

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING RECOMMENDATION REPORT



City Planning Commission

Date: December 8, 2016
Time: After 10:00 am
Place: Los Angeles City Hall
200 North Spring Street
Room 340
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Case No.: CPC-2016-2112-ZC

Related Case No.: CPC-2016-2110-CA
CEQA No.: ENV-2016-2111-ND
Council No.: 4 – David Ryu
5 – Paul Koretz
10 – Herb Wesson
11 – Mike Bonin

Public Hearing:

August 29, 2016
August 30, 2016
August 31, 2016
September 13, 2016
September 20, 2016
October 13, 2016 (CPC)
November 10, 2016 (CPC)

Plan Area: Various
Certified NC: Various
GPLU: Various
Zone: R1-1
Applicant: City of Los Angeles

PROJECT LOCATION: The area consists of several communities throughout the City identified in the proposed Ordinances by the following neighborhood names: Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, Larchmont Heights, Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Fairfax, Mar Vista / East Venice, Kentwood and Pacific Palisades.

PROPOSED PROJECT: As follow-up to Interim Control Ordinance number 183,497 and 184,381, the proposed zone change ordinance will provide more specialized development regulation for single-family dwelling units within the project boundaries identified in the attached proposal utilizing the new “R1- One-Family Variation Zones” proposed for the Los Angeles Municipal Code via a separate Code Amendment, case number CPC-2016-2110-CA. The new zones represent context sensitive zoning meant to preserve the neighborhood character of the Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, Larchmont Heights, Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Fairfax, Mar Vista / East Venice, Kentwood and Pacific Palisades communities.

REQUESTED ACTION:

1. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the California Resources Code, the adoption of Negative Declaration No. ENV-2016-2011-ND.
2. Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code approve a recommendation that Council will adopt a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Lower Council District 5 proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1V2.

3. Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code approve a recommendation that Council will adopt a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Inner Council District 5 proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1VNew.
4. Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code approve a recommendation that Council will adopt a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Fairfax proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1VNew.
5. Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code approve a recommendation that Council will adopt a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Mar Vista / East Venice proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1V2.


RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. **FIND**, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15074(b), after consideration of the whole of the administrative record, including the Negative Declaration, No. ENV-2016-2011-ND ("Negative Declaration"), and all comments received, there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment; **FIND** the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City; and **ADOPT** Negative Declaration.
2. **Approve and Recommend** that the City Council **Adopt** the **Zone Change Ordinance** establishing a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Lower Council District 5 proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1V2 and R1V2-RG.
3. **Approve and Recommend** that the City Council **Adopt** the **Zone Change Ordinance** establishing a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Inner Council District 5 proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1VNew. (Exhibit K)
4. **Approve and Recommend** that the City Council **Adopt** the **Zone Change Ordinance** establishing a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Fairfax proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1VNew. (Exhibit M)
5. **Approve and Recommend** that the City Council **Adopt** the **Zone Change Ordinance** establishing a **Zone Change** to those parcels lying within the Mar Vista / East Venice proposed Ordinance Maps from R1-1 to R1V2 and R1VNew. (Exhibit N)
6. **Adopt** the attached Findings.

VINCENT P. BERTONI, AICP
Director of Planning



Craig Weber, Principal City Planner



Christine Saponara, City Planner
Telephone: (213) 978-1363

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Analysis	A-1
Project Summary	
Background	
Initiation	
Issues	
Conclusion	
Findings	F-1
<i>(Findings made separately for each proposed Zone Change Area)</i>	
General Plan/Charter Findings	
Zone Change Findings	
CEQA Findings	
Public Hearing and Communications	P-1
Exhibits:	
A – Map with proposed Zone Changes	
B – Lower Council District 5 Zone Change Ordinance and Map	
C – Inner Council District 5 Zone Change Ordinance and Map	
D – Fairfax Zone Change Ordinance and Map	
E – Mar Vista / East Venice Zone Change Ordinance and Map	
F – Environmental Clearance - ENV-2016-2111-ND	
G – Council File 14-0656	
H – Ordinance Number 183,497	
I – Ordinance Number 184,381	

PROJECT ANALYSIS

CPC – October 13, 2016 and November 10, 2016

On October 13, 2016, The City Planning Commission held a public hearing to discuss Case numbers CPC-2016-2112-ZC and CPC-2016-2115-ZC. During this meeting, the City Planning Commission approved case number CPC-2016-2115, which included a Zone Change for those parcels lying within the proposed Oaks of Los Feliz Ordinance Map from R1-1, R1-1D, RE9-1, RE9-1D, RE11-1D and RE15-1D to RE9-1D, RE11-1D, RE15-1D and R1-1D, with a modifications to Lot Coverage and FAR in the Existing Development “D” Limitation. The “D” Limitation would be modified to include maximum lot coverage requirements as well as modifications to the calculations of residential floor area ratio to include the calculation of “above ground basements.”

Regarding case number CPC-2016-2112-ZC, the City Planning Commission held a public hearing and discussion for zone changes within the following seven “neighborhood conservation” communities: Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock and Larchmont Heights. With a tentative zone change or R1R2-RG selected for those communities.

On November 10, 2016, City Planning Commission held a public meeting to discuss zone changes for Beverlywood (R1VNew) , Mar Vista (R1VNew), Kentwood(R1VNew) and Pacific Palisades (R1V1 and R1H1) and continued the public hearing for Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, East Venice and Fairfax.

On December 8, 2016, Commission will re-open the public hearing for the zone change request for Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, East Venice and Fairfax.

Staff Report Notes

Communities for which a decision was made at a previous City Planning Commission Hearing will appear within the analysis section of the staff report but not within the Findings. The City Planning Commission’s forthcoming letter of decision, should the Commission decide to act according to the recommended actions of this report, will contain all the communities shown in the project summary.

Project Summary

The proposed project includes a series of Zone Changes for neighborhoods across the City of Los Angeles utilizing a variety of new Single Family Zones which are proposed for inclusion in the Los Angeles Municipal Code(LAMC) section 12.21.6 in Case Number CPC-2016-2110-CA. The new Single Family zones were developed to provide a broader range of context sensitive zoning options for single-family zoned communities throughout the City. The proposed zone changes reflect a series of community outreach efforts conducted by Department Staff over the course of one year to classify the diversity and characteristics of 15 communities citywide.

In response to a City Council Motion dated November 4, 2014, the Department of City Planning has prepared a proposed ordinance to create a new series of R1 Single Family Zones. The Code

amendment creates sixteen R1 subzones that vary in scale, size, and massing from the standard R1 Single Family Zone. Referred to as the R1 Variation Zones, the new zones provide tailored development regulations to meet the varying characteristics of Los Angeles's single-family neighborhoods.

The Code amendment creates sixteen subzones of the R1 Zone that vary as to the permitted location of the primary bulk of mass and in size and scale, allowing houses larger or smaller than the standard R1 Zone. The new zones are organized into four categories: Variable-Mass, Front-Mass, Rear-Mass, and Hillside. Each category contains four zone scales that vary in allowed Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) by lot size. The amendment also creates a Rear Detached Garage Supplemental Use District (SUD) that could be applied to lots in the R1 Zone, as well as in other single-family zones, such as RA, RE, and RS, to mandate that garages be detached and placed in the rear of the property. The new zones and SUD offer more tailored development options that respond to Los Angeles' diverse R1 One-Family neighborhoods and would foster additions and new construction more consistent with a community's predominant building forms.

The proposed project includes the Zone Change (CPC-2016-2112-ZC) for those parcels lying within the Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, Larchmont Heights, Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Fairfax, Mar Vista / East Venice, Kentwood and Pacific Palisades communities, as bounded by the proposed ordinance maps for each community. Due to the number of communities, this proposal has been split into several Commission Dates.

Community Summary Part 1 – October 13, 2016

For the following communities, Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock and Larchmont Heights, a majority of the parcels will be rezoned from R1-1 to R1R2-RG and some will be rezoned to R1V2-RG. The proposed R1R2-RG zone permits a building envelope that requires a 30 foot setback of the second story massing of a single family house. It also requires a 45 degree encroachment plane in the front portion of the house for structures that exceed 12 feet in height, creating a dual massed structure for two story homes. The R1R2-RG zone also permits an FAR scale that starts at 0.45 FAR, for lots smaller or equal to 6,000 square feet, to 0.35 FAR, for lots larger or equal to 10,000 square feet. Lastly, the proposed zone requires new garages to be constructed in the rear of the property as detached structures. Within the Faircrest Heights and Picfair Village communities some parcels which have a typical lot width but a shallow lot depth would be rezoned R1V2-RG which permits a variable building envelope, an FAR scale that starts at 0.45 FAR, for lots smaller or equal to 6,000 square feet, to 0.35 FAR, for lots larger or equal to 10,000 square feet and a requirement to build new garages be located in the rear of the property.

Community Summary Part 2 – November 10, 2016 and December 8, 2016

A majority of the proposed zones for the Part 2 communities are within the R1V category, which permits a variable massing envelope. The other proposed zoning category is the R1H, which mirrors the building envelope of the R1V, but is intended for Hillside lots. The

R1 V, Variable-Mass Variation Zones and R1H, Hillside Variation Zone offer the most flexible building envelope of the new zones. In this variation, the location of bulk is not regulated, and the second story can be placed anywhere within the maximum building envelope. Any design that fits within the maximum building envelope and conforms to all other requirements is permitted. The scale chosen for each community varies, depending on existing development typologies and results of community input from the individual neighborhoods.

For Lower Council District 5, and East Venice, the R1V2 zone was selected. The Proposed R1V2 zone permits a variable building envelope that requires a 45 degree encroachment plane for any portion of a structure that exceed 20 feet and permits an FAR scale that starts at 0.45 FAR, for lots smaller or equal to 6,000 square feet, to 0.35 FAR, for lots larger or equal to 10,000 square feet. For some portions of Lower Council District 5, the R1V2-RG was selected, which requires the construction of a new garage to be located in the rear.

For Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Mar Vista, Kentwood and Fairfax, the R1VNew zone was selected. The Proposed R1VNew zone permits a variable building envelope that requires a 45 degree encroachment plane for any portion of a structure that exceed 20 feet and permits an FAR scale that starts at 0.55 FAR, for lots smaller or equal to 6,000 square feet, to 0.45 FAR, for lots larger or equal to 10,000 square feet.

For Pacific Palisades, the R1V1 and R1H1 were selected. The R1V1 zone is proposed for flat lots and the R1H1 are proposed for lots with a Hillside Designation within the Los Angeles Municipal Code. The Proposed R1V1 zone permits a variable building envelope that requires a 45 degree encroachment plane for any portion of a structure that exceed 22 feet and an FAR scale that starts at 0.65 FAR, for lots smaller or equal to 6,000 square feet, to 0.55 FAR, for lots larger or equal to 10,000 square feet. The proposed R1H1 zone permits a variable building envelope determined by the Baseline Hillside Ordinance and an FAR scale that starts at 0.65 FAR, for portions of the lot with slope less than 15%, to 0.45 FAR, for portions of the lots with slope from 60 -99%.

Initiation

In a motion (CF 14-0656, 14-0519, 14-1135, 14-0625, 14-0343, 14-0344, 14-1262) dated November 4, 2016, the City Council directed the Department of City Planning to establish an interim Control Ordinance (ICO) and new single-family zones for a number of neighborhoods throughout the city. The ICO and new single-family zones were part of a four pronged approach to address neighborhood conservation and the proliferation of large, often out-of-scale, new houses.

Background

In 2014, the City Council directed the Planning Department to address the issue of out-of-scale development and loss of neighborhood character in single-family zones, with a focus on the R1 Zone. In a motion (CF 14-0656, 14-0519, 14-1135, 14-0625, 14-0343, 14-0344, 14-1262) dated November 4, 2016, the City Council outlined a four-pronged approach that directed the

Department of City Planning to tackle the issues of neighborhood conservation. The motion included the following directives: amend the Baseline Mansionization and Baseline Hillside Ordinances; establish an interim control ordinance (ICO) to restrict development in specific neighborhoods; establish new Historic Preservation Overlay Zones covering specific neighborhoods; and establish new single-family zones which would be applied to specific neighborhoods. The motion has been addressed through five separate Planning Department initiatives.

1.) BMO/BHO Code Amendment

The first is an update to the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance and Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BMO/BHO) that proposes to modify regulations for all single-family zones (RA, RE, RS, R1) throughout the city. This is a broad brushed approach to address the proliferation of large, often out-of-scale, new houses citywide. After months of outreach and two draft ordinances, the City Planning Commission recommended approval of the BMO/BHO Code amendment on July 14, 2016 and the matter is now pending review and approval by the City Council.

The updates to the R1 Zone through the BMO/BHO include:

- A Residential Floor Area Ratio (RFAR) of 0.45 instead of 0.50
- Removal of all bonuses that previously allowed a 20% increase in Residential Floor Area for the R1 Zoned properties
- Inclusion of an Encroachment Plane for walls along the front and side setbacks that would begin at 20 feet and slope towards the center of the building at a maximum angle of 45 degrees to a maximum building height of 30 feet.
- Required side articulation of 5 feet deep and 10 feet long along the side yard setback when there is a continuous horizontal expanse of wall over 45 feet long and 14 feet tall
- Required articulation of 25% of the front façade for a depth 20% of the building's length
- Revised definition of Residential Floor Area that revises exemptions for the following square footages:
 - Covered patios, breezeways, and porches (previously 250 sq. ft. was exempt)
 - Ceilings over 14 feet in height (previously 100 sq. ft. was exempt)
 - A garage at the front of the lot will receive a 200 sq. ft. exemption (previously 400 sq. ft. was exempt). Garages located at the rear of the lot will continue to receive a 400 sq. ft. exemption.

2.) Interim Control Ordinance

In March of 2015 the City Council placed restrictions on development through an Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) in 15 neighborhoods throughout the city (Exhibit M - Ordinance 183,497). The Ordinance included the following communities for which this staff report proposes a zone change: Faircrest Heights, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, Larchmont Heights, The Oaks of Los Feliz, Mar Vista/East Venice, Kentwood, Beverlywood, Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5 and Fairfax communities. The ICOs provided communities immediate relief from the current R1-Development Standards that were determined to allow the development of homes that were out of scale

with the character of the neighborhood. In a subsequent motion in June, 2016, five more neighborhoods were placed under an ICO (Exhibit N - Ordinance 184,381). The Ordinance included the following communities for which this staff report proposes a zone change: Picfair Village and Wilshire Vista.

The ICOs implement temporary regulations lasting for a maximum of two years in the ICO areas. Each ICO contained a different set of temporary regulations that mandated more restrictive development standards than what was permitted by the R1 Zone.

The ICOs were put in place to prevent drastic changes from occurring to the physical environment of the communities while a permanent zoning solution was being developed.

3.) Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs)

Six neighborhoods under the Interim Control Ordinance are under consideration to become Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ), Los Angeles's version of historic districts. HPOZ designation will serve as the tool to maintain the architectural character of the neighborhoods and manage appropriate development. The proposed HPOZs are currently moving through the adoption process.

4.) R1 Variation Zones

The proposed R1 Variation Zones aim to be the tool to address neighborhood character in many of the ICO areas and in a few additional Single-Family neighborhoods. The R1 Variation Zones create more tailored versions of the R1 Zone that may be applied to an entire neighborhood through a zone change.

The R1 Variation Zones offer a wider variety of Single-Family Development standards, with varying mass, scale, setback, height and character preservation options. They are similar to R1, but provide more refined development standards. In turn, the R1 Variation Zones have a different maximum building envelope than R1 and aim to maintain the housing form, scale, and massing of the communities in which the zones are applied.

Four categories with four zones each are proposed for a total of 16 new zones:

- R1V, Variable-Mass
 - R1V1, R1V *New*, R1V2, R1V3
- R1F, Front-Mass
 - R1F1, R1F *New*, R1F2, R1F3
- R1R, Rear-Mass
 - R1R1, R1R *New*, R1R2, R1R3
- R1H, Hillside
 - R1H1, R1H *New*, R1H2, R1H3

5.) R1 Variation Rezoning Effort

Currently the City of Los Angeles has only one single family zone, R1. However, the City of Los Angeles has a variety of neighborhood types, each with a varying neighborhood character. The goal of the rezoning effort was to identify character defining features within neighborhoods and apply context sensitive and community tailored development

standards. After determining a neighborhood's character defining features, with regards to scale, mass, proportion and garage orientation, a zone was selected from the new range of R1-Variation zones and to be applied via a zone change, as is proposed by this project.

The Zone Change effort for the case numbers CPC-2016-2112-ZC and CPC-2016-2115-ZC will be for those parcels zoned R1-1 lying within the Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, Larchmont Heights, Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Fairfax, Mar Vista / East Venice, Kentwood and Pacific Palisades communities as bounded by the proposed ordinance maps for each community.

Due to the number of communities, this proposal has been split into two parts. Part 1 of the proposal will be presented to City Planning Commission on October 13, 2016 and part 2 on November 13, 2016. Part 1 will include the Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock and Larchmont Heights. Part 2 will include Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Fairfax, Mar Vista / East Venice, Kentwood and Pacific Palisades.

Research and Analysis

While similar in many ways, not all neighborhoods zoned R1 share the same character. Some neighborhoods have very specific building patterns, scale, and massing, while others are defined by a variety of building sizes and forms. Many communities have expressed that the allowances of the R1 zone are not compatible with the scale and needs of their neighborhood. Approximately 320,000 parcels (38% of the City) are zoned R1, within which there is much variety in terms of topography, development patterns, building patterns, architectural style, and size. The intent of the R1 Variation Zones and Rear Detached Garage Supplemental Use District (SUD) is to serve as new tools to address issues related to neighborhood character, scale, and massing for communities currently zoned R1.

Part 1 Communities

The proposed Zone Change changes within part one of this report are for single family zone parcels within the Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock and Larchmont Heights. For these communities we are proposing a series of zone changes as shown in the table below:

Community (Part 1)	Current Zone	Proposed Zone
Faircrest Heights	R1-1	R1R2 - RG and R1V2 - RG
Picfair Village	R1-1	R1R2 - RG and R1V2 - RG
Wilshire Vista	R1-1	R1R2 - RG
Crestview	R1-1	R1R2 - RG
South Hollywood	R1-1	R1R2 - RG
La Brea Hancock	R1-1	R1R2 - RG
Larchmont Heights	R1-1	R1R2 - RG

As shown above, a majority of the parcels within part one of this zone change (CPC-2016-2112-ZC) will be rezoned to R1R2-RG. During staff research it was determined that Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock and Larchmont Heights all possessed similar character defining features with regards to the built form, massing and scale. These communities are currently improved with modest, single family houses, primarily built in the 1930s. These houses are typically single-story with a detached garage built in the rear. According to data from the Los Angeles County Assessor's Office, the median FAR for these communities range from 0.15 to 0.30. Properties with second stories typically setback the second story to the rear portion of the house. This pattern of development lends itself to the R1R2-RG zone which contains regulations that control the massing of the building envelope, applies setbacks of the upper levels of the house, encourages a moderate FAR scale for new houses and remodels and enforces a rear garage orientation.

For more technical analysis of the zone, the R1R2-RG Zone permits a building envelope that requires a 30 foot setback of the second story massing of a single family house. It also requires a 45 degree encroachment plane in the front portion of the house for structures that exceed 12 feet in height. The combination of these requirements encourage the development of dual massed structures where the larger mass would be located in the rear of the property thereby maintaining a unified single-story appearance from the street. The R1R2-RG zone also permits an FAR scale that starts at 0.45 FAR, for lots smaller or equal to 6,000 square feet, to 0.35 FAR, for lots larger or equal to 10,000 square feet. This FAR allowance allows for expansion of existing houses in order to meet modern needs, but allows less overall floor area on larger parcels than is permitted by the BMO revision. Lastly, the proposed zone requires the development of new garages to be constructed in the rear of the property as a detached structure.

By requiring the primary mass to be pushed towards the rear of a structure, reducing the overall FAR allowance and requiring rear detached garages, the R1R2-RG Zone maintains the current character defining features of the Faircrest Heights, Wilshire Vista, Picfair Village, Crestview, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock and Larchmont Heights communities, as found by staff research and expressed in community participation events. However, there were a couple atypical properties within Faircrest Heights and Picfair Village, where an abnormally shallow lot depth made the second story setback and encroachment plane of the R1R2-RG zone infeasible. Those parcels have a lot depth of less than 90 feet, with some as low as 33 feet. A typical lot depth is over 100 feet in these communities. Those parcels would be zoned R1V2-RG, which varies from the R1R2-RG with regards to the building envelope and second story step back, allowing greater flexibility with these otherwise more restrained lots. The R1V2-RG zone allows the second story of the structure be located at any location above the first. The structure would also be subject to an encroachment plane that encroaches at a 45 degree angles for walls over 20 feet at the setback line.

Part 2 Communities

The proposed Zone Change changes within "Part 2" of this report are for single family zoned parcels within the Lower Council District 5, Inner Council District 5, Beverlywood, Fairfax, Mar Vista / East Venice, Kentwood and Pacific Palisades communities. For these communities we are proposing a series of zone changes as shown in the table below:

Community (Part 2)	Current Zone	Proposed Zone
Lower Council District 5	R1-1	R1V2 and R1V2-RG
Inner Council District 5	R1-1	R1V <i>New</i>
Beverlywood	R1-1	R1V <i>New</i>
Fairfax	R1-1	R1V <i>New</i>
Mar Vista / East Venice	R1-1	R1V2 and R1V <i>New</i>
Kentwood	R1-1	R1V <i>New</i>
Pacific Palisades (Flats)	R1-1	R1V1
Pacific Palisades (Hillside)	R1-1	R1H1

A majority of the proposed zones for the Part 2 communities are within the R1V category, which permits a variable massing envelope. The other proposed zoning category is the R1H, which mirrors the building envelope of the R1V, but is intended for Hillside lots. The R1V, Variable-Mass Variation Zones and R1H, Hillside Variation Zone offer the most flexible building envelope of the new zones and is intended for communities that are currently improved with a variety of housing typologies and styles. During staff research it was determined the Part 2 communities all included such a diverse spectrum of massing typologies. As such, the R1V and R1H offered the massing flexibility that allow the diverse building typologies to continue. In allowing the variability in massing, the diverse character of the Part 2 communities is preserved. The differences between these communities lie in the existing scale of built structures, thus the proposed zone change ordinances also vary in the selected scale.

Conclusion

The proposed zone changes reflect a series of community outreach efforts and internal research intended to create and place residential development standards that reflect the varying characteristics of Los Angeles' unique neighborhoods. After identifying subtle shifts in massing, scale, height and style throughout the varying neighborhoods, the Department proposes a series of zone changes that aim to preserve the character of 15 neighborhoods throughout the City. Eight of those will be presented within part 1 of the staff report, while the remaining seven will be presented within part 2 of the staff report.

The following is a condensed table of the proposed zone changes along with the date each will appear for review by the City Planning Commission.

Part	Community	Proposed Zone	CPC Date
1	Faircrest Heights	R1R2 - RG R1V2 - RG	October 13, 2016
	Picfair Village	R1R2 - RG R1R2 - RG	October 13, 2016
	Wilshire Vista	R1R2 - RG	October 13, 2016
	Crestview	R1R2 - RG	October 13, 2016
	South Hollywood	R1R2 - RG	October 13, 2016
	La Brea Hancock	R1R2 - RG	October 13, 2016
	Larchmont Heights	R1R2 - RG	October 13, 2016

2	Lower Council District 5	R1V2 R1V2-RG	November 10, 2016
	Inner Council District 5	R1VNew	November 10, 2016
	Beverlywood	R1VNew	November 10, 2016
	Fairfax	R1VNew	November 10, 2016
	Mar Vista/ East Venice	R1VNew R1V2	November 10, 2016
	Kentwood	R1VNew	November 10, 2016
	Pacific Palisades	R1V1	November 10, 2016
	Pacific Palisades (Hillside)	R1H1	November 10, 2016

FINDINGS (Lower Council District 5)

General Plan/Charter Findings

In accordance with Charter Sections 556 and 558, the proposed zone change is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the City's General Plan, and all applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

General Plan Framework/ Community Plan Consistency

The proposed zone change ordinance for the Lower Council District 5 Community is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework, in addition to several similar provisions echoed in most of the Community Plans that make up the Land Use Element of the General Plan

General Plan Framework

The proposed Zone Change Ordinance is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework:

- Goal 3B** Preservation of the City's stable single-family residential neighborhoods.
- Objective 3.5** Ensure that the character and scale of stable single-family residential neighborhoods is maintained, allowing for infill development provided that it is compatible with and maintains the scale and character of existing development.
- Policy 3.5.2** Require that new development in single-family neighborhoods maintains its predominant and distinguishing characteristics such as property setbacks and building scale.
- Policy 3.5.4** Require new development in special use neighborhoods such as water-oriented, rural/agricultural, and equestrian communities to maintain their predominant and distinguishing characteristics.

Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code this proposal is for a Zone Change to those parcels lying within the Lower Council District 5 Community, bounded within the proposed Ordinance Map, from R1-1 to R1V2 and R1V2-RG. The current Single Family "R1" regulations for the Lower Council District 5 Community allow large, box-like structures that may compromise the existing character of the smaller scaled neighborhood, potentially limiting light and air to adjacent buildings. The proposed zone change ordinance for the Lower Council District 5 Community is necessary in order to preserve and maintain the character defining features, such as scale, proportion, building mass and garage orientation that make the existing single-family neighborhood unique.

With regards to scale and proportion, the existing R1 zone allows for a Floor to Area Ratio that reaches 0.60 for net livable space. Currently, the area is regulated by an interim Control

Ordinance 183,497 which states, “Notwithstanding any section of the LAMC, no building permit shall issue for a Project in Lower Council District 5 unless the proposed structure's Residential Floor Area—without exceptions for detached accessory buildings; porches, patios and breezeways; and over-in-height ceilings—does not exceed the base Residential Floor Area set forth in the Zoning Code. No Residential Floor Area bonus shall be allowed for green building, proportional stories, or front façade articulation.” The R1V2 zone reduces the allowable FAR from 0.60 to a range that reaches a maximum 0.45 on smaller lots to a minimum 0.35 on larger lots. This FAR allowance is more in keeping with the existing FAR makeup of the community, which averages 0.28 FAR, while still allowing for a reasonable expansion of house size to meet modern needs. It also is in keeping with the intent of the Interim Control Ordinance for the area.

Furthermore, the current R1 is inadequate as it does not control building massing. The existing R1 development standards neither limits the setback distance of the upper portions of the walls nor the structure mass. The new building envelope for the proposed zone, R1V2 and R1V2-RG, requires that walls over 20 feet in height employ an encroachment plane of 45 degrees to a maximum height of 30 feet. The encroachment plane curtails the overall massing of the structure, reducing the perception of size and bulk while enhancing the overall visual quality of the street by providing a more unified and low scale appearance which increases light and air circulation.

West Los Angeles and Westwood Community Plans

The proposed zone change will promote the objectives, policies and goals of the West Los Angeles and Westwood Community Plans by continuing to protect the character of the existing single-family neighborhood in the Lower Council District area. By instituting more restrictive development regulations, the proposed regulations require new development to be compatible with neighborhood character. As new houses are developed in conformance with the proposed regulations, and are built with smaller height, floor area and lot coverage envelopes, the overall existing character of the Lower Council District community is preserved. The proposed zone changes are consistent with applicable objectives and policies of the West Los Angeles Community Plan, including the following:

West Los Angeles Community Plan

- Policy 1-1.1** Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from new out-of-scale development and other incompatible uses.
- Policy 1-1.2** Promote neighborhood preservation in all residential neighborhoods.

Westwood Community Plan

- Policy 1-1.1** Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from new out-of-scale development and other incompatible uses.
- Policy 1-1.2** Protect the quality of residential environment and promote the maintenance and enhancement of the visual and aesthetic environment of the community.

The policies listed above will be accomplished through the implementation of the proposed zone change to R1V2 and R1V2-RG. Based on data from the existing housing stock in the Lower

Council District 5 Community, including floor area and analysis of building typologies, the proposed new zone was selected from a range of new single family subzones. The proposed zone requires all new development to be similar in character to the majority of existing houses in the project area. No changes are proposed to the community's residential density – the project area will remain designated for single family development. On the whole, the proposed zone change to R1V2 and R1V2-RG act as a refinement of the existing Single Family Development Standards contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code, tailoring existing types of development regulations to more specifically address the needs of a well-defined community.

Public Necessity, Convenience, General Welfare, and Good Zoning

Los Angeles **City Charter Section 558** and **LAMC Section 12.32(C)(7)** require that prior to adopting a land use ordinance, the City Council make findings that the ordinance conforms with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice. The proposed Zone Change conforms to public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice in the following respects: The proposed single family development standards of the R1V2 and R1V2-RG create guidelines and standards for new development which help protect the character of Lower Council District 5 and reinforce the neighborhood's scale. The new single family standards within the R1V2 Zone will ensure that new construction is compatible with the existing context; new projects will enhance and reinforce the existing environment; and that the aesthetic and visual quality of the area will be improved and complement the character of the Community.

The proposed zone change began with a desire voiced by the community to preserve the built character of the Lower Council District 5 community. Planning staff responded by researching building form in the community, as well as extensive field work and meetings with community members to better understand the issues facing the area. Through this methodology, staff determined that there was an impetus for additional single family development regulations in the Lower Council District 5 community; it was true that the built form of the neighborhood was beginning to change, and that the changes were potentially negatively affecting the character of the community. The proposed zones, R1V2 and R1V2-RG offers protections and methods to preserving the overall character of the community.

The proposed zone change ordinance substantially advances a legitimate public interest in that it will further protect single-family residential neighborhoods from out-of-scale development that often leads to structures that are built-out to the maximum size allowed in the LAMC. In recent years, Citywide property values have increased rapidly and this high premium for land has driven a trend where property owners and developers tear down the original houses and replace them with much larger structures or significantly remodel existing houses with large-scale two-story additions which are out-of-scale with the neighboring properties. Good zoning practice requires new development standards for single-family residential zones to further maintain and control the preservation of neighborhood character. This proposed zone change ordinance accomplishes this requirement.

The proposed ordinance is not arbitrary as the Department has thoroughly analyzed many different approaches and has determined that the proposed amendments are the simplest and most direct way of dealing with the issue of "mansionization" or development of homes that are disproportionate in size within their community. There is a reasonable relationship between a legitimate public purpose which is maintaining existing single-family residential neighborhood

character and the means to effectuate that purpose. Delaying the implementation of these code amendments could result in the continuation of over-sized development of single-family residential neighborhoods which is inconsistent with the objectives of the General Plan and would create an irreversible negative impact on the quality of life in the communities within the City where a Zone Change has been proposed.

Rear Garage (RG) Supplemental Use District

LAMC Section 12.32(S) requires initiation of a Supplemental Use District on the part of the City Council, City Planning Commission, or the Director of Planning. The establishment of the Rear Garage (RG) District furthers several goals of General Plan Framework and will thus be initiated by the Director of Planning within this proposed Zone Change. In keeping with Goal 3B of the General Plan Framework, the proposed “RG” Supplemental Use District ensures that new developments are consistent with the existing architectural character and setting of the Lower Council District 5 community.

After a visual analysis of the existing built form, it was found that a majority of properties within this community maintain a rear, detached garage. There are many urban design benefits to maintaining this garage orientation as it relates to the ultimate preservation of neighborhood character. First, this garage orientation disassociates the garage (a required vehicular storage facility) from the front elevation of the single family dwelling, leaving more room for more inviting features such as porches, entryways and gardens. Second, the rear garage necessitates a vehicular passage way, which creates additional buffering between neighbors, facilitating the circulation of light and air between structures. This vehicular passage way may also be decoratively landscaped and/or designed of pervious ground cover conducive to water preservation. Third, this orientation dissociates the mass of the house from the mass of the garage, reducing the overall bulk of the house. Lastly, In addition to these aesthetic benefits, detached garages have functional attributes, such as limiting the amount of noise and pollution that filters into the house.

Based on the above findings, the proposed Rear Garage District is deemed in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the City’s General Plan, and all applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC); consistent with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice; and in is accordance with the establishment of a Supplemental Use District, satisfies the purposes of the proposed zone change and furthers the overall quest for conservation of the neighborhood character through urban design.

CEQA Findings

Pursuant to Section 210821(c)(3) of the California Public Resource Code, the Department of City Planning prepared a Negative Declaration (ENV-2016-2111-ND), which concludes that the proposed zone change for the Lower Council District 5 (as bounded by the Proposed Ordinance Map) will result in less than significant impacts and/or that there will be no impacts. The Negative Declaration was published for a period of 20 days, from September 29, 2015 and will be complete by October 19, 2015. We will address comments as they are submitted and will have a final response to comments by second City Planning Commission hearing on November 10, 2016.

As stated in the mandatory findings of significance in the Negative Declaration, the Department of City Planning concludes the following:

- a) Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed zone changes would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development. Further, development (e.g., additions, new construction) of single-family units that occurs pursuant to the proposed project would not impact any endangered fauna or flora, modify any special status species habitat, and would only occur on lots zoned for single-family development. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project area and the surrounding area, construction activities and operation of future development would not impact the habitat or population in the Project Area. In addition, the proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development in any identified Biological Resource Areas. The proposed project would not impact the habitat or population level of fish or wildlife species, nor would it threaten a plant or animal community, nor impact the range of a rare endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, impacts to Cultural Resources and related archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant following the implementation of the regulatory compliance measures.
- b) No significant impacts were identified for the 17 environmental factors analyzed within the Initial Study. Currently, a proposed Code amendment to the 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and the 2011 Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) are undergoing similar environmental review that could be viewed in connection to the proposed Project. The proposed Code amendment to the BHO/BMO specifically amends the existing BMO and BHO to establish more stringent development standards for properties zoned R1, modify RFA calculations, adjust grading provisions for single-family lots located in designated "Hillside Areas," and eliminate the "Green Building Option" bonus for properties zoned RA, RE, and RS, and eliminate all bonuses in the R1 zones that currently permit additional RFA in exchange for the inclusion of particular building features.

As mentioned throughout, the proposed Code amendment would establish variations of the existing R1 Zone that are tailored to meet the varying character and design of single-family neighborhoods throughout the City. These zones regulate lot coverage maximums, height, placement of bulk, and size. The proposed Project would also create a new Supplemental Use District that mandates garages to be detached from the main building and located at the rear of a property. The proposed Project, by itself, does not propose or authorize any development and would not authorize or expand any new or existing land uses.

The proposed Code amendment to the BMO/BHO (i.e. Related Project) would further apply specific requirements related to form and massing to single-family zoned properties in the area. The Related Project applies specific requirements related to form and process, triggered by an application for a building and/or grading permit in any single family zoned

lot (RA, RE, RS, R1). The combination of the proposed Project and the Related Project is not expected to incentivize any new construction; rather, these projects together would in effect address concerns of perceived out-of-scale construction in single-family neighborhoods and help regulate form in residential zones. It is also important to note that no significant impacts were identified for the Related Project.

Thus the proposed Project in combination with Related Projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable effect

- c) A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and regulatory compliance measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Delegation of City Planning Commission Authority

In accordance with **Charter Sections Charter 559**, and in order to insure the timely processing of this ordinance, the City Planning Commission authorizes the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove for the Commission any modification to the subject ordinance as deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety and/or the City Attorney's Office. In exercising that authority, the Director must make the same findings as would have been required for the City Planning Commission to act on the same matter. The Director's action under this authority shall be subject to the same time limits and shall have the same effect as if the City Planning Commission had acted directly.

FINDINGS (Inner Council District 5)

General Plan/Charter Findings

In accordance with Charter Sections 556 and 558, the proposed zone change is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the City's General Plan, and all applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

General Plan Framework/ Community Plan Consistency

The proposed zone change ordinance for the Inner Council District 5 Community is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework, in addition to several similar provisions echoed in most of the Community Plans that make up the Land Use Element of the General Plan

General Plan Framework

The proposed Zone Change Ordinance is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework:

- Goal 3B** Preservation of the City's stable single-family residential neighborhoods.
- Objective 3.5** Ensure that the character and scale of stable single-family residential neighborhoods is maintained, allowing for infill development provided that it is compatible with and maintains the scale and character of existing development.
- Policy 3.5.2** Require that new development in single-family neighborhoods maintains its predominant and distinguishing characteristics such as property setbacks and building scale.
- Policy 3.5.4** Require new development in special use neighborhoods such as water-oriented, rural/agricultural, and equestrian communities to maintain their predominant and distinguishing characteristics.

Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code this proposal is for a Zone Change to those parcels lying within the Inner Council District 5 Community, bounded within the proposed Ordinance Map, from R1-1 to R1VNew. The current Single Family "R1" regulations for the Inner Council District 5 Community allow large, box-like structures that may compromise the existing character of the smaller scaled neighborhood, potentially limiting light and air to adjacent buildings. The proposed zone change ordinance for the Inner Council District 5 Community is necessary in order to preserve and maintain the character defining features, such as scale, proportion, building mass and garage orientation that make the existing single-family neighborhood unique.

With regards to scale and proportion, the existing R1 zone allows for a Floor to Area Ratio that reaches 0.60 for net livable space. Currently, the area is regulated by an interim Control

Ordinance 183,497 which states, “Notwithstanding any section of the LAMC, no building permit shall issue for a Project in Inner Council District 5 area unless the proposed structure's Residential Floor Area—without exceptions for detached accessory buildings and over-in-height ceilings—does not exceed the base Residential Floor Area set forth in the Zoning Code. Residential Floor Area bonuses permitted by the Zoning Code shall be limited to 15% of the maximum Residential Floor Area.” The R1VNew zone reduces the allowable FAR from 0.60 to a range that reaches a maximum 0.55 on smaller lots to a minimum 0.45 on larger lots. This FAR allowance is more in keeping with the existing FAR makeup of the community, which averages 0.30 FAR, while still allowing for a reasonable expansion of house size to meet modern needs. It also is in keeping with the intent of the Interim Control Ordinance for the area, which proposed modest reductions.

Furthermore, the current R1 is inadequate as it does not control building massing. The existing R1 development standards neither limits the setback distance of the upper portions of the walls nor the structure mass. The new building envelope for the proposed zone, R1VNew, requires that walls over 20 feet in height employ an encroachment plane of 45 degrees to a maximum height of 30 feet. The encroachment plane curtails the overall massing of the structure, reducing the perception of size and bulk while enhancing the overall visual quality of the street by providing a more unified and low scale appearance which increases light and air circulation.

West Los Angeles Community Plan

The proposed zone change will promote the objectives, policies and goals of the West Los Angeles Community Plan by continuing to protect the character of the existing single-family neighborhood in the Inner Council District area. By instituting more restrictive development regulations, the proposed regulations require new development to be compatible with neighborhood character. As new houses are developed in conformance with the proposed regulations, and are built with smaller height, floor area and lot coverage envelopes, the overall existing character of the Inner Council District community is preserved. The proposed zone changes are consistent with applicable objectives and policies of the West Los Angeles Community Plan, including the following:

- Policy 1-1.1*** Protect existing single family residential neighborhoods from new out-of scale development and other incompatible uses
- Policy 1-1.2*** Promote neighborhood preservation in all residential neighborhoods

The policies listed above will be accomplished through the implementation of the proposed zone change to R1VNew. Based on data from the existing housing stock in the Inner Council District 5 Community, including floor area and analysis of building typologies, the proposed new zone was selected from a range of new single family subzones. The proposed zone requires all new development to be similar in character to the majority of existing houses in the project area. No changes are proposed to the community's residential density – the project area will remain designated for single family development. On the whole, the proposed zone change to R1VNew act as a refinement of the existing Single Family Development Standards contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code, tailoring existing types of development regulations to more specifically address the needs of a well-defined community.

Public Necessity, Convenience, General Welfare, and Good Zoning

Los Angeles **City Charter Section 558** and **LAMC Section 12.32(C)(7)** require that prior to adopting a land use ordinance, the City Council make findings that the ordinance conforms with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice. The proposed Zone Change conforms to public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice in the following respects: The proposed single family development standards of the R1VNew create guidelines and standards for new development which help protect the character of Inner Council District 5 and reinforce the neighborhood's scale. The new single family standards within the R1VNew Zone will ensure that new construction is compatible with the existing context; new projects will enhance and reinforce the existing environment; and that the aesthetic and visual quality of the area will be improved and complement the character of the Community.

The proposed zone change began with a desire voiced by the community to preserve the built character of the Inner Council District 5 community. Planning staff responded by researching building form in the community, as well as extensive field work and meetings with community members to better understand the issues facing the area. Through this methodology, staff determined that there was an impetus for additional single family development regulations in the Inner Council District 5 community; it was true that the built form of the neighborhood was beginning to change, and that the changes were potentially negatively affecting the character of the community. The proposed zone, R1VNew offers protections and methods to preserving the overall character of the community.

The proposed zone change ordinance substantially advances a legitimate public interest in that it will further protect single-family residential neighborhoods from out-of-scale development that often leads to structures that are built-out to the maximum size allowed in the LAMC. In recent years, Citywide property values have increased rapidly and this high premium for land has driven a trend where property owners and developers tear down the original houses and replace them with much larger structures or significantly remodel existing houses with large-scale two-story additions which are out-of-scale with the neighboring properties. Good zoning practice requires new development standards for single-family residential zones to further maintain and control the preservation of neighborhood character. This proposed zone change ordinance accomplishes this requirement.

The proposed ordinance is not arbitrary as the Department has thoroughly analyzed many different approaches and has determined that the proposed amendments are the simplest and most direct way of dealing with the issue of "mansionization" or development of homes that are disproportionate in size within their community. There is a reasonable relationship between a legitimate public purpose which is maintaining existing single-family residential neighborhood character and the means to effectuate that purpose. Delaying the implementation of these code amendments could result in the continuation of over-sized development of single-family residential neighborhoods which is inconsistent with the objectives of the General Plan and would create an irreversible negative impact on the quality of life in the communities within the City where a Zone Change has been proposed.

CEQA Findings

Pursuant to Section 210821(c)(3) of the California Public Resource Code, the Department of City Planning prepared a Negative Declaration (ENV-2016-2111-ND), which concludes that the

proposed zone change for the Inner Council District 5 (as bounded by the Proposed Ordinance Map) will result in less than significant impacts and/or that there will be no impacts. The Negative Declaration was published for a period of 20 days, from September 29, 2015 and will be complete by October 19, 2015. We will address comments as they are submitted and will have a final response to comments by second City Planning Commission hearing on November 10, 2016.

As stated in the mandatory findings of significance in the Negative Declaration, the Department of City Planning concludes the following:

- a) Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed zone changes would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development. Further, development (e.g., additions, new construction) of single-family units that occurs pursuant to the proposed project would not impact any endangered fauna or flora, modify any special status species habitat, and would only occur on lots zoned for single-family development. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project area and the surrounding area, construction activities and operation of future development would not impact the habitat or population in the Project Area. In addition, the proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development in any identified Biological Resource Areas. The proposed project would not impact the habitat or population level of fish or wildlife species, nor would it threaten a plant or animal community, nor impact the range of a rare endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, impacts to Cultural Resources and related archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant following the implementation of the regulatory compliance measures.
- b) No significant impacts were identified for the 17 environmental factors analyzed within the Initial Study. Currently, a proposed Code amendment to the 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and the 2011 Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) are undergoing similar environmental review that could be viewed in connection to the proposed Project. The proposed Code amendment to the BHO/BMO specifically amends the existing BMO and BHO to establish more stringent development standards for properties zoned R1, modify RFA calculations, adjust grading provisions for single-family lots located in designated "Hillside Areas," and eliminate the "Green Building Option" bonus for properties zoned RA, RE, and RS, and eliminate all bonuses in the R1 zones that currently permit additional RFA in exchange for the inclusion of particular building features.

As mentioned throughout, the proposed Code amendment would establish variations of the existing R1 Zone that are tailored to meet the varying character and design of single-family neighborhoods throughout the City. These zones regulate lot coverage maximums, height, placement of bulk, and size. The proposed Project would also create a new Supplemental Use District that mandates garages to be detached from the main building and located at the rear of a property. The proposed Project, by itself, does not propose or authorize any development and would not authorize or expand any new or existing land uses.

The proposed Code amendment to the BMO/BHO (i.e. Related Project) would further apply specific requirements related to form and massing to single-family zoned properties in the area. The Related Project applies specific requirements related to form and process, triggered by an application for a building and/or grading permit in any single family zoned lot (RA, RE, RS, R1). The combination of the proposed Project and the Related Project is not expected to incentivize any new construction; rather, these projects together would in effect address concerns of perceived out-of-scale construction in single-family neighborhoods and help regulate form in residential zones. It is also important to note that no significant impacts were identified for the Related Project.

Thus the proposed Project in combination with Related Projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable effect

- c) A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and regulatory compliance measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Delegation of City Planning Commission Authority

In accordance with **Charter Sections Charter 559**, and in order to insure the timely processing of this ordinance, the City Planning Commission authorizes the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove for the Commission any modification to the subject ordinance as deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety and/or the City Attorney's Office. In exercising that authority, the Director must make the same findings as would have been required for the City Planning Commission to act on the same matter. The Director's action under this authority shall be subject to the same time limits and shall have the same effect as if the City Planning Commission had acted directly.

FINDINGS (Fairfax)

General Plan/Charter Findings

In accordance with Charter Sections 556 and 558, the proposed zone change is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the City's General Plan, and all applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

General Plan Framework/ Community Plan Consistency

The proposed zone change ordinance for the Fairfax Community is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework, in addition to several similar provisions echoed in most of the Community Plans that make up the Land Use Element of the General Plan

General Plan Framework

The proposed Zone Change Ordinance is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework:

- Goal 3B** Preservation of the City's stable single-family residential neighborhoods.
- Objective 3.5** Ensure that the character and scale of stable single-family residential neighborhoods is maintained, allowing for infill development provided that it is compatible with and maintains the scale and character of existing development.
- Policy 3.5.2** Require that new development in single-family neighborhoods maintains its predominant and distinguishing characteristics such as property setbacks and building scale.
- Policy 3.5.4** Require new development in special use neighborhoods such as water-oriented, rural/agricultural, and equestrian communities to maintain their predominant and distinguishing characteristics.

Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code this proposal is for a Zone Change to those parcels lying within the Fairfax Community, bounded within the proposed Ordinance Map, from R1-1 to R1VNew. The current Single Family "R1" regulations for the Fairfax Community allow large, box-like structures that may compromise the existing character of the smaller scaled neighborhood, potentially limiting light and air to adjacent buildings. The proposed zone change ordinance for the Fairfax Community is necessary in order to preserve and maintain the character defining features, such as scale, proportion, building mass and garage orientation that make the existing single-family neighborhood unique.

With regards to scale and proportion, the existing R1 zone allows for a Floor to Area Ratio that reaches 0.60 for net livable space. Currently, the area is regulated by an interim Control Ordinance 183,497 which states, "Notwithstanding any section of the LAMC, no building permit shall issue for a Project in Fairfax area unless the proposed structure's Residential Floor Area—

without exceptions for detached accessory buildings and over-in-height ceilings—does not exceed the base Residential Floor Area set forth in the Zoning Code. Residential Floor Area bonuses permitted by the Zoning Code shall be limited to 15% of the maximum Residential Floor Area.” The R1VNew zone reduces the allowable FAR from 0.60 to a range that reaches a maximum 0.55 on smaller lots to a minimum 0.45 on larger lots. This FAR allowance is more in keeping with the existing FAR makeup of the community, which averages 0.31 FAR, while still allowing for a reasonable expansion of house size to meet modern needs. It also is in keeping with the intent of the Interim Control Ordinance for the area, which proposed modest reductions.

Furthermore, the current R1 is inadequate as it does not control building massing. The existing R1 development standards neither limits the setback distance of the upper portions of the walls nor the structure mass. The new building envelope for the proposed zone, R1VNew, requires that walls over 20 feet in height employ an encroachment plane of 45 degrees to a maximum height of 30 feet. The encroachment plane curtails the overall massing of the structure, reducing the perception of size and bulk while enhancing the overall visual quality of the street by providing a more unified and low scale appearance which increases light and air circulation.

West Los Angeles Community Plan

The proposed zone change will promote the objectives, polices and goals of the West Los Angeles Community Plan by continuing to protect the character of the existing single-family neighborhood in the Fairfax area. By instituting more restrictive development regulations, the proposed regulations require new development to be compatible with neighborhood character. As new houses are developed in conformance with the proposed regulations, and are built with smaller height, floor area and lot coverage envelopes, the overall existing character of Fairfax community is preserved. The proposed zone changes are consistent with applicable objectives and policies of the West Los Angeles Community Plan, including the following:

- Policy 1-1.1*** Protect existing single family residential neighborhoods from new out-of scale development and other incompatible uses
- Policy 1-1.2*** Promote neighborhood preservation in all residential neighborhoods

The policies listed above will be accomplished through the implementation of the proposed zone change to R1VNew. Based on data from the existing housing stock in the Fairfax Community, including floor area and analysis of building typologies, the proposed new zone was selected from a range of new single family subzones. The proposed zone requires all new development to be similar in character to the majority of existing houses in the project area. No changes are proposed to the community’s residential density – the project area will remain designated for single family development. On the whole, the proposed zone change to R1VNew act as a refinement of the existing Single Family Development Standards contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code, tailoring existing types of development regulations to more specifically address the needs of a well-defined community.

Public Necessity, Convenience, General Welfare, and Good Zoning

Los Angeles **City Charter Section 558** and **LAMC Section 12.32(C)(7)** require that prior to adopting a land use ordinance, the City Council make findings that the ordinance conforms with

public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice. The proposed Zone Change conforms to public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice in the following respects: The proposed single family development standards of the R1VNew create guidelines and standards for new development which help protect the character of Fairfax and reinforce the neighborhood's scale. The new single family standards within the R1VNew Zone will ensure that new construction is compatible with the existing context; new projects will enhance and reinforce the existing environment; and that the aesthetic and visual quality of the area will be improved and complement the character of the Community.

The proposed zone change began with a desire voiced by the community to preserve the built character of the Fairfax community. Planning staff responded by researching building form in the community, as well as extensive field work and meetings with community members to better understand the issues facing the area. Through this methodology, staff determined that there was an impetus for additional single family development regulations in the Fairfax community; it was true that the built form of the neighborhood was beginning to change, and that the changes were potentially negatively affecting the character of the community. The proposed zone, R1VNew offers protections and methods to preserving the overall character of the community.

The proposed zone change ordinance substantially advances a legitimate public interest in that it will further protect single-family residential neighborhoods from out-of-scale development that often leads to structures that are built-out to the maximum size allowed in the LAMC. In recent years, Citywide property values have increased rapidly and this high premium for land has driven a trend where property owners and developers tear down the original houses and replace them with much larger structures or significantly remodel existing houses with large-scale two-story additions which are out-of-scale with the neighboring properties. Good zoning practice requires new development standards for single-family residential zones to further maintain and control the preservation of neighborhood character. This proposed zone change ordinance accomplishes this requirement.

The proposed ordinance is not arbitrary as the Department has thoroughly analyzed many different approaches and has determined that the proposed amendments are the simplest and most direct way of dealing with the issue of "mansionization" or development of homes that are disproportionate in size within their community. There is a reasonable relationship between a legitimate public purpose which is maintaining existing single-family residential neighborhood character and the means to effectuate that purpose. Delaying the implementation of these code amendments could result in the continuation of over-sized development of single-family residential neighborhoods which is inconsistent with the objectives of the General Plan and would create an irreversible negative impact on the quality of life in the communities within the City where a Zone Change has been proposed.

CEQA Findings

Pursuant to Section 210821(c)(3) of the California Public Resource Code, the Department of City Planning prepared a Negative Declaration (ENV-2016-2111-ND), which concludes that the proposed zone change for the Fairfax (as bounded by the Proposed Ordinance Map) will result in less than significant impacts and/or that there will be no impacts. The Negative Declaration was published for a period of 20 days, from September 29, 2015 and will be complete by October 19,

2015. We will address comments as they are submitted and will have a final response to comments by second City Planning Commission hearing on November 10, 2016.

As stated in the mandatory findings of significance in the Negative Declaration, the Department of City Planning concludes the following:

- a) Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed zone changes would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development. Further, development (e.g., additions, new construction) of single-family units that occurs pursuant to the proposed project would not impact any endangered fauna or flora, modify any special status species habitat, and would only occur on lots zoned for single-family development. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project area and the surrounding area, construction activities and operation of future development would not impact the habitat or population in the Project Area. In addition, the proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development in any identified Biological Resource Areas. The proposed project would not impact the habitat or population level of fish or wildlife species, nor would it threaten a plant or animal community, nor impact the range of a rare endangered plant or animal. Furthermore, impacts to Cultural Resources and related archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant following the implementation of the regulatory compliance measures.
- b) No significant impacts were identified for the 17 environmental factors analyzed within the Initial Study. Currently, a proposed Code amendment to the 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and the 2011 Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) are undergoing similar environmental review that could be viewed in connection to the proposed Project. The proposed Code amendment to the BHO/BMO specifically amends the existing BMO and BHO to establish more stringent development standards for properties zoned R1, modify RFA calculations, adjust grading provisions for single-family lots located in designated "Hillside Areas," and eliminate the "Green Building Option" bonus for properties zoned RA, RE, and RS, and eliminate all bonuses in the R1 zones that currently permit additional RFA in exchange for the inclusion of particular building features.

As mentioned throughout, the proposed Code amendment would establish variations of the existing R1 Zone that are tailored to meet the varying character and design of single-family neighborhoods throughout the City. These zones regulate lot coverage maximums, height, placement of bulk, and size. The proposed Project would also create a new Supplemental Use District that mandates garages to be detached from the main building and located at the rear of a property. The proposed Project, by itself, does not propose or authorize any development and would not authorize or expand any new or existing land uses.

The proposed Code amendment to the BMO/BHO (i.e. Related Project) would further apply specific requirements related to form and massing to single-family zoned properties

in the area. The Related Project applies specific requirements related to form and process, triggered by an application for a building and/or grading permit in any single family zoned lot (RA, RE, RS, R1). The combination of the proposed Project and the Related Project is not expected to incentivize any new construction; rather, these projects together would in effect address concerns of perceived out-of-scale construction in single-family neighborhoods and help regulate form in residential zones. It is also important to note that no significant impacts were identified for the Related Project.

Thus the proposed Project in combination with Related Projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable effect

- c) A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and regulatory compliance measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Delegation of City Planning Commission Authority

In accordance with **Charter Sections Charter 559**, and in order to insure the timely processing of this ordinance, the City Planning Commission authorizes the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove for the Commission any modification to the subject ordinance as deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety and/or the City Attorney's Office. In exercising that authority, the Director must make the same findings as would have been required for the City Planning Commission to act on the same matter. The Director's action under this authority shall be subject to the same time limits and shall have the same effect as if the City Planning Commission had acted directly.

FINDINGS (Mar Vista / East Venice)

General Plan/Charter Findings

In accordance with Charter Sections 556 and 558, the proposed zone change is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent and provisions of the City's General Plan, and all applicable provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC).

General Plan Framework/Wilshire Community Plan Consistency

The proposed zone change ordinance for the Mar Vista/ East Venice Community is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework, in addition to several similar provisions echoed in most of the Community Plans that make up the Land Use Element of the General Plan

General Plan Framework

The proposed Zone Change Ordinance is consistent with the following goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan Framework:

- Goal 3B** Preservation of the City's stable single-family residential neighborhoods.
- Objective 3.5** Ensure that the character and scale of stable single-family residential neighborhoods is maintained, allowing for infill development provided that it is compatible with and maintains the scale and character of existing development.
- Policy 3.5.2** Require that new development in single-family neighborhoods maintains its predominant and distinguishing characteristics such as property setbacks and building scale.
- Policy 3.5.4** Require new development in special use neighborhoods such as water-oriented, rural/agricultural, and equestrian communities to maintain their predominant and distinguishing characteristics.

Pursuant to Section 12.32(F) of the Los Angeles Municipal Code this proposal is for a Zone Change to those parcels lying within the Mar Vista/ East Venice Community, bounded within the proposed Ordinance Map, from R1-1 to R1V2 and R1V/New. The current Single Family "R1" regulations for the Mar Vista/ East Venice Community allow large, box-like structures that may compromise the existing character of the smaller scaled neighborhood, potentially limiting light and air to adjacent buildings. The proposed zone change ordinance for the Mar Vista/ East Venice Community is necessary in order to preserve and maintain the character defining features, such as scale, proportion, building mass and garage orientation that make the existing single-family neighborhood unique.

With regards to scale and proportion, the existing R1 zone allows for a Floor to Area Ratio that reaches 0.60 for net livable space. Currently, the area is regulated by an interim Control

Ordinance 183,497 which states, “Notwithstanding any section of the LAMC, no building permit shall issue for a Project in Mar Vista/East Venice unless the proposed structure's Residential Floor Area—without exceptions for detached accessory buildings; porches, patios and breezeways; and over-in-height ceilings—does not exceed the base Residential Floor Area set forth in the Zoning Code. No Residential Floor Area bonus shall be allowed for green building, proportional stories, or front façade articulation.” The R1V2 zone reduces the allowable FAR from 0.60 to a range that reaches a maximum 0.45 on smaller lots to a minimum 0.35 on larger lots. The R1VNew zone reduces the allowable FAR from 0.60 to a range that reaches a maximum 0.55 on smaller lots to a minimum 0.45 on larger lots. These FAR allowances are more in keeping with the existing FAR makeup of the community, which averages 0.25 FAR, while still allowing for a reasonable expansion of house size to meet modern needs. It also is in keeping with the intent of the Interim Control Ordinance for the area, which proposed reductions.

Furthermore, the current R1 is inadequate as it does not control building massing. The existing R1 development standards neither limits the setback distance of the upper portions of the walls nor the structure mass. The new building envelope for the proposed zone, R1V2 and R1VNEW, requires that walls over 20 feet in height employ an encroachment plane of 45 degrees to a maximum height of 30 feet. The encroachment plane curtails the overall massing of the structure, reducing the perception of size and bulk while enhancing the overall visual quality of the street by providing a more unified and low scale appearance which increases light and air circulation.

Venice and Palms – Mar Vista –Del Rey Community Plan

The proposed zone change will promote the objectives, policies and goals of the West Los Angeles Community Plan by continuing to protect the character of the existing single-family neighborhood in the Mar Vista/ East Venice area. By instituting more restrictive development regulations, the proposed regulations require new development to be compatible with neighborhood character. As new houses are developed in conformance with the proposed regulations, and are built with smaller height, floor area and lot coverage envelopes, the overall existing character of Mar Vista/ East Venice community is preserved. The proposed zone changes are consistent with applicable objectives and policies of the Venice and Palms-Mar Vista- Del Rey Community Plans, including the following:

Venice Community Plan

- Objective 1-1** To provide for the preservation of the housing stock and its expansion to meet the diverse economic and physical needs of the existing residents and projected population of the Plan area to the year 2010.
- Policy 1-1.2** Protect the quality of the residential environment and the appearance of communities with attention to site and building design.
- Policy 1-1.3** Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from new out-of-scale development and other incompatible uses.

Palms-Mar Vista-Del Rey Community Plan

- Objective 1-1** To provide for the preservation of existing housing and for the development of new housing to meet the diverse economic and physical needs of the existing residents and projected population of the Plan area to the year 2010.
- Policy 1-1.2** Protect the quality of the residential environment and the appearance of communities with attention to site and building design.
- Policy 1-1.3** Protect existing single-family residential neighborhoods from new out-of-scale development and other incompatible uses.

The policies listed above will be accomplished through the implementation of the proposed zone change to R1V2 and R1VNEW. Based on data from the existing housing stock in the Mar Vista/ East Venice Community, including floor area and analysis of building typologies, the proposed new zone was selected from a range of new single family subzones. The proposed zone requires all new development to be similar in character to the majority of existing houses in the project area. No changes are proposed to the community's residential density – the project area will remain designated for single family development. On the whole, the proposed zone change to R1V2 and R1VNEW act as a refinement of the existing Single Family Development Standards contained in the Los Angeles Municipal Code, tailoring existing types of development regulations to more specifically address the needs of a well-defined community.

Public Necessity, Convenience, General Welfare, and Good Zoning

Los Angeles **City Charter Section 558** and **LAMC Section 12.32(C)(7)** require that prior to adopting a land use ordinance, the City Council make findings that the ordinance conforms with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice. The proposed Zone Change conforms to public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice in the following respects: The proposed single family development standards of the R1V2 AND R1VNEW create guidelines and standards for new development which help protect the character of Mar Vista/ East Venice and reinforce the neighborhood's scale. The new single family standards within the R1V2 AND R1VNEW Zone will ensure that new construction is compatible with the existing context; new projects will enhance and reinforce the existing environment; and that the aesthetic and visual quality of the area will be improved and complement the character of the Community.

The proposed zone change began with a desire voiced by the community to preserve the built character of the Mar Vista/ East Venice community. Planning staff responded by researching building form in the community, as well as extensive field work and meetings with community members to better understand the issues facing the area. Through this methodology, staff determined that there was an impetus for additional single family development regulations in the Mar Vista/ East Venice community; it was true that the built form of the neighborhood was beginning to change, and that the changes were potentially negatively affecting the character of the community. The proposed zone, R1V2 and R1VNEW offers protections and methods to preserving the overall character of the community.

The proposed zone change ordinance substantially advances a legitimate public interest in that it will further protect single-family residential neighborhoods from out-of-scale development that

often leads to structures that are built-out to the maximum size allowed in the LAMC. In recent years, Citywide property values have increased rapidly and this high premium for land has driven a trend where property owners and developers tear down the original houses and replace them with much larger structures or significantly remodel existing houses with large-scale two-story additions which are out-of-scale with the neighboring properties. Good zoning practice requires new development standards for single-family residential zones to further maintain and control the preservation of neighborhood character. This proposed zone change ordinance accomplishes this requirement.

The proposed ordinance is not arbitrary as the Department has thoroughly analyzed many different approaches and has determined that the proposed amendments are the simplest and most direct way of dealing with the issue of “mansionization” or development of homes that are disproportionate in size within their community. There is a reasonable relationship between a legitimate public purpose which is maintaining existing single-family residential neighborhood character and the means to effectuate that purpose. Delaying the implementation of these code amendments could result in the continuation of over-sized development of single-family residential neighborhoods which is inconsistent with the objectives of the General Plan and would create an irreversible negative impact on the quality of life in the communities within the City where a Zone Change has been proposed.

CEQA Findings

Pursuant to Section 210821(c)(3) of the California Public Resource Code, the Department of City Planning prepared a Negative Declaration (ENV-2016-2111-ND), which concludes that the proposed zone change for the Mar Vista/ East Venice (as bounded by the Proposed Ordinance Map) will result in less than significant impacts and/or that there will be no impacts. The Negative Declaration was published for a period of 20 days, from September 29, 2015 and will be complete by October 19, 2015. We will address comments as they are submitted and will have a final response to comments by second City Planning Commission hearing on November 10, 2016.

As stated in the mandatory findings of significance in the Negative Declaration, the Department of City Planning concludes the following:

- a) Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, the proposed zone changes would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development. Further, development (e.g., additions, new construction) of single-family units that occurs pursuant to the proposed project would not impact any endangered fauna or flora, modify any special status species habitat, and would only occur on lots zoned for single-family development. Due to the highly urbanized nature of the project area and the surrounding area, construction activities and operation of future development would not impact the habitat or population in the Project Area. In addition, the proposed project does not propose or authorize any new development in any identified Biological Resource Areas. The proposed project would not impact the habitat or population level of fish or wildlife species, nor would it threaten a plant or animal community, nor impact the range of a rare endangered plant or animal. Furthermore,

impacts to Cultural Resources and related archaeological and paleontological resources would be less than significant following the implementation of the regulatory compliance measures.

- b) No significant impacts were identified for the 17 environmental factors analyzed within the Initial Study. Currently, a proposed Code amendment to the 2008 Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and the 2011 Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) are undergoing similar environmental review that could be viewed in connection to the proposed Project. The proposed Code amendment to the BHO/BMO specifically amends the existing BMO and BHO to establish more stringent development standards for properties zoned R1, modify RFA calculations, adjust grading provisions for single-family lots located in designated "Hillside Areas," and eliminate the "Green Building Option" bonus for properties zoned RA, RE, and RS, and eliminate all bonuses in the R1 zones that currently permit additional RFA in exchange for the inclusion of particular building features.

As mentioned throughout, the proposed Code amendment would establish variations of the existing R1 Zone that are tailored to meet the varying character and design of single-family neighborhoods throughout the City. These zones regulate lot coverage maximums, height, placement of bulk, and size. The proposed Project would also create a new Supplemental Use District that mandates garages to be detached from the main building and located at the rear of a property. The proposed Project, by itself, does not propose or authorize any development and would not authorize or expand any new or existing land uses.

The proposed Code amendment to the BMO/BHO (i.e. Related Project) would further apply specific requirements related to form and massing to single-family zoned properties in the area. The Related Project applies specific requirements related to form and process, triggered by an application for a building and/or grading permit in any single family zoned lot (RA, RE, RS, R1). The combination of the proposed Project and the Related Project is not expected to incentivize any new construction; rather, these projects together would in effect address concerns of perceived out-of-scale construction in single-family neighborhoods and help regulate form in residential zones. It is also important to note that no significant impacts were identified for the Related Project.

Thus the proposed Project in combination with Related Projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable effect

- c) A significant impact may occur if the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts, as discussed in the preceding sections. All potential impacts of the proposed project have been identified, and regulatory compliance measures have been prescribed, where applicable, to reduce all potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Upon implementation of mitigation measures identified and compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Delegation of City Planning Commission Authority

In accordance with **Charter Sections Charter 559**, and in order to insure the timely processing of this ordinance, the City Planning Commission authorizes the Director of Planning to approve or disapprove for the Commission any modification to the subject ordinance as deemed necessary by the Department of Building and Safety and/or the City Attorney's Office. In exercising that authority, the Director must make the same findings as would have been required for the City Planning Commission to act on the same matter. The Director's action under this authority shall be subject to the same time limits and shall have the same effect as if the City Planning Commission had acted directly.

PUBLIC HEARING AND COMMUNICATIONS

Stakeholder Meetings

The community outreach strategy for the Neighborhood Conservation Initiative included community workshops, focus group meetings, and other forms of community engagement including e-mail and phone exchanges with various stakeholders of the different neighborhoods. The stakeholder meetings described in this section includes the comprehensive outreach strategy for all the neighborhoods included in the Neighborhood Conservation effort.

In the months of May, June, July, and August, the Department of City Planning held sixteen community workshops with stakeholders from the various Neighborhood Conservation neighborhoods in need of specialized zoning. Each community workshop included an open house, presentation, question-and-answer period, and small group discussions. The locations, dates, and times of the sixteen community meetings are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Stakeholder Community Workshops

East Venice ICO Area When: Saturday, May 7 Time: 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. Where: Beyond Baroque 681 Venice Blvd. Venice, CA 90291	Cheviot Hills (Inner Council District 5) ICO Area When: Wednesday, May 11 Time: 5:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m. Where: Palms - Rancho Park Branch Library 2920 Overland Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90064	Faircrest Heights ICO Area When: Thursday, May 12 Time: 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Where: Claude Pepper Senior Citizen Center 1762 S. La Cienega Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90035	Bel-Air ICO Area When: Tuesday, May 17 Time: 5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m. Where: Westwood Branch Library 1246 Glendon Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90024
Kentwood ICO Area When: Wednesday, May 18 Time: 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Where: Westchester District Office, Community Rm. 7166 W. Manchester Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90045	Mar Vista ICO Area When: Thursday, May 19 Time: 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Where: Penmar Recreation Center 1341 Lake St. Venice, CA 90291	Beverlywood ICO Area When: Monday, May 23 Time: 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Where: Robertson Recreation Center 1641 Preuss Rd. Los Angeles, CA 90035	Oaks of Los Feliz ICO Area When: Wednesday, May 25 Time: 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Where: Fire Station 82 Annex Conference Rm. 1800 N. Bronson Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90028
Valley Village ICO Area When: Tuesday, May 31 Time: 5:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m. Where: North Hollywood Regional Library 5211 Tujunga Ave. North Hollywood, CA 91601	Lower Council District 5 ICO Area When: Wednesday, June 1 Time: 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Where: Robertson Recreation Center 1641 Preuss Rd. Los Angeles, CA 90035	Fairfax ICO Area When: Thursday, June 2 Time: 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Where: Poinsettia Recreation Center 7341 Willoughby Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90046	La Brea Hancock ICO Area When: Saturday, June 4 Time: 10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Where: Will & Ariel Durant Branch Library 7140 W. Sunset Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90046
Larchmont Heights ICO Area When: Saturday, June 11 Time: 10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Where: Will & Ariel Durant Branch Library 7140 W. Sunset Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90046	South Hollywood ICO Area When: Saturday, June 25 Time: 10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. Where: Will & Ariel Durant Branch Library 7140 W. Sunset Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90046	Pacific Palisades When: Wednesday, July 13 Time: 6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Where: Pacific Palisades Charter High School 15777 Bowdoin Street Pacific Palisades, CA 90272	Crestview, Wilshire Vista, and Picfair Village When: Wednesday, July 20 Time: 6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. Where: Robertson Rec. Center 1641 Preuss Rd. Los Angeles, CA 90035

At the community workshops, stakeholders were presented with the first draft of the new tailored single-family zones described as R1-A, R1-B, R1-C, R1-D, R1-E and R1-F and an overview of the proposed amendments to the Baseline Masonization Ordinance (BMO) and Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO). Stakeholders had the opportunity to provide feedback on the new zone options as well as provide feedback on which zone option is most appropriate for their neighborhood. The group discussions included questions on what features create neighborhood character and whether they felt the proposed amended BMO/BHO addressed their neighborhood conservation issues or if the new single-family zones are a better fit. The feedback from the community meetings led to the proposed zone change recommendations and modification to the first draft of the single-family zones to reflect “smaller,” “standard,” “moderate,” and “larger” home options, or four floor area ratio (FAR) ranges instead of six, an additional variable-mass building envelope option, and various building envelope options for different FAR ranges.

Open House/ Public Hearing (Part 1)

Five noticed public hearings, grouped by Council District, were held for fifteen neighborhoods in need of specialized zoning. Described in this section is part one of the case CPC-2016-2112-ZC staff report and includes public hearing information for Council Districts 10 (with portions of Council District 5 for Crestview) and Council District 4. Each public hearing included an open house for questions, presentation, and public hearing. A summary of the locations, dates, times and approximate number of attendees of the three meetings are shown in Table 2. A summary of verbal and written testimony received at the respective public hearings are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2
Public Hearings for Council Districts 10 and 4**

Public Hearing Information	Number of Attendees
Faircrest Heights, Crestview, Wilshire Vista and Picfair Village When: Monday, August 29, 2016 Time: Open House at 5:30 p.m., Presentation at 6:30 p.m., Public Hearing at 6:30 p.m. Where: Claude Pepper Senior Center, 1762 S. La Cienega Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90035	Faircrest Heights: 34 Crestview: 53 Wilshire Vista: 23 Picfair Village: 31 Other/ Unspecified: 22 Total: 163
South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, and Larchmont Heights When: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 Time: Open House at 5:30 p.m., Presentation at 6:30 p.m., Public Hearing at 6:30 p.m. Where: Claude Pepper Senior Center, 1762 S. La Cienega Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90035	South Hollywood: 5 La Brea Hancock: 13 Larchmont Heights: 23 Other/ Unspecified neighborhood: 3 Total: 44
Oaks of Los Feliz: D-Limitation When: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 Time: Open House at 5:30 p.m., Presentation at 6:30 p.m., Public Hearing at 6:30 p.m. Where: Fire Station 82 Annex, 1800 N. Bronson Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90028	Total: 17
Grand Total of Attendees	224

Table 3
Tally of Verbal and Written Testimony Received at the Respective Public Hearings

Neighborhood	Support Proposal	Oppose Proposal	Unspecified/ General Comment	Total
Faircrest Heights	8	3	3	14
Crestview	15	13	2	30
Picfair Village	13	3	0	16
Wilshire Vista	5	5	1	11
South Hollywood	1	1	0	2
La Brea Hancock	11	0	0	11
Larchmont Heights	0	11	5	16
Grand Total of Verbal and Written Testimony Received				100

Summary of Public Hearing and Communications Received

In addition to written and verbal testimony submitted at the public hearing, the public comment period for the Faircrest Heights, Crestview, Picfair Village, Wilshire Vista, South Hollywood, La Brea Hancock, Larchmont Heights and the Oaks of Los Feliz neighborhoods was left open through September 25, 2016 for additional written communication. Table 4 shown below is a tally of comments received in support and opposition of the proposed zoning, following the table is a summary of written comments grouped by neighborhood. All written comments described in the table are e-mails or letters received by postal mail.

Table 4
Tally of Written Comments received by September 25, 2016

Neighborhood	Support Proposal	Oppose Proposal	Unspecified/ General Comment	Total
Faircrest Heights	48	8	0	56
Crestview	39	37	0	76
Picfair Village	27	0	0	27
Wilshire Vista	75	0	0	75
South Hollywood	1	0	0	1
La Brea Hancock	5	0	0	5
Larchmont Heights	0	19	0	19
Grand Total of Written Comments Received				259

Faircrest Heights

The majority of written comments received from the Faircrest Heights neighborhood were in support of the proposed zone change. A bulk of the comments submitted came from a template letter expressing the same points. The key points expressed in the letter include their support for the new zones because it better reflects the varying character of single-family neighborhoods in Los Angeles and that the new zones, particularly the R1R2-RG zone, will allow reasonable renovations, expansions and new construction. Additionally, Neighborhoods United also known as the Faircrest Heights' Neighborhood Association submitted ten signatures in support of the R1R2-RG zone.

There was minimal opposition to the R1R2-RG zone. Of the opposition comments the key points express that they are in favor of the R1V2 zone option (i.e., variable-mass envelope with FAR range of 0.35 – 0.45) or the R1R*New zoning option (i.e., 0.45 – 0.55 FAR range), imposing a detached garage is unfavorable, a maximum FAR of 0.45 on smaller lots is a de facto prohibition on second stories, opponents to building are hoping families will stay out of their neighborhoods, and that they purchased their home with the intention of expanding it in the future to meet the needs of their family.

Crestview

The comments received were fairly even between Crestview community members in support and opposition of the proposed R1R2-RG zone change. A slightly higher percentage of the comments received were in favor of the proposed R1R2-RG zone change.

A majority of the comments submitted in favor of the R1R2-RG zone came from a template letter expressing the same points. The key points expressed in the support letter describe that the zone will help protect their neighborhood character while allowing reasonable renovations, expansions and new construction.

A majority of the comments submitted in opposition of the R1R2-RG zone also came from a template letter expressing the same points. The key points expressed in the opposition letter express that they are in favor of the R1R*New zoning option (i.e., 0.45 – 0.55 FAR range), imposing a detached garage is unfavorable, a maximum FAR of 0.45 on smaller lots is a de facto prohibition on second stories, opponents to building are hoping families will stay out of their neighborhoods, and that they purchased their home with the intention of expanding it in the future to meet the needs of their family.

Picfair Village

The written comments received for the Picfair Village neighborhood were overwhelmingly in support of the proposed zone change, with no comments in opposition of the proposed R1R2-RG zone change. The key points expressed that the R1R2-RG zone will curb out-of-scale development and keep garages in the rear. Two comments indicate that they would also like to see the same protections for the R2 zones.

Wilshire Vista

The written comments received for the Wilshire Vista neighborhood were overwhelmingly in support of the proposed zone change, with no comments in opposition of the proposed R1R2-RG zone change. A majority of the comments submitted came from a template letter expressing the same points. The key points expressed in the letter include their support for the new zones because it better reflects the varying character of single-family neighborhoods in Los Angeles and that the new zones, particularly the R1R2-RG zone, will allow reasonable renovations, expansions and new construction.

South Hollywood

Two written comments were received from the South Hollywood neighborhood. One e-mail letter was submitted by South Hollywood Neighborhood Association (SHNA) indicating that the board and members in attendance at their July 13, 2016 board meeting

unanimously voted to support the R1R2-RG zone. An additional note in the e-mail with the SHNA letter attachment described one concern that the 20 foot height limit in the front envelope would still allow two stories to be built and recommends limiting the front envelope height to be reduced to 16 feet.

La Brea Hancock

The written comments received for the La Brea Hancock neighborhood were overwhelmingly in support of the proposed zone change, with no comments in opposition of the proposed R1R2-RG zone change. A majority of the comments submitted came from a template letter expressing the same points. The key points expressed support of the R1R2-RG zone because the new zone will help protect their neighborhood character while allowing reasonable renovations, expansions and new construction. Additionally, comments expressed the desire to consider the undeveloped lots on the west side of south Sycamore's 400 block (407, 413, 419, 423, 429, 433, 439, 443, 449, 453), as well as those at the south end of Sycamore (664, 665, 668, 669), Orange (658, 664, 665, 669) and Citrus (668), to be included as part of the new single family zone.

Larchmont Heights

The written comments received for the Larchmont Heights neighborhood were generally in support of the proposed zone change. A majority of the comments received were against the proposed front-mass R1F2-RG zone option but in favor of the rear-mass option R1R2-RG. A majority of the comments in opposition of the R1F2-RG came from a template letter expressing the same points. The key points expressed were support for the R1R2-RG zone option, FARs ranging from 0.35 to 0.45 will help preserve the neighborhood quality, most properties in Larchmont Heights are single-story; and the new zone will allow residents to add, renovate or expand their home by adding living space at the rear of the property rather than at the front.

One comment in opposition of the 0.35 to 0.45 FAR range indicated a preference for the R1V*New variable-mass option with the FAR range of 0.45 to 0.55 and rear garage requirement. Additional comments regarding the R1R2 option were that the front building envelope depth of 30 feet is too restrictive for smaller lots and the encroachment plane should begin at 22 feet.

Additional Communications Received

In addition to the feedback received from the community workshops and public hearing, a survey was posted on the www.preservation.lacity.org/neighborhoodconservation website from May to the close of the public comment period September 25, 2016. The questions in the survey generally sought feedback on neighborhood character as it relates to the current neighborhood conservation issues of looming, massing, etc., favorable FAR ranges, building envelope types and garage location preferences.

The survey results generally indicated that zoning tools for their respective neighborhood should be more restrictive. The FAR that survey participants were most comfortable with in their neighborhoods is the "standard" FAR or the 0.35 to 0.45 FAR range. Lastly, the survey indicated that generally there is no preference for the location of the garage, however, there is a higher

percentage of those who preferred the garage to be detached and located in the rear versus attached garages.

Open House/ Public Hearing (Part 2)

Described in this section is Part 2 of the case CPC-2016-2112-ZC staff report and includes public hearing information for Council Districts 11 and Council District 5. Each public hearing included an open house for questions, presentation, and public hearing. A summary of the locations, dates, times and approximate number of attendees of the two meetings are shown in Table 5. A summary of verbal and written testimony received at the respective public hearings are shown in Table 6.

Table 5
Public Hearings for Council Districts 10 and 4

Public Hearing Information	Number of Attendees
Mar Vista/ East Venice, Kentwood, and Pacific Palisades When: Tuesday September 13, 2016 Time: Open House at 5:30 p.m., Presentation at 6:30 p.m., Public Hearing at 6:30 p.m. Where: Henry Medina Building, 11214 Exposition Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90064	Mar Vista: 97 East Venice: 9 Kentwood: 26 Pacific Palisades: 49 Other/ Unspecified: 7 Total: 188
Inner Council District 5, Lower Council District 5, Beverlywood, and Fairfax When: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 Time: Open House at 5:30 p.m., Presentation at 6:30 p.m., Public Hearing at 6:30 p.m. Where: Henry Medina Building, 11214 Exposition Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90064	Inner Council District 5: 2 Lower Council District 5: 110 Beverlywood: 58 Fairfax: 11 Other/ Unspecified neighborhood: 4 Total: 185
Grand Total of Attendees	373

Table 6
Tally of Verbal and Written Testimony Received at the Respective Public Hearings

Neighborhood	Proposed¹ Zone	Support Proposal	Oppose Proposal	Unspecified/ General Comment	Total
Mar Vista/ East Venice	R1V2	3	15	8	26
Kentwood	R1V2	1	6	3	10
Pacific Palisades	R1V1 and R1H1	3	10	10	23
Inner CD 5	R1V2	2	4	0	6
Lower CD 5	R1V2	11	22	11	44
Beverlywood	R1V2	5	22	5	32
Fairfax	R1V2	0	4	2	6
Grand Total of Verbal and Written Testimony Received					147

Summary of Public Hearing and Communications Received

¹ The proposed zones listed were the first proposed zone change recommendations as described in the mail notice and presented at the public hearings. The proposed zones for Beverlywood, Inner CD 5 and Fairfax has since changed to R1V New.

In addition to written and verbal testimony submitted at the public hearing, the public comment period for the Mar Vista/ East Venice, Kentwood, Pacific Palisades, Inner Council District 5, Lower Council District 5, Beverlywood, and Fairfax neighborhoods was left open through October 13, 2016 for additional written communication. Table 4 shown below is a tally of comments received in support and opposition of the proposed zoning, following the table is a summary of written comments grouped by neighborhood. All written comments described in the table are e-mails or letters received by postal mail.

Table 7
Tally of Written Comments received by October 13, 2016

Neighborhood	Proposed¹ Zone	Support Proposal	Oppose Proposal	Unspecified/ General Comment	Total
Mar Vista/ East Venice	R1V2	8	31	9	48
Kentwood	R1V2	8	20	16	44
Pacific Palisades	R1V1 and R1H1	26	17	15	58
Inner CD 5	R1V2	2	7	7	16
Lower CD 5	R1V2	42	33	9	84
Beverlywood	R1V2	31	16	7	54
Fairfax	R1V2	1	47	2	50
Unspecified Neighborhood	N/A	0	0	18	18
Grand Total of Written Comments Received					372

Mar Vista/ East Venice

The majority of written comments received from the Mar Vista/ East Venice neighborhood were against the proposed zone change to R1V2. However, looking at the Mar Vista and East Venice neighborhood separately, comments from the East Venice neighborhood are generally more supportive of the proposed zone change to R1V2. Key points from comments in support of the proposed R1V2 zoning option include, in support of R1V2 but would like to see the covered parking requirement removed, supports R1V2 if there were a 28' height limit and supports the scale of R1V2 but would prefer the massing requirement be towards the front to maintain backyard privacy.

A majority of comments in opposition of the R1V2 option were generally from the Mar Vista neighborhood. The points most commonly expressed include:

- Opposes the R1V2 zoning option and supports R1V New or the R1V1 options.
- The Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) and R1 Variation Zones are too restrictive.
- Proposed restrictions are forcing homes to look a certain prescribed way and legislates a conservative architectural intolerance.
- Height restrictions don't accommodate crawl spaces. Encroachment planes should begin at 24 feet or 22 feet.
- Tiered percentages are flawed and penalizes larger lots sizes.

- New regulations will limit the ability for families to grow and for homes to accommodate multiple generational living.
- New regulations will affect property values.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support or opposition of the R1V2 zone, commented that they were in support of limiting construction and over development because it is infringing on parking, sunlight, and privacy. Additionally, comments were received noting that the Mar Vista Community Council at a meeting held on September 21, 2016 recommended the R1V New zone for Mar Vista.

Kentwood

The written comments received for the Kentwood neighborhood were generally opposed to the proposed zone change to R1V2. The key points in opposition of the R1V2 zone include:

Supports larger homes

- Opposes R1V2 in support of R1V1, but nothing less than R1V New. The FAR of 0.45 is too restrictive.
- R1V1 zone provides the most flexibility.
- Opposes all changes and wants current regulations to remain in place.
- Most homes are built to R1V1 so property values will diminish.
- Different portions of Kentwood have different characteristics. North Kentwood homes are larger.

Supports smaller homes

- Opposes R1V2 and in favor of the most restrictive R1V3 option. The homes currently being built are too large and impose on the once quaint community because reducing neighbors' privacy, light, air circulation, and puts stress on the environment.

A link (<https://www.change.org/p/families-in-kentwood-demand-sensible-sized-homes>) to an online petition was submitted via email in opposition of the proposed R1V2 zone. On October 21, 2016, there were 124 supporters of the zone option to build up to 55% of lot size.

Of the Kentwood comments received in support of R1V2, the points most commonly expressed include:

- Supports R1V2 because 45% of 6,000 square feet is sufficient.
- Regulations keep open space and allow for more permeability.
- Tighter FAR restrictions are essential to preserving neighborhood character and affordability of housing stock in Kentwood.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support or opposition of the R1V2 zone, generally had comments similar to the two viewpoints, comments favoring larger homes and comments favoring smaller homes.

Pacific Palisades

The written comments received for the Pacific Palisades neighborhood were generally in support of the proposed zone change to R1V1 and R1H1. The key points expressed include:

- Support for R1V1 and R1H1, anything less would take away property rights promised when they purchased the property. Supports building up to 65% of lot.
- Supports new regulations with exemptions for garages, covered patios, porches and breezeways.
- New regulations will allow them to build out their homes like their neighbors and will keep the homes in character of the neighborhood.
- New regulations will be consistent with the Alphabet Streets neighborhood character.
- Individual comment stating new regulations are consistent with Tract 9300 regulations of the Pacific Palisades Civic League.
- Supports new zones however, living in the Palisair area which is mostly RE lots, only R1 lots are receiving the new zones.

Comments generally against the R1V1 zone change include:

- Opposed to being exempt from Baseline Mansionization Ordinance and Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BMO/BHO).
- Favors the most restrictive R1V3, R1V2 zones or the BMO.
- Opposed to any zone changes.
- Opposes R1H1 thinks that the upper Chautauqua hillside has a predominately single-story home character and prefers to limit size.
- New zone will increase traffic.
- R1H1 is not the same as today's BMO because there are no incentives for good design.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support or opposition of the R1V1 zone, generally had comments similar to the two viewpoints, comments favoring larger homes and comments favoring smaller homes.

Inner Council District 5

The written comments received for the Inner Council District 5 neighborhood were generally against the proposed zone change to R1V2. The key points expressed state that the R1V2 zone is too restrictive, limits families from expanding their homes and property values would be adversely affected. Comments in support of R1V2 generally stated that the new zone will help protect privacy, improve light, and increase open space.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support of opposition of the proposed R1V2 zone, the comments stated they were generally in favor of smaller homes or regulations to protect privacy, open space, and limiting new development from dwarfing their homes.

Lower Council District 5

The written comments received for the Lower Council District 5 neighborhood were generally split with comments in support and against the proposed zone change to R1V2. The key points in support of the R1V2 zone include:

- New zones will retain character and scale of the neighborhood.
- New zones will allow ample footage to remodel or rebuild without excessive harm to neighbors.
- Decreasing allowable footage as lot size increases prevents huge, oversized structures out of character with the rest of the neighborhood.
- Larger homes negatively impact the City's infrastructure and the environment.
- New larger homes are oversized, too closed together and block sunlight.
- Supports R1V2, but would also like to see the RG district applied to their area.

A majority of the individual came from residents of Comstock Hills using a template letter. Comstock Hills residents generally stated the same key points noted above in support of the R1V2 zone.

The written comments opposing the R1V2 zone were in favor of R1V1, R1V New and the most restrictive R1V3 zone options. Although comments may have stated they were in opposition of the R1V2 zone, their comment stated their preference for more permissive or tighter restrictions. Below is a breakdown of the opposing comments by home size preference. Key points opposing the R1V2 zone include:

Supports larger homes (R1V1 and R1V New)

- R1V1 and R1V New will preserve property values and allow to build to the same size as the rest of their neighborhood.
- Older home are not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) friendly, more square footage will allow people to remodel their homes to accommodate ADA features.
- Smaller zone options does not accommodate working at home or multiple generations living in one home.

Supports smaller homes (R1V3)

- R1V3 zone better retains open space, trees and landscape while allowing for reasonable expansion.
- R1V3 zone reduces the overall development on a lot and height limit.
- In areas where rear garages are the norm, new development should be required to have rear garages.
- Smaller homes will prevent traffic from increasing.
- Concerned that larger homes will be used for short-term rentals.

A majority of the individual comments opposing the R1V2 option came from the residents of Rancho Park and Reynier Village, Westwood Village and Brentwood.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support or opposition of the R1V2 zone, generally had comments similar to the two viewpoints, comments favoring larger homes and comments favoring smaller homes.

Beverlywood

The written comments received for the Beverlywood neighborhood were generally in support of the proposed zone change to R1V2. The key points in support of the R1V2 zone include:

- R1V2 allows for more green space, natural light and privacy.
- Prefers the amended BMO, but supports R1V2 to limit house size.
- New zone preserves the Beverlywood neighborhood character.
- FAR larger than 45% will increase carbon emissions.
- New zone will help control out-of-scale development while allowing new development.

The written comments opposing the R1V2 zone generally opposed R1V2 but were in favor of R1V1. Key points opposing the R1V2 zone include:

- New regulations will limit ability for families to expand their home.
- Concerned that restrictions will affect their property values.
- Tiered system is not equitable because most lots are more than 6,000 square feet so most homes will have a maximum FAR of 43% which is less than the current home sizes. Effects will split the neighborhood from those who have updated their homes to those that have not.
- Jewish community needs larger than average kitchen space to observe Kosher practices.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support or opposition of the R1V2 zone, generally had comments similar to the two viewpoints, comments favoring larger homes and comments favoring smaller homes.

Fairfax

The written comments received for the Fairfax neighborhood were overwhelmingly against the proposed zone change to R1V2. A majority of the comments received came from a template letter stating they are against R1V2 and in favor of R1V1 (65-55% or at least R1V-New (45-35%), they feel it is a matter of fairness that the Orthodox Jewish community in the Fairfax ICO area is consulted with for zoning and related concerns. Additionally, a petition with 56 signatures state they are in favor of the following:

- R1V1 or R1V New zoning with RFA of 55% to 65% or 45% to 55%.
- No reduction in garage allowance.
- An allowance of up to 250 feet for patios/balconies/breezeways and up to 400 feet of outbuildings.
- Reasonable changes in the proposed building envelope and driveway size

- Consultations with community representatives to resolve their concerns.

Of the comments that did not specify whether they were in support of opposition of the proposed R1V2 zone, the comments stated they were generally in favor of smaller homes.

Additional Communications Received

In addition to the feedback received from the community workshops and public hearing, a survey was posted on the www.preservation.lacity.org/neighborhoodconservation website from May to September 25, 2016. The questions in the survey generally sought feedback on neighborhood character as it relates to the current neighborhood conservation issues of looming, massing, etc., favorable FAR ranges, building envelope types and garage location preferences.

Described in Table 8 is a tally of the responses received regarding preferred FAR ranges in each neighborhood. Of the responses received, Mar Vista/ East Venice generally preferred the standard FAR of 0.35-0.45; Kentwood generally preferred the highest FAR option of 0.55-0.65; Pacific Palisades generally preferred the highest FAR option of 0.55-0.65; Inner CD 5 was generally split with preferences for the highest FAR option of 0.55-0.65 and the standard FAR option of 0.35-0.45; Lower CD 5 generally preferred the standard FAR option of 0.35-0.45; Beverlywood generally preferred the standard FAR option of 0.35-0.45; and Fairfax generally preferred the standard FAR option of 0.35-0.45.

Table 8
Tally of Survey Responses regarding Preferred FAR Ranges

Survey Question: I am comfortable with the following floor area ratio (FAR) in my neighborhood						
Neighborhood	0.55-0.65 (Highest)	0.45-0.55 (Moderate)	0.35-0.45 (Standard)	0.30-0.40 and 0.25-0.35 (Lowest)	No Response	Total Responses
Mar Vista/East Venice	4	3	6	1	1	15
Kentwood	12	3	0	1	0	16
Pacific Palisades	9	4	5	5	0	23
Inner CD 5	1	0	1	0	0	2
Lower CD 5	11	8	39	13	3	74
Beverlywood	20	17	74	18	1	130
Fairfax	1	0	2	0	0	3

Described in Table 9 is a tally of the responses received regarding preferred location of garages in each neighborhood. Of the responses received, Mar Vista/ East Venice generally has no preference for garage location; Kentwood generally has no preference for garage location; Pacific Palisades generally preferred attached garages; Inner CD 5 generally preferred attached garages; Lower CD 5 generally has no preference for garage location; Beverlywood generally has no preference for garage location; and Fairfax generally has no preference for garage location.

Table 9
Tally of Survey Responses regarding Garage Placement Preference

Survey Question: I prefer my garage to be					
Neighborhood	No Preference	Attached	Detached located in the Rear	No Response	Total Responses
Mar Vista/East Venice	8	2	5	0	15
Kentwood	13	2	1	0	16
Pacific Palisades	9	13	1	0	23
Inner CD 5	0	2	0	0	2
Lower CD 5	37	8	28	1	74
Beverlywood	65	32	33	0	130
Fairfax	2	1	0	0	0