft exemption for garages in the front of the house. After much negotiation, we have accepted Councilman Koretz compromise of the 200 sq ft exemption for the garage in the front of the house.

Now we hear that the City Council is considering a change to this compromise and that the 200 sq ft exemption might be taken away for garages in the front of the house.

This change has never been discussed or debated by our neighborhood and would destroy the delicate compromise the Councilman has negotiated.

It would be completely unfair to the public to make such a change at this point in the long process that has been debated over and over.

Please do not destroy the compromise that has been negotiated and agreed upon. It would be unfair to the neighborhood and the city residents.

Thank you so much for your consideration on this matter.

Jeremy Ives

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File 16-1460

gilat englanoff <genglanoff@gmail.com>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 7:52 AM

Dear Honorable Members of PLUM Committee,

I understand that the committee is going to be discussing the new Neighborhood Conservation Zones and new RI Zones for certain neighborhoods.

I live in the Beverlywood neighborhood which is part of these new zones. Our neighborhood has had a very lively debate about which new zones we should be part of. There have been many meetings and conversations with Councilman Koretz's office discussing these new zones. The Councilman has negotiated a compromise after many months of conversations. The compromise for our neighborhood is the new zone R1V2, 55-45%. Part of these conversations were about the garage exemption. Beverlywood primarily has garages in the front of the house and that is the design the neighborhood prefers. We discussed with Councilman Koretz that we would prefer the full 400 sq ft exemption for garages in the front of the house. After much negotiation, we have accepted Councilman Koretz compromise of the 200 sq ft exemption for the garage in the front of the house.

Now we hear that the City Council is considering a change to this compromise and that the 200 sq ft exemption might be taken away for garages in the front of the house.

This change has never been discussed or debated by our neighborhood and would destroy the delicate compromise the Councilman has negotiated.

It would be completely unfair to the public to make such a change at this point in the long process that has been debated over and over.

Please do not destroy the compromise that has been negotiated and agreed upon. It would be unfair to the neighborhood and the city residents.

Thank you so much for your consideration on this matter.

Dr Gilat Englanoff



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File 16-1460

1 message

Julie Fessel <jtfessel@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 10:00 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Honorable Members of PLUM Committee,

I understand that the committee is going to be discussing the new Neighborhood Conservation Zones and new R1 Zones for certain neighborhoods.

I live in the Beverlywood neighborhood which is part of these new zones. Our neighborhood has had a very lively debate about which new zones we should be part of. There have been many meetings and conversations with Councilman Koretz's office discussing these new zones. The Councilman has negotiated a compromise after many months of conversations. The compromise for our neighborhood is the new zone R1V2, 55-45%. Part of these conversations were about the garage exemption. Beverlywood primarily has garages in the front of the house and that is the design the neighborhood prefers. We discussed with Councilman Koretz that we would prefer the full 400 sq ft exemption for garages in the front of the house. After much negotiation, we have accepted Councilman Koretz compromise of the 200 sq ft exemption for the garage in the front of the house.

Now we hear that the City Council is considering a change to this compromise and that the 200 sq ft exemption might be taken away for garages in the front of the house.

This change has never been discussed or debated by our neighborhood and would destroy the delicate compromise the Councilman has negotiated.

It would be completely unfair to the public to make such a change at this point in the long process that has been debated over and over.

Please do not destroy the compromise that has been negotiated and agreed upon. It would be unfair to the neighborhood and the city residents.

Thank you so much for your consideration on this matter.

Julie Fessel Fenigstein

Sent from my iPhone 5

RE: Council File 16-140

1 message

Mary Streit <mary@foothillent.com>

Tue, Feb 14, 2017 at 11:11 AM

To: "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "Zina.Cheng@lacity.org" <Zina.Cheng@lacity.org>

RE: Council File 16-1460

Dear Honorable Members of the PLUM Committee:

The Committee is going to be discussing the new Neighborhood Conservation Zones and the new R1 Zones for certain neighborhoods this afternoon. We live in the neighborhood just north of Beverlywood and south of Beverly Hills and we would be affected by any decisions made.

We are a vibrant and growing community, within walking distance of stores, restaurants, schools and houses of worship. Our community accommodates people of all ages including families with children. There were recently some decisions made with regard to the zoning in Beverlywood, R1V2 (55-45% FAR). Our community and Beverlywood share all the same characteristics and we should get the same zoning as was decided for Beverlywood. We would like to see zoning decisions that can comfortably accommodate the young and growing families that represent the future for all of us. We are not asking for mansions. And we are concerned about our property values falling if we are subject to restrictions that have not been imposed on neighboring communities.

Furthermore, we understand that a compromise was reached in Beverlywood for a 200 sq. ft. exemption for the front garage. While we would prefer a full front garage exemption, we believe we should be afforded the same decision as Beverlywood.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Aric and Mary Streit

1543 Edris Dr.

Los Angeles, CA 90035