

#### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: PICO Neighborhood Council

Name: Brad Kane

Phone Number: [323-732-4857](tel:323-732-4857)

Email: [bkane@kanelaw.la](mailto:bkane@kanelaw.la)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(15) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 12/09/2015

Type of NC Board Action: For if Amended

#### Impact Information

Date: 12/11/2015

Update to a Previous Input: Yes

Directed To: **City Council and Committees**

Council File Number: 14-0656

Agenda Date: 12-09-2015

Item Number: 12-b

Summary: The PICO Neighborhood Council Board supports meaningful reform of the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and proposes modifications to the 10/27/2015 draft amendments.

Mansionization is one of the top concerns of P.I.C.O. Neighborhood Council stakeholders. We are grateful to Councilmember Koretz for sponsoring the motion to amend the BMO, to Planning staff for drafting amendments, and to Council President Wesson for sponsoring the first of the public outreach meetings.

The draft amendments look positive overall. While we support its reasonable floor-area-ratios (FAR), counting attached garage space, and the elimination of some counterproductive bonuses and exemptions, we urge you to correct some loopholes that weaken the amendments proposed by Councilmember Koretz.

1. The draft still excludes from the FAR calculation lattice-roofed porches, patios, and breezeways, and sets no limit on this uncounted space. This is just the kind of loophole that can turn houses into McMansions. With or without a solid roof, these spaces add bulk and should be counted. This unlimited exemption for patios, breezeways, and balconies with open or lattice roofs should be eliminated.
2. The draft retains the proportional stories bonus and sets a tighter proportion (60%, which we support). The second floor calculation should be based on the net square footage of the first floor, not including any exempted space. And as with other “discretionary” matters, the planning department should handle bonuses in a properly-noticed public hearing, which would provide transparency our stakeholders seek.
3. The draft keeps the Zoning Administrator’s discretionary 10 percent “adjustment.” Given community concerns re: lack of transparency, we don’t need yet another adjustment that gets approved behind closed doors. As the city has existing processes for seeking variances and a wealth of flexible zoning tools currently in development, this provision should be eliminated.