

Communication from Public

Name: John Kaliski

Date Submitted: 03/17/2024 12:12 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose CF-23-0623 unless projects in historic districts are exempted from the eligibility allowances for automatic administrative approval. The proposed ordinance protects individual historic and contributing resources but ignores their settings and designated historic districts. In this last regard the public policy purposes of HPOZs are well articulated in LAMC 13B.8.1 including, "...protects and enhances...areas", "...develops and maintains...settings and environments to preserve ...areas", and "...fosters public appreciation of the...accomplishments of its past as reflected through its ...areas". These purposes, to protect historic "areas," "settings", and "environments", are substantially diminished if historic districts and HPOZs are not recognized in the proposed ordinance. Interestingly, the proposed ordinance does not exempt 100% affordable housing projects from standard review when exceptions to General Plans and Specific Plans, amendments to Specific Plans, adjustments and amendments to Redevelopment Plans, exceptions to Coastal Development Permits, Zoning Variances, Adjustments and Slight Modifications, Land Use Legislative Actions, waivers to Street Dedications, CPIO exceptions, and waiver of Conditional Use Permits for Public Benefit Projects are proposed. Developing in a designated historic district should be treated by the City no differently than the exception cases noted above. Adding a Subsection (7) to proposed Section 12.22 A.36 (c) Eligibility Requirements will address the above policy oversight. This language may read; • The project is not located within a designated historic district listed under a local, state, or federal designation program. With the addition of the above language, the public policy purposes and legacies of historic districts will be addressed as projects of all types are considered in these areas.

Communication from Public

Name: Catherine Estrada
Date Submitted: 03/17/2024 09:30 PM
Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I love L.A.! I know you do too and therefore urge the PLUM Committee to amend draft Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1 coming before them Tuesday, March 19, 2024. The implementation of Mayoral Executive Directive No.1 (draft Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1) for All-Affordable housing is commendable in its intent, however, it does not take into consideration some important assets of Los Angeles. It is actually destructive to reminders of our Los Angeles history because it does not take into consideration our historic areas. There are no protections for L.A.'s City certified historic districts. Section 12.20.3 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code protects Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ). This draft Ordinance does not respect this Municipal Code. There are also Specific Plans, National Register Districts, Community Plan Implementation Overlay Districts, Neighbor Stabilization Overlay Zones, etc. that are at risk. I support affordable housing development, nevertheless, I do not support uncontrolled and unreasonable development within the heart of any of these districts which will occur under this ordinance. The intent of these historic districts and zones is to promote better urban design and ensure that development is appropriate to the character of that community. The Planning and Land Use Management Committee must find a balance here. Amendment of this directive is necessary to conserve our neighborhoods' history, culture and architecture. Our heritage must be respected as we evolve. There must be respect for the democratic process as well. I appreciate the opportunity to have a voice in this hearing and join with others to request amendments to draft Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1. I support draft Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1 IF AMENDED with the following: • Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1 rules shall not supersede Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs), Community Plan Implementation Overlays (CPIOs), Neighborhood Stabilization Overlay Districts (NSOs), Specific Plans nor active Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) project areas. • Projects in HPOZs, CPIOs, NSOs, active CRA projects areas, and specific plans should be ineligible under the new Ordinance. • Projects in National Register or CA Register Districts, or listed in official, adopted surveys (e.g., SurveyLA, CRA, Bureau of Engineering) should be exempt. • Language should be added that for infill developments: massing,

scale, volume, and setbacks, shall adhere to the prevailing (the most commonly occurring on the specific block face.) • Waiver requests shall not be unlimited. Thank you for your attention and time regarding this matter. Sincerely, Cathy Estrada Angeleno University Park Stake holder

Communication from Public

Name: Alexandra

Date Submitted: 03/17/2024 06:36 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to support the ED1 Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1 ONLY IF AMENDED with the following changes: · Projects in HPOZs, CPIOs, NSOs, active CRA projects areas, and any kind of specific plan/overlay should be ineligible under the new Ordinance. · Projects in National Register or CA Register Districts, or listed in official, adopted surveys (e.g., SurveyLA, CRA, Bureau of Engineering) should also be ineligible for the ED1 streamlining, since historic resources should be subject to CEQA review. · Language should be added that for infill developments, massing, scale, volume, and setbacks shall adhere to the specific design standards that City Council has previously adopted for these districts and overlays. · The new Ordinance CF 23-0623-S1 rules shall not supersede HPOZs, CPIOs, NSOs, Specific Plans nor active CRA project areas. · Waiver requests and off-menu incentives shall not be unlimited; the Planning Commission's recommendations to limit waivers and incentives to six also seems excessive, since any of these projects can still be approved with review through existing land use processes. Only one waiver allowed if it is an environmental category (such as reduction of open space or reduced number of trees). · Require rear 15-foot setbacks to allow for trees to grow and storm water to be captured. Front setbacks should align with building lines and/or adjoining sites' prevailing setbacks.

Communication from Public

Name: Judy Reidel

Date Submitted: 03/17/2024 08:24 PM

Council File No: 23-0623-S1

Comments for Public Posting: The case number for the draft ordinance is CF 23-0623-S1. I'm in country club park and want the city to protect our historic neighborhoods and Hpozs. These buildings are treasures that are irreplaceable. The new 7 n 5 story blocks of new TOC apartments n condos are an eyesore. Make them put fabric awnings over sidewalks for shade like old downtown pix of LA. Get some design standards. Preserve our old houses and apartments that actually look and function so well. Unchanged, the ED1 ordinance / CF 23-0623-S1 is a betrayal of many previously-enacted land use ordinances that promised protections to the West Adams District neighborhoods and other older, character neighborhoods throughout the City. Please change ordinance. Thanks Judy Reidel