CFMS 16-1470

Kerrin Clark Posted in group: Clerk-PLUM-Committee Mar 16, 2018 7:32 AM

10331 Dunleer Drive Los Angeles, CA 90064

Councilmember Paul Koretz 200 N. Spring Street Suite 440 Los Angeles, CA 90012

March 15, 2018

Dear Councilmember Koretz -

As you can imagine, we closely followed your presentation to the Los Angeles City Council on March 9, with respect to CFMS 16-1470.

We were gratified that you acknowledged the threat which speculative development continues to pose to Cheviot Hills. Our motivation in advocating to remain in the R1/BMO zone has been just that for the past 16 months: preventing a zoning designation that would offer greater incentives for developer demolitions without protecting neighborhood character or scale. Our neighborhood lacks the prohibitions against predatory development available to residents of California Country Club Estates and Beverlywood through their CC&Rs.

The amendment you offered asks the City Planning Department "to draft an ordinance with options to limit the R1V2 zoning from incentivizing speculative developers, including only allowing the additional zoning allowance for families who are constructing a primary residence, or conducting a remodel of less than 50% of floor area."

We would love to support your effort to find the balance between preserving the scale and character of Cheviot Hills while allowing flexibility for those families who are contemplating modest additions to homes that are already close to the R1/BMO RFAR of 45%. In that light, tying R1V2 to the magnitude of the remodel, addition or rebuilding of any house in Cheviot Hills makes sense. Those families that simply want to add an in-law suite, or home office, or expand a dining room or kitchen would be able to proceed with those plans while homes torn down would be limited to .45 RFAR, which is still 150% larger than historical RFAR in Cheviot.

Instituting an unmitigated R1V2 designation for Cheviot Hills, even for a few months, is not, however, something we can support; nor is it wise. As you know, plans filed under an existing ordinance have a three year shelf life. Allowing a 6-12 month window (or longer) in which speculative developers could file plans defeats the purpose of your creative amendment. We have already found several instances of a development company appearing to file permit requests prior to actually owning the property. Telegraphing an adverse change in zoning allowances sometime in the next year could lead to a blizzard of plans being filed in anticipation of that change. The neighborhood character and scale of Cheviot Hills that the variation zones were created to protect would be irreversibly harmed while this proposed ordinance was studied, drafted, reviewed and approved by City Planning, P.L.U.M., the City Attorney and the full City Council.

We look forward to remaining engaged on this issue with your office and the Planning Department. To that end, please inform us of the process going forward. Who should we connect with in Planning to get questions answered and be involved in the process? How can we receive progress reports on the drafting of the ordinance and on progress towards achieving the 6 month goal for implementation you would like? How can we receive notifications from your office regarding hearings, or other actions before the PLUM committee and the full City Council?

We will continue to update your office with the Cheviot Hills sales, permit and development trends and statistics submitted to you on March 1, 2018, as we continue to work together to fine tune a final zoning designation for our neighborhood. It is our hope the trend line indicated in the data will continue to reflect the positive effects of being under the protection of R1/BM for the past year, so that Cheviot Hills remains a neighborhood welcoming, available, and attractive to families in Los Angeles who work here, educate their children here, and actively participate in the civic life of this city.

cc: Clerk.plumcommittee

Hard copy to follow