



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656 COMMENT from MGS architecture

1 message

Magdalena Glen-Schieneman <mglen@mgsarchitecture.com>

Tue, Nov 22, 2016 at 10:25 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Hello Sharon,

We are an architectural office and worked over the years on residential projects big and small in our city in hillside areas. In fact we specialize in hillside residential projects.

The proposed ordinance penalizes small lots in several residential hillside zones.

Example: per present and proposed ordinance lot of 3000 s.f. is too big to be below 50% threshold of "standard" 5,000 s.f. lot to qualify for some exceptions- and too small to have economically feasible small house put on. The owners of those lots usually are on shoe string budget- unable to afford larger lots in LA- want to develop small homes 1,500 s.f – but are unable to do so because of proportioned maximum areas based on lot SF and slope calculations. The proposed code change does not address this – in fact it is making it worst! The proposed code focuses on limiting the development –BUT THE SMALL LOTS UNDER THE 5,000 S.F. are being penalized disproportionately! Those existing lots should get AUTOMATIC MINIMUM allowed square footage. Based on our experience we suggest 1,500 plus 400 s.f. garage.

At present plan checkers suggest those lots are just not to be developed. Well- city is in housing crisis –those small lots exist- the reality of housing shortage and cost to develop land should be taken into account when rewriting the ordinance.

In our opinion it is absolutely critical to create "BASIC SMALL HOUSE" rule. Give the minimum square footage area of house by right (on the side note – your use of "by right" in code is not logically correct- you are using it as "maximum" allowed). This path would allow people to develop homes without the massive code calculations, floor area calculations, slope analysis, grading calculations etc. Do you realize we have to do 3 to 4 DIFFERENT FLOOR AREA CALCULATIONS to satisfy the building code, zoning code, taxes, school fees? And their exact definitions are not always clearly defined and understood as the "bulletins" change. All require dimensioned diagrams too....

So please simplify rather than complicate, help the "small lot" and help establish PRESCRIPTIVE MINIMUM HOUSE RULE for hillside.

By creating a minimum house floor area allowed by right, you would help people who want a modest house on often substandard lot.

I can be reached at your office contact below if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Magdalena Glen-Schieneman, AIA, LEED AP

www.MGSarchitecture.com

4551 Glencoe Avenue, Suite 250

Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

T. (310) 301 6419

F. (310) 301 9102



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656

1 message

Michael Steuer <msteuer@gmail.com>

Tue, Nov 22, 2016 at 10:13 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Sharon,

I live on Gibson Street in one of the areas affected by your proposed amendment.

As I have previously indicated regarding the above referenced file, I strongly object to the new regulations further reducing the abilities of our families and our neighborhoods to flourish. The city would be acting against the interests of its citizens by artificially reducing property values, further limiting growing families to provide a home for their dependents on their lawful property, basically forcing growing families to leave the area which will result in a fundamental demographic shift in these neighborhoods which will severely hit local businesses (which would be such a shame when areas like SoRo were just seeing a revitalization of local businesses catering to young families) and is basically greatly reducing the city's competitive edge. I'm sure the folks in Culver City, Beverly Hills, Santa Monica, Glendale and all other cities in/around LA are laughing all the way to the bank. I'm amazed that the City Council would be willing to shoot ourselves in the foot this much.

Please reconsider this ordinance and find a happy medium that works for all Angelenos, not a few anti-progress troublemakers who'd like to believe we still live in the 1950s... Factory jobs are not coming back, nor are 1200 square foot houses for families of 6. Let's get real.

Michael.

--

Michael Steuer

(310) 869-3326





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656

1 message

Sandra Cutuli <scutuli@earthlink.net>

Tue, Nov 22, 2016 at 11:47 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

I am writing in support of the proposed Baseline Mansionization/Baseline Hillside (BMO/BHO) Code Amendment. I support it because I suspect it's the best we can do. But just for the record, I would go further:

1. Any building practices known to be "green" should be required of all new buildings.
2. Solar power, water capture and a certain percent of permeable/open ground for ground-water replenishment should also be required.
3. Ways should be found to make it impossible for a new building to steal or invade the privacy of the yard of an adjacent or nearby building.

As one active in outdoor education (through the Los Angeles Zoo and Botanical Gardens and Los Angeles Audubon), I am concerned about increased anxiety/depression, lower academic achievement, and general reduced mental health that has been traced, in numerous studies, to a lack of contact with nature. Our building codes should discourage people eliminating their own access to outdoor space (building footprint limited to 35 percent of total lot size, say) and stealing it from their neighbors.

Sincerely,

Sandra Cutuli
1840 Preuss Road
Los Angeles, CA 90035
CD 10