

**Issues for Planning Commission
Consideration and Policy Discussion
May 17, 2010**

The following are specific requests from comment letters on the Draft LUCE. These requests represent basic changes on height, standards and uses of the LUCE and principles, and as such have not been recommended in the errata sheet. However, they are highlighted here for further discussion by the Planning Commission.

1. Additional 3-foot building height at Tiers 2 and 3 for design flexibility

Height limits in non-residential districts are based on a 15 foot ground floor-to-floor height with 10 feet for upper floor-to-floor heights. The Strategy Framework initially proposed adding three feet to the maximum height for most commercial areas. The modest three foot increase would enhance the quality of architecture and interior space without allowing additional stories, floor area or intensifying uses. However, the proposal was not pursued due to opposition to the height increase. The addition of three (3) feet for design purpose may be a topic for discussion by the Planning Commission and City Council. It is paramount that any change in height also ensure the community benefit tiering structure and that the affordable housing bonuses be retained.

Several policies, including Citywide Policy LU15.10 (page 2.1-21), provide that development standards allow some flexibility to encourage better building design. The Planning Commission and City Council could choose to adopt development standards in the Zoning Ordinance that would allow limited portions of a building to be higher than the roof line to achieve quality architectural design.

2. Expansion of Auto Dealership Use on Lincoln Boulevard

The SMADA requests that new auto dealerships be allowed along the east side of Lincoln Boulevard from I-10 to Wilshire Boulevard. The LUCE envisions this area with active mixed-uses consistent with a transitioning scale from the downtown. Staff does not support changing the vision for Lincoln Boulevard between Wilshire and I-10. For discussion purposes, should the Planning Commission and City Council choose to accommodate the expansion of the existing auto dealerships onto Lincoln Boulevard, this could occur at the northeast corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Lincoln Boulevard, provided the properties are developed with the urban auto dealer format. Extending the auto dealership use along Lincoln Boulevard is not recommended.



3. Expansion of Mixed Use Boulevard Low designation Lincoln south of I-10

Lincoln Boulevard, south of the I-10 Freeway is considered the area that most needs incentives for properties to be upgraded. Additional height was analyzed as a potential incentive, but few parcels are large enough to accommodate more than two stories (most parcels are 46 to 50 feet wide and 80 to 100 feet deep, have no alley access and abut residential). Larger properties at Lincoln/Ocean Park and Lincoln Pico are identified as opportunity sites with additional potential.

Staff does not recommend changing land use designations for Lincoln Boulevard or any part of the LUCE. If the Planning Commission and City Council desire to incentivize affordable hotels, the site that is an existing motel located on the west side of Lincoln Boulevard, between Grant and Pacific Streets, would be such a site.



4. Flexibility, less rigidity, and variety in building heights, FARs, and setback requirements

The LUCE incorporates some of the existing, prescriptive requirements that are in the existing Zoning Ordinance. These requirements for upper level setbacks for buildings facing a boulevard and for buildings adjacent to residential properties are intended to reduce the perceived mass and ensure neighborhood compatibility.

The Architectural Review Board’s (ARB) comments on the Draft LUCE express a desire for greater design flexibility than exists today. The ARB’s concerns are addressed in policies for all boulevards that require roofline variation, building articulation, and an activated street frontage (see Policies LU15.7 to LU15.11). If the Planning Commission and City Council choose to discuss this issue further, staff will provide more detailed design language (Chapter 2.1 Land Use Policy) for Planning Commission and City Council discussion.