



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

---

**Not Good- what City Council Seems to be Doing here for Vote Today**

1 message

---

**Lozzi Media Services** <epl@lozzipr.com>

Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 12:55 AM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: metrodesk@latimes.com, dnmetro@dailynews.com, news@edit.nydailynews.com

Dear Councilmember,

**STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED**

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will voting on this Wednesday (TOMORROW) that would allow 12.24F to be used to evade standards in a way not currently allowed, and not as was originally proposed.

It now says: "Except as allowed by Section 12.24 F and 14.00 A of this Code. . . ." the BMO/BHO regulations apply.

This is not okay and makes it seem like City Council is trying to sneak last minute changes through to give Conditional Use Permit (CUP) institutions special treatment. Exempting conditionally permitted uses from the BHO/BMO would not be a clarification but rather a significant change from the municipal code.

Please stand up for your constituents and make sure the BMO/BHO actually protects Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Development Standards!!! The City should go back to the original language - strike out section 13 of the current proposal - or go back to the originally proposed section 19 as it was proposed in September 2016.

Edward Lozzi

Studio City

epl@lozzipr.com



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

---

**Strike out Section 13**

1 message

---

**j.g.green@roadrunner.com** <j.g.green@roadrunner.com>  
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 12:33 AM

Dear Councilmember,

**STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED**

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will voting on this Wednesday (TOMORROW) that would allow 12.24F to be used to evade standards in a way not currently allowed, and not as was originally proposed.

It now says: "Except as allowed by Section 12.24 F and 14.00 A of this Code. . . ." the BMO/BHO regulations apply.

This is not okay and makes it seem like City Council is trying to sneak last minute changes through to give Conditional Use Permit (CUP) institutions special treatment. Exempting conditionally permitted uses from the BHO/BMO would not be a clarification but rather a significant change from the municipal code.

Please stand up for your constituents and make sure the BMO/BHO actually protects Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Development Standards!!! The City should go back to the original language - strike out section 13 of the current proposal - or go back to the originally proposed section 19 as it was proposed in September 2016.

Your Constituent,

Jonathan Green  
4041 Alta Mesa Drive  
Studio City, CA 91604



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

---

## Strike Out Phrase of Section 13 Needed

1 message

---

**Mary Mallory** <marymallory0@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 8:21 AM

To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers:

Please delete section thirteen language that says: "Except as allowed by Section 12.24F and 14.00A of this Code..." the BMO/BHO regulations apply."

This new language in the BMO/BHO plan would allow this section to be employed **to evade** standards not currently allowed and not what was originally proposed.

This new language suggests that the Council is attempting to evade the will of the people and sneak in last minute changes exempting Conditional Use Permit (CuP) institutions from following the law like everyone else, and thereby defeating the whole process. It's a slap in the face to your constituents, and just adds to the overmansionization and overdevelopment situation we already have. This isn't a clarification but a major rewriting of the municipal code.

Strike out this section 13 and go back to the one originally proposed in September 2016, one which is fair to all and actually protects Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Development Standards!

Sincerely,

Mary Mallory  
11161 1/4 Acama St.  
Studio City, CA 91602



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

---

**STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13**

1 message

---

**Joël Badie** <soulfinga@gmail.com>  
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 8:24 AM

Dear Sharon Dickinson,

**STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED**

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will voting on today Wednesday March 1, 2017 that would allow 12.24F to be used to evade standards in a way not currently allowed, and not as was originally proposed.

It now says: "Except as allowed by Section 12.24 F and 14.00 A of this Code. . . ." the BMO/BHO regulations apply.

This is not okay and makes it seem like City Council is trying to sneak last minute changes through to give Conditional Use Permit (CUP) institutions special treatment. Exempting conditionally permitted uses from the BHO/BMO would not be a clarification but rather a significant change from the municipal code.

Please stand up for your constituents and make sure the BMO/BHO actually protects Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Development Standards!!! The City should go back to the original language - strike out section 13 of the current proposal - or go back to the originally proposed section 19 as it was proposed in September 2016.

Your Constituent,

Joel D. Badie  
13435 Cheltenham Dr.  
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423



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

---

**Strike out phrase of section 13 in BMO/BHO**

1 message

---

**karen@thinktheta.com** <karen@thinktheta.com>

Wed, Mar 1, 2017 at 9:08 AM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

**Dear Councilmember Dickinson,****STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED**

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will voting on this Wednesday (TODAY) that would allow 12.24F to be used to evade standards in a way not currently allowed, and not as was originally proposed.

It now says: *"Except as allowed by Section 12.24 F and 14.00 A of this Code. . . ."* the BMO/BHO regulations apply.

This is not okay and makes it seem like City Council is trying to sneak last minute changes through to give Conditional Use Permit (CUP) institutions *special treatment*. Exempting conditionally permitted uses from the BHO/BMO would not be a clarification but rather a significant change from the municipal code.

Please stand up for your constituents and make sure the BMO/BHO actually protects Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Development Standards!!! The City should go back to the original language - strike out section 13 of the current proposal - or go back to the originally proposed section 19 as it was proposed in September 2016.

Your Constituent,  
**KAREN ABRAMS**  
4038 Van Noord Ave.  
Studio City, CA 91604

--  
Theta Healing with Karen Abrams  
2001 Barrington Ave.  
Suite 111  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
www.thinktheta.com  
310-738-3858