



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Support of BMO for Cheviot Hills CF 14-0656, 16-460, 16-470

1 message

Kerrin Clark <allmomswork@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:41 PM

To: Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>, Sharon Gin <sharon.gin@lacity.org>, Zina Cheng <zina.cheng@lacity.org>, paul.koretz@lacity.org

Re: Support of BMO for Cheviot Hills


Dear Ms. Dickinson, Ms. Gin, Ms. Cheng.

Please see attached document with 5 hand collected signatures of Cheviot residents **supporting the new BMO (CF 14-0656) for Cheviot Hills** and opposing R1VNew/2. Signatures on these documents are certified true and correct to the best of my knowledge as I personally contacted each of the signatories at their home addresses listed.

Please enter this document, along with all those provided by Colleen Mason Heller, into the Council File **supporting of the BMO (CF 14-0656)** for Cheviot Hills, and opposing R1VNew/2 **Variation Zones Code Amendment Council File 16-1470** for Cheviot Hills.

The necessity to take action prior to the expiration of the ICOs, along with the inadequate education, outreach and explanation of the R1Variation zones and the lack of any independent survey or canvas of the Cheviot Hills neighborhood to receive a comprehensive understanding of community preference, requires any action on R1V designations be postponed until such time as these minimal basic efforts have been made.

Sincerely,
Kerrin Clark



Stop Mansionization In Cheviot Hills!

WE SUPPORT THE BASELINE MAINTENANCE ORDINANCE ("BMO") FOR CHEVIOT HILLS. The updated BMO is a rational, respectful zoning plan that both removes incentives for developers to target homes in Cheviot Hills for demolition and over-building, and also provides residents with the flexibility to build out. The updated BMO supports renovation, rebuilding, and additions, while preserving the light, space and privacy between neighboring properties. The updated BMO has been approved citywide as the fairest and most balanced compromise, and we want the same protection from out-of-scale development for Cheviot Hills.

DATE	SIGNATURE	NAME AND ADDRESS	EMAIL
	Sherry Weber	10615 Rossmore Rd	sherryweber24@yahoo.com
	Cheryl Weber	10603 Bradbury Rd Los Angeles, CA 90064	CherylWeber@aol.com
	Vicki Sanford	10604 Bradbury Rd L.A. 90064	
	Dan Byrd	10604 BRADBURY RD L.A. 90064	
	Ed Miller	10337 Duxton Dr LA 90064	



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Not OK!!

1 message

Walter Afanasieff <dudey58@me.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 5:53 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,

Walter Afanasieff
12985 Galewood St.
Studio City CA 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Coldwater canyon parking lot project

1 message

Jonathan Weiss <jondebiweiss@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 5:52 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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 Weiss

5316 goodland Ave

Valley village CA 91607

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE Droid



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Mansionization amendment

1 message

Laura Glass <sprpoochma@aol.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 7:06 PM

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

I implore the City Council to add an amendment to the BMO and BHO ordinance so that the entire square footage of front-facing garages is calculated as part of the total square footage allowed.

Mansionization has ruined neighborhoods and must be stopped!!

Thank you,

Laura Glass
4307 Babcock Ave.
Studio City 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO BHO ORDINANCE

1 message

Donna Mann <mamu5355@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:58 PM

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,
Donna Mann
3970 Van Noord Ave.
Studio City, Ca 91604

Sent from my iPad



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Wednesdays vote

1 message

Anna Maguire <amaguire711@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:00 PM

Dear Sharon Dickinson

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,
Anna M Maguire
3635 Potosi Ave., Studio City, CA 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO Ordinance

1 message

Sue Culhane <sueculhane@sbcglobal.net>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:02 PM

Reply-To: Sue Culhane <sueculhane@sbcglobal.net>

To: "Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, "paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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,
Sue Culhane
Studio City



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE: BHO/BMO vote TOMORROW Wednesday

1 message

Sarah Boyd <stboyd69@yahoo.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 3:26 PM

Reply-To: Sarah Boyd <STBoyd@aya.yale.edu>

To: "councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org" <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>

Cc: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Dear Councilmember Krekorian,**STRIKE OUT OF SECTION 13 PHRASE NEEDED FROM BMO/BHO**

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

You should know that it really makes it seem like City Council is trying to sneak last minute changes through to give CUP institutions SPECIAL TREATMENT.

There are many eyes on this issue -- since it effects all of Los Angeles's hillsides -- however in regards to YOUR VOTE, it effects your council district in particular, in light of the Harvard-Westlake parking project. As you know this is a project which is out-of-scale for a hillside environment, seeks numerous zoning exceptions and hillside building exceptions (grading and excavation greatly in excess of what is allowable) and it is a prime example of a CUP institution looking for SPECIAL TREATMENT from City Council and PLUM.

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,**Sarah Boyd****Studio City resident and homeowner**

Sarah Boyd
STBoyd69@yahoo.com
(818) 687-6286 c.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO

1 message

Jeffrey Jacobs <jjacobs9@aol.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 5:00 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: jjacobs9@aol.com

Dear Councilmember,

STRIKE OUT OF SECTION 13 PHRASE NEEDED FROM BMO/BHO

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 way the code is now.

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.

Cordially,

Jeffrey District 2

Jeffrey S. Jacobs

Attorney at Law

Phone: 818-995-3399

2/28/2017

City of Los Angeles Mail - BMO/BHO

Fax: 818-995-3399

Email: jjacobs9@aol.com



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO Ordinance

1 message

Jeff Stuart <jeffstuart@earthlink.net>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 7:47 PM

Reply-To: Jeff Stuart <jeffstuart@earthlink.net>

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

Howdy folks,

Some new language that would allow folks to evade the standards you have carefully drafted for the BMO/BHO Ordinance has crept into the picture, and we need to get it out of there.

It seems like there are always people who think laws that apply to everyone should make exceptions for them, and those exceptions can seep into proposals like this one, and now, more than ever, we need to be FAIR. So:

The new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will vote on this tomorrow 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 someone or some agency is trying to sneak last minute changes through to give Conditional Use Permit (CUP) institutions special treatment. (This is what I mean. Someone wants the rules you make for EVERYONE to not apply to them.)

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.

Thanks for your time, and fairness.

Jeff Stuart
4106 Alcove Avenue
Studio City



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO

1 message

Maria Elena Laas <enshala@gmail.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 7:05 PM

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 (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,
Maria McQuhae-Laas
3928 Fairway Ave
Studio City, 91604

Sent from the future



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE: BMO/BHO City Council Vote on March 1

1 message

Andrew Ferrell <andrewdavidferrell@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:14 PM

Bcc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,
Andrew Ferrell
10619 Landale St. Apt. 205
North Hollywood, CA 91602



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO Ordinance From No Litter Zone and Angry Constituent

1 message

Jackie Hunsicker <thejax@me.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:34 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, "arnoldtheprinterdslextrreme.com" <arnoldtheprinter@dslextrreme.com>, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear CouncilMembers:

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. IT IS OUTRAGEOUS.

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,
Jackie Hunsicker
3251 Coldwater Canyon Avenue, Studio City, CA 91604

Have been serving the Coldwater/Mulholland/ Laurel Canyon Community unpaid for eight years with No Litter Zone. Recently we received a grant from Clean Street Initiative. Thank you so much for sticking up for us.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BHO/BHO ordinance language change--meeting tomorrow

1 message

perrycontact@aol.com <perrycontact@aol.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:34 PM

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

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,
Thomas Perry
3730 Mound View Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Jack Bornoff <jbornoff@sbcglobal.net>
Reply-To: Jack Bornoff <jbornoff@sbcglobal.net>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:33 PM

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,
Jack Bornoff
4217 Ethel Ave.
Studio City, 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BHO/BMO ordinance language change

1 message

Jo Perry <joaperry@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:26 PM

To: Council Member Krekorian <councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, "councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org" <councilmember.cedillo@lacity.org>, cc: councilmember.koretz@lacity.org" <councilmember.koretz@lacity.org>, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember,

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13, PLEASE!

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.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jo Perry
Studio City



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

FW: Save Coldwater Canyon

1 message

Sandra Lucchesi <SLucchesi@gersh.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:23 PM

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

Dear Sharon Dickinson

I hope that you will hear my voice in saving Coldwater Canyon.

Los Angeles has been deemed the #1 traffic capital of the US. Coldwater Canyon is an extremely important artery for so many working commuters. As it stands, it takes me a good 50 minutes to travel from Ventura Blvd to Beverly Blvd and back. If Harvard-Westlake gets their way, they will be impeding my travel time astronomically. This feels like a very selfish and arrogant step by the school who want more parking spaces for their students who should be learning the important values of maintaining ecological balance and learning to be thoughtful about the neighborhood that their school exists in. It's hard for me to understand why this is even a consideration.

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.

-

I hope you listen to your hard working constituents.

Your Constituent,

Sandra Lucchesi
13435 Cheltenham Dr.
Sherman Oaks

Gersh

SANDRA LUCCHESI | Senior Vice President

slucchesi@gersh.com

9465 Wilshire Blvd, 6th Floor, Beverly Hills, CA 90212

tel: 310-205-5872



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO Ordinance

1 message

Susan Jacobs <susanj719@icloud.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:57 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Council Member Krekorian <Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org>, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,
Susan Jacobs, Studio City

Susan Jacobs
susanj719@icloud.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

William Nix <wnix@creativeprojectsgroup.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:53 PM

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 (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,

William Nix

3957 Goodland Place

Studio City, CA 91604

818.763.0374 (Tel)

3/1/2017

City of Los Angeles Mail - STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

818.788.7406 (Fax)



Please consider the environment and whether you need to print this email.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO

1 message

Sarah Whistler <sarahxand@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:50 PM

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,
Sarah Whistler
4422 Kraft Avenue
Studio City, CA 91602



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Andrew Lasken <andrew.lasken@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 7:36 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,
Andrew Lasken
3696 Dixie Canyon Ave.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Harvard Westlake / Coldwater Canyon

1 message

Deborah Ambrosino <deborahambrosino@me.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 7:19 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,

Deborah Ambrosino
4016 Alta Mesa Dr
Studio City CA 91604

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,
Anne Mosell
4033 van noord ave
studio city 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Atwater, Julie <Julie.Atwater@disney.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 9:17 PM

To: "councilmember.wesson@lacity.org" <councilmember.wesson@lacity.org>, "Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org>, "councilmember.ryu@lacity.org" <councilmember.ryu@lacity.org>, "paul.koretz@lacity.org" <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, "sharon.dickinson@lacity.org" <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

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,**Julie Atwater****3944 Van Noord Ave
studio city CA 91604**

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Don't sneak last minute changes into BMO/BHO

1 message

Karen Brooks <karenxbrooks@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:21 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

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,
Karen Brooks
11521 Canton Drive, Studio City 91604

--
karenxbrooks@gmail.com
landline 818.760.3356
mobile 818.517.4357





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Tomorrow's vote

1 message

Jon Boorstin <jon.boorstin@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:32 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,

Jon Boorstin
4007 Avenida del Sol
Studio City 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

City Council Vote on March 1, 2017 re: BMO/BHO Ordinance

1 message

Laurie Cohn <Imarbe@sbcglobal.net>
To: Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:41 PM

Dear Councilmember Krekorian:

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.

-
Thank you.

Your constituent,

*Laurie Cohn**4227 Bellaire Ave**Studio City, CA 91604*

818-985-7788



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO vote March 1, 2017

2 messages

Laurie Cohn <lmarbe@sbcglobal.net>
To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:43 PM

Dear Councilmember Wesson:

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.

-
Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Laurie Cohn**4227 Bellaire Ave**Studio City, CA 91604*

818-985-2865



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

Laurie Cohn <imarbe@sbcglobal.net>
To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org
Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:45 PM

Dear Councilmember Ryu:

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.

-
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Laurie Cohn

4227 Bellaire Ave

Studio City, CA 91604

818-985-2865



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO vote March 1, 2017

1 message

Laurie Cohn <lcohn2010@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:45 PM

To: paul.koretz@lacity.org

Cc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Koretz:

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.

-

Thank you.

Sincerely,

*Laurie Cohn**4227 Bellaire Ave**Studio City, CA 91604**818-985-2865*



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO - Strike out phrase of section 13 needed!

1 message

555lr <555lr@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:57 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember,

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will be voting on this Wednesday, 3/1/17, 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 12.24F and 14.00A 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.

Thank you,

Lawrence Broch and Susan Dickes
3961 Alcove Ave.
Studio City, CA 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BHO VOTE --STRIKE OUT 11th hour SECTION 13 LANGUAGE

1 message

Jennifer Rothman <jennifer.rothman@lls.edu>
To: councilmember.krekorian@lacity.org
Cc: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 9:10 PM

Dear Councilmember Krekorian,

Please STRIKE OUT the unlawfully added language to SECTION 13, **subsection 12.24F** of BMO/BHO to be voted on tomorrow (Wednesday, March 1st). The new proposed language exempts CUP institutions and affords them special treatment. This last-minute change to 12.24 allows these institutions to evade standards in a way not currently allowed, and was not what was originally proposed nor what the public was given NOTICE for in advance of the vote.

It is bad policy and dangerous to exempt these institutions. Granting exemptions from the BMO and BHO to CUP uses would be a dramatic change. The language in the original ordinances clearly states that the code is intended for ALL residential lots. Conditional uses in residential areas are not allowed and should NOT be granted special exemptions from BMO/BHO restrictions as they locate or expand in such a zone. Exempting conditionally permitted uses from the BHO/BMO would not be a clarification but **a significant and radical alteration** from the current Los Angeles Municipal Code.

In addition, the last minute change WITHOUT NOTICE is unlawful and unethical. It also suggests inappropriate back-room dealing and suspicious favorable treatment given to these institutions.

This affects your council district in particular, in light of the proposed Harvard-Westlake parking project for which you have still not taken any position. As you know this is a project which is out-of-scale for a hillside environment, seeks numerous zoning exceptions and hillside building exceptions (grading and excavation greatly in excess of what is allowable) and it is a prime example of a CUP institution looking for SPECIAL TREATMENT from City Council and PLUM.

This 11th hour language, that CUP institutions likely tried to sneak in, is an unacceptable back-door effort to get this and similar projects through that are currently expressly disallowed. An without an appropriate comment period and time for disucssion.

Your constituents are counting on you to step up and do the right thing--protect the hillsides and residential communities from destructive overdevelopment.

It is your duty to make sure the BMO/BHO protects Single-Family Zone Hillside Area Development Standards. **The City should put back 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.**

Jennifer Rothman, Esq.

Studio City resident and homeowner, 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Tomorrow's vote

1 message

Snow Mercy <snowmercy@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 7:50 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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,
Dr. Sarah Villa
3454 Coldwater Canyon Ave
Studio City, CA 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Mike Kichaven <kichaven@mac.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 8:11 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Paul Krekorian <Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org>, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

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.

Mike Kichaven
4129 Greenbush Av.
Sherman Oaks, Ca. 91423
kichaven@mac.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Re: Strike out Phrase of §13

1 message

John Schouweiler <john.schouweiler@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 9:31 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember,

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will voting on 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 §13 of the current proposal - or go back to the originally proposed section 19 as it was proposed in September 2016.

Your Constituent,
John Schouweiler
3944 Vantage Avenue
Studio City, CA 91604
818.679.3550 (mobile)

THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE AND ITS CONTENTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT, 18 U.S.C. SECTIONS 2510-2521 AND ARE CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION THAT IS INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION, COPYING OR OTHER USE OF THIS MESSAGE AND ITS CONTENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY SENDER IMMEDIATELY BY REPLY E-MAIL AT john.schouweiler@gmail.com AND DELETE THE MESSAGE. THANK YOU.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

PLEASE: Strike out Phrase of Section 13

1 message

Susan Goldberg <goldberg@switzer.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 9:45 PM

Dear Councilmember,

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 2016.

Sincerely,

Susan Goldberg, 4001 Avenida del Sol

Studio City, CA 91604





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

5 messages

Sari & Arden Rynew <rynew@roadrunner.com>
 To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:10 PM

Dear Council Pres. Wesson,

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,
 Arden & Sari Rynew

Sari & Arden Rynew
 13027 Galewood Street
 Studio City, Ca. 91604-4048

818 501-7906
 rynew@roadrunner.com

Sari & Arden Rynew <rynew@roadrunner.com>
 To: Councilmember Paul Krekorian <Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:10 PM

Dear Councilmember Krekorian,

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,
Arden & Sari Rynew

Sari & Arden Rynew
13027 Galewood Street
Studio City, Ca. 91604-4048

818 501-7906
rynew@roadrunner.com

Sari & Arden Rynew <rynew@roadrunner.com>
To: councilmember.ryu@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:11 PM

Dear Councilmember Ryu,

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,
Arden & Sari Rynew

Sari & Arden Rynew
13027 Galewood Street
Studio City, Ca. 91604-4048

818 501-7906
rynew@roadrunner.com

Sari & Arden Rynew <rynew@roadrunner.com>
To: paul.koretz@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:11 PM

Dear Councilmember Koretz,

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,
Arden & Sari Rynew

Sari & Arden Rynew
13027 Galewood Street
Studio City, Ca. 91604-4048

818 501-7906
rynew@roadrunner.com

Sari & Arden Rynew <rynew@roadrunner.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 10:11 PM

Sharon Dickinson,

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,
Arden & Sari Rynew

Sari & Arden Rynew
13027 Galewood Street
Studio City, Ca. 91604-4048

818 501-7906
rynew@roadrunner.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO -- DELETE SECTION 13

1 message

Suellen Wagner <swag1274@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 5:16 PM

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

BMO/BHO -- STRIKE OUT OF SECTION 13 PHRASE NEEDED

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO to be voted 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 inappropriate 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 way the code is written now.

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.

CD2 Constituent
Suellen Wagner
12184 Laurel Terrace Dr.
Studio City, CA 91604

1 Hope Schenk-de Michele who lives at:
10149 TOLUCA LAKE AVE TOLUCA CA 91602
 Address City Zip Code

Support, Councilman, David Ryu's motion to designate 2 acres of the Bob Hope Estate located at 10350 W. Moorpark St., Toluca Lake, CA 91602 as a "Historic Cultural Monument" under the procedures of Section 22.17.10 of the Administrative Code. See Below:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Section 22.17.10 of the Administrative Code provides that the Council, Cultural Heritage Commission, or Director of Planning may initiate consideration of a proposed site, building, or structure as a Historic Cultural Monument. After reviewing and approving any such Commission designation, the Cultural Heritage Commission staff approve or disapprove on their or in part the proposed ordinance and submit a report upon such action to Council.

Council District 7's Toluca Lake neighborhood includes many buildings that are architecturally rich and worthy of preservation. One such historic building is the Hope Estate, located at 10350 West Moorpark Street, Toluca Lake, CA 91602. The estate, approximately 12,000 square feet in size and set on a 2.2-acre site, was built in 1940 for Bob and Shirley Hope. The English traditional style home was designed by architect Richard F. Oldaker, who designed and renovated homes for prominent other Hollywood icons. In the mid-1950s, architect John Elmer Ward, known for his Hollywood and American style, was commissioned to remodel and update the Hope Estate. The home was known to be a place for large parties and intricate cause there celebrity neighbors like Bing Crosby and Frank Sinatra.

In a report published in January 2013 for the Sherman Oaks Studio City Toluca Lake Culveridge Pass Community Plan Area, Survey LA - the City's Historic Resources Survey - has identified the Hope Estate as an example embodying the theme of a residence of an important person in the neighborhood history. 1940-1960 Bob Hope had a great influence on the neighborhood and culture. He was the legendary Academy Award-winning entertainer.

It is imperative that the City's historic-cultural resources are celebrated and its historic architecture preserved for future generations. The Hope Estate, located on Toluca Lake Moorpark Street, is an architectural treasure and integral to it area and character of the Toluca Lake neighborhood, as identified in Survey LA.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Council determine, as provided in Section 54994.2(b)(2) of the Government Code, and pursuant to Rule 23 of the Rules of the City Council, that there is a need to take immediate action on this matter AND that the need for action come to the attention of the City Council subsequent to the posting of the agenda for today's Council meeting.

I FURTHER MOVE that the Council initiate consideration of the Hope Estate, located at 10350 West Moorpark Street, Toluca Lake, CA 91602, as a City Historic-Cultural Monument under the provisions of Section 22.17.10 of the Administrative Code, and submit the Planning Department to prepare the Historic Cultural Monument application for review and consideration by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

I FURTHER MOVE that after reviewing the application, the Cultural Heritage Commission submit its report and recommendations to the Council regarding the historicity of the Hope Estate in the City's list of Historic Cultural Monuments.

PROPOSED BY: David Ryu
 DAVID RYU
 Council Member, District 7

SECONDED BY: Hope Schenk-de Michele

Hope Schenk-de Michele
 Signature

818 7666551
 Phone Number

HopeSDM@yahoo.com
 Email

Email to Councilman David Ryu : sharon.dickinson@lacity.org CC: alice.roth@lacity.org
 Or FAX: 213-978-1040



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO

1 message

Ruth Wald <rw1950@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:14 PM

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,
Ruth Wald
2221 Sunset Crest Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Add a Link

Ruth Wald
rw1950@aol.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Peter Juzwiak <pjuzwiak@jlpfirm.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:09 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org, councilmember.ryu@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers,

There is new proposed language in the BMO/BHO you will be 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 the 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.

Sincerely,

Peter Juzwiak and Don DeRose

4109 Shadyglade Avenue

Studio City, CA 91604



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

BMO/BHO - STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Sabrina Parke <sabrinafaire@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:02 PM

Bcc: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember,

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,
Sabrina Parke
Toluca Lake, CA 91602



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Babbie Green <greenbabbie@gmail.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:21 PM

Dear Council Member Dickinson:

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,
Babbie Green
4548 Sunnyslope Ave.
Sherman Oaks, CA. 91423

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRIKE OUT PHRASE OF SECTION 13 NEEDED

1 message

Joseph Bishara <josephbishara@mac.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Tue, Feb 28, 2017 at 6:19 PM

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,

Joseph Bishara Kebbe
3454 Coldwater Canyon Ave. Studio City, CA 91604