



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Baseline Mansionization Ordinance concerns - please do not pass the new prohibitive regulations

1 message

Stephen Esmond <sesmond@att.net>
Reply-To: Stephen Esmond <sesmond@att.net>
To: Stephen Esmond <sesmond@att.net>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 8:31 AM

To whom it may concern,

Please note my opposition to the new 'Anti-Mansionization' regulations for this reason:

1. It hurts growing middle class families:

Many of us are average middle class and growing families. Our only option is to expand/remodel our homes to make room for our kids. I would estimate the cost to be about \$200,000, more or less, for this option. If we were not to be allowed to do this, we would have to move. It's not even saying that we want to maximize to RFA .5. It's just that we should have the option. The options to move would be to spend \$1.2 - \$1.6 million just to buy in a regular home in our neighborhoods. That cost is prohibitive. The other option is to move to a lesser quality neighborhood than the ones we have been living in for so long. The proposals limiting the options down to .4 RFA are prohibitive to us all.

Alternate proposals:

1. To prevent 'speculators', a property must be owned for at least one year before being approved at up to .5 RFA, with the bonus options available too.
2. Anyone owning their home for a certain amount of time prior to any new regulations being passed, such as 1 year, would be grandfathered in to the older standards, being that those were the ones we bought our homes with.
3. Households are free to choose the new proposed standards if they do choose so, but they do not have the right to impose their standards on others.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns and for thinking them through.

Sincerely,

Stephen Esmond
Los Angeles, 90034



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

STRS - CF#14-1635-S2; CPC-2016-1243

1 message

Rodney Liber <rodliber@me.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:25 AM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Bonin@lacity.org, Councilmember.Cedillo@lacity.org,
Councilmember.Koretz@lacity.org

I am opposed to the Short Term Rental Ordinance, but believe if the City is on the road to support, we must at least have the maximum number of written protections.

Please support necessary changes to ensure the rights of not just would-be renters, but their neighbors as well!



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Comments for Council File #14-0656

1 message

Mary Cordaro <marycordaro@sbcglobal.net>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 2:44 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Hello, this is in reference to Council File #14-0656:
The Council must reinstate the 0.45 ratio for R-1 neighborhoods and get rid of the 400 square foot freebie for attached garages.

Thank you.

Mary Cordaro

Mary Cordaro, Inc.

Expertise in healthy and sustainable building materials, interiors and indoor air quality for 25 years. Commercial and residential, existing and new construction.

Phone and Fax: 818.766.1787

<http://marycordaro.com/>

info@marycordaro.com

Blog: <http://marycordaro.com/blog>

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/mary.cordaro.7>

Safbaby: <http://www.safbaby.com/meet-mary-cordaro-safbabys-healthy-home-and-environment-expert/>



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

RE: BMO/BHO Code Amendment at full City Council Weds. 12/7/16

1 message

Luke Tarr <luke@apeldesign.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 2:49 PM

To: Planning Conservation <neighborhoodconservation@lacity.org>, "niall.huffman@lacity.org" <niall.huffman@lacity.org>, Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>
Cc: Amit Apel <amit@apeldesign.com>

Hi Sharon,

How can we know that our projects that are currently under review for different planning approvals, such as Mulholland DRB, that are not submitted to building and safety yet will not be required to be changed by this new ordinance?

The outline points below only state certain zoning entitlements, but is very vague. This will be a very big factor for many of our current projects.

Thank you for your assistance,

Luke

Luke Tarr | Project Coordinator

Amit Apel Design, Inc.
6411 Independence Ave.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
T: 818.346.9828 | F: 310.919.3001
<http://amitapel.com>



AMIT APEL DESIGN INC.®

In Association with Michael Maclaren, AIA- Architect

From: niall.huffman@lacity.org [mailto:niall.huffman@lacity.org] **On Behalf Of** Planning Conservation
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2016 2:36 PM
To: Planning Conservation
Subject: BMO/BHO Code Amendment at full City Council Weds. 12/7/16

Dear Stakeholders,

On **Wednesday, December 7, 2016**, the City Council will consider the proposed Baseline Mansionization/Baseline Hillside (BMO/BHO) Code Amendment at its regularly scheduled meeting. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 10:00 a.m. in the John Ferraro Council Chamber (Room 340) of Los Angeles City Hall, 200 N Spring St, Los Angeles, CA 90012. The meeting agenda is available at the following link: http://ens.lacity.org/clk/councilagendas/clkcouncilagendas3108029_12072016.html

We do not know whether the City Council will be taking public testimony on the item, as the Public Hearing was held and closed by the Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee on November 29. **To have written comments included in the record, please email Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org** and reference Council File #14-0656 in your correspondence.

Adoption Process

The proposed ordinance will not be up for a final adoption vote at Wednesday's meeting. There are at least four steps remaining in the adoption process, including:

- Approval of the proposed BMO/BHO ordinance provisions by the City Council (under consideration at Wednesday's meeting).
- Preparation of the official BMO/BHO ordinance by the City Attorney.
- Adoption of the BMO/BHO ordinance by the City Council.
- The Mayor's signature of the ordinance.

Once these steps have been completed, the City Clerk will post the adopted ordinance for a period of 10 days, at the end of which a 31-day waiting period will begin before the ordinance goes into effect.

PLUM Recommendations

As part of its action at the November 29 meeting, the PLUM Committee recommended several modifications to the proposed ordinance. The PLUM Committee's recommended changes to the proposed ordinance include:

- Reduce Hillside Area guaranteed minimum Residential Floor Area from 1,000 to 800 square feet.
- Reduce R1 Zone, Hillside Area by-right maximum grading from 2,000 to 1,000 cubic yards.
- Change starting height of R1 encroachment plane from 20 to 22 feet.
- Remove front articulation requirement in the R1 Zone.
- Restore 0.5 Floor Area Ratio for R1 lots smaller than 7,500 square feet.
- Restore full 400 square foot exemption for garages, regardless of location.
- Clarify that conditionally permitted uses are subject to the provisions of the BMO and BHO.
- Add a provision exempting projects currently in the process of seeking zoning entitlements from following the ordinance.
- Other technical edits and clarifications.

The Committee also recommended that the Department of City Planning be instructed to report back with a policy recommendation on limiting the Hillside Area grading exemption for pile and caisson foundations.

To have written comments included in the record, please email Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org and reference Council File #14-0656.

For questions, please contact Niall Huffman, niall.huffman@lacity.org 213-978-3405.

Thank you for your continued interest in the BMO/BHO Code Amendment.

--

	Neighborhood Conservation Team Department of City Planning
	HPOZ Community Planning Code Studies
	preservation.lacity.org/neighborhoodconservation



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File # 14-0656

1 message

Randy Traweek <rtraweek@roadrunner.com>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 2:54 PM

December 5, 2016

Subj: BMO/BHO Amendments, CF no. 14-0656

Dear Ms. Dickinson:

When I spoke at the Claude Pepper Senior Center public hearing August 20th in regards to the proposal to restrict development (aka "MacMansions") in Crestview, Faircrest Heights and surrounding areas, I opened by saying, "I strongly support the city's (then) proposal." I should have finished that thought by adding, "...even though I am diametrically opposed to it."

I then should have gone on to explain said opposition as I am a strict preservationist and believe as unique, rapidly vanishing communities to be treasured, we should preserve jewels like Crestview. But I speak to you in strong support of a proposal I otherwise condemn because I am a reasonable person, recognize we live in a diverse community, that I am not an 'island of one' and I respect the committee for reaching a sensible compromise that, while not protecting our communities as much as I would have wished, it is a fair compromise given our said diversity.

"I speak this way, supporting a proposal I oppose, in the hope you will remember these words when you hear my counterparts argue, 'I strongly condemn this proposal because this is my property and I should be free to do as I please with it.' Such a message implies, "I do not recognize that I live in a community, I AM an island of one, and the only thing that matters is my wish." Such "blank-you" attitudes towards everyone but their own self-centered selves run counter to our community and counter to America..."

Alas, it seems The City Planning Commission paid too much attention to those who insisted their "island of one" philosophy should prevail, that the voices of developers should trump a very reasonable compromise and then compromised on their original compromise, their original BMO/BHO, destroying the very essence of the common-sense compromise, the one we all supported as reasonable even though we didn't necessarily like it. This latest draft makes a *mockery of the previous draft, particularly in regards to attached garages which by itself eviscerates the central aspect that makes our community special* –that we can walk and drive down the streets enjoying lovely houses rather than unsightly garage doors.

Livable, loveable communities are made of quaint homes, not multiple-car garage door after door after door after door after...well...you get the idea. What preserved our community was the provision that garages remain detached at the rear of each property. That was central to the city's presentation (and received the loudest cheer) August 20th at Claude Pepper.

Must we beg? Please! The lovely homes make our community lovely, NOT garage doors! Think for five seconds. Lovely Spanish arches, leaded glass windows, etc., compared to unsightly, dehumanizing, monolithic structures that serve no purpose other than our perverse worship of the automobile. A great community should put people first, not the cars of

individuals. The Committee needs to keep people in the front of its mind and garage doors off the front of our homes. I cannot say this strongly enough. Please do not allow this "island of myself" mentality to destroy our precious community. Do not, do not, do NOT!

Garages in our neighborhood belong in the back where they can be used and not seen. I ask you: As you look out your window onto your street, would you rather see a lovely home or a hideous garage door, perhaps nothing but garage doors? This "garage front and center" (or even to the side) mentality is the mentality of the developer, NOT the community member. Please side with our community and our quality of life. You literally hold in your hands our quality of life. Do not destroy it completely.

Do not remove the one provision that made your reasonable compromise reasonable.

As it stands now, the latest draft may as well be laissez-faire development, in other words the status quo of continued MacMansions. Don't do it. Don't go back on your word. Don't abandon common sense. We are a community of homes, not home depots. Driveways separating homes literally give residents room to breathe. As we walk our streets, they give us time to think, to see the sun rise and set. Compare that to the endless assault garage doors impose on the senses, on the aesthetics of a community.

We are not The Valley. We are more than a housing development. Please preserve what makes us unique, our homes facing the street without doors perhaps better suited for spanning moats. Were the doors in castle walls EVER considered attractive? Or rather were they meant to convey a sense of exclusion? These garage doors say, "Go away". We want our homes to say, "Come in."

I would only add that the latest draft also goes too far when it comes to grading and hauling allowances. These are truly excessive and again reflect the thinking of developers, not community members. Please reconsider. Please rid the latest draft of the so-called "bonuses" which are again a bonus for developers, not community members on RA/RS/RE lots. They add 20% more bulk to buildings that arguable are already going to be too bulky. On August 20, the City told us they had decided "enough is enough" when it came to size increases with its original BMO/BHO. Twenty percent more than already more than enough is too much. It is way too much. Get rid of it. You were right the first time. Enough is enough without any extra "bonuses".

Prior to August 20, the city had listened carefully to all stakeholders and made a reasonable compromise. This latest draft betrays that effort. Do not abandon your reason. Do not cause us to lose ours.

Thank you for your time,

Randall Traweek

1851 S. Wooster St.

Los Angeles, CA 90035

(Crestview)

-Randy

Not sent by an iPhone or any other highly-addictive, carcinogenic, electronic device.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656: Mansionization Ordinance

1 message

toby horn <thorn626@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 3:16 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: david.ryu@lacity.org, Paul Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, shawn.bayliss@lacity.org

Ms. Dickinson,

I am not in agreement with some of the amendments as proposed by the PLUM related to the mansionization ordinance.

- The amendment need to be revised to reflect that the 0.45 ratio for R-1 neighborhoods MUST be reinstated and that the 400 square foot freebie for attached garages be deleted. Detached garages must be rewarded.

- Front Articulation requirements MUST be restored. The introduction of flat fronted "Kleenex boxes" into our neighborhoods has proven to be an important element of the destruction of historic and conforming neighborhoods.

I appreciate your listening to and including my opinions in the public record. Also, please tell Council what I want them to do.

Thank you,

Toby Horn
146 South Fuller Avenue
Los Angeles 90036
(323)934-5611
thorn626@gmail.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Objection to Proposed Zone Change in Inner Council District 5

1 message

Bruce Russell <brucerussell@icloud.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 3:19 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, christine.saponara@lacity.org

Cc: Paul.koretz@lacity.org, Hillary Gabor Vari <hillaryvari@gmail.com>, schulmanrd@gmail.com, Gordon Cutler <gordonbcutler@msn.com>, "Jeff Eckardt M.D." <jeckardt@mednet.ucla.edu>

The proposed zone change to R1VNew or 0.45 on larger lots means that I could not replace my house at its current size and no future buyer could rebuild at the present size. My house was rebuilt in 1980 at its current size and I have owned it for 20 years. I consider this a seizure of my property asset value and believe the city should compensate my family for such seizure based upon current values. At present, the loss in square footage at the current home value shows a loss in property value of \$144,527. Does the city plan to pay this?

Bruce Russell

brussell@earthlink.net

Cell 310-346-6131



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Please Enter Into Official Council File #14-0656: Mansionization Ordinance

1 message

toby horn <thorn626@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 3:42 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Cc: david.ryu@lacity.org, Paul Koretz <paul.koretz@lacity.org>, shawn.bayliss@lacity.org

Ms. Dickinson,

I am not in agreement with some of the amendments as proposed by the PLUM related to the mansionization ordinance.

- The amendment need to be revised to reflect that the 0.45 ratio for R-1 neighborhoods MUST be reinstated and that the 400 square foot freebie for attached garages be deleted. Detached garages must be rewarded.

- Front Articulation requirements MUST be restored. The introduction of flat fronted "Kleenex boxes" into our neighborhoods has proven to be an important element of the destruction of historic and conforming neighborhoods.

I appreciate your listening to and including my opinions in the public record. Also, please tell Council what I want them to do.

Thank you,

Toby Horn
146 South Fuller Avenue
Los Angeles 90036
(323)934-5611
thorn626@gmail.com
.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Deni Mosser <dm@mosserdesign.net>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 3:51 PM

To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

December 5, 2016

Dear City Council members:

Residential neighborhoods need your help and good public policy.

When voting on Dec. 7 on the BMO/BHO, please:

- Support the reasonable 0.45 FAR (floor area ratio) for R-1 zone, and
- Count front attached garages in total floor area - no exemption!

Attached garages in the front usually take away one public parking space in the street (due to wider driveway cuts). Public street parking is already at a premium. The city and the public cannot afford to lose more street parking.

Thank you!

Deni Mosser
8971 W. 24th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90034



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Building restrictions

1 message

Judy Silk <jsilk@earthlink.net>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 3:56 PM

I live in Pacific Palisades. I moved here over 20 years ago, and I did so because I saw it as a long term investment. Some people make investments in the stock market, but I invested in my neighborhood. I am deeply concerned that some loud mouthed neighbors think they have the right to tell me that they don't like larger houses, and so are seeking to take that right away from me. It amounts to theft. It should not be tolerated. On my street, the 1100 block of Hartzell St, there are at least half a dozen remodels that have nicely improved our property value. If the restrictive building regulations are put in place, I will be at a severe economic disadvantage.

I am a divorcee who gave up participation in my ex-husband's lucrative business because I wanted to stay in this house, where I was raising two children as a stay at home Mom. I sacrificed my earning potential to focus on their health and development (each of them has learning issues). You cannot take away my retirement investment. I had remarried in 2008, and was then widowed in 2013. I might have been able to rely upon my second husband to replace the potential earnings loss, but he got cancer. In addition to killing my soul, I was even more dependent on the future value of my home. Who are these "not in my backyard" jerks to rob me of that security?

The homes that have been built are tasteful, and are part of a general upscaling of this neighborhood. Has the idea of increasing home values become a crime? If so, I'm not familiar with that new law.

Please don't let them take away my future nest egg. It's not fair. It's an overreaction to a couple of squeaky wheels in the Palisades who like nothing more than to spoil things for neighbors. I don't care if they remodel their homes, but they can't take my rights away.

Judy Silk
1106 Hartzell St
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272
310-613-4905

Judy Silk
www.judysilk.com



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

1 message

Dan Silver <dsilverla@me.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 4:03 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, jose.huizar@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, Paul Koretz <Paul.Koretz@lacity.org>, councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Councilmembers:

Please prevent masionization. Please Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July 2016 and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

Dan Silver, MD
222 S Figueroa St #1611
Los Angeles CA 90012



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments (revised email)

1 message

Deni Mosser <dm@mosserdesign.net>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 4:12 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, councilmember.huizar@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

(Revised email)

December 5, 2016

Dear City Council members:

Residential neighborhoods need your help and good public policy.

When voting on the BMO/BHO (on Dec. 7th) please:

- Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July 2016
- Support the reasonable 0.45 FAR (floor area ratio) for R-1 zone, and
- Count attached garages in total allowable sq. footage - no exemption!

Attached garages in the front usually take away one public parking space in the street (due to wider driveway cuts). Public street parking is already at a premium. The city and the public cannot afford to lose more street parking.

Thank you!

Deni Mosser (10th Council District)
8971 W. 24th St.
Los Angeles, CA 90034



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #24-0656

1 message

Robin Tucker <robnt@pacbell.net>
To: Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 4:25 PM

Dear Ms. Dickinson:

I live at 9120 Beverlywood Street in Lower CD5, and would like to once again voice my support for more restrictive zoning in our area. The RIV2 allows for a large house (actually much larger than most of the lots in the neighborhood can support), and would not destroy our area or our property values, as many misinformed neighborhood bloggers have said.

I would also like to voice my displeasure at the events of the recent Nov. 29 Planning and Land Use Management Committee meeting. To have public comments and support for the amendments ignored by Councilman Huizar was a disgrace. I understand several of our council members were blindsided by his actions. It was a bait-and-switch of the lowest order and should not be tolerated.

Please help our neighborhoods preserve their character and make them a welcoming place for people of all incomes.

Sincerely,

Robin Tucker

9120 Beverlywood St.

Los Angeles, CA 90034



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

City Council Mansionization hearing this Wednesday - No to the loophole for attached garages

1 message

ed hunt <edvhunt@earthlink.net>
To: please email <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 4:57 PM

Dear Sharon, Re ensure that my below letter is included in your Council File #14-0656

From: ed hunt [mailto:edvhunt@earthlink.net]

Sent: Sunday, December 04, 2016 5:02 PM

To: MITCH O'FARRELL (councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org); Chris Robertson (chris.robertson@lacity.org); CHRISTINE PETERS (christine.peters@lacity.org)

Cc: shelley@wagersmail.net; councilmember.koretz@lacity.org; councilmember.wesson@lacity.org; Melrose Hill (melrosehill@yahoo.com); Anthony.Lagasca@HSDNC.org; 'Aram Taslagyan'; 'Richard Platkin' (rplatkin@gmail.com); Hollywood Alliance (downtownhollywoodalliance@gmail.com); 'Councilmember.Ryu@lacity.org'; VINCE BERTONI (VINCE.BERTONI@LACITY.ORG); 'Lisa Webber'; kevin.keller@lacity.org; Bernstein, Ken (ken.bernstein@lacity.org); Karen Gilman <gilperson2@gmail.com> (gilperson2@gmail.com); Homer@hollywoodforever.com

Subject: City Council Mansionization hearing this Wednesday - No to the loophole for attached garages

Honorable Melrose Hill Councilmember, Mitch and team,

As you are probably aware, the paid off members of the LA "PLUM" Committee's outrageous moves to gut the mansionization ordinance and make it one more issue to insure the passage of the Neighborhood Integrity Initiative ballot measure have triggered some pretty major pushback. Resident's calls and emails seem to have turned the tide with Councilmembers that have some integrity.

It is our understanding the ordinances will now get heard by the full City Council this coming Wednesday. We also understand Councilmembers Koretz, Wesson, and Ryu will have the integrity to try to get the ordinance back on track. I'm hearing that neighborhoods are really getting tired of the current pay to play system to try to blight and devalue neighborhoods.

We believe Champions Koretz, Wesson, and Ryu aim to try to restore a tighter ratio for R-1 zones (we recommend 4.0) and, outside the hillsides, count attached garage space as floor space. But we are also sure developers, zoning consultants, construction unions, etc. will fill the council chamber pushing for the 5.0 FAR and at least 50% credit loophole for attached garages so we need you to stand firm.

1. Please reinstate the 0.45 ratio for R-1 neighborhoods or better yet, hold out for 4.0 max. FAR.
2. Please get rid of the 400 square foot freebie loophole for attached garages.

Please let us know how you vote on these issues and please see that my letter goes into the official council file. Please call if questions or if you need additional information. Best wishes to you and your staff for the coming holy season!

Sincerely, Edward Villareal Hunt, AIA, ASLA;

37-year resident of Hollywood in the Melrose Hill Neighborhood, 323-646-6287



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0656

1 message

James Hanes <jameshanes@sbcglobal.net>
Reply-To: James Hanes <jameshanes@sbcglobal.net>
To: Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 6:45 PM

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

I am a Crestview resident and I request that you put in the record pertaining to the Council File listed above that I add my voice to those who strongly oppose runaway "mansion-ization" on undersized lots all over this city, and all over my neighborhood.

Specifically, I urge the City Council to do away with exemptions for attached garages that allow the garages not to be included in the calculation of the overall square footage of a house. Attached garages loom over the sidewalk and detract from the character of the neighborhood. Detached garages, on the other hand, are almost always in the rear of the property, and thus they are reached by a driveway, which performs the essential function of acting as a buffer between residences, thus affording increased light and increased privacy. Hulking "McMansions" with attached garages do just the opposite, impinging on neighbors (but preserving light and privacy for themselves).

Additionally, I urge Council Members to limit acceptable square footage of houses to a .45 ratio to lot size. This too will help limit the size and spread of these oversized eyesores and do something to preserve the character of my beloved Crestview.

Thank you. Sincerely, James Hanes, a Crestview stakeholder



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

4 messages

Emily Milder <emily.milder@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 6:55 PM

To: paul.koretz@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org

Dear Councilmember Koretz,

As your constituent, I want to thank you for your strong support for strengthening the BMO/BHO.

I walk around Beverly Fairfax, my beautiful neighborhood full of character, and am alarmed by each new teardown – every single one of them replaced by an identical, character-free mansion that dwarfs the surrounding bungalows. And I mean identical. They are out of a cookie cutter mold, clearly built not to anyone's personal taste but by a developer aiming for maximum square footage and maximum generic. The irony is, many of them remain on the market for months and months. Apparently not many people actually want to pay top dollar to live in these soulless concrete monstrosities, but that hasn't yet stopped them from multiplying.

Every one of these mansions is a loss for the neighborhood, which is slowly but surely being effaced. If it were about changing tastes it would be one thing, but clearly nobody is clamoring for these. They are being forced on Los Angeles by business entities that have no emotional stake in our neighborhoods.

Thank you again for your good work on this issue. I hope you will remain strong and press your colleagues to join you.

Sincerely,
Emily Milder
Resident of 428 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.

Emily Milder <emily.milder@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:03 PM

To: councilmember.huizar@lacity.org

Cc: afine@laconservancy.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Huizar,

I write to urge you to support the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July 2016 and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

I walk around Beverly Fairfax, my beautiful neighborhood full of character, and am alarmed by each new teardown – every single one of them replaced by an identical, character-free mansion that dwarfs the surrounding bungalows. And I mean identical. They are out of a cookie cutter mold, clearly built not to anyone's personal taste but by a developer aiming for maximum square footage and maximum generic. The irony is, many of them remain on the market for months and months. Apparently not many people actually want to pay top dollar to live in these giant charmless boxes, but that hasn't yet stopped them from multiplying.

Every one of these mansions is a loss for the neighborhood, which is slowly but surely being effaced. If it were about changing tastes it would be one thing, but clearly nobody is clamoring for these. They are being forced on Los Angeles by business entities that have no emotional stake in our neighborhoods.

Please take Angelenos' feelings about their own neighborhoods seriously and support these amendments.

Sincerely,
Emily Milder
Resident of 428 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.

Emily Milder <emily.milder@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:06 PM

To: councilmember.bonin@lacity.org

Cc: afine@laconservancy.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Bonin,

I write to urge you to support the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July 2016 and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

I walk around Beverly Fairfax, my beautiful neighborhood full of character, and am alarmed by each new teardown – every single one of them replaced by an identical, character-free mansion that dwarfs the surrounding bungalows. And I mean identical. They are out of a cookie cutter mold, clearly built not to anyone's personal taste but by a developer aiming for maximum square footage and maximum generic. The irony is, many of them remain on the market for months and months. Apparently not many people actually want to pay top dollar to live in these giant charmless boxes, but that hasn't yet stopped them from multiplying.

Every one of these mansions is a loss for the neighborhood, which is slowly but surely being effaced. If it were about changing tastes it would be one thing, but clearly nobody is clamoring for these. They are being forced on Los Angeles by business entities that have no emotional stake in our neighborhoods.

Please take Angelenos' feelings about their own neighborhoods seriously and support these amendments.

Sincerely,
Emily Milder
Resident of 428 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.

Emily Milder <emily.milder@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:08 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: afine@laconservancy.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org

Dear Councilmember Wesson,

I write to urge you to support the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July 2016 and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

I walk around Beverly Fairfax, my beautiful neighborhood full of character, and am alarmed by each new teardown – every single one of them replaced by an identical, character-free mansion that dwarfs the surrounding bungalows. And I mean identical. They are out of a cookie cutter mold, clearly built not to anyone's personal taste but by a developer aiming for maximum square footage and maximum generic. The irony is, many of them remain on the market for months and months. Apparently not many people actually want to pay top dollar to live in these giant charmless boxes, but that hasn't yet stopped them from multiplying.

Every one of these mansions is a loss for the neighborhood, which is slowly but surely being effaced. If it were about changing tastes it would be one thing, but clearly nobody is clamoring for these. They are being forced on Los Angeles by business entities that have no emotional stake in our neighborhoods.

Please take Angelenos' feelings about their own neighborhoods seriously and support these amendments.

Sincerely,
Emily Milder
Resident of 428 N. Sierra Bonita Ave.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Council File #14-0646

1 message

Jean <jeanbush@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:35 PM

Please email sharon.dickinson@lacity.org Deadline is tomorrow (Tuesday)
Ref: Council File #14-0646

I, Jean Bushnell, a resident of Comstock Hills in Westwood, support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the **Planning Commission** which limits FAR in R-1 residential neighborhoods to .45. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. Please be sensitive to citizens trying to preserve the character of their community and do not cater to speculators and builders who harm the value of existing homes while ruining neighborhoods.

Jean Bushnell
10348 Eastborne Ave
Los Angeles, CA. 90024



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Ref: Council File #14-0646

1 message

Scott Nabat <scottnabat@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:36 PM

To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Dear Ms. Dickinson,

My Wife and I live in Comstock Hills/ Westwood and support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the **Planning Commission** which limits FAR in R-1 residential neighborhoods to .45. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. Please be sensitive to citizens trying to preserve the character of their community and do not cater to speculators and builders who harm the value of existing homes while ruining neighborhoods.

Sincerely,
Scott Nabat

 Mansionization on Warnall.pdf
7471K

New Neighbor built so high and so close that we lost more than half of the natural light into our living room and 2 of 3 bedrooms.



They replaced a 2100 sq ft house with a 4000 sq ft house on a 6500 sq foot lot. As they built the second floor and the 'Bonus' front turrets, our satellite TV went out. DirecTV had to come out and move our dish to the top of our chimney. It was the only place high enough to get signal around the height and proximity of our new neighbors.





10264 Rochester

Now looks at an 11 ft wall with an 8000 SF house behind it.
Plans are drawn for a second house even closer.





Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

SUPPORT R1R2-RG For Faircrest Heights-SUPPORT LA'S OLDR AND HISTORIC ENIGHBORHOODS

1 message

emily williams <iamemilywilliams@me.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 7:39 PM

To: councilmember.bonin@lacity.org, paul.koretz@lacity.org, jose.hulzar@lacity.org, councilmember.hulzar@lacity.org, councilmember.hamis-dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.english@lacity.org, councilmember.priest@lacity.org
Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org

Representatives;

As a resident of Los Angeles for over 50 years and homeowner in Faircrest Heights for over 20 years, I am writing you to voice my concerns about the recent proposed changes to the efforts to stop BMO/BHO.

Support maintaining LA's older and historic neighborhoods for current and future generations. Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

At the public meeting held in the fall, the majority of residents and homeowners currently living in Faircrest Heights who attended the public meeting voiced their support of R1R2-RG for Faircrest Heights.

What is the loophole rolling back the hard work of the neighborhood council for Faircrest Heights to preserve the architectural integrity of our neighborhood? How can one office roll back the will of the majority of the residents of Faircrest Heights?

STOP BMO/BHO FROM ERODING the character of neighborhood! This picture is an example of many issues R1R2-RG would help to correct



Ebulliently,
-emily

Emily Williams, Faircrest Heights Resident
(323) 719-7377

At the height of laughter, the universe is flung into a kaleidoscope of new possibilities
-Jean Houston



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Ref: Council File #14-0646

1 message

Lucie Zimmerman <wineladylucie@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 8:51 PM

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

I, *Lucie Zimmerman*, a resident of Comstock Hills in Westwood support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the **Planning Commission** which limits FAR in R-1 residential neighborhoods to .45. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. Please be sensitive to citizens trying to preserve the character of their community and do not cater to speculators and builders who harm the value of existing homes while ruining neighborhoods.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Ref: Council File #14-0646

1 message

Douglas Zimmerman <douglasczimmerman@gmail.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 8:56 PM

Subject: Ref: Council File #14-0646

I, *Doug Zimmerman, a resident of Comstock Hills in Westwood* support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the **Planning Commission** which limits FAR in R-1 residential neighborhoods to .45. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. Please be sensitive to citizens trying to preserve the character of their community and do not cater to speculators and builders who harm the value of existing homes while ruining neighborhoods.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Fwd: Council file # 14-0656

1 message

Roberta <normeppy@aol.com>
To: sharon.dickinson@lacity.org

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:12 PM

Sent from my iPhone

Subject: Council file # 14-0656

My name is Roberta Epstein and I am a homeowner and resident of Comstock Hills, Westwood. I support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the Planning Commission. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. We hope to preserve the charm and character of our community and we do not want to cater to speculators and builders who are only concerned with their own agendas. Thank you,
Roberta Epstein

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

CF 14-0656, BMO/BHO Ordinance Amendments

4 messages

avak sarafian <avaka@msn.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:06 PM

To: "david.ryu@lacity.org" <david.ryu@lacity.org>

Cc: "NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org" <NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org>, "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Good Evening Councilmember Ryu,

I am writing to you as one of your constituents in the 4th District and a life long Angeleno. I urge you to reject the trend of mansionization that is turning our City into a landfill of ugly oversize architecture. The voices of ordinary citizens like me who don't have the benefit of millions of developer dollars deserve to be heard too!!

There should be NO 400 foot garage exemption for front garages and NO 400 square foot exemption for rear garages.

There should NOT be a Floor Area Ratio of 0.5 for lots under 7,500 sq feet and NO Floor Area Ratio of 0.45 for lots over 7,500 sq ft.

And, there certainly should not be an increase in the encroachment plane for R1 zones starting at 22 feet.

I encourage you to address the loopholes in the Baseline Mansionization and Hillside Ordinances so that we don't end up with more and more of these out of scale, ugly buildings that are often built in the middle of neighborhoods with historic homes.

Residents of the Miracle Mile and in the rest of the 4th District feel strongly about this issue. The issue of thoughtless development played a roll in your own election to the City Council and you are already aware of a strong movement in the Miracle Mile to establish an HPOZ there. Voting Angelenos are acutely aware of these issues and deserve the support of their elected officials in preserving quality of life in this City.

Thank you for your consideration. I'm counting on you to be one of the powers that puts an end to mansionization in our City and support the strengthening of the BMO / BHO in favor of maintaining the historic character of Los Angeles neighborhoods!

Sincerely,

Avak S.

avak sarafian <avaka@msn.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:15 PM

To: "Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org" <Councilmember.huizar@lacity.org>

Cc: "NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org" <NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org>, "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Dear Councilmember Huizar,

I am writing to you as a life long Angeleno. I don't understand why you directed the City Attorney to draft a new Ordinance that would effectively support continued mansionization in our City. I strongly urge you to **reject the trend of mansionization** that is turning our City into a landfill of ugly oversize architecture. The voices of ordinary citizens like me who don't have the benefit of millions of developer dollars deserve to be heard too!!

There should be NO 400 foot garage exemption for front garages and NO 400 square foot exemption for rear garages.

There should NOT be a Floor Area Ratio of 0.5 for lots under 7,500 sq feet and NO Floor Area Ratio of 0.45 for lots over 7,500 sq ft.

And, there certainly should not be an increase in the encroachment plane for R1 zones starting at 22 feet.

I encourage you to address the loopholes in the Baseline Mansionization and Hillside Ordinances so that we don't end up with more and more of these out of scale, ugly buildings that are often built in the middle of neighborhoods with historic homes.

Voting Angelenos are acutely aware of these issues and deserve the support of their elected officials in preserving quality of life in this City. What is more important? the people who live in this City or the profits of greedy realtors and developers?

Thank you for your consideration. I'm counting on you to be one of the powers that puts an end to mansionization in our City and support the strengthening of the BMO / BHO in favor of maintaining the historic character of Los Angeles neighborhoods!

Sincerely,

Avak S.

avak sarafian <avaka@msn.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:20 PM

To: "Councilmember.Bonin@lacity.org" <Councilmember.Bonin@lacity.org>

Cc: "NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org" <NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org>, "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Dear Councilmember Bonin,

I am writing to you as a life long Angeleno. I don't understand why you are in support of continued mansionization in our City. Instead, I strongly urge you to **reject the trend of mansionization that is turning our City into a landfill of ugly oversize architecture.** The voices of ordinary citizens like me who don't have the benefit of millions of developer dollars deserve to be heard too!!

There should be NO 400 foot garage exemption for front garages and NO 400 square foot exemption for rear garages.

There should NOT be a Floor Area Ratio of 0.5 for lots under 7,500 sq feet and NO Floor Area Ratio of 0.45 for lots over 7,500 sq ft.

And, there certainly should not be an increase in the encroachment plane for R1 zones starting at 22 feet.

I encourage you to address the loopholes in the Baseline Mansionization and Hillside Ordinances so that we don't end up with more and more of these out of scale, ugly buildings that are often built in the middle of neighborhoods with historic homes.

Voting Angelenos are acutely aware of these issues and deserve the support of their elected officials in preserving quality of life in this City. What is more important? the people who live in this City or the profits of greedy realtors and developers?

Thank you for your consideration. I'm counting on you to be one of the powers that puts an end to mansionization in our City and support the strengthening of the BMO / BHO in favor of maintaining the historic character of Los Angeles neighborhoods!

Sincerely,

Avak S.

avak sarafian <avaka@msn.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 9:25 PM

To: "Paul.Koretz@lacity.org" <Paul.Koretz@lacity.org>

Cc: "NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org" <NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org>, "Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org" <Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org>, "afine@laconservancy.org" <afine@laconservancy.org>

Dear Councilmember Koretz

I am writing to you as a life long Angeleno. **I want to thank you for fighting against the trend of mansionization** that is turning our City into a landfill of ugly oversized architecture.

I encourage you to continue to exert pressure on your colleagues on PLUM and the rest of the City Council regarding this issue. **No more mansionization!!**

Thank you for your consideration. I'm counting on you to be one of the powers that puts an end to mansionization in our City and your continued support in strengthening the BMO / BHO in favor of maintaining the historic character of Los Angeles neighborhoods!

Sincerely,

Avak S.



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

Support revised BMO/BHO

1 message

Susan Irving <Susan@susanirving.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 8:10 PM

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

I, Susan Irving, a resident of Cheviot Hills) support the revised BMO/BHO as presented by the **Planning Commission** which limits FAR in R-1 residential neighborhoods to .45. I oppose the increase proposed by PLUM. Please be sensitive to citizens trying to preserve the character of their community and do not cater to speculators and builders who harm the value of existing homes while ruining neighborhoods.

Susan Irving

2741 McConnell Drive

Los Angeles, CA 90064

MEMO

UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs
Luskin Center for Innovation

December 5, 2016

3323 Public Affairs Building
Los Angeles, CA 90095

Honorable Councilmembers,

The UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation would like to express its strong support for the Existing Building Energy and Water Efficiency Program. While stringent building codes have led to more energy-efficient buildings throughout California, it is also necessary to have continuous testing and improvement of a building's operations.

The additional information emerging from this program can be used to adjust and modify energy targets within the existing building stock. Even with California's stringent energy standards, there is still low-hanging fruit that has yet to be identified in many buildings; lighting upgrades, heating and cooling adjustments, and even air leakage can be identified through building audits. The largest buildings in Los Angeles will report their energy use first, which creates the greatest potential in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

It is important to understand how efficiently a building performs; much like you know the fuel economy on your car – a measure of its efficiency – building owners should understand how their buildings perform as well. Having the ability to compare a building's efficiency with those of similarly sized buildings can encourage the adoption of greater efficiency measures. The program makes it easier to identify aspects of buildings that are underperforming and need maintenance, ultimately resulting in energy and financial savings. Additionally, the program has the potential to spur local economic and job growth, as engineers and building professionals work to enhance LA's existing building stock.

Not only will this improve efficiency throughout LA's buildings, but the program will increase the transparency of the city government, setting an example for the rest of the city to follow. Other large cities, including New York and Chicago, have had their programs implemented for years and can attest to its success. By having city-owned buildings participate in the benchmarking program as well, others will have an example to look towards.

This ordinance creates a balanced approach to energy and water efficiency for all buildings in the city, makes financial and environmental sense, and we urge you to pass this ordinance and unlock the savings potential from LA's buildings.

Sincerely,



J.R. DeShazo

Director, UCLA Luskin Center for Innovation



Sharon Dickinson <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>

MO/BHO Ordinance - support July 2016 amendment recommendations!

1 message

Sylvia Schveri <sschveri@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 5, 2016 at 8:39 PM

To: councilmember.wesson@lacity.org

Cc: NeighborhoodConservation@lacity.org, Sharon.Dickinson@lacity.org, afine@laconservancy.org

Dear Councilmember Wesson,

On Weds., Dec. 7th, please stand up for the changes to the MO/BHO Ordinance that your stakeholders have so tirelessly worked for. Support the City Planning Commission's recommendations from July 2016 and further strengthen the BMO/BHO by including all of the square footage of attached garages in the total allowable square footage count.

Having served as a member of the P.I.C.O. Neighborhood Council, I am aware of all the effort that has been put into the amendments to this ordinance and have high expectations on our City Councilmembers to follow through.

Thanks for all your work,

Sylvia Schveri