

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 03:16 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge the PLUM Committee to support the proposed Wildlife Ordinance (CF-14-0518). Below are a few of the many reasons why this Ordinance is so critical for the future of our City and its inhabitants, both human and animal. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Once again, for all the reasons stated above and more, thank you for supporting the proposed Wildlife Ordinance (CF-14-0518), Jesse

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lisa

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 03:27 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** bonnie burroughs

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 01:43 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance as well as the amendments proposed by council districts 4 & 5. Preserving our city's natural resources is vital for animal habitat. The unique natural features of Los Angeles should be maintained for the enjoyment and enrichment of all Angelenos, especially children and the economically disadvantaged. It should not be developed for the financial enrichment of a few. Finally, it is in the interest of all of us, no matter our age or level/lack of wealth, to respect and keep the wild natural parts of LA in tact as a critical, strategic and intentional way to combat climate change.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 02:06 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Good afternoon, I am a strong support of the Wildlife Corridor in the Santa Monica Mountains and urge you to support this bill.  
Many thanks from Sherman Oaks.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sandra Bell

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 02:08 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance, along with amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. We must not continue our disregard for the myriad plant and animal species who live in the Santa Monica mountains. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintains access to the connected habitat they need in order to survive and thrive. Some effects of unchecked, rampant development and habitat fragmentation are not evident for many years. As an environmentalist, I've been watching, with grief, the incremental encroachment upon the web of life over past decades. It's important that we protect what little we have left, as extinction is forever and not an option.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Keri Dearborn

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 02:12 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support Council File Number 14-0518, the Wildlife Ordinance, including the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. My family has lived and voted here in Los Angeles and Santa Monica for over 100 years. We have witnessed the decline of local wildlife and increasing fragmentation of habitat. The diversity of native plants and wildlife that depends on our unique landscape attracts visitors from around the world. As a conservation professional working with the Channel Island fox, I meet people from across the country and around the world who come here to experience our local endemic species. Los Angeles has the opportunity to join an elite group of international cities that are demonstrating that people and wildlife can live sustainably together. People are part of Los Angeles' biodiversity, not separate from it. Embracing this Wildlife Ordinance would be a positive step toward preserving our unique California Floristic Province biodiversity and moving our city into a greener, wilder, future.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dayna Diamond  
**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 02:36 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. We need to help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains. Protecting wildlife can be done in ways that also protect property interests. Adopting this ordinance quickly can be expanded to sensitive habitat to the City of Los Angeles. Thousands of plants and animals, some exclusive to this area, are threatened, some by extinction. Sprawling development puts them at great risk, and they need access to the connected habitat in order to thrive. Preserving natural open space is not only beneficial to people, native plants and wildlife but can significantly reduce fire risk. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** A R

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 02:50 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I respectfully oppose the wildlife hillside building ordinance in its current form. I wish for this ordinance to be properly researched and shared with the public in a way that promotes meaningful feedback. I share the desire to protect our hillsides and to allow our beautiful wildlife the opportunity to flourish. The current form of this ordinance does not do that and unduly limits a homeowners' rights to build on his or her land. Please return this ordinance to the drawing board for further review. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chain Fangs

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 03:00 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Chain Fangs team strongly supports the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. Being based in Los Angeles, we feel strongly for these amendments and believe that it is necessary to protect the wildlife in our communities. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 12:51 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat needed to thrive. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants and wildlife. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shelley L Billik

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 12:31 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi, my name is Shelley Billik, and I'm the chair of the Community Forest Advisory Committee (CFAC). We represent communities in the 15 council districts and Mayor's office, and our role is to advise city departments on urban canopy policies. CFAC voted unanimously in support of this Ordinance, participated in meetings and hearings, and submitted letters with specific recommendations about significant and protected trees. We applaud the measures relating to significant trees as the city currently has very little protection for our mature tree canopy. Trees represent shelter & food for wildlife, cooling and clean air, as well as beauty and wellbeing for humans. Personally, I DO live within the proposed district and wholeheartedly support it! We thank the Planning department staff for the hard work they've put in to streamline the draft, without weakening it despite the intense building lobby pressure. It's taken more than 8 years to get to this point, and we urge you to finalize and implement it very soon, as well as expand it to other areas of the city to the east of the 101, west of the 405 and coastal areas that also have precious undeveloped land under threat of speculative and resource intensive development. Please remember that we in the LA region live in 1 of only 36 biodiversity hotspots on the planet – that means we have many species that only exist in this area, and also means that many of them are threatened with extinction. This privilege comes with a responsibility to impose and comply with restrictions to protect it and for us to be caretakers of the land that we're borrowing from nature and from future generations. So when you hear the fear-mongering and misinformation being banded around, you need to ask yourself, what is their motivation? Does greed outweigh what science tells us, more important than public health, more important than the clear signs we see all around us, that we're heading towards more frequent extreme heat events, more frequent and intense fires, water scarcity, reduced tree canopy, less food and habitat for wildlife, disappearing species? Without nature we don't survive. That's not hyperbole - it's reality. Nature provides us with our water, our food, medicines, the very air we breathe, it's vital to our physical and mental health, to our quality of living. So we have to consider the impact we have on the few remaining natural habitats. Indigenous cultures have known this for thousands of years and

know how to live in balance and harmony with nature. But we don't have that kind of time to learn, we need to act now, with authority and urgency.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kathleen Whitaker

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 12:33 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am Dr. Kathleen Whitaker. I am a native-born Californian, and reside in Eagle Rock in the Northeast area of Los Angeles. I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposed ordinance and its mandates will help wildlife species survive in our urban Los Angeles environment and offer safer survival and sustain natural connector routes for wildlife to and from the Santa Monica AND the San Gabriel mountains. While the existing standards are designed to safeguard wildlife and property interests, they also allow for expansion to areas throughout our great city, especially for the Northeast Los Angeles area. Such connector routes are critically important for the coyotes, bears, raptors and their nests, and other wildlife that migrate to and from our local mountain ranges to sensitive habitats throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. This initial ordinance development is a critically important beginning and should be passed into law. Why am I supporting this? For years developers have attempted to decimate the last remaining hillside in Eagle Rock with ill-advised, financially-driven land use projects, destroying one of the last wildlife corridors in the area, and eliminating forever species of plants and animals that make their homes between our area and remnants of the Santa Monica and San Gabriel mountain areas. Moreover, our wonderful city has experienced decades of unschooled campaigns by developers and their supporters to suppress ethical environmental laws. This careless disregard for healthy growth in Los Angeles and lack of protection for our native and indigenous cultural landscapes has gone mainly unchallenged; and in some cases has been supported by "pay to play" politics. There has been a relentless and fundamental effort to alter standards of a clean, healthy biodiversity in our city. This happens when society values deceitful "extravagant junketing;" a society that is split between healthy mental and physical 'makers,' and endless unhealthy 'takers.' Sadly, some members of our state and local governments have promoted and largely ignored the results of this woefully inadequate stewardship of the land, its flora and fauna. Los Angelenos who care can do better! It seems we may be on the right track toward greater preservation of what is left of our natural environment. Today we are presented with an opportunity for positive change - to turn around the misdirection of past irrational influences. This Wildlife Ordinance is a small,

but healthy step toward sustainment of what is left of our natural environments and its wildlife habitats. I urge a swift adoption of this district Wildlife Ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. Thank you. Kathleen Whitaker, Ph.D 2501 Kerwin Place, Los Angeles, 90065

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 01:06 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please step up to protect our native wildlife and vegetation before it is too late! It is critical to do what we can, we have waited far too long in acting like wise conservators of our beautiful planet.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Paula Ely

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 01:11 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing in support of the Wildlife Ordinance proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. Protecting our natural resources including plants and animals unique to the Santa Monica mountains is critical to the well-being of our citizens. Development of needed housing and infrastructure can be accomplished within standards that also protect our essential natural infrastructure. Responsible development is key! Thank you for your attention to this issue of vital importance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lynnette Kampe

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 01:17 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge you to take action in favor of the proposed Wildlife Ordinance incorporating the amendments put forward by CD 4 and 5. A balance is needed between the trend to build mega-mansions and the preservation of habitat connectivity in order to make Los Angeles a more climate resilient City and preserve biological diversity. The size of homes has risen dramatically over the past decade entailing massive grading and uses of energy. The Wildlife Ordinance would be a step in the right direction to find some balance - it recognizes the need for development and the importance of habitat connectivity. It would recognize the value of mature non-native trees to wildlife and to combating climate change and provide some mitigation for their removal, currently offered to only 6 "protected" species. Developers are now building on the formerly "un-buildable" lots with maximum footprints, massive grading and staggering habitat destruction. Some limits are needed to live with respect for nature. Luxury homes are still possible while leaving more ground open to the sky to allow wildlife, native plants and trees of all kinds. I am eager to see the Ordinance pass into law as soon as possible and look forward to the eventual expansion of the Ordinance to all hillside areas. The diverse east side communities of the Arroyo Seco have expressed their support of the Ordinance in a letter sent by the Arroyo Seco Neighborhood Council. Let us begin now with the limited area and look to the future to do better.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** V Sud

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:55 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. The ordinance is absolutely essential to wildlife survival in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat needed to thrive. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. As we know, preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants and wildlife. I strong encourage you to support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan Collins  
**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:55 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Remove CF# 14-0518, "The Wildlife Ordinance" from the June 20th meeting agenda until proper outreach has been conducted with constituents. Not one proponent of this legislation has been identified as actually living in the proposed affected area, which is probably why no care seems to be given to affected homeowners and taxpayers like we are. Not one advocate of such affected groups has been presented by the city. Property owners are not opposed to good policy for promoting wildlife and open space protection. However, these new regulations do not work to preserve large open spaces. They don't create corridors between these open spaces that are as free from potential human contact as possible. In fact they do very few things that are actually good for wildlife. This ordinance will gravely affect small property owners, not the mega mansion developers they are claiming to be going after. This set of regulations sets the City in a direct path towards confrontation within the state. This is down-zone plain and simple and thus will run afoul with State law— including CEQA, HAA and other rules regarding zoning. It will end up tying the city up in lawsuit knots- for no reason. It will make our housing shortage worse. It will cause more population outflows. And without truly helping wildlife in the region. Due process—this ordinance has been pushed by bureaucratic insiders. It has yet to be fully vetted or even discussed in an open and honest way. Most people in the hills still don't realize what is happening. There have been no major studies on the environmental, economic and housing impacts of this ordinance. There has been no effort made to track down who will be negatively impacted—and how badly. Instead this ordinance continues to be shuttled around the back hallways of City Hall without being truly and openly debated.

<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ik=d7f4f8eac1&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f:1768881158523394191&simpl=msg-f:1768881158523394191>  
1/2 6/16/23, 10:51 AM City of Los Angeles Mail - Public Comments Not Uploaded WILDLIFE ORDINANCE We ask the PLUM Committee send this ordinance back to the planning department to be fully vetted, to have the parts of the rules removed that don't directly help wildlife and to expand those elements that truly help our wildlife—by formally designating our open areas, to plot out how to connect these habitats and corridors in a way that keeps wildlife out of harm's way (i.e. away from people), and efforts that true wildlife experts have suggested will help LA maintain its unique and wonderful access to nature. Lastly, nobody has explained how this is not an unlawful government taking of private property without just compensation, in violation of the U.S. Constitution. Please prepare for masses of lawsuits or perhaps a class action. Thank you, Susan Collins

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Aylam Orian

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:58 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance, along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in the Santa Monica Mountains through development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests, and creating wildlife corridors that are essential to wildlife survival in this city! Please approve this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles! Thank you!



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sherry Sotres

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 12:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** To Whom It May Concern: Please! I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat needed to thrive. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants and wildlife. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance. It's the right thing to do! Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Spencer Solomon

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 10:27 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I care about the wildlife in my city, it is one of the things that brings me the most joy in life to see a cool animal. Please protect them so they don't disappear!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Deborah Kulik

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 10:18 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. ?? The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. ?? There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. ?? Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. ?? Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. ?? Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Thank you Deborah Kulik

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christina Ku

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:02 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Wildlife corridor laws are intelligent, compassionate and safe methods to protect ALL (humans and all the wildlife who are call this land their home too). Humans cannot be allowed to build, expand without rules to create ways to co-exist with neighbors/wildlife. The myths about restrictions on buildings are perpetuated by developers and owners who only care about profit and money. This state and the entire planet is facing mass extinctions of wildlife at an alarming rate. The Wildlife Corridor proposal is an example of how humans can start an attempt to build smarter taking into account of biodiversity, preservation and respect of nature and wildlife. To fail on this ordinance is conceding to greed, profit and money. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:05 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. We must do what we can to protect ecologically sensitive areas from rampant and careless development. While it will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains, it will also benefit people by encouraging thoughtful development and land use that fosters climate change resilience and the protection of our precious water resources. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to other sensitive habitat areas throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christina Ku

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:08 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. ?? The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. ?? There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. ?? Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. ?? Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. ?? Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Paul

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:27 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi LA City Leaders, As a lifelong resident who was born at UCLA in 1980, I am scared of this new proposal that will drag the city down a dark path of investment flight, a lower available city fiscal budget and even more extreme homelessness. At a time when housing shortages are in all of the news stories, 2 councilmembers are looking for ways to hurt the property owners and developers of the city. Like many other issues recently, trying to rashly adjust one problem many times only leads to a host of other problems. This plan on the new wildlife ordinances brings very little benefit but causes great harm to the communities that it's claiming to help. The tax paying property owners who fund these ideas are directly affected financially by these half baked ideas and threaten their investments and retirement savings. The trickle down affect ends up being that these property owners will have less funds to contribute to extra housing for the poor, less tax revenue for the city and overall less ability to hire and help those in need. Remember the old quote of "high tide lifts all boats" while also understanding the opposite of a low tide lowers all boats. Please don't bring a low tide to the city's housing and real estate needs. We know you mean well. Unfortunately some of the best intentions go horribly wrong. Please save our city from this potential downfall. And yes, we are stake holders who can promise you that the potential consequences of this proposal will be dire. This will cost a lot of money to a lot of people and also put a lot of developers who are currently interested in building affordable housing in a different mind set where their investments will go elsewhere. We are asking the city not to shoot itself in the foot... Not to mention, according to state law this whole idea is illegal to begin with. Please don't bog the city down in a costly and lengthy legal fight over something that hardly any real stakeholder wants. It's not good for the homeless, home owners, construction workers with supporting businesses, and anyone else who wants to live on a thriving city. Many of those people need the city's support but unfortunately if this passes the city will have less revenue from permits, material sales, wage taxes, professional services taxes, lunch time restaurant revenue loss, less beds for people to sleep on and many more... This proposal will have the UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCE of hurting all of these people as well. Is that something that the council really

wants to take credit for (especially considering how the writers strike is hurting people not even in the film industry but a support business). When debating this proposal all i ask is you to keep in mind all of the SUBSTANTIAL UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES this law will have. Please think of all of the people of city and not just a limited few squeaky wheels... There are a lot more points to be addressed but I will keep this email brief. Please just know, in the end this proposal will do more overall harm than good to the city by more than a factor of 10! I'm sure nobody wants to be associated with those type of terrible numbers. Maybe if this was only targeting houses going over 5,000 or 10,000 square feet it might be more reasonable. Targeting every hillside property will be damaging especially considering that not all hillside areas in Los Angeles are wealthy. Many are in poorer areas which this will affect greatly... Thank you for taking the time to read our concerns - I hope you make the helpful choice for your constituents and currently the great city of Los Angeles... Paul



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Melora Harte

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:50 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Wildlife Ordinance council file: 14-0516 I strongly support this ordinance with amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 & 5.. I live in the Hollywood Hills and my greatest joy is seeing Wildlife around every day . They make living in Los Angeles special and unique. We must help the wildlife survive in the Santa Monica Mountains and preserve open space to keep the risk of fires at a minimum.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kathy Schaeffer  
**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 10:24 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please support the proposed Wildlife Ordinance. It will protect thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Development must be carefully considered to protect the areas that our local flora and fauna require for their survival. In addition, protection of our native landscapes and natural resources are vital to reach the City's L.A.'s climate and water conservation goals.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sejal Patel

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 10:37 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of the City of Los Angeles for 25 years, and Commissioner (appointed by Mayor Karen Bass) of the LA Community Forest Advisory Committee, I would like to express my strong support of the Wildlife District Ordinance being considered by the esteemed members of the Planning and Land Use Management Committee of the LA City Council. The ordinance began in 2014 to protect the structurally critical native habitat, flora, and fauna in our global biodiversity hotspot the beautiful Los Angeles basin. This necessary ordinance comes your way with excitement and hope for our City's sustainable future. Now 10 years later, the honorable PLUM committee members are privileged with the honor of establishing your legacy of protecting our home, our planet, and our people for generations to come. How lucky!! Thank you for your commitment to our beautifully sensitive ecosystem to enable its resiliency and thriving!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Paul Martin

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 10:56 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I have owned a home in Pacific Palisades for 30 years. During that period of time I have witnessed parcels of land being snatched up with destruction of trees and wildflowers with no concern for the wildlife that depend on them. Based on my personal observations our wildlife is now less diverse. If Los Angeles is to preserve what is left of our natural environment we need to act now to preserve wildlife corridors and avoid harm to our wildlife from new structures

## Communication from Public

**Name:** John Callas

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 11:01 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Please the Wildlife Ordinance. Thank you. Sincerely, John Callas Pasadena, California

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joanne D'Antonio

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 11:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am in support of Council File 14-0518 -- I lived in the Hollywood Hills for 25 years, and it was no challenge whatsoever to respect the surrounding nature. Owning property in the hills requires people to respect biodiversity, which is necessary for the health of the entire city. Landowners should do their part to be stewards for the native flora and fauna, and their building projects need to respect this co-existence. Concessions to property owners have been made and now, after a nine-year effort, it is time to pass an ordinance to at least offer some protection to the trees and animals, which have been shown scientifically as crucial to the health of the City. Please help the future of LA and vote yes on this ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** JESSYCA NYGREN

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 11:38 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello and thank you for this opportunity for me to make a few points. We have a responsibility to protect the plants, animals and habitats that were here before us. They have no voice but ours to keep them safe and foster an environment to help them thrive. It benefits us all, not to mention the value of health to have open green spaces. Another consideration is how it keeps our property values high to not be absorbed into the concrete jungle like the rest of LA is quickly doing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 11:40 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support enactment of the proposed Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. I am sure all Council members are aware that commercial development will create damage to wildlife that are essential to preservation of our environment, and will otherwise create permanent environmental harm by adding traffic to an already highly-trafficked area, and increase air pollution. If those who support development don't care about the harm which will occur from opposing this legislation, and only care about political power enhanced by the wealthy opposition to this legislation, they should be aware that this will cause many voters who otherwise pay no attention to voting for council members will face vigorous, well-funded opposition to their re-election.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 12:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I along with many others, am in full support of the wildlife ordinance. It is crucial we move forward with it.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jacqueline Keller

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 12:54 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. This is an important ordinance that should be passed immediately, before we destroy even more of our environment. Sincerely, Jackie Keller, a 50 year resident of Benedict Canyon

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Judith Parker

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 01:56 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** CLAW's advocacy campaign, the Wildlife Ordinance, was first introduced in 2014 in response to wildlife destruction in the Santa Monica mountains. The canyons have been built up since then and the ordinance needs to be revised to protect natural resources and wildlife. The ordinance would require new construction to meet certain criteria to maintain wildlife corridors and avoid structures that would injure wildlife. It is imperative that we protect the natural beauty that surrounds us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cybele Pascal

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 02:19 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I am writing to voice my support for the wildlife ordinance. Please protect our wildlife. Their survival depends on your support of this initiative. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robert Mason

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 05:52 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I would like to add my voice to support for the wildlife ordinance. Easy access Corridors have to be constructed to allow wildlife to move from one habitat to another. Issues of danger or inconvenience are not insurmountable. My family lives in the valley where coyotes a mountain lions have been seen. I also have pets and small grandkids but we have implemented family practices to address those issues. We need to embrace a worldview of participation rather than the same old domination perspective that has contributed to the present plight we are living in today. Thanks you

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 06:50 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. ?? The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. ?? There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. ?? Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. ?? Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. ?? Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nikki Alvarado

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 06:59 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to give support to the Wildlife Ordinance to amend Sections 12.03, 12.04, 12.32, 13.21, 13.22, and 16.05 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code. I am a resident of Tarzana and I believe this ordinance should be passed by the City Council.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Todd Durham

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 08:35 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Thank you.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Allison Saldana

**Date Submitted:** 06/17/2023 10:08 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** We need to fully support this wildlife ordinance to protect and secure future biodiversity generations for the purpose of perpetuity. I urge this council to approve this vital ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Adriana

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 07:10 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello office of city clerks, I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. We must act protect wildlife to protect human kind existence. The future is not looking too good for us surviving on earth. We must all work together! Nos is the time to act!! I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. Thanks. Adrianna Holly Place . 90046

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Barbara

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 07:30 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am fully in favor of adopting the Wildlife Ordinance and its amendments! Please consider the ecological balance between man and nature that is so crucial for our planet to survive. We cannot, morally, destroy animal habitats while creating more and more for ourselves. This attitude of greed will eventually lead to nature's response: wildfires, landslides, floods, invasion of host species. We cannot do one thing blindly ( even with safety measures) without harming those that came before us: wildlife. Please look into your heart before making a lifelong decision like this. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kelly Rubin

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 09:02 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elaine Livesey-Fassel

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 01:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As an active animal/environmental activist for some 70 years now, I can attest to the desperate need for our human species to appreciate and support in every way imaginable the remaining wildlife that attempts to live and thrive in our region. Our Santa Monica Mountains is the home of keystone species such as the mountain lion, and we have shown support for P-22 in great numbers which is evidence that many citizens do care for and about their existence. We derive physical and mental benefits from learning about their being as we do about our deep concern about the deleterious effects of lethal rodenticides and other pesticides and pollutants and hunting and trapping which decimates many small creatures. They are stressed and even exterminated by human over -development and resultant habitat fragmentation. We must protect while we can our land, water and air from even more pollutants and most assuredly from the possibility of allowing areas to become built up thereby encouraging the frequency and intensity of intense damaging fire. We must preserve what natural resources with which our area has been blessed while we still can. Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 01:24 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) By jumping in with substantial changes (in the letter dated June 17th) to the Wildlife Ordinance at this late stage and without giving the public a realistic time-frame to comment, undermines all prior public comment and suggestions (hundreds of comments and debate over several long years) as well as the all hard work of the City Planning Department in presenting proposals and counter-proposals to stakeholders and the public at large.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 01:33 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** RE: THE PROPOSED WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (14-0518)  
Information about new and substantial changes to the Wildlife Ordinance just became available to me (a hillside property owner) on June 16, just four days before the PLUM hearing. I would respectfully suggest that the Wildlife Ordinance with proposed changes be sent back to the City Planning Department, or at a minimum delayed so that it may be better vetted and considered by all stakeholders in a timely fashion.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 01:47 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** RE: THE PROPOSED WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (14-0518) I'm staunchly opposed to the adoption of the Wildlife Ordinance as it is unfair to the small home and property owner. A Biological Assessment according to the US Government guidelines is required when evaluating the proposed actions on listed species and on listed habitat, particularly wetlands. The proposed ordinance turns the principle of bioassessments upside down by requiring a Biological Assessment on the chance that something on your lot may be damaging to a species or habitat if your parcel falls within an arbitrary buffer. The chance that this is true is likely zero (unless you are building on wetlands). Here the burden of proof is placed on the landowner. I feel this is an unfair and unreasonable.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Patty Naegely

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 01:52 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance including the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 02:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** RE: THE PROPOSED WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (14-0518)  
Dear PLUM Councilmembers: I was dismayed to learn of new restrictive changes being proposed on the eve of the ordinance going to the PLUM committee with limited chance for input or debate. The new proposals as outlined in the letter dated June 13, 2023 by Councilmembers Nithya Raman and Katy Yaroslavsky substantially change the overall impact of the ordinance with new slope-band requirements. With long-time experience as a builder, and as a hillside home designer for the Los Angeles foothills, I estimate 97-99% of undeveloped lots would be virtually 'condemned' under the changes proposed.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson  
**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 02:08 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518  
**Comments for Public Posting:** RE: THE PROPOSED WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (14-0518) As a hillside property owner and stakeholder I am staunchly opposed to the adoption of the Wildlife Ordinance as it is unfair to the small home and property owner.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 02:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) The recent proposed amendment to the Wildlife Ordinance (dated June 16, 2023) which prohibits building on slope bands of 60% (31 degrees) or greater – throwing out the long-standing Minimum Guaranteed Floor Area Formula means property owners with lots with slope bands greater than 31 degrees will be unable to build. This change will disallow new construction on the vast majority (97-99%) of lots in the foothills and is unfair.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laurie Rittenberg

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 02:58 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ron McGill

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 12:55 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dorrit Ragsine

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 03:19 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident in one of Los Angeles' last areas with small houses on large lots and that has battle with development inconsistent with our existing neighborhood, it is urgent to immediately prevent the further alteration or irreversible loss of wildlife habitat and to minimize future obstacles to wildlife connectivity in the Santa Monica Mountains of Los Angeles. My neighborhood embraces the wild areas and native flora and fauna and believe it is important not only for protecting them, but ultimately protecting Los Angeles from the impacts that property line to property line development has created, not the least of which is the aggregate influence on climate change. We truly need to think in a longer timeframe - seven generations - to preserve and protect natural and undisturbed land in Los Angeles. My home is home to many native wildlife and trees. I consider it my duty to protect their home as I would mine. This plan is reasonable and implementable and hopefully will serve an educational purpose to land developers and help them to recognize the long term impacts of their work so they can evolve their practices. I am fully in support of the Wildlife ordinance. Dorrit Ragsine 3855 Fredonia Drive Los Angeles, CA 90068

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 03:35 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am staunchly opposed to the adoption of the WILDLIFE ORDINANCE. The hillside parcel next to mine is designated as a Wildlife Resource which triggers a Biological Assessment should I decide to build because it falls within a 25-foot Resource Buffer. The lot next to mine has an old foundation, fronts a residential street, and lies within the boundaries of the LAFD Brush Clearance Regulation (200 feet of neighboring buildings). The lot was previously zoned as residential for nearly a century. Wildlife Resources should be limited to water features and riparian areas (the reason US Fish & Game created biological assessments in the first place) and not residential lots that fall within an arbitrary buffer. I've tracked the progress of the Wildlife Ordinance for years joined by many of my neighbors who echo my opposition.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sherrell Cuneo

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 05:23 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** To whom it may concern, Los Angeles lies within one of only 36 biodiversity hotspots recognized worldwide, and has more than 4,000 unique native plants and animals. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Many are unique to this area, and are at risk of going extinct. P-22 and our local population of mountain lions is one such example. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This ordinance will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental health benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. Additionally sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires, this as the threats of wildfires have become a year round concern. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Please pass the new and improved proposed wildlife ordinance. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** t.addison brown

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 06:20 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. Protecting native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. I encourage you to LISTEN to the citizens and include our public comments, concerns and well being in decisions that are being made with regards to the Earth, Our shared habitat. Thank you, t.addison brown resident SM mountains, wildlife conservationist & advocate

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kian Schulman, Poison Free Malibu

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 06:33 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Poison Free Malibu is an environmental nonprofit dedicated to preserving wildlife in the Santa Monica Mountains, California, and everywhere. The Santa Monica Mountains range from Point Mugu to Griffith Park. What affects the wildlife anywhere in the range affects them all, even with the barriers of the 405 and 101 highways. We urge that the strongest possible ordinance be approved, including the amendments submitted by Council members Raman and Yaroslavsky (1) eliminating the 1000 square foot basement exemption and (2) further specifying application materials. This will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. Poison Free Malibu encourages the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles, and protecting ALL of Santa Monica Mountains wildlife.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Georgia Fanthorpe

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 10:47 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** With dramatic mountains falling off sharply into the ocean, and golden hills fading into the distance as far as the eye can see, Southern California is renowned for its beauty. It is why a lot of us live here. I have spent all 23 years of my life living in Los Angeles, and I was lucky enough to be surrounded by coast live oaks, with their distinct curled leaf and sharp spikes. Los Angeles, despite the sprawling concrete, is a fragile ecosystem, and every part is connected. The oaks provide shade, food, and shelter to native animals. The leafs decomposing at the base of their trunks provide nutrients to insects that break down waste. The dense evergreen canopies cool the surrounding air during 100 degree heat waves by upwards of 10 degrees. I understand wanting to live amongst the oaks, but work with them, not against them. I strongly support the wildlife ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Amy Wolfbergt

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 10:54 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a lifelong resident of Los Angeles (born and raised here), I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. In addition to my comments above, we are so very fortunate to live amongst such a dazzling array of biodiversity. It is our moral imperative to ensure flora and fauna in our region not only survives, but thrives now and in the future. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Hunt

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 11:26 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. Living on Fredonia Drive, a hillside community within the ordinance's proposed boundaries, I'm surrounded by a variety of beautiful mature trees. six species are already protected, but the others don't have any protection, even though their canopies help to cool the urban heat island we live in. Hillside land is at a premium, however allowing construction on these wooded parcels of land disturbs the wildlife, who use to forested areas to hunt and feed, and as a corridor to traverse from one safe wild area to another, to mate, raise their young and to keep cool. Developments destroys mature trees, which are home to many varieties of birds as well as to insects and reptiles. We need to look longterm at these special little pockets within the hills, but rather than allowing gated and fenced mansions to be constructed, we should be saving this land from the bulldozer. Leaving it intact, keeping it open and allowing it to breath, for it is the heartbeat of our city. and a lifeline to the natural world.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kira Durbin

**Date Submitted:** 06/18/2023 10:23 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please pass the Wildlife Ordinance. It's the LEAST we can do to try and protect wildlife. In my opinion between the landslides and the wildfires and the lack of sustainable energy infrastructure NO ONE should be building anything in the hills. But at least we can try and protect SOME of our natural resources and wildlife. Please vote yes to support.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan Streaser

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 01:34 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The natural world around us in the City of Los Angeles needs and deserves our protection. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance.  
Susan Streaser Resident: Los Angeles Council District 1



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Hunt

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:02 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. Living on Fredonia Drive, a hillside community within the ordinance's proposed boundaries, I'm surrounded by a variety of beautiful mature trees. Six species are already protected, but the others don't yet have any protection, even though their canopies help to cool the urban heat island that is Los Angeles. Hillside land is at a premium, however allowing construction on these wooded parcels of land disturbs the wildlife, who use the forested areas to hunt and feed, and as a corridor to traverse from one undeveloped area to another, to mate, raise their young and to keep cool. Developments destroy mature trees, which are home to many varieties of birds as well as to insects and reptiles. We need to look longterm at these unique little pockets within the hills, and rather than allowing gated and fenced new homes to be constructed, we should work together to save this land from the bulldozer. Leaving it intact, keeping it open and allowing it to breath, for it is the heartbeat of our city and a lifeline to the natural world.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sofia Lacin

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:28 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. In this time of rampant habitat destruction, we have a responsibility to consider not just ourselves, but also the wildlife we share this land with. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dyan Sublett

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:21 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Santa Monica Mountains are a resource and a treasure. They are a key part of why we live in Benedict Canyon. Protecting plant species, habitat and access for wildlife protects all of us—today and for the future. LA's Wildlife Ordinance is a smart long-range approach to ensuring what we value and need. Don't let short-term greed destroy a resource that will never be replaced.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:45 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi, I'm writing to voice my and many others' opposition to THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518). We are supportive of the measures in the ordinance that are directly related to properly protecting wildlife, but reducing people's buildable size by 50% is an outrageous downzoning, extremely financially harmful and completely unnecessary. 1) Property owners are not opposed to good policy for promoting wildlife and open space protection. However, these new regulations do not work to preserve large open spaces. They don't create corridors between these open spaces that are as free from potential human contact as possible. In fact they do very few things that are actually good for wildlife. This ordinance will gravely affect small property owners, not the mega mansion developers they are claiming to be going after. 2) This set of regulations sets the City in a direct path towards confrontation within the state. This is down-zone plain and simple and thus will run afoul with State law—including CEQA, HAA and other rules regarding zoning. It will end up tying the city up in lawsuit knots for no reason. It will make our housing shortage worse. It will cause more population outflows. And without truly helping wildlife in the region. 3) Due process—this ordinance has been pushed by bureaucratic insiders. It has yet to be fully vetted or even discussed in an open and honest way. Most people in the hills still don't realize what is happening. There have been no major studies on the environmental, economic and housing impacts of this ordinance. There has been no effort made to track down who will be negatively impacted—and how badly. Instead this ordinance continues to be shuttled around the back hallways of City Hall without being truly and openly debated. 4) We ask the PLUM Committee send this ordinance back to the planning department to be fully vetted, to have the parts of the rules removed that don't directly help wildlife and to expand those elements that truly help our wildlife—by formally designating our open areas, to plot out how to connect these habitats and corridors in a way that keeps wildlife out of harm's way (i.e. away from people), and efforts that true wildlife experts have suggested will help LA maintain its unique and wonderful access to nature.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Patt Healy  
**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:06 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please support this ordinance as written. Many thanks. Patt Healy  
Cofounder, Malibu Coalition for Slow Growth.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Patt Healy

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:09 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Malibu Coalition for Slow Growth urges you to recommend the ordinance as written. With Many Thanks, Patt Healy . Co founder

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Yael Pardess

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:09 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. We have seen too many deaths of wild animals trying to cross roads and freeways to survive. They cannot thrive being enclosed in smaller spaces with limited biodiversity and resources or the ability to mate and improve their genetics Please approve the wildlife ordinance and make all efforts to expand it so that all hillsides in LA are included and wildlife corridors are preserved Thank you Yael Pardess

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elizabeth Quayle

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:18 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elizabeth Quayle

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:21 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a Los Angeles resident. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Grant Riley

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I live at the bottom of Roscomare Rd. in Los Angeles. I support the proposed Wildlife Ordinance 100%. We must take stronger action to protect wildlife and biodiversity in our city and, more specifically, in our hillside canyons. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dr. Elsa Knutson

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:48 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Neville Dunn

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:48 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shirley Sacks

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:49 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please allow wild animals, who share our land to be able to take care of themselves by building a corridor for them to transverse. I can see NO reason why we can't do this simple thing to help those who share our world. Shirley Sacks

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jillana

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:51 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeanne McConnell

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 10:09 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles is a biodiversity hotspot. Meaning that it is celebrated for its rich and unique biodiversity however it also means the biodiversity is in severe decline and experiencing unprecedented habitat loss. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica mountains. Many scientists believe we are experiencing the beginnings of the ecological collapse and a mass extinction event. Since the 1970s there has been a 69% loss in species according to the World Wildlife Fund. Much of which is due to development and modern day practices. If Los Angeles wants to become a world class city leading the way in protecting its resources it needs to reverse this trend. The local mountain lion is going extinct. California Black Walnut trees are under threat. The California Black Walnut is considered threatened by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The City continues to issue permits to remove California Black Walnut Trees at a rate of one mature tree every 7.2 days. This ordinance will be a large first step to helping to preserve the local flora and fauna while maintaining access to the connected habitat they need in order to survive. We urge you to pass this ordinance. Thank you Jeanne McConnell Co Founder Angelenos for Trees

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chris Leverich

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Thank you, Chris Leverich



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:30 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ruta Soltanpour

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:13 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Trish Wrenn

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** SAVE THE PUMAS! SAVE THE WILDLIFE! SUPPORT THIS ORDINANCE! I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive. Some effects of habitat fragmentation are not seen until years after development. We cannot sit and wait for these negative impacts to happen before we take action. PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING AND SAVE WHAT IS LEFT OF THE WILDLIFE. SUPPORT THIS ORDINANCE. THANK YOU

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James Hoff

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:42 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I live in studio city near the Santa Monica Mountains and I wholeheartedly support the wildlife corridor. We have few chances left to protect this invaluable wildlife habit. Please pass this ordinance. Thank you, James Hoff

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ron McGill

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:48 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Debbie Reinberg

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:50 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** June 19th, 2023 Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, The Bel Air Hills Association represents approximately 950 homes located within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District ("WLD"). Bel Air Hills is a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, whose homes are primarily smaller 1950's ranch homes on large steep lots with small building pads. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's letter to the PLUM Committee. These concerns, and others, have been previously communicated in our letters to the Planning Department (dated July 28th, 2022) and the City Planning Commission (dated November 14th, 2022). 1. I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. 2. I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees)

contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposal for a blanket reduction in allowed home size on steeper lots is a classic example of regulatory overkill. Simply put, there is no nexus between home size, slope steepness, and wildlife habitat destruction where the home is on an already developed parcel with an existing pad, as is the case of the majority of homes in the WLD. Absent additional grading, which is already regulated under other sections of the Wildlife Ordinance, this reduction in allowable home size severely negatively impacts homeowners while providing minimal benefit to wildlife or biodiversity. Most homes in our neighborhood have slopes greater than 60% (31 degrees), and most of these homes are relatively small in size. Reducing allowable home size for the majority of our residents will prevent needed increases in home size to accommodate growing families, aging parents, and home offices for remote work. The larger homes that exist in our community will be rendered non-conforming, with the attendant mortgage and insurance difficulties. Moreover, this heavy-handed reduction in allowable home size would only worsen the City's housing shortage. The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has already warned the City that reducing RFA below its current level would likely violate California Government Code Section 66300, subdivision (b)(1)(A).

3. I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation.

4. I VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, similar to most in our neighborhood, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these h

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ruta Soltanpour

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:15 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shabnam Bormand

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 08:16 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi, I'm a Los Angeles resident. I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** William Eckert

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jill Henderlight

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:07 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jessica HUEbner

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:17 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Please! I already see terrible fallout from all of the nonstop construction on Mt. Washington Los Angeles where it was one of the last open areas for wildlife. Please! I support this!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Usha Peddamatham

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:25 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lauren Rodriguez

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:17 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's letter to the PLUM Committee.

1. I OPPOSE Councilmembers Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's proposal to revert to Version 2's inclusion of non-Open Space designated City-owned vacant land in the definition of Open Space. Per the Planning Department, this change would place Resource Buffers on approximately 1000 adjacent parcels, requiring the owners of those adjacent parcels to undergo expensive and time-consuming Site Plan Review for Projects. The mere fact that the City owns the unimproved parcel does not justify this result, especially where the City itself has declined to designate the parcel as Open Space.
2. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section Section F.1(j) that requires trash cans to be stored in a building or special enclosure. According to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) and the Planning Department, these trash can enclosures would be considered structures and thus prohibited in side and front setback areas. Consequently, they would need to be situated in the central portion of homeowners' backyards. Most homes in our neighborhood are on small pads with small or non-existent back yards, and some back yards are only reachable by stairs. Having odorous and unsightly trash cans enclosures in the middle of our small back yards is untenable, as is dragging them up and down stairs - especially for the elderly or disabled. Storing odorous, insect-attracting trash cans in the garage is equally unacceptable. Additionally, given that Wildlife intrusion into trash cans stored behind fences on homeowners' properties is extremely rare, and that Wildlife resistant latches are readily available for under \$20, this regulation is wholly unreasonable.
3. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section F.1(j) for

Site Plan Review for homes resulting in greater than 6,000sf. The 6,000sf threshold is too low. The Planning Department has stated that the average new/rebuilt home in the WLD is over 6,000sf, consequently this regulation would require that the majority of new/rebuilt homes undergo Site Plan Review. 4. I OPPOSE the failure of Section H.3 to provide for a simplified review process in cases where a Resource is erroneously mapped and does not actually exist in the mapped location and/or where it is clear that the Project would have a negligible impact on the Resource. The Planning Department has not verified that the Resources are accurately mapped, and the Wildlife Ordinance unreasonably shifts this burden to the homeowner at the significant expense and difficulty of a Site Plan Review and Biological Assessment. See Exhibit 1 for examples. 5. I OPPOSE the failure of Section E.1 to exclude homes destroyed by casualties other than natural disasters (e.g. cooking or electrical fires) from the Wildlife Ordinance regulations. This failure is entirely unreasonable and will result in homeowners having difficulty obtaining mortgages or refinancing. 6. I OPPOSE the failure of F.1(e)(2) to utilize R1 and R2 Zoning rather than lot size in determining which parcels are subject to the Wildlife Ordinance's Lot Coverage regulations, and to give an overly generous Lot Coverage allowance to large parcels. Many RE zoned homes in the WLD are on lots that are smaller than R1/R2 lots. Our neighborhood, although zoned primarily RE-15, has several such lots (e.g. lots of 6,000sf - 7000sf) and these homeowners would be greatly burdened by the application of a 50% Lot Coverage limit to their properties. This burden on homeowners of smaller parcels is especially galling in the face of the absolute gift to developers of mega-mansions of up to 100,000sf of Lot Coverage for larger parcels. It is these mega-mansion Projects that have a negative impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity, not the small parcel home. 7. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of a basement exemption, contrary to CPC recommendations. I propose basement exemptions that equal the footprint of the ground/main level of the home. This will not affect wildlife or biodiversity and should remain an option to property owners, especially since they are not allowed to utilize SB9 or 10, due to other area conditions.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:04 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I represent the homeowner of a property within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District ("WLD"), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's letter to the PLUM Committee. 1. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section F.1(j) for Site Plan Review for homes resulting in greater than 6,000sf. The 6,000sf threshold is too low. The Planning Department has stated that the average new/rebuilt home in the WLD is over 6,000sf, consequently this regulation would require that the majority of new/rebuilt homes undergo Site Plan Review. This requirement would increase the uncertainty, cost and time of building a new home, at a time when construction costs are at an all time high. Furthermore, this would affect property values and therefore, property taxes that the city receives negatively affecting the city's tax revenues. 2. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of a basement exemption, contrary to CPC recommendations. I propose basement exemptions that equal the footprint of the ground/main level of the home. This will not affect wildlife or biodiversity and should remain an option to



property owners, especially since they are not allowed to utilize SB9 or 10, due to other area conditions. 3. We OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation. 4. We OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these homes up to current standards and building codes significantly increases the likelihood of exceeding the Major Remodel threshold. Consequently, it is crucial to exempt owner-occupied homes of a certain age from this category of Project. 5. We OPPOSE the requirement in Section F.1(j) that requires trash cans to be stored in a building or special enclosure. According to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) and the Planning Department, these trash can enclosures would be considered structures and thus prohibited in side and front setback areas. Consequently, they would need to be situated in the central portion of homeowners' backyards. Some back yards are only reachable by stairs. Having odorous and unsightly trash cans enclosures in the middle of our back yards is untenable, as is dragging them up and down stairs - especially for the elderly or disabled. Storing odorous, insect-attracting trash cans in the garage is equally unacceptable. Additionally, given that latches are readily available for under \$20, this regulation is wholly unreasonable. 6. I OPPOSE the failure of Section E.1 to exclude homes destroyed by casualties. This failure is entirely unreasonable and will result in homeowners having difficulty obtaining mortgages or refinancing. This resolution is bad for the CITY AND HOMEOWNERS!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maryfrances Careccia

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:31 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi! We've done so much damage to wildlife and their habitats, and we owe it to our fellow creatures to do the right thing!!! I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. PLEASE VOTE YOUR CONSCIENCE!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joseph Cioffi

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 04:34 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. Our city is more than just the streets, buildings and people that live here. Choosing to ignore the flora and fauna removes unique assets to our city that not only benefits wellness of the citizens (and the flora and fauna) but also acts as a meaningful attraction for citizens and business owners who want to live near these areas. Importantly these area increase property values. The Wildlife Ordinance is a no brainer and would serve to continue to push the reputation of City of Los Angeles as a national leader of wildlife and citizen wellness.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dixie Holtz

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 05:49 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I do not support the passage of the Wildlife Ordinance and amendments as currently proposed. It compromises we property owners' rights and if there are changes that would help the wildlife, they should not so impact the rights we assumed upon our purchase, e.g. reduction of size of a proposed dwelling improvement.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** BIJAN

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 05:55 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Patricia Zingheim

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:29 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly object to two of the revisions proposed by Nithya Raman and Katy Yaroslavsky to the Wildlife Ordinance (CF 15-0518): 1. The limitation on calculation of RFA for 60% slopes, and 2. The 1000-sf basement restriction. These two new restrictions are overkill because the already-proposed Wildlife Ordinance's restrictions have covered the intent of what the two Council members are proposing, specifically: 1. 45' height restriction. 2. Grading restrictions. Additional reasons include: 1. You are impacting the small homeowner with these restrictions whose houses are on slopes. With the 45' height and grading restrictions, the Wildlife Ordinance will not even allow me to build the same size residential area. These two restrictions will reduce my square footage likely to less than ½. My 4,500-sf house built in 1956 is on a steep slope undeveloped below the house. It is not a McMansion. As an FYI, not all of us in the pilot area are wealthy—some of us are hard-working professionals who bought their houses many years ago and this is their most significant asset. 2. As one of most respected Los Angeles' environmental scientists said, animals are not challenged by slopes—they can handle the slopes as they have before any development. 3. A lot of consideration went into developing the Wildlife Ordinance with public input, including feedback from the Bel Air-Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council. Last year, this Council, considered a thoughtful group, spent over 20 hours in special sessions about what was reasonable and fair to all, including property owners. Their recommendations did not include these two new proposals although they discussed these—I listened to all the sessions as an interested homeowner. 4. What is the number of homes who will have their resulting square footage limited under these new proposals and what is the loss of square footage if they were to rebuild? If so, please tell us these results. A homeowner impact study should be done before making these additional restrictions. 5. Changing it in the 11th hour without public comment is not honorable. Most of your latest work was likely with environmental activists who include a small group of homeowners but likely not the majority of homeowners if they knew about this new proposal. I consider myself an environmentalist but want reasonableness. 6. Other homeowners not in the pilot area but in the City of Los Angeles and Santa

Monica Mountains should be notified that this will be happening to them and the City should get their public comment. I hope you do not approve the two new proposed restrictions: 60% RFA restriction and basement restriction. Sincerely, Patricia K. Zingheim 1541 Bel Air Road, Los Angeles, CA 90077

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gary Davidson

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:39 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District (“WLD”), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, whose homes are primarily smaller 1950’s ranch homes on large steep lots with small building pads. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky’s and Ramen’s letter to the PLUM Committee. I OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 09:56 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Any action that limits further devastation and fragmentation of our natural wildlife habitat is vitally important so we don't lose what cannot be replaced. Our wildlife is precious and our quality of life depends upon it.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tom Sherman Oaks resident

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 10:05 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District (“WLD”), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, whose homes are primarily smaller 1950’s ranch homes on large steep lots with small building pads. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky’s and Ramen’s letter to the PLUM Committee. 1. I OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. 2. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposal for a blanket reduction in allowed home size on steeper lots is a classic example of regulatory overkill. Simply put, there is no nexus between home size, slope steepness, and wildlife habitat destruction where the home is on an already

developed parcel with an existing pad, as is the case of the majority of homes in the WLD. Absent additional grading, which is already regulated under other sections of the Wildlife Ordinance, this reduction in allowable home size severely negatively impacts homeowners while providing minimal benefit to wildlife or biodiversity. Most homes in my neighborhood have slopes greater than 60% (31 degrees), and most of these homes are relatively small in size. Reducing allowable home size for the majority of our residents will prevent needed increases in home size to accommodate growing families, aging parents, and home offices for remote work. The larger homes that exist in our community will be rendered non-conforming, with the attendant mortgage and insurance difficulties. Moreover, this heavy-handed reduction in allowable home size would only worsen the City's housing shortage. The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has already warned the City that reducing RFA below its current level would likely violate California Government Code Section 66300, subdivision (b)(1)(A). 3. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation. 4. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, similar to most in our neighborhood, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these homes up to current standards and building codes significantly increases the likelihood of exceeding the Major Remodel threshold. Consequently, it is crucial to exempt owner-occupied homes of a certain age from this category of Project. WHY ARE MY COMMENTS LIMITED ON SUCH AN IMPORTANT ISSUE OR ANY ISSUE? more comments next submission!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Roger Hollander

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 10:42 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Thank You  
Roger Hollander

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brandon Younesi

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 10:57 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I Object to the Wildlife Ordinance. This unduly burdens homeowners in the area that have purchased homes to now have their property values unduly burdened under the guise of wildlife protection. There are thousands of other ways to preserve our wildlife than to impose development restrictions. Already many homeowners are burdened via zoning, lot coverage, slope bands, etc. There is no need to add even more restrictions. Instead the council is choosing to burden homeowners to perpetuate an agenda that has nothing to do with wildlife and drum up support for financially burdening these homeowners under a noble cause stimulating support for those who do not live in these areas or own property in these areas. We need to object this ordinance and work toward a more sensible and sustainable solution that does not place the entire burden homeowners.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:04 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael & Cheryce Fischer

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:13 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** June 19th, 2023 Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District ("WLD"), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, whose homes are primarily smaller 1950's ranch homes on large steep lots with small building pads. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's letter to the PLUM Committee. I OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance I OPPOSE the requirement in Section E(1)(e) and Section F.1(f), as to non-native trees only, that 2 new trees be planted for the removal of each non-native Significant (aka large) tree. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section F.1(f), as to non-native

trees only, that prohibits grading or construction within the dripline of a Significant (aka large) tree. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section Section F.1(j) that requires trash cans to be stored in a building or special enclosure. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section F.1(j) for Site Plan Review for homes resulting in greater than 6,000sf. I OPPOSE the failure of Section H.3 to provide for a simplified review process in cases where a Resource is erroneously mapped and does not actually exist in the mapped location and/or where it is clear that the Project would have a negligible impact on the Resource. I OPPOSE the failure of Section E.1 to exclude homes destroyed by casualties other than natural disasters (e.g. cooking or electrical fires) from the Wildlife Ordinance regulations. This failure is entirely unreasonable and will result in homeowners having difficulty obtaining mortgages or refinancing. I OPPOSE the failure of F.1(e)(2) to utilize R1 and R2 Zoning rather than lot size in determining which parcels are subject to the Wildlife Ordinance's Lot Coverage regulations, and to give an overly generous Lot Coverage allowance to large parcels. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section F.1(c)(2)(i)(a) to the extent that it would prohibit stairs and decks on slopes greater than 100% (aka 45 degrees). I OPPOSE Councilmembers Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's proposal to revert to Version 2's inclusion of non-Open Space designated City-owned vacant land in the definition of Open Space. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of a basement exemption, contrary to CPC recommendations. I propose basement exemptions that equal the footprint of the ground/main level of the home. This will not affect wildlife or biodiversity and should remain an option to property owners, especially since they are not allowed to utilize SB9 or 10, due to other area conditions. I sincerely hope that the above explanation of the impacts of just some of the proposed regulations makes clear that the current version of the Wildlife Ordinance is deeply flawed. Sincerely, Michael and Cheryce Fischer 1059 Somera Road Los Angeles, CA 90077



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mariam Shah-Rais

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:29 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a Los Angeles resident. I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gloria Chavez

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 11:41 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please vote against this destructive bill! Limiting square footage does nothing for the wildlife but it will disproportionately impact people of color in Los Angeles! Help!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jane Nachazel-Ruck

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:14 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Janet

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:41 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Sincerely, Janet Albaugh  
2750 Hutton Drive LA CA 90210

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Hunt

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:47 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. Living on Fredonia Drive, a hillside community within the ordinance's proposed boundaries, I'm surrounded by a variety of beautiful mature trees. Six species are already protected, but the others don't yet have any protection, even though their canopies help to cool the urban heat island that is Los Angeles. Hillside land is at a premium, however allowing construction on these wooded parcels of land disturbs the wildlife, who use the forested areas to hunt and feed, and as a corridor to traverse from one undeveloped area to another, to mate, raise their young and to keep cool. Developments destroy mature trees, which are home to many varieties of birds as well as to insects and reptiles. We need to look longterm at these unique little pockets within the hills, and rather than allowing gated and fenced new homes to be constructed, we should work together to save this land from the bulldozer. Leaving it intact, keeping it open and allowing it to breath, for it is the heartbeat of our city and a lifeline to the natural world.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Hunt

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:47 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance. Living on Fredonia Drive, a hillside community within the ordinance's proposed boundaries, I'm surrounded by a variety of beautiful mature trees. Six species are already protected, but the others don't yet have any protection, even though their canopies help to cool the urban heat island that is Los Angeles. Hillside land is at a premium, however allowing construction on these wooded parcels of land disturbs the wildlife, who use the forested areas to hunt and feed, and as a corridor to traverse from one undeveloped area to another, to mate, raise their young and to keep cool. Developments destroy mature trees, which are home to many varieties of birds as well as to insects and reptiles. We need to look longterm at these unique little pockets within the hills, and rather than allowing gated and fenced new homes to be constructed, we should work together to save this land from the bulldozer. Leaving it intact, keeping it open and allowing it to breath, for it is the heartbeat of our city and a lifeline to the natural world.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:54 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable members and Los Angeles city planning staff. I do recognize the need for protection of wildlife and biodiversity, and would welcome a factual wildlife ordinance based on the scientific data, I do not support this wildlife ordinance as it is not factual or scientific. I request the PLUM committee, the city Council, and the planning department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed wildlife ordinance and united oppose this proposal. I propose that the plum committee reject the current wildlife ordinance in its entirety, and direct city planning to draft an appropriate wildlife ordinance that relies upon factual research to better protect wildlife and biodiversity, without unduly, burdening the ordinary homeowners However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations. content in the current proposed wildlife ordinance, and in council members Yaroslavsky's and Ramen's letter to the PLUM committee. 1. I oppose the failure of the wildlife ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/ pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. 2. I oppose the proposal, forwarded by council members, Yaroslavsky and Ramen, to reinstate the dis allowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% or 31° contained in version two of the wildlife ordinance Sincerely,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Martin Pichinson

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 04:24 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** When is it time to say, "so called progress" is more important than nature? We have so little beauty left, surrounding our wonderful city and we have already destroyed enough. History will memorialize how we continue to destroy our natural habitat, when we all now know that climate change is real. What are we leaving for future generations? More buildings and less nature? Isn't it enough that a developer is trying to build an hotel that is not needed? The questions is always, WHY? "Why do we need something that is not needed, but destroys what we have?" When do we as citizens of this planet and specifically the great city of Los Angeles and say, "we have destroyed enough?" Shouldn't we be protectors and guardians of our trees, animals and nature? We have so little left. What is going on,? Why do our City Leaders want approve the destruction of our wildlife and natural surrounding? What are they thinking as we continue to destroy? It is time to give back to the beauty and serenity of our city, not continue to destroy and take away. The continued destruction is nothing more than greed and profit for the few. Their stories and reasoning are all hype with twisted truths of what they believe is better for the city. It is not better for the city as it is all about what the "few" want for themselves! Personally, I do not get it. ENOUGH! We as a society have destroyed enough all because the few share their flawed reasoning of why it is ok to take away. Nonsese. Thank you.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jenny Mangelsdorf

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 04:24 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please vote for the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. As a fourth-generation Angeleno, our wildlife has been horribly harmed over the past 50 years. The city needs this ordinance to help our remaining wildlife survive while still protecting property. Please adopt this district ordinance as soon as possible so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. If our wildlife cannot live here, it will not be a viable place for humans either, much less remain the beautiful environment people want to live in and attract visitors to spend their vacation time. Thank you for setting the standard for what Los Angeles used to be and will be for the future.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christopher Geukens

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 04:40 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat needed to thrive. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants and wildlife. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 04:46 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to urge you to support the Wildlife Ordinance and the recently proposed amendments as I am a long time resident of Benedict Canyon. I am hoping that the Santa Monica mountains and the Canyons can continue to be a safe place for the various animal and plant species that inhabit the area. This is what makes the mountain and canyon areas so unique and special to those of us who live here. In addition, each year brings the threat of fire as more and more development is allowed. I recall the Bel Air fire which was the first of many fire experiences in my lifetime. It is terrifying. I hope that we can avoid such an fearful incident like that by protecting our mountain and canyon areas. Thank you.  
Susan S

## Communication from Public

**Name:** JOANNE SHINOZAKI

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 04:55 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** PLEASE SUPPORT THE WILDLIFE ORDINANCE AND PROTECT WHAT MAKES LOS ANGELES SPECIAL! I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat needed to thrive. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants and wildlife. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Caitlin

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:20 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kate

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:20 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stacy Tinker

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:20 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** John Paladin

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:21 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. We don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. There should be more safe wildlife crossings over freeways, highways and busy streets. John Paladin, Box 801777, Valencia, CA 91380.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. We don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Amy Squires

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:23 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Los Angeles City Council, I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. With thanks, Amy Squires Hawthorne, CA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Debra Lichstein

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:25 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I reside in Agoura Hills and strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Kadin

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:25 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear PLUM Committee, Thank you for your diligence in reviewing the proposed Wildlife Ordinance. As residents in Benedict Canyon which is in the affected zone, we strongly support the Wildlife Corridor/Santa Monica Mountains (Hillside Ordinance Zone)/Zone Change and support Councilmembers Raman and Yaroslavsky's letter of 6/13/2023. which strikes a fair balance of interests of property owners and of those individuals and organizations seeking to preserve our fragile, unique and necessary habitat . As their letter states, preparing for climate change and bolstering biodiversity by fostering wildlife connectivity alongside responsible development patterns must inform land use decision-making and process going forward. It is critical to protect and enhance wildlife corridors, crossings, and connectivity in Greater Los Angeles for climate resilience. The city also needs an open space buffer of 50 feet that allows for site plan reviews across the street from open space. If the 25-foot buffer is maintained, the width of streets and roads must be removed from the distance from open space to make sure projects on the opposite side of the street are reviewed. Access to nature is essential for our communities, so we have to ensure that land use decisions enable equitable access and conservation of open space. Sincerely, David and Ana Kadin 1611 San Ysidro Drive Beverly Hills, CA 90210

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mirja Bishop

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:30 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a long time resident of Los Angeles and a BIG time animal advocate. Please follow the recommendations as below. Thank you! I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brandi

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:30 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a citizen of Los Angeles I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with development. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:37 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:38 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** darynne jessler

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:42 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** BRENDA BARNETSON

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:42 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** • I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. • Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. • Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kaye Clarke

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:43 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a Los Angeles resident and I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please have the foresight to adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Scottie Hileiao

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:45 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I have lived in Los Angeles 90034-7005 for over 60 years. I am in the same house my father lived in and my Grandmother & Grandfather. I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. This includes all of the Santa Monica Mountains and make the oil drill site and places around it in Baldwin Hills as Green Spaces. We are already seeing negative impacts of habitat fragmentation as animals have little space to live and grow safely with habitat they need. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. The Los Angeles community truly appreciates your support, compassion, to save wild animals in our area!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Julie M Desnick

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:57 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:01 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Let's think about the future NOW and support this Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Steve D

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 05:52 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:17 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michelle Geil

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:27 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi! I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Please know despite the pre-written paragraphs, these are all important points that we need in our city for health, habitat and safety. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carol Iu

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:32 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a LA City resident and I'm writing to support the Wildlife Ordinance and the Amendments by District Council 4 and 5 because I care deeply for wildlife diversity and I believe wildlife should have safe passages in the area instead of having to dangerously navigate fragmented habitat. The animals are part of our ecosystem and we as human beings should do all we can to responsibly care for their well being.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jillana

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 06:38 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Sir/Madam: I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. These animals need a place to circumvent human urban sprawl and vehicle collisions. We have left these animals with nowhere to go, but we must share the earth with other species, and this will go a long way to ensure their safety. Please help them survive humankind. Very Sincerely, Mrs. Jill Laufer

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jerry

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:26 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Insert Name Insert

Relevant Title, Examples: Homeowner, Realtor, Contractor,  
Environmental Advocate, Social Justice Advocate, or Builder

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Faina Schwartzberg

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:28 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Faina Schwartzberg,

## Homeowner and Environmental Advocate

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chuck Maginnis

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:31 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am truly upset that the letters written by Councilmember Katy Yaroslavsky and Nithya Raman were submitted to PLUM with NO NOTIFICATION or INPUT from the constituents they represent. What a sad day this is for the hillside communities in Los Angeles as this appears to have the drumbeat of special interest groups like CLAW. One also has to ponder whether this might have been hurried to help discourage the hotel being challenged in Benedict Canyon hills. Having retired from Bel Air Beverly Crest Neighborhood Council after 20+ years and as Safety Chair for most of them, I firmly oppose the restrictions these two councilmembers have taken upon themselves to initiate. They appear to have ignored the many months of discussion and hearings we have all participated in prior to their election. Our largest investments and lifetime savings are at stake! I hope they will read our complaints and reconsider their undemocratic actions.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Francois Appiah

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:31 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. We always go to other parts of the world to admire what they have because they preserved what they have and show it to us. Let us preserve what we have and let that attracts others to come and see and learn from us. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. Let us protect our native landscapes is a vital part of reaching L.A.'s goals regarding climate change resilience and water preservation. This will help protect the water we drink every day, and the air our children breathe. Let us create an atmosphere where LA will lead and our cities will lead climatic action. Preserve Santa Monica Mountains for now and future. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Steve Bardack

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:41 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a real estate finance expert. The proposed Wildlife Ordinance will reduce the lot values of the impacted hillside homes by 50-100%. This will results is tens of billions is reduced tax assessed values and the loss of hundreds of millions in LA property taxes. What is your plan to solve this shortfall?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Simin Tabibnia

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:42 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** From Simin Tabibnia, Real Estate Agent Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Mauricio Umansky

mumansky@theagencyre.com Lic. #1222825

## Communication from Public

**Name:** josie benjamin

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:45 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Josie Benjamin,

Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Armen Sarkissian  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:47 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Armen V. Sarkissian





## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jonathan Genish  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 02:55 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jonathan Genish

Homeowner, Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan Cai

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 03:09 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive, and also preserves natural spaces for everyone to enjoy. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lillian Cai

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 03:14 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Santa Monica Mountains in LA County remains one of the only areas along urbanized cities that is still pristine with high ecological value and intact biodiversity. Habitat fragmentation has become one of the largest threats to biodiversity and the ecosystem. We are already seeing genetic bottlenecks in our local mountain lion populations. It is critical that we require new infrastructure to consider all environmental factors that may have adverse effects to wildlife connectivity. How much more do we have to lose before we start acting proactively to protect our natural environment?

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 03:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 03:23 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joseph C

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 04:24 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Joseph A. Camile



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 04:30 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** This ordinance is very deceptively named. It will do little to help the wildlife and endangered species but will put an undue and great financial burden on those who are living in the hillsides covered by this ordinance. I would like to city to undertake a comprehensive Financial Impact Study along with a study that quantifies the beneficial impact on wildlife. The manner in which this ordinance is being promoted seems to be less democratic and more special interest. Those impacted have not been properly informed of the pros and cons and neither have they been given a proper chance to express their opinions. If this ordinance is passed, i expect legal challenges with serious cost to the taxpayer.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Katz

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 04:40 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, David Katz

Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Anglisano

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 05:13 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed Hillside Ordinance, specifically its potential implications on property development and the lack of evidence supporting the claimed wildlife preservation objectives. While I wholeheartedly support initiatives aimed at wildlife preservation, it is evident upon reading the full draft that the majority of the outlined restrictions are anecdotal and fail to provide substantial evidence of their effectiveness. Having examined the recent hillside ordinances, I find that there are already significant limitations on property development. It would be pertinent to assess the wildlife impact of these recent ordinances, as conducting such studies would provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of the proposed restrictions outlined in the current draft. Square footage and basement restrictions do not have a direct correlation with wildlife conditions. These restrictions do not preserve wildlife habitats on a property. The size of a property or the presence of a basement does not dictate the quality of wildlife habitats or their overall well-being. Wildlife conservation and preservation require comprehensive strategies that address factors such as habitat availability, food sources, water access, and ecological connectivity, rather than focusing solely on property characteristics. The focus should be on enhancing the quality of habitats rather than imposing restrictions based on square footage or basement presence. Implementing measures to promote biodiversity, such as creating wildlife corridors, planting native vegetation, providing nesting sites, and managing invasive species, can have a more significant impact on wildlife populations. These actions encourage the establishment of sustainable ecosystems that support a variety of wildlife species. Furthermore, wildlife species have shown remarkable adaptability to various environments, including urban and suburban areas. Restricting square footage or basement use limit human activities, but it does not restrict wildlife movements or their ability to find suitable habitats. Wildlife often adjust their behavior and find alternative resources within the available landscape. Therefore, it is crucial to focus on creating wildlife-friendly environments rather than imposing additional arbitrary development restrictions. Imposing these restrictions will not effectively preserve wildlife habitats, but in fact will have unintended consequences. For

example, homeowners may feel discouraged from creating wildlife-friendly gardens or providing nesting opportunities if their property size is limited. The disproportionate impact of targeting basements and square footage penalizes environmentally conscious homeowners. These restrictions could also lead to increased habitat fragmentation as smaller properties may have limited space for wildlife to thrive. Considering alternative approaches that incentivize wildlife-friendly practices rather than imposing restrictions will yield better outcomes. Basement and square footage restrictions ignore the ecological impact of the flat pad of the house, cantilevered decks, and landscaped areas; of which are not incentivized to foster or enhance wildlife habitats. This alone negates the intent of grading and property development restrictions set forth in the proposed ordinance. Wildlife conservation is a complex and multifaceted issue that requires a thorough science-based approach, which the current property development restrictions fail to address. Rather than imposing property-based restrictions that are not proven to enhance wildlife habitats, broader conservation strategies that involve a range of stakeholders can have a more positive impact on wildlife. This can include community engagement, education programs, land-use planning, habitat restoration initiatives, and collaborations with local wildlife organizations. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will give due consideration to the concerns raised and take appropriate action to address them. I look forward to a response regarding the steps being taken to ensure a balanced approach to wildlife preservation and property development in the Hillside areas.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Andy

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 05:31 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The proposed bill is not applicable to the current LA real estate market and should not be passed. This should not be the driving force that drives home values down.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jason Pietruszka

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 05:46 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jason Pietruszka -  
Homeowner, Contractor, Builder.



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 06:08 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Wildlife Ordinance because it protects both wildlife and property interests while enacting reasonable restrictions on new construction. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kimberlina Whettam

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 03:01 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council, I would like you to consider that the wildlife ordinance be limited to protecting wildlife only and not be a cover to further restrict the size of homes in the hillside. The ordinance draft has grown to be a fourth reduction in home sizes in the last 12 years. I love our wildlands confined within this beautiful City of Los Angeles and we all want to take measures to protect the associated wildlife. I typically do not speak out about policy changes, however, this one is absurd as currently drafted. The issue is that the City of LA is looking at making sweeping changes that will further limit the size of homes in the hillside all under the guise of a wildlife ordinance. I am not sure how removing a basement saves wildlife, grading for a basement has a 1-time impact and actually reduces above grade density. Reminder that the City already passed three ordinances that drastically limited the size of homes (BHO in 2011, further amended in 2017 + the HCR Limitations in 2017). These were all publicly noticed with explanations re: reductions to the size of homes. The wildlife ordinance did not complete any studies with respect to the true impacts to the thousands of homes in the hillside. Overall, I think 99% of people would be in full support of the ordinance if you make 3 changes to this policy: • Maintain RFA exemption for basements underneath the footprint of the first floor (there is no savings to the wildlife by restricting the size of basements) • Maintain RFA allowance for slopes > 60% (I do not believe you have the right to take away a property owner's right to build on an already residential zoned parcel) • Remove Site Plan Review requirements (this is insanity to require an entitlement for a SFD. You will case additional costs and major time delays and further bog down an already taxed City Planning Department. How do you justify the cost and labor to review SFD projects when we have a housing crisis? There would still be thousands of properties affected by the Wildlife Resource buffers which I do find very problematic as the map of these is absurd (city drainage easements are mapped as "Resources", for example), but overall massing allowances would remain intact. A much simpler solution would be to increase yard setbacks. I do not understand why this policy grew to be more complicated than it needed. I implore you to hit the "pause" button and complete a series of studies of what the true impacts are with the current policy and adjust the policy

before proceeding. Otherwise, I cannot support this policy as drafted. Sincerely a resident of CD3 and small business owner of a development consulting firm + previous CD5 staff member.  
Kimberlina

## Communication from Public

**Name:** ROBERT GARFIELD

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 03:35 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of Los Angeles and as a homeowner I object to the Wildlife Ordinance as it is presently written. As before with previous drafts, it appears that we homeowners involved in this proposal are being deceived without fair representation. Please hold more public hearings on the proposed Wildlife Ordinance. Respectfully submitted, Robert and Arlene Garfield 2720 Aqua Verde Circle Los Angeles, CA 90077-1502 310-890-4363

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Wesley Edberg

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 04:03 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Sincerely,

## Homeowner and Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 04:05 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jacqueline Freedman

## Environmental Advocate



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lori Caden

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 06:21 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** You have named this proposal the "Wildlife Protection" proposal, and yet its language does absolutely nothing to in fact protect the Wildlife Corridor. This appears to be an ongoing tactic by our government to pull at the hearts of its voters with proposal names that would get the public involved for a matter they are deeply concerned about, and yet the language within does nothing to help these poor animals. How does forcing a homeowner to include their home's total square footage (a basement located directly underneath the livable space above, protect wildlife? This ruse is another unacceptable tactic. DO SOMETHING to actually protect teh Wildlife Corridor. These last-minute additions without notification to citizens is very sneaky!!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Drew

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:38 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** ?Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Drew Mandile .

Brooke Knapp Real Estate Advisors Mandile / Knapp Team  
310.749.7124 Sotheby's International Realty  
Drew.Mandile@Sothebys.Realty DRE Lic# 00412173 Mandile |  
Knapp | Biography 9665 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 400 Beverly Hills,  
CA 90212

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:55 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a lifelong resident watching the endless growth unfold, sadly to say our wildlife has suffered from the elimination of their habitat. The least we can do is find a way to foster a safer environment for those that remain. This measure seems a reasonable way to accomplish that. I, as many hope you see the benefit of enacting this measure. Seems a cost effective way to preserve what is left of once was bountiful. Do the right thing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Diana Kliche

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:13 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. We truly appreciate your support to save wild animals in our area!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Justin

**Date Submitted:** 06/21/2023 01:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District (“WLD”), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, whose homes are primarily smaller 1950’s ranch homes on large steep lots with small building pads. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky’s and Ramen’s letter to the PLUM Committee. 1. IOPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. 2. IOPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposal for a blanket reduction in allowed home size on steeper lots is a classic example of regulatory overkill. Simply put, there is no nexus between home size, slope steepness, and wildlife habitat destruction where the home is on an already developed parcel with an existing pad, as is the case of the majority of homes in the WLD. Absent additional grading, which is already regulated under other sections of the Wildlife Ordinance, this reduction in allowable home size severely negatively impacts homeowners while providing minimal benefit to wildlife or biodiversity. Most homes in my neighborhood have slopes greater than 60% (31 degrees), and most of these homes are relatively small in size. Reducing allowable home size for the majority of our residents will prevent needed increases in home size to accommodate growing families, aging parents, and home offices for remote work. The larger homes that exist in our community will be rendered non-conforming, with the attendant mortgage and insurance

difficulties. Moreover, this heavy-handed reduction in allowable home size would only worsen the City's housing shortage. The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has already warned the City that reducing RFA below its current level would likely violate California Government Code Section 66300, subdivision (b)(1)(A). 3.

IOPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation. 4.

IOPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, similar to most in our neighborhood, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these homes up to current standards and building codes significantly increases the likelihood of exceeding the Major Remodel threshold. Consequently, it is crucial to exempt owner-occupied homes of a certain age from this category of Project. 5.

IOPPOSE the requirement in Section E(1)(e) and Section F.1(f), that 2 new trees be planted for the removal of each non-native Significant (aka large) tree. This regulation poses a significant fire hazard. Section 4906.4.2 of the 2023 California Fire Code

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shelly Greenfield  
**Date Submitted:** 06/21/2023 07:37 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Insert Name - Insert



Relevant Title, Examples: Homeowner, Realtor, Contractor,  
Environmental Advocate, Social Justice Advocate, or Builder.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/21/2023 08:47 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman, that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance, with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written, the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions, and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however, that will not be the impact. Without the amendment, we will have another well-intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle-class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis, and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Andrew & Ben J Ben

Bourgeois Homeowner Andrew Rhoda Homeowner, Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Steven Hamblin  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:39 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Steven Hamblin

Coldwell Banker Realty 301 N Canon Drive Beverly Hills,  
California 90210 DRE#02001018

## Communication from Public

**Name:** sachha smith

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:40 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** susan smith

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:40 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Danny Brown

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:41 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** ? Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Best regards, Danny Brown Principal



Luxury Estates Division DRE# 01335192 Compass M:  
310.901.7405 E: [dbrown@compass.com](mailto:dbrown@compass.com) W:  
[www.dannybrownla.com](http://www.dannybrownla.com) Podcast THE DEAL

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Melissa Ryan

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:42 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Melissa Ryan

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Oliver Thornton  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:47 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I hope that this email finds you well. I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation and Gratitude, Oliver

Thornton Co-CEO of Hollywood Estates, Partner at Thornton  
Development Group

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Vanessa Shealy

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:47 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Vanessa Shealy

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michelle Schwartz

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:47 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Michelle Schwartz

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Clemens Mandell  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:49 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Clemens Mandell,

Realtor



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:50 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cory Weiss

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:50 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Cory Weiss

## **Communication from Public**

**Name:** Lucien Lacasse  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:52 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518  
**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly oppose this unfair proposal.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jennifer Purdue

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:53 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets With Appreciation, Jennifer Purdue -

## Homeowner & Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Vincenzo DiMauro

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:54 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Vincent DiMauro

Director, Luxury Estates SFJ Group | [sfjgroup.com](http://sfjgroup.com) M.  
917.536.5838 | O. 310.579.2200 | DRE# 02048914 Compass  
Beverly Hills, 9454 Wilshire Blvd, 4th Floor, Beverly Hills, CA  
90212

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dimitri

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:54 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets With Appreciation, Insert Name - Insert



Relevant Title, Examples: Homeowner, Realtor, Contractor,  
Environmental Advocate, Social Justice Advocate, or Builder.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** KC

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:55 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kathryn Kidd

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:57 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I totally join in with CLAW in supporting the Wildlife Ordinance as well as the amendments. How can wildlife survive in the Santa Monica mountains without this in place? The animals and their welfare in this area are extremely important to me and we need to do everything possible to protect them and make sure they thrive! Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael H Collins

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:57 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of missionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Michael Collins

Coldwell Banker Global Luxury I CalRe#00963037 c:  
310.413.1100 e: Michael@MichaelCollins.com I  
MichaelCollins.com 301 North Canon Drive Suite E I Beverly  
Hills, California 90210 Instagram I Facebook I LinkedIn I Yelp I  
Zillow

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:57 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Oren David

Mordkowitz Realtor Homeowner Environmental Advocate (818)  
933-5866 Direct

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Annie Challis

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:59 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting



people off of the streets. With appreciation ANNIE CHALLIS  
Associate Broker Coldwell Banker Realty 301 N. Canon Drive,  
Beverly Hills, Ca 90210 anniechallis@mac.com 310 720 1234

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maya Hazen Manshel

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:00 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Maya Maya Hazen

Manshel Estates Director Aaron Kirman Group | Christie's  
International Real Estate 310.902.5060 Mobile mayamanshel.com  
DRE 01920190

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Natalie Amir

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:00 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Wendi Chandler  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:00 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19--VOTE NO! Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, WENDI  
CHANDLER, REAL ESTATE AGENT WITH SOTHEBY'S  
INTERNATIONAL REALTY. THE BRENTWOOD OFFICE  
(310) 435-2488

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Saul R. Smith

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Saul R Smith,

Homeowner.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Zachary Schiller  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:07 PM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Zachary Schiller

Homeowner, Environmentalist, Social Justice Activist CEO  
Boies/Schiller Entertainment

## **Communication from Public**

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:09 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Voicing my opinion in Opposing the ordinance

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Rick Beck

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:10 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, THEAGENCY A

Global Marketing and Sales Organization RICK BECK  
Broker-Associate I Global Luxury Specialist NAR-Global  
Council Committee t: | m: 310 990 7925

## Communication from Public

**Name:** RJ Kas

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:13 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Sincerely, Richard

"RJ" Kas Coldwell Banker Realty | CBRE | KAS & KAS, Inc.  
CalDRE # 01352771

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Susan B Janneck

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:13 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I do not support the current version of the Wildlife Ordinance because it fails to distinguish between pristine undeveloped land and already developed properties, and consequently many of its regulations are overly burdensome for residents while providing insufficient protection for wildlife. There is too much left unsaid and the people that will try to regulate this will put undue burden on tax payers and homeowners. How can they encourage adding on a dwelling for more density in the suburban area and then say you cannot build more than an allotted amount on each parcel of land. Also, last time I looked, I did not have any animals traversing thru my back yard. Racoons and squirrels and bunnies and rats, yet but not the big animals. It is very restrictive for us and the Santa Monica Mountains are there for that purpose.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nadia K

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:14 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Sincerely, Nadia Kas

Bel Air Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dr Jeremiah Eden

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:16 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Dr Jeremiah Eden

DPT, Realtor, Investor.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joline S

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:18 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. Our local wildlife is already at an extreme disadvantage when it comes to surviving in our modern landscape. This ordinance will ensure there are more systems in place for our local species and plants to coexist so that future generations can appreciate the unique life and nature that Los Angeles offers. Please consider this important initiative. Thank you!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeffrey Greenfield

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:22 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jeffrey Greenfield,

Developer Red Door Homes, Inc.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James b. Rea, Jr.

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:28 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I could not attach my Objection Letter so I emailed it today and completed this form. Best regards, James B. Rea, Jr. 2305 Donella Circle Los Angeles, CA 90077



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Darlene Kelly

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:28 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Darlene Kelly

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sun Kim

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:31 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the wildlife ordinance because, as an LA resident, primarily chose to move to LA for its unique wildlife (ex: oak trees and mountain lions) so this ordinance will help protect native inhabitants instead of causing more destruction and traffic.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ian Reed

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:32 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Ian Reed ,

homeowner in Sherman Oaks hills and Realtor who specializes in  
home along the Mulholland Corridor. Ian Reed

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Howie Nicoll

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:27 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Howie Nicoll MS  
Property Partners Keller Williams Beverly Hills

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brynn Sutherland  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:27 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Brynn

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jodie Francisco

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:28 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jodie Jodie E.

Francisco Berkshire Hathaway Home Services California  
Properties 14141 Ventura Blvd Suite 8 Sherman Oaks, Ca. 91423  
cell 818-970-3936 <http://www.jodiefrancisco.com> DRE #  
01330628



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Francis LaRocca

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:28 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello all, Please vote NO on agenda item 19. This is an obvious anti-development issue disguised as an environmental measure. There are much better ways to protect our environment that dont remove thousands of jobs from our less fortunate neighbors and millions of tax revenue dollars from our City. Please help and vote NO! Thanks, Frank

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Derick Vallance  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:28 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Derick Vallance, --

THEAGENCYA Global Marketing and Sales  
Organization DERICK VALLANCERegional Managert: | m: 310  
871 4663TheAgencyRE.comDRELic#.01746208

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Pate Steve's

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:28 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Pate Stevens

HomeOwner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** William Harris

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:29 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Re: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. Sincerely, Donny Harris Home Owner,  
Construction Professional and Environmental Advocate

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kim K

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:30 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Kim K



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Christian Padilla

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Monica Hegedus, MD

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I urge you to please pass this ordinance. As a physician, I am aware of the importance that a healthy ecosystem plays in the health of not only the animals within it, but the people as well. I support this ordinance and strongly believe that it is possible to develop communities in which we respect our surrounding environment and the animals within it. Not only is it in our best interest to do so, but this is becoming a more popular idea which will be attractive to consumers when looking for properties. I hope that you support this ordinance. Thank you for your consideration, Dr. Monica Hegedus

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Raquel Oberfeld  
Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Frank

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hi Everyone! Pleeeeeeaaaaase vote NO on Agenda Item 19. I understand that the top 1% of Angelenos dont want neighbors with bigger houses than theirs but this is not the way! Construction in these areas provides jobs for working families and gives our kids the opportunity to go to college and maybe buy a home someday. This is just not right!!! Please vote NO. I appreciate your time. Thanks! Frank

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gloria Carmona  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:33 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Danny M.

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, DANNY



MAHELKA Coldwell Banker Commercial NRT Associate  
Manager 301 N. Canon Dr. Suite E, Beverly Hills, CA. 90210  
Cell (213) 359-4097 |Office (310) 887-0220 Email:  
Danny@Lasold.net CAL DRE: 01170359

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nicole Howard

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:34 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Nicole Howard 11:31?AM (0 minutes ago) to Councilmember.Harris-Dawson, Councilmember.Yaroslavsky, councilmember.rodriquez, heather.hutt, Councilmember.Lee Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibly of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't

meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,  
Nicole Howard Homeowner Realtor Thank you, Nicole Howard  
REALTOR® 310.617.7257 DRE 01968285

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hollywood Hills West Resident

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:35 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a relative newcomer to the Cahuenga pass/Mulholland area, as I've only lived here for six years. But even in that "short" amount of time, I've witnessed the importance of maintaining and helping wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains. From deer to bobcats, I've seen all walks of life in my own backyard that I hope to share with my soon-to-be born daughter. To me, it's a miracle that we are able to experience nature so closely. I've also witnessed the degradation of the habitat. A couple of years ago, a wildlife corridor was recently all but destroyed due to a mansion being built on our street. There was a fight put up by residents, which ultimately fell short. I've seen a decline in wildlife. On a side note, the most regrettable part is that the owner rented out the property, which is now occupied by folks who throw regular parties (and have been cited more than once). Whatever the cause, the streets are frequently littered. Put differently, we've replaced natural beauty with trash and careless partygoers. What a shame. Now, this may not be true in every scenario, but in mine it is. I wholly support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Leslie Y. Chacon

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:35 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the right of nature, which includes the wildlife who have the pure instinct to survive as nature designed. It is we, the humans who must align with the survival of all that walk this earth, and earth itself. TOGETHER WE CAN CO- EXIST .

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Everett Peña

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:36 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Everett Peña Everett

S. Peña, Realtor Cell: 323-841-8881 CalRE# 01958136 Coldwell  
Banker Realty 301 N. Canon Dr., Beverly Hills, Ca 90210

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Billy Rose

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:36 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Billy Rose Founder



of The Agency, Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:38 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dan Ricketts

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:33 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** From: Dan Ricketts Date: June 20, 2023 at 12:31:00 PM PDT To: councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org, Councilmember.Yaroslavsky@lacity.org, councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org, heather.hutt@lacity.org, Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 ? Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to

build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,  
Dan Ricketts Homeowner 5th Council District

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kathleen Wright

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:35 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Kathleen Wright P.S.  
Concentrate on elderly being evicted from apartments -- due to  
inflation, they cannot make ends meet, and have no place to go,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nathan Karimi

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:37 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District (“WLD”), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, whose homes are primarily smaller 1950’s ranch homes on large steep lots with small building pads. While I recognize the need for protection of Wildlife and Biodiversity and would welcome a well-designed Wildlife Ordinance founded on scientific research, I do not support this Wildlife Ordinance as it is neither of those. I urge the PLUM Committee, the City Council, and the Planning Department to respect the will of the affected residents of the proposed WLD, who overwhelmingly oppose the Wildlife Ordinance in its current incarnation, as evidenced by their comments submitted to the Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. I would strongly prefer that the PLUM Committee reject the current incarnation of the Wildlife Ordinance in its entirety, and direct City Planning to draft a Wildlife Ordinance that relies upon scientific research to better protect Wildlife and Biodiversity without unduly burdening the ordinary homeowner. However, if that will not be done, I wish to express my vehement opposition to the following regulations contained in the current proposed Wildlife Ordinance, and in Councilmembers Yaroslavsky’s and Ramen’s letter to the PLUM Committee. I OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposal for a blanket reduction in allowed home size on steeper lots is a classic example of regulatory overkill. Simply put, there is no nexus between home size, slope steepness, and wildlife habitat destruction where the home is on an already developed parcel with an existing pad, as is the case of the

majority of homes in the WLD. Absent additional grading, which is already regulated under other sections of the Wildlife Ordinance, this reduction in allowable home size severely negatively impacts homeowners while providing minimal benefit to wildlife or biodiversity. Most homes in my neighborhood have slopes greater than 60% (31 degrees), and most of these homes are relatively small in size. Reducing allowable home size for the majority of our residents will prevent needed increases in home size to accommodate growing families, aging parents, and home offices for remote work. The larger homes that exist in our community will be rendered non-conforming, with the attendant mortgage and insurance difficulties. Moreover, this heavy-handed reduction in allowable home size would only worsen the City's housing shortage. The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has already warned the City that reducing RFA below its current level would likely violate California Government Code Section 66300, subdivision (b)(1)(A). I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, similar to most in our neighborhood, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these homes up to current standards and building codes significantly increases the likelihood of exceeding the Major Remodel threshold. Consequently, it is crucial to exempt owner-occupied homes of a certain age from this category of Project. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section F.1(f), as to non-native trees only, that prohibits grading or construction within the dripline of a Significant (aka large) tree.



## **Communication from Public**

**Name:** Joe Nowell

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:37 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I do not support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:42 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Thanks for your time.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James Hubble

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:43 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** We've heard about what you want to do. This is what we're going to do:- If this ordinance passes, we will submit the information we have about the corruption and bribe taking in Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, through our lawyers, to request an investigation be opened (a further investigation that is) It is the practice of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (a number of the staff there) to use the complexity of the LA ordinances to exact bribes from applicants to process and approve building permits. Corruption thrives in bureaucracy. Often the enormous complexity, internal inconsistency of the Planning code and vastness of it's controls renders a home on a sloped lot ineligible for anything at all. That's where the delinquents rush into – to collect their money – some of the staff in LA DBS. What we will ask the FBI to investigate is whether LA Planning staff are connected to these corrupt schemes in LA DBS. Whether in fact there is collusion between LA Planning – they to make the Ordinances even more complex and burdensome so that the easier way – in fact the only way - is for the applicant is simply to pay money under the table. We make a promise – if you pass this deceptive ordinance – that is what we will do We're looking forward to it James Hubble PS Why was this meeting announced with only 3 or 4 days notice? - We're watching you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** B. Broide

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:22 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Planning Department took great pains to oversee and implement a long and very inclusive process in the crafting of the ordinance now being considered. There were multiple opportunities to participate in the process and to weigh in. Unfortunately, some residents did not get involved until they realized that a new measure might have an impact on their own property. Many have been rallied by developers who profit from building large homes. That should not be a reason to delay or derail the current measure which has created very important guidelines to support healthy and sustainable development in our hillsides for all creatures that inhabit the area. It should be considered a privilege to live in the hillside areas where there are many environmental challenges, particularly with climate change. Land in the hillsides, a high fire severity zone, is already shielded from some of the new land use policies that protect the low-density nature of the area. The recognition of the need to tailor future construction to allow for the survival of wildlife, and not only humans in the hillsides, is critical. One can wander the hillsides and see many oversized developments that create impassable islands on the landscape and that helped to inspire the measure before you. They cannot be permitted to continue to eat up the remaining open space. Concessions must be made to foster the survival of the wildlife who have always made their homes in these hills. I urge support for the measure and its advancement to the full Council for ratification.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jared M Page

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:45 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jared Page Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:51 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:53 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gabriel M

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:55 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** CORRUPTION! Councilmember Yaroslavsky and Councilmember Ramen:- In the strongest possible terms, I urge you not to get involved in the corruption of the planning/building process in the City of Los Angeles. There are several reports out that in order to get a building permit under the existing Hillside ordinance, that it is necessary to bribe staff at LA DBS. Serious allegations - and serious acts. The whole scheme relies on the fact that the Hillside ordinances and overlays created around 2009 to 2014 (and before) are so draconian - regulating every inch of private property - height, setbacks, volumes, grading, parking, that it is darn near impossible if not impossible to comply with the Ordinance to either build a new home, or make renovations to an old one (and as well all know, the majority of homes in the Hills are older) Do not enable these corrupt acts by building permit staff by creating yet more bureaucracy Do not aid and abet them. It's time to make the point directly. Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen and other Council members - if you continue with this utter madness and folly, with the deceptive 'Wildlife Ordinance' - too funny - we will take every opportunity available to us to stop you. You - as an individual - will be sued and investigated. It's not a threat - it's an absolute promise Gabriel M.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ryan Jancula

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 12:58 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Ryan Jancula

Principal & Lead Broker DRE#: 01904981 m: 310.729.6852  
Compass Office Locations: Via De La Paz, Pacific Palisades, CA  
90272 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90405 [janculagroup.com](http://janculagroup.com)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joshua Morrow

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:00 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Joshua Morrow  
Husband, Broker, Investor, Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Colin Davis

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:02 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Colin Davis and I live in the district. I welcome this ordinance having seen recent construction impact the wildlife in my area. We had multiple owls and other animals inhabit our neighborhood and even with the welcomed rain, the wildlife has not been the same since the construction. It is vital to me that we continue to consider the long term impacts of injuring our ecosystem. With climate change and other negative impacts we cannot pile on to things that hurt our environment. Thank you,  
Colin

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gregory Brody

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:03 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Greg Brody Builder

## Communication from Public

**Name:** ERIC DOBKIN

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:12 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, ERIC DOBKIN



DOBKIN CONSTRUCTION, INC

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ladd P Jackson

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:29 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, -- Ladd Jackson -

Check out my step-by-step home Buyer/Seller Guide - My business depends on your referrals. Please forward my info to anyone you know that might be looking to Sell or Buy a home or condo. DRE #01405651 310-346-1744 [www.laddjackson.com](http://www.laddjackson.com)  
Carolwood Partners, Inc. 9440 Santa Monica Blvd. 8th Beverly Hills, Ca 90210

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Caroline Kelly

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:32 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council members,I am begging you to vote no on agenda item 19 or at least revise it so that it doesn't deccimate property values for people like my mother. She is 77 years old and within a few years will need to sell her home, which is in the hills of Bel Air in order to move to a smaller property. It is her main asset and the only way she will be able to fund the move. Currently, there is a 10-15,000 square foot home being built right next door and another home that will be at least 6-10,000 square feet on the other side of her. Her lot is huge but your current agenda item will prevent any new home buyer from building anything approaching those homes. Any home built will be dwarfed by the neighbors. It will easily cut the value of her land by at least half. There are already extensive hillside ordinances in place. There has also been extensive construction already done. Putting this ordinance in place penalizes people like my Mom, who pretty much lives on a small pension from my late father and social security. The part of the ordinance banning basements will hurt her the most. EVERY single home built in the last decade on her street has added this level, including the houses on either side of her which are currently under construction. Please at least get rid of this terrible provision that doesn't help nature and destroys the property value. Thank you, Caroline Kelly

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Arsine Mnatsakanyan

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:33 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** We oppose the proposed wildlife ordinance as it will have detrimental effects on any proposed future projects in the proposed catchment area of Los Angeles. We hope that a middle ground can be found that can please all stakeholders.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cynthia Biret

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 01:35 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** It is imperative to approve the wildlife ordinance to preserve natural open space, to prevent wasteful development, and to protect our ecosystem and wildlife, such as mountain lion's habitats and corridors.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jacob Greene

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jacob Greene



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Heidi Mackay

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:34 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Wildlife Corridor/Santa Monica Mountains (Hillside Ordinance Zone)/Zone Change. I also support Councilmember Yaroslavsky's Amendments letter of 6/13/2023. Preparing for climate change and bolstering biodiversity through wildlife connectivity, along with compatible development must be the basis for the land use process. It is essential to protect and enhance wildlife crossings and connectivity to allow adaptation and survival as the climate changes. All these steps will foster access to nature, which improves community quality and equity. Please do not bow to developers and homeowners. The Baseline Hillside Ordinance has, unfortunately, not prevented the destruction of our precious and irreplaceable wildlife and habitat resources in the Santa Monica Mountains. If you care about the future of our City and the planet, and the health of Los Angeles Residents, you will enact the Wildlife District with the Yaroslavsky Amendments. The Planning Commission and City Council need to prove that they are operating in an ethical manner and not chasing dollars.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laura Hamilton

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:40 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I fully support this ordinance to help preserve habitat connectivity. I hope it will act as a strong foot in the door for future bills that aim to protect our wild spaces. This is a huge priority to me. In light of the devastating losses of species and biodiversity our planet is suffering, this is, literally, the least we can do.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mitchell Guzik

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:47 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** 1. Property owners are not opposed to good policy for promoting wildlife and open space protection. However, these new regulations do not work to preserve large open spaces. They don't create corridors between these open spaces that are as free from potential human contact as possible. In fact they do very few things that are actually good for wildlife. This ordinance will gravely affect small property owners, not the mega mansion developers they are claiming to be going after. 2. This set of regulations sets the City in a direct path towards confrontation within the state. This is down-zone plain and simple and thus will run afoul with State law—including CEQA, HAA and other rules regarding zoning. It will end up tying the city up in lawsuit knots for no reason. It will make our housing shortage worse. It will cause more population outflows. And without truly helping wildlife in the region. 3. Due process—this ordinance has been pushed by bureaucratic insiders. It has yet to be fully vetted or even discussed in an open and honest way. Most people in the hills still don't realize what is happening. There have been no major studies on the environmental, economic and housing impacts of this ordinance. There has been no effort made to track down who will be negatively impacted—and how badly. Instead this ordinance continues to be shuttled around the back hallways of City Hall without being truly and openly debated. 4. We ask the PLUM Committee send this ordinance back to the planning department to be fully vetted, to have the parts of the rules removed that don't directly help wildlife and to expand those elements that truly help our wildlife—by formally designating our open areas, to plot out how to connect these habitats and corridors in a way that keeps wildlife out of harm's way (i.e. away from people), and efforts that true wildlife experts have suggested will help LA maintain its unique and wonderful access to nature.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Duane Clark

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:53 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council Members, I would like to lodge my objection to Wildlife Ordinance #CF14-0518 in its current draft form. In concert with BAHA (Bel Air Hills Association) which has provided you with a more detailed assessment of the Ordinance's shortcomings, I would voice my voice my concerns that the draft provides insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. Regards, Duane Clark

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/19/2023 07:53 PM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am using the words of In Defense of Animals with which I agree wholeheartedly. I was born and raised in LA. There were farms bordering our backyard in North Hollywood. Animals, wild and domestic are crucial for people, who are, actually animals. We need to protect them. Here are the words provided by IDA: I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Please adopt the ordinance so that your grandchildren will NOT despise you. Thank you for your time and attention.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christy Schilling

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:13 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. The Santa Monica Mountains are a natural resource and treasure for all of Los Angeles. Maintaining healthy connections within this resource ensures that all Angelenos can attain the physical and mental benefits that come with access to the natural spaces of this ecosystem. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their home in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some can only be found in this area. Others are at risk of going extinct, such as our local population of mountain lions. All of them are affected by sprawling development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they need in order to thrive.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lorraine Becker

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:09 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Wildlife Ordinance We understand the premise of the Ordinance and agree with it. What we don't agree with is how, as written, it will affect the properties that are already in the ordinance area. It is a wonderful idea to keep the pristine land the way it is, but the built-upon land shouldn't have to suffer. If we had a fire or natural disaster that took our home we would want to be able to rebuild the same home again. As the current ordinance is written, we would not be able to do so. We homeowners need protection too. Please take us into consideration. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** SUELLEN WAGNER

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:11 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a 30 year resident of the Santa Monica Mountains, within the proposed Wildlife District, and Board Member of Save Coldwater Canyon!, I support the Wildlife Corridor/Santa Monica Mountains (Hillside Ordinance Zone)/Zone Change. I also support Councilmember Yaroslavsky's Amendments letter on 6/13/2023. Preparing for climate change and bolstering biodiversity through wildlife connectivity, along with compatible development must be the basis for the land use process. It is essential to protect and enhance wildlife crossings and connectivity to allow adaptation and survival as the climate changes. All these steps will foster access to nature, which improves community quality and equity. Please do not bow to developers and homeowners that for some reason expected to fully develop each inch of their property. That was never promised and the Baseline Hillside Ordinance has, unfortunately, not prevented the destruction of our precious and irreplaceable wildlife and habitat resources in the Santa Monica Mountains. If you care about the future of our City and the planet, and the health of Los Angeles Residents, you will enact the Wildlife District with the Yaroslavsky Amendments. The Planning Commission and City Council need to prove that they are operating in an ethical manner and not chasing dollars.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ken Goeller

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:12 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** You are effectively stealing from my retirement. I purchased my home 21 years ago, knowing that it would appreciate in value. This law reduces my home value, and therefore I view this law as theft. A reduction in the value of my home is going to have a tremendous impact on my retirement and standard of living. I urge you to vote no.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Samantha Lau

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:58 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of Los Angeles since 1982, I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael Guivatchian

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:59 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I object to basement size and grading quantity limitations ; We just went through major ordinance covering the hillside , in 2018. Why another attempt on further decrease in size , with a mis-named ordinance that has nothing to do with wild life. !!! Eliminating the basement sq footage . Counting the Grading quantities from the basement. How would such a requirement help either the wild life or even the ridge line protection. Why would someone place such burden on property owners if it does not serve any of the such mentioned intentions. These grading volumes are coming from below structures and do not impact on any wild life , nor will have any visual effect consequences. But they will make many building non economical. And many houses too small. And reduce the Property tax and school tax basis. All this to the benefit of no one. only argument supporting the basement reduction I have seen is that it creates burden on streets while exporting the dirt and also have our effect on land alteration. 1- Already there are numerous ordinances that have passed ( only within the last 10 years) placing limitation on grading quantities and haul routs. where will this continues crusade stop. this matter has already been addressed. 2- if by land alteration , one means the alteration at the property under construction , what kind of statement is this ? the alteration is happening from below footprint of the building. very illogical statement. if it means alteration at the receiving property , those properties are usually out of the crowded city areas and do not have any impact on the city of LA. and many cases are used for fabrication flat lands in the county or outside of the county. 3- depriving the city for revenue , now and during the life of a house ( for a century or so ) , only to have less driving on the streets while exporting the dirt is illogical. just think of it ; especially if you are so pro education and pro other services that you expect the city to provide for the poor and environment. loss of school fees at the permit stage , loss of property tax (almost as much as 30% of the tax revenue) for almost a century. who looses ? Poor , students , fire , environment , and ..... who gains , no one rents increase in the city , since less room to live or rent or have ADU less space to have basement garages , and that will burden the hillside streets . less space for family expansion. with elimination of basement , or reduction of it , no visual gain for the city , no

visible land alteration , no wild life protected , Please think Why are you even considering this. All you need to do is to have one sentence added to the previous ordinances ,. limit the basement boundaries to the footprint of the floor above it. that is it. no other limitation is logical. not even placing grading quantity limitation , nor square foot limitations. placing other limitations on basement size or inclusion of its grading in the grading quantities is like the city shooting her own leg, with absolutely no gain for any one nor for environment , but many many losses at many front . losses for home owner , for poor , for schools , for fire services , for other environmental services, for human services that city provides and needs the revenues for. !!!!!!!!! take 1000 sq ft limitation out take the grading quantity inclusion out we need more space and what better way than having this space coming from below the footprint without other visual effects on the city . I would think , a liberal, pro environment person would welcome and support such means. a larger basement will be all gains for such an activist . Think Think Think.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Priscilla

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 06:31 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello: I am a Los Angeles resident and have been living in LA County since birth. I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. Thank you for protecting our wildlife - they deserve our respect & consideration as much as any other citizen of LA. Sincerely, Priscilla

## Communication from Public

**Name:** KIM SANTELL

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As an L.A. County resident and voter, I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Helping wildlife helps us all. Thank You, Kim

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carmen Totty

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:43 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I deeply and strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the Amendments proposed by Council District 4 & 5. We truly must protect our natural resources in this vast city of Los Angeles. They are a treasure and a home to so many wildlife. Sincerely,  
Carmen Totty

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Samantha Lau

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:51 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stephen Bresnick, M.D.

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:19 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** THE PROPOSED WILDLIFE ORDINANCE IS A VIOLATION OF MY PROPERTY RIGHTS. The ordinance does little to protect wildlife, as the major roads, such as Beverly Glen Blvd which my home abuts is a major kill zone for wildlife, taking the lives of racoons, skunks, coyotes and other animals regularly. Like other parts of our city, I should retain the right to completely rebuild my home if it is damaged in an earthquake or fire and add and ADU as allowed by state law. I should have the ability to add square footage to my home based on my lot size in accordance with current building regulations. The city does not have the right, without appropriate notification of my community with wide mailings and extensive publicity, to enact restrictive property regulations and violate our community rights. This proposed legislation is being pushed by organizations and activists who do not live in our community and seek to hurt hillside property owners. There are ridiculous provisions in the proposed ordinance that anyone who has lived on the hillside would know based on our life experiences. I live adjacent to a busy road (Beverly Glen Blvd) and need security fencing to keep homeless people from camping or trespassing onto my property. My neighbor who lives on the same road just had a home invasion last month and my family must have appropriate security from trespassers and criminals. The ordinance restricts my ability to protect my family by not allowing protective fencing. This is not acceptable. Many of the homeowners that this provision will injure will link and obtain legal remediation, including a lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles. We have much to lose if this unfair, illegal, and injurious policy is implemented. I plan to participate in any legal action to protect the rights of my family and our property. Stephen Bresnick, MD Beverly Glen Terrace, Sherman Oaks

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stacey C

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 07:25 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a resident of Benedict Cyn for 25 years , I am MORTIFIED by this ruling you are trying to sneak behind homeowners backs !!!!!!!!!!! Its' an insult to our intelligence !!!!! Having several people decide about 10000's of residents homes and properties is mortifying . NO WAY do I support your plan regarding Wild animals . Your decision is unfathomable Go protect the people that work hard in LA from the crime drug addicts and homeless tents Not freaking wildlife Stacey Cohen

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Win Holtzman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 06:39 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Fifth Amendment provision bars the Government from taking private property for public use absent just compensation, “the takings clause.” Our family has owned a three-acre vacant lot at 1740 Summitridge Dr. for more than 60 years. For about 10 years now, Los Angeles politicians seem to believe that they can use our property for their personal agendas without any just compensation, despite seriously eroding our property rights and decreasing the value of the property. It is our property, not some activists groups property. You have done enough damage, and it is time to stop. Win Holtzman 6/20/23

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation

## Communication from Public

**Name:** July Scott

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, July Scott --

THEAGENCY A Global Marketing and Sales Organization  
JULY SCOTT Marketing Manager | Grauman Rosenfeld m:  
415.855.5141 GraumanRosenfeld.com | TheAgencyRE.com

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:18 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written, the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Luz Rincon



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jaron Robbins

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:18 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Jaron Robbins 9:17?AM (0 minutes ago) to Councilmember.Harris-Dawson, Councilmember.Yaroslavsky, councilmember.rodriquez, heather.hutt, Councilmember.Lee Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us

create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, THEAGENCY A Global Marketing and Sales Organization JARON ROBBINS Director of Operations | Grauman Rosenfeld Group m: 424.343.6775 [GraumanRosenfeld.com](http://GraumanRosenfeld.com) | [TheAgencyRE.com](http://TheAgencyRE.com)

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:30 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Renee.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Bianca Fields

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Bianca Fields The  
Agency in Beverly Hills Real Estate Agent

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Robert Rave

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:34 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I am writing in opposition to the Wildlife Ordinance and many of its restrictions. I am a home owner of a small home on a steep sloped lot, with a small growing family. The current WLO would restrict the ability for me to expand (possibly at all) to accommodate my family, while still providing ample opportunity for larger lots to develop in a less controlled manner. This ordinance hurts families like mine, severely limiting the largest investment we've made in our life. The restrictions of the ordinance are not proven to help wildlife, and solely are being used to control property development in an unlawful way. We ask that you please reconsider the drafting of this ordinance to be more focused and less damaging to small hillside properties. Thank you for time and consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ron Holliman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:37 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please !Remove the Wildlife Ordinance from their June 20th meeting agenda until proper outreach has been conducted with your constituents, not activist groups that endorsed your campaigns.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Roxan Rivas

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:42 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Pacoima Beautiful supports the Wildlife Corridor/Santa Monica Mountains (Hillside Ordinance Zone)/Zone Change and supports Councilmembers Raman and Yaroslavsky's letter on 6/13/2023. As their letter states, preparing for climate change and bolstering biodiversity by fostering wildlife connectivity alongside responsible development patterns must inform land use decision-making and process going forward. It is critical to protect and enhance wildlife corridors, crossings, and connectivity in Greater Los Angeles for climate resilience. The city also needs an open space buffer of 50 feet that allows for site plan reviews across the street from open space. If the 25-foot buffer is maintained, the width of streets and roads must be removed from the distance from open space to make sure projects on the opposite side of the street are reviewed. Access to nature is essential for our communities, so we have to ensure that land use decisions enable equitable access and conservation of open space.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Guy Levy

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:42 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Guy Levy, Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Walter Lamb

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:43 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support a ordinance to provide stronger protections for wildlife in the Santa Monica Mountains. It is critical for future generations of people and wildlife that we do everything we can to strengthen protections. Special interest groups will undoubtedly oppose stronger protections, but the City should act in the interest of all residents, including those who may not be in a position to attend meetings or otherwise get engaged.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** James Harris

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:44 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** James Harris 9:43?AM (0 minutes ago) to Councilmember.Harris-Dawson, Councilmember.Yaroslavsky, councilmember.rodriquez, heather.hutt, Councilmember.Lee Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibly of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us

create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Best, THEAGENCY Redefining real estate JAMES HARRIS  
Principal o: 7424 400 5915 | m: 310.733.8038 TheAgencyRE.com  
Lic# 01909801

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alex Molloy

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:45 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Alex Molloy and I live in the district and I welcome the LA Wildlife Ordinance because it protects our wildlife coordinators and I have seen first hand how new development has hurt our ecosystem. We recently have had a large house constructed without wildlife consideration and has change the path of bobcats, coyotes and deer in our neighborhood. Our mountains are a vital resource in protecting the land for ALL!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Patricia Shenker  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:46 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Councilmembers- I am here today to strongly urge your support of the Wildlife Corridor. LA's magnificent wildlife needs this corridor if they are to survive here & most Los Angelenos want them to be able to survive and thrive in and around our city. We all know the tragedies that befell P-22 who was sick due to rodenticides and then struck by a car and P-65 who was only 5 years old when she succumbed to the five different coagulants rodenticides that she had ingested through eating prey animals. They are just two of the mountain lions who we have tragically lost. However, there is some good news. P-77 has given birth to three female kittens. This gives us even more reason to pass this corridor so these babies have a chance of surviving and hopefully, thriving and having their own babies in the future. To give them the best chance of living a full life, as well as other wildlife, we MUST create and protect habitat connectivity as well as ban rodenticides, which kills them in a very inhumane manner or make them sick and more likely to be killed. According to Our World In Data- wild mammals globally account for 4% of the Earth's biomass while humans account for 34% and livestock make up 62% of the world's mammal biomass. In my opinion, this is a global tragedy! LA's wildlife has so many challenges- rodenticides, freeways, encroachment on their habitat due to human overpopulation and livestock and this corridor will be one big way to help them survive. As the great environmentalist, Sir David Attenborough, said- "In our hands now lies not only our own lives BUT that of all other living creatures with whom we share this earth." Let's do right for them! Please pass this wildlife corridor so the wildlife can enjoy their lives and we can know we helped to make that happen for them. Patty Shenker & Doug & Julia Stoll 5441 Dubois Ave. Woodland Hills, Ca. 91367

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Anita Kostas

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:49 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am born and raised in California and I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance and the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5 to improve connectivity and biodiversity for wild animals who currently struggle to survive in a fragmented habitat. Please adopt this ordinance and expand it to sensitive habitats throughout Los Angeles. Sadly, we don't see the negative impacts of habitat fragmentation until it's too late. Please approve the Wildlife Ordinance before wild animals are only part of our historical landscape. Open space helps us reach our climate change goals and reduces fire risks that mount with irresponsible development. I live in an area where they are constantly developing housing tracks with little regard for environmental impact.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:50 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** June 19th, 2023 Via Email and Messenger Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District (“WLD”), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, with smaller homes. 1. I OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. 2. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposal for a blanket reduction in allowed home size on steeper lots is a classic example of regulatory overkill. Simply put, there is no nexus between home size, slope steepness, and wildlife habitat destruction where the home is on an already developed parcel with an existing pad, as is the case of the majority of homes in the WLD. Absent additional grading, which is already regulated under other sections of the Wildlife Ordinance, this reduction in allowable home size severely negatively impacts homeowners while providing minimal benefit to wildlife or biodiversity. Most homes in my neighborhood have slopes greater than 60% (31 degrees), and most of these homes are relatively small in size. Reducing allowable home size for the majority of our residents will prevent needed increases in home size to accommodate growing families, aging parents, and home offices for remote work. The larger homes that exist in our community will be rendered non-conforming, with the attendant mortgage and insurance difficulties. Moreover, this heavy-handed reduction in allowable home size would only worsen the City’s housing shortage. The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has already warned the City that reducing RFA below its current level would likely violate California Government Code Section 66300, subdivision (b)(1)(A). 3. I OPPOSE the regulation



in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation. 4. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, similar to most in our neighborhood, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these homes up to current standards and building codes significantly increases the likelihood of exceeding the Major Remodel threshold. Consequently, it is crucial to exempt owner-occupied homes of a certain age from this category of Project. 5. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section E(1)(e) and Section F as to non-native trees only, that 2 new trees be planted for the removal of each non-native Significant (aka large) tree. This regulation poses a significant fire hazard. Further, the native flora in the WLD is primarily chaparral - large native trees are generally only found in riparian areas. 10. I OPPOSE the failure of Section E.1 to exclude homes destroyed by casualties other than natural disasters (e.g. cooking or electrical fires) from the Wildlife Ordinance regulations. This failure is entirely unreasonable and will result in homeowners having difficulty obtaining mortgages or refinancing. 11. I OPPOSE the failure of F.1(e)(2) to utilize R1 and R2 Zoning rather than lot size in determining which parcels are subject to the Wildlife Ordinance's Lot Coverage regulations, and to give an overly generous Lot Coverage allowance to large parcels. Many RE zoned homes in the WLD are on lots that are smaller than R1/R2 lots. Our neighborhood, although zoned primarily RE-15, has several such lots (e.g. lots of 6,000sf - 7000sf) and these homeowners would be greatly burdened by the application of a 50% Lot Coverage limit to their properties.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Melanie Goldberger

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:58 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Melanie Goldberger  
Estates Director, The Agency

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stella Oganessian

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:00 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through carefully crafted development standards that protect both wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitat throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. There are thousands of species of plants and animals that make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. In fact, according to iNaturalist, there are over 3,000 native plant species in just Los Angeles County, which is twice as many as there are in Hawaii, and about the same amount as Florida. Some can only be found in this area. California in total has almost 8,000 native species of plants according to the California Native Plant Society. More plants equals more habitat for animals. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat needed to thrive. It will set a precedent for the rest of the state to introduce ordinances to protect habitat. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants and wildlife. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Adam Severi

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:03 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Adam Severi and I live in the district and I welcome the LA Wildlife Ordinance because it protects our wildlife corridors and I have seen first hand how new development has hurt our ecosystem. Our mountains are a vital resource in protecting the land for ALL and we need to protect them!

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christopher Smith

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:06 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Christopher Smith, and I live in the district. I understand that my property will be impacted, and I welcome the LA Wildlife Ordinance because it protects our wildlife coordinators. I have seen first hand how new development has hurt our ecosystem. Our mountains are a vital resource in protecting the land for ALL and we need to protect them! “When we lose the hills, we lose Los Angeles”. - Jack Nicholson I emphatically urge adoption of the LA Wildlife Ordinance.  
Christopher Smith

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alex Moussazadeh

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:09 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written. I am an owner of a sloped lot. I just used my life savings to buy my first home. This ordinance is unfair to me and my family, not to mention all the other homeowners in my position. We are not against saving wildlife, but we are against all the added regulations for if I want to build or remodel my home one day. We are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. This proposal is ludicrous and does nothing to further your agenda of saving wildlife.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gilberto Mello

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:09 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Gilberto Mello and I live in the district and I welcome the LA Wildlife Ordinance because it protects our wildlife coordinators and I have seen first hand how new development has hurt our ecosystem. Our mountains are a vital resource in protecting the land for ALL and we need to protect them!  
Gilberto Mello 6851 Sunny Cv Los Angeles 90068



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ronnie Jenkins

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:09 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Ronnie Jenkins

## Realtor and Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Lindy Franklin

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:22 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Sprawling development has so many negative consequences over time. We need to preserve open spaces to reduce fire risk for people and give habitat to a rapidly declining ecosystem, including endangered mountain lions. We humans are so very short-sighted and stunted in terms of our place in this world, yet we have so much power. We are losing pollinators, local flora and fauna and their habitats. The harmful domino effect from those losses is multiplying. Instead, let L.A. show the world how to live with an ecosystem that thrives. We have great inspiration from some countries already. We can learn from them and incorporate what they've shown works in populated natural areas. We know our future is in jeopardy because of reckless, blind development of land, chemicals, profit driven agriculture... its a long list at this point... This Wildlife Ordinance is one of the first steps toward that.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** michael Guivatchian

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 08:25 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Objection to preventing construction on grades exceeding 30 degree slopes. more than half of the slope lots fall within such slopes. preventing construction on those slopes will have many many many negative impacts on peoples use of land and size of their house and such. there is a better solution to a concern. that is requiring a Landscape Architect to address plans and looks of the land within certain distance around the buildings. with sensitivities to water saving plants. Rather than placing a no construction on such slopes , look for constructive solutions that while addressing environmental concerns , also at the same time allow building size that is needed so badly for the city . we need more space to live and rent and more revenues to support city services. so look for solutions. rather than just a blanket prevention of construction. Thant is not a solution. allow creative mind to address legitimate concerns without loosing badly needed livable space. it is interesting that a liberal Government is the state capital is pushing for more habitable space within the cities and liberals within the city of LA are hard at work to minimize habitable space in any which way they can , without considering that such a push , will increase the rents , decrease the city revenues and no gains for environment. Environment will also loose. please have a wider vision and evaluation of continuous crusade on limiting the production of habitable space within the city.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:50 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** June 19th, 2023 Via Email and Messenger Los Angeles City Council, PLUM Committee, and Los Angeles City Planning RE: THE PROPOSED DRAFT WILDLIFE ORDINANCE (CF 14-0518) Dear Honorable Members and Los Angeles City Planning Staff, I live within the proposed Wildlife Supplemental Use District (“WLD”), a fully developed and well-established neighborhood, with smaller homes. 1. I OPPOSE the failure of the Wildlife Ordinance to promulgate different regulations for undeveloped/pristine lots and those lots which have already been developed. This failure results in insufficient protections for undeveloped/ pristine land of high habitat and/or biodiversity value, combined with overly burdensome regulation of homes on already developed parcels that have limited habitat or biodiversity value. 2. I OPPOSE the proposal put forth by Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Ramen to reinstate the disallowance of RFA for slopes greater than 60% (aka 31 degrees) contained in Version 2 of the Wildlife Ordinance. This proposal for a blanket reduction in allowed home size on steeper lots is a classic example of regulatory overkill. Simply put, there is no nexus between home size, slope steepness, and wildlife habitat destruction where the home is on an already developed parcel with an existing pad, as is the case of the majority of homes in the WLD. Absent additional grading, which is already regulated under other sections of the Wildlife Ordinance, this reduction in allowable home size severely negatively impacts homeowners while providing minimal benefit to wildlife or biodiversity. Most homes in my neighborhood have slopes greater than 60% (31 degrees), and most of these homes are relatively small in size. Reducing allowable home size for the majority of our residents will prevent needed increases in home size to accommodate growing families, aging parents, and home offices for remote work. The larger homes that exist in our community will be rendered non-conforming, with the attendant mortgage and insurance difficulties. Moreover, this heavy-handed reduction in allowable home size would only worsen the City’s housing shortage. The California Department of Housing & Community Development (HCD) has already warned the City that reducing RFA below its current level would likely violate California Government Code Section 66300, subdivision (b)(1)(A). 3. I OPPOSE the regulation

in Section E(1)(b) which defines additions of greater than 500sf as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. This 500sf threshold is entirely too low and is applied regardless of the size of the existing home. As a result, it unreasonably burdens the owners of smaller, older homes, such as those that constitute the majority of homes in our neighborhood. Additionally, it encourages homeowners who need more space to sell their homes rather than enlarge them, which is not only detrimental to neighborhood cohesiveness but also has the presumably unintended consequence of increasing the risk that the homes will be bought by developers who will build the largest home they can. At a minimum, additions that would result in homes of less than 3,500sf or 75% of allowed RFA should be exempted from this regulation. 4. I OPPOSE the regulation in Section E(1)(c) which defines Major Remodels as a Project under the Wildlife Ordinance. Homeowners with smaller, older homes, similar to most in our neighborhood, will face an unjustifiable burden due to the applicability of the Major Remodel threshold. Bringing these homes up to current standards and building codes significantly increases the likelihood of exceeding the Major Remodel threshold. Consequently, it is crucial to exempt owner-occupied homes of a certain age from this category of Project. 5. I OPPOSE the requirement in Section E(1)(e) and Section F as to non-native trees only, that 2 new trees be planted for the removal of each non-native Significant (aka large) tree. This regulation poses a significant fire hazard. Further, the native flora in the WLD is primarily chaparral - large native trees are generally only found in riparian areas. 10. I OPPOSE the failure of Section E.1 to exclude homes destroyed by casualties other than natural disasters (e.g. cooking or electrical fires) from the Wildlife Ordinance regulations. This failure is entirely unreasonable and will result in homeowners having difficulty obtaining mortgages or refinancing. 11. I OPPOSE the failure of F.1(e)(2) to utilize R1 and R2 Zoning rather than lot size in determining which parcels are subject to the Wildlife Ordinance's Lot Coverage regulations, and to give an overly generous Lot Coverage allowance to large parcels. Many RE zoned homes in the WLD are on lots that are smaller than R1/R2 lots. Our neighborhood, although zoned primarily RE-15, has several such lots (e.g. lots of 6,000sf - 7000sf) and these homeowners would be greatly burdened by the application of a 50% Lot Coverage limit to their properties.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Katie Knobbe

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 09:56 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Katie Knobbe

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Maureen Toth

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:10 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I live in the proposed area of this ordinance and I am strongly in support of its measures. We MUST value wildlife, natural habitat, natural resources and the native flora for all living things to benefit - including ourselves. If plummeting species numbers, fires and other natural disasters that are occurring with alarming frequency don't indicate we should act more as stewards and less as consumers - I cannot for the life of me imagine what does. There are very fine folks making a more detailed case for support - but after reviewing and hearing concerns from the other side - I feel this is a measured and thoughtful approach that will be a great step in the right direction. We desire to create homes in these sensitive areas precisely because they are beautiful, verdant, have wildlife etc. As. such - we should respect, protect and aid in preserving that beauty and the health of the ecosystem for generations to come.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ryan Fitzgerald  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:11 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Ryan (homeowner,

builder, contractor and concerned citizen of Los Angeles County)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Farsak Palia

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:45 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below-ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however, that will not be the impact. Without the amendment, we will have another well-intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle-class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis, and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Farsak Palia, S.E.

Senior Project Engineer

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Constance Franklin

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:45 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** As an American and Los Angeles City resident gravely concerned with thriving biodiversity and healthy ecosystems, I am writing in strong support of the wildlife ordinances and amendments proposed by CD 4 and CD 5 to improve connectivity for our local wildlife. As we know, it's very difficult for wildlife to survive in dwindling and fragmented habitat. As we know, it is precisely wildlife that is essential for balancing healthy ecosystems and I beleive we have an ethical obligation to help wildlife thrive and protect them from preventable harm. We owe it to wildlife, and we owe it to future generations who should live in a world of thriving biodiversity. Let's do everything we can ! Thank you for your serious consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Cesar

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:46 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, ? Cesar R. Quezada

Homeowner & Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:46 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting



people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:46 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Blake & Karina

## Mirkin Homeowners

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David T Kessler  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:48 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, David Kessler

Coldwell Banker

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Phyllis Bowman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:49 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Phyllis Bowman,  
Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Isaac Levy

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:49 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Isaac Levy, Real



Estate Advisor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Karen Thelin

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:50 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Karen Thelin

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Laura Finley

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:51 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Denise Hamilton

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:51 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Denise Hamilton  
Realtor // Coldwell Banker Realty

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Adrienne Herkes

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:51 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Adrienne Herkes

## Communication from Public

**Name:** jimmy martinez

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:52 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jimmy Martinez



Homeowner, Realtor, Environmental Advocate,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Phillip Neman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:55 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Phillip Neman

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:57 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Steve Shanks Reator

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jennifer Perez

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:58 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jennifer Perez Agent

THEAGENCY Redefining Real Estate

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Will Smith

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:59 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mostafa Khalil

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:00 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below-ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however, that will not be the impact. Without the amendment, we will have another well-intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle-class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis, and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Pareesa Nindra

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:00 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sara Ortins

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:01 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Regards, Sara Ortins

Executive Assistant & Project Coordinator Office: 213-239-9700  
x 130 [www.labibfunk.com](http://www.labibfunk.com) | Instagram | LinkedIn

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jonathan Nash

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:02 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jonathan Nash

Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hilary Stevens

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:02 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Sincerely, Hilary Stevens

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Richard Klug

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:03 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Richard Klug

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Homeowner

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:03 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting



people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stephen Resnick

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:03 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Stephen Resnick

Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:04 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Flora Martin

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:04 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Flora Martin Realtor  
Equity Union Real Estate 16820 Ventura Blvd Encino, CA 91436  
(310) 403-3324 cell

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Heather Ashby  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:04 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518  
**Comments for Public Posting:** Please save the big cats and their land.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:05 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Philip Roslev

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:05 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Philip Roslev Realtor



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Oliver Moussa

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:05 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written. I have been living in Los Angeles for over 40 years I am an owner of a sloped lot. We are against all the added regulations for if I want to build my home one day. We are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Thank you, Oliver, Homeowner, real estate broker, father

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Hatem Dhiab

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:05 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eric Daniels

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:06 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Eric Daniels Realtor

& Property Owner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Torrey

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:07 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Torrey Homeowner,

Realtor, Contractor, Environmental Advocate,



## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:08 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shirin Javid

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:09 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I, a 40-year resident of East Bel Air, along with other Bel Air residents do not agree with the Wildlife Ordinance scheduled for voting by the City Council members at the 2:00PM meeting today. We believe this ordinance has a strong adverse impact on our property values, safety and security and quality of life. I respectfully request that the discussion and voting be postponed to a later date after we and the public have had the chance to review and comment on it. Thank You, Shirin Javid

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dipo Arjanggih

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:10 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eddie Reay

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:12 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Matt Dugally

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:13 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Miller

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:14 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Thank you

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:15 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Opposing this ordinance. We already are aware of our wild life. Any further restriction will be a destruction of private property values and rights.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:16 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Lasman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. By removing basement exemption allowances and reducing Floor Area allowances for sloped lots, the ordinance is massively reducing how much can be built on these properties. Based on case studies completed, this amounts to 50% or more in reductions to allowable RFA on many properties, but the notices that have been sent regarding the ordinance mentioned absolutely nothing about reductions to floor area. Reducing basements has no beneficial impact on Wildlife. It is clear that this is simply an anti-development ordinance using environmentalism as a shield. Requiring Site Plan Review entitlements for any property with a Wildlife Resource or more than 6,000 sf of floor area is a massive waste of resources and will further congest the Planning Department. Ordinances should not be based around requiring additional discretionary entitlements. It is currently taking 12+ months to process many discretionary entitlements through City Planning - this is only going to further congest the process and add costs to homeowners. I implore you to engage an architect to complete 50+ case study property analyses to actually understand the impacts of this ordinance. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to

reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Peter

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Peter

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Stephen@stephenapelian.com

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Stephen Apelian

Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Avi Lasman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:18 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. By removing basement exemption allowances and reducing Floor Area allowances for sloped lots, the ordinance is massively reducing how much can be built on these properties. Based on case studies completed, this amounts to 50% or more in reductions to allowable RFA on many properties, but the notices that have been sent regarding the ordinance mentioned absolutely nothing about reductions to floor area. Reducing basements has no beneficial impact on Wildlife. It is clear that this is simply an anti-development ordinance using environmentalism as a shield. Requiring Site Plan Review entitlements for any property with a Wildlife Resource or more than 6,000 sf of floor area is a massive waste of resources and will further congest the Planning Department. Ordinances should not be based around requiring additional discretionary entitlements. It is currently taking 12+ months to process many discretionary entitlements through City Planning - this is only going to further congest the process and add costs to homeowners. I implore you to engage an architect to complete 50+ case study property analyses to actually understand the impacts of this ordinance. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to

reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeffrey T. S.

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:19 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Francis LaRocca

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:21 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Thanks, Frank

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Darian Robin

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:26 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Darian Robin The

Agency BRE#014-10426

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Carlos Castillo

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:26 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, THEAGENCY A

Global Marketing and Sales Organization CARLOS CASTILLO  
Estates Director m: 781 861 7228?  
Carlos.Castillo@TheAgencyRE.com CalDRE# 01254307

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:27 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Myesha Alexander

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:27 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Myesha Alexander,



MBA Financial Administrator Direct: 424-335-6249  
[www.labibfunk.com](http://www.labibfunk.com) | Instagram | LinkedIn

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ross Klein

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:28 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Ross Klein, PE

Senior Project Engineer Labib Funk + Associates Direct:  
626-351-3367 [www.labibfunk.com](http://www.labibfunk.com) | Instagram | LinkedIn

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sharon Oberfeld  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:29 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Dear Members of the

PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Sharon Oberfeld

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:29 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:30 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jacob Rodriguez,

Structural Engineer Principal 149 Pasadena Avenue, Suite B  
South Pasadena, CA 91030 Direct: 626-351-3367 ext. 504 | Cell:  
818-389-6827 [www.labibfunk.com](http://www.labibfunk.com) | Instagram | LinkedIn



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brian Lane

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:30 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Brian Lane

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joe Grauman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:30 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Joe Grauman

Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeremy

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I object to the re-zoning proposal. The home owners have not been properly included in the process, the public comment period was completely unhelpful, without enough notice for most to attend and the calls were stacked with activists who dont even live in these neighborhood! There was no assessment of the impact on homeonwners houses, values in the future, taxes. You asking use to save the planet, at least have the respect to inform us on what this means for our future. The city has made it impossible for me to understand the impact on my home. Do this with the homeowners not against, most of us agree with the intent of the plan, just not how you've chosen to execute it and communicate with us.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Thomas J. Dunlap

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:32 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well-intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, TOM DUNLAP,

Branch Manager Coldwell Banker Realty 301 N. Canon Drive,  
Ste E, Beverly Hills, CA 90210 C. 310.422.1404 | O.  
310.777.6200 CaBRE License #00927204

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Peter Behnam

Homeowner, Environmental Advocate



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alan Kuang

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:33 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Alan Kuang

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Thomas DeSanto

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:35 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Tom DeSanto,

Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** VG2  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:35 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Vivianne Garcia

Property Manager 213-239-9700 ext. 220

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Caitlin Bishop

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:36 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Thank you, Caitlin Bishop Senior Project

Engineer-Labib Funk & Associates

## Communication from Public

**Name:** george ghiz

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:37 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low-income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below-ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however, that will not be the impact. Without the amendment, we will have another well-intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle-class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis, and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, George James



GhizHomeowner/Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** DP

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:38 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear LA City Planning Commission, and Honorable Council members, and City Attorney Hydee Feldstein, This email is in regards to The Wildlife Ordinance meeting scheduled this Tuesday June 20th 2pm. I was just notified Friday? This is too short of notice for this public hearing. And this item should be removed from the June 20th meeting agenda. . I'm just now being notified on this public hearing scheduled for today Tuesday June 20th? On a holiday weekend? I feel this timeline is not Due Process. I'm in favor of protecting our Wildlife, but not in favor of reducing square footage, or building envelope for hillside homes, and lots. I was able to read a letter recently prepared by councilmember Raman, and Yaroslavsky. As a constituent, I am appalled that I was NOT notified of their opinions and suggestions. I am against all of Nithya Raman, and Newly appointed Councilwoman Katy Yaroslavsky's proposed changes to the draft. One of their suggestions was to eliminate the 1,000sf exception for basements. And counting this square footage in the overall sf of the home. I am opposed to any square footage of height reductions...They're suggesting making this ordinance even more RESTRICTIVE and impactful for property owners. Too much of this ordinance has been pushed by certain stakeholders, without concern for our property values. This has not been discussed openly with the land owners, and home owners in the hills. I would like the PLUM committee to send this ordinance back to the planning department to have the parts of the rules removed that don't directly help wildlife. Two business days notice for this public hearing is absurd. Why is there a need for a reduction in allowable square footage for rebuilds, or new construction? This is a downzoning! disguised as a Wildlife ordinance. Most of my neighbors are also against this. How can we be involved in new meetings, discussions on this proposed ordinance? Thank you for your consideration. DP 323-595-7944 8340 Grand View DR. Los Angeles CA 90046

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Mohamed Elhossary

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:38 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** J

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:38 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Jake Rodriguez

## Property Manager Assistant

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Feroz Taj

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:39 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** From: Feroz Taj Date: June 20, 2023 at 9:29:43 AM PDT To: Councilmember.Harris-Dawson@lacity.org, councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org, councilmember.rodriquez@lacity.org, heather.hutt@lacity.org, Councilmember.Lee@lacity.org Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 ? Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to

build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, FT

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:39 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Insert Name Akshay



Modi, PE Structural Engineer

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:41 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Ber Oberfeld

Homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joshua S. Myler  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:41 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I, Josh Myler, write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign-in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that places the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people, while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Joshua S. Myler

Home Owner / Real Estate Agent THE AGENCY Redefining real  
estate JOSH MYLER Founding Member / Director, Residential  
Division m: 323 333 0301 TheAgencyRE.com Lic# 01443547

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:41 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:12 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am against this ordinance. This just put a severe burden on a property owner for no good reason.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Michael J Visconti

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:13 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Michael Visconti and I live in the district and I welcome the LA Wildlife Ordinance because it protects our wildlife coordinators and I have seen first hand how neww development has hurt our ecosystem. Our mountains are a vital resource in protecting the land for ALL and we need to protect them! Thank you so very much!



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tatiana Derovanessiam

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:14 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Tatiana

Derovanessian LA Resident, Homeowner and Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Luis Hernandez  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:16 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Luis Hernandez

Realtor

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Roger Ewing

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:17 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Council File Number 14-0518 I strongly support the Wildlife Ordinance along with the amendments proposed by Council Districts 4 and 5. It will help wildlife survive in our Santa Monica Mountains through careful development standards protecting wildlife and property interests. I encourage the swift adoption of this district ordinance so that it can be expanded to sensitive habitats throughout the entire City of Los Angeles. Thousands of species of plants and animals make their homes in the Santa Monica Mountains. Some are indigenous to only this area. Others are at risk of going extinct such as our local iconic mountain lions. All of these animals are negatively affected by uncontrolled development. This ordinance will ensure that our local flora and fauna maintain access to the connected habitat they require to thrive. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsible development. Preserving habitat is beneficial for people, native plants, and wildlife. Please support the Wildlife Ordinance.

## **Communication from Public**

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:19 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** .

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:20 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Paul Skikne Real

Estate Developer



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Deborah Neikirk

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:20 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I live just off Mulholland Drive, in the Hollywood Hills. Every year we clear the brush around our homes, because of the very real danger of fire. Sprawling development in very high fire severity zones has continually increased the frequency and intensity of fires. Preserving natural open space can help to reduce this fire risk by reducing irresponsibly crowded development.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:21 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting

people off of the streets.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Baron Rogers

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:25 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. Your attention to the matter is greatly

appreciated. Best regards, Baron Rogers, Homeowner, Resident,  
Contractor and Developer KellyBaron DESIGN |  
DEVELOPMENT | CONSTRUCTION KellyBaron.com

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:25 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Melissa Doorn, S.E.

## Associate LFA

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Dennis Maynard

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:26 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Dennis Maynard



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gina Martino

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:42 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: Please Consider Common Sense Amendments To Today's Agenda Item 19 Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below-ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however, that will not be the impact. Without the amendment, we will have another well-intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle-class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents

down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,  
Gina Martino

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sasha K Pollak

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:43 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** William Grundfest

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 10:44 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Hello, I'm an affected homeowner, 68 years old, who has raised a family for 26 years in a 2500 sf house on Linda Flora, built in the 1950's, and whose ability to fund my retirement and my children's education has been based largely on the plan to sell our home when we downsize. This "Wildlife ordinance" destroys my ability to do so. You simply do not care about older affected homeowners who have invested in this community for 26 years. The continued trust in the City Council - which is already eroded massively - is at stake in this ordinance - especially in the recent letter from Councilpeople Yaroslavsky and Raman asking for it to be made even more restrictive and more needlessly damaging to their AFFECTED home owning constituents. The overwhelming majority OF AFFECTED HOMEOWNERS is against this Wildlife ordinance - and certainly against this letter from Yaroslavsky and Raman - written with zero notice to affected homeowners - which has been PROVEN over the many months we have fought with the Planning Commission over it. The most recent EVIDENCE of this MAJORITY OPPOSITION was shown in the zoom calls that were open to public comment, in which over 300!! viewers waited to comment, and the majority of affected homeowners voiced their opposition to the ordinance. It's FACT that this majority opposition exists as the ordinance is opposed by even the Bel Air Homeowners Association - a group of 950 AFFECTED homeowners. The recent letter from Councilpeople Yaroslavsky and Raman asking for the latest draft of the ordinance to be more restrictive was written and sent with ZERO outreach or notification to the affected homeowners. a "dead of night" kinda City Council "legislative process" ploy that has eroded the trust of the people of Los Angeles in the City Council as well as most elected representatives. Further, the ordinance has ZERO science in it - it is total conjecture - there are ZERO lines drawn between any of its points and any particular benefit to any particular wildlife - I challenge you to offer ANY such science - and there is certainly ZERO discussion - OR CARE - for the damage to affected homeowners. All this ordinance has is a great name - who can be against Wildlife? - and a cynical desire to get cheap votes. Yes, cheap votes from folks who are not affected. There are ways to address wildlife issues without destroying the futures of our families. This isn't it.

If the City Council wanted to be honest, it would simply. say:  
"There are more votes to be had from unaffected activists who've only heard the title of the ordinance, have never read or understood the damage done by this ordinance, than to be had from the affected homeowners who will be needlessly damaged." This ordinance will be the subject of lawsuits on many levels - which again you don't care about, because you don't have to pay your lawyers, while we do. I get it - my family and I - and the other affected homeowners simply don't count. Bill Grundfest  
Affected homeowner

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jay E Silverman  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:24 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** I APPOSE THIS ACTION 100000% My home which is only 3 yrs old is approximately 4,800 square feet. With the passing of this Ordinance that number would be reduced to approximately 2,000 square feet if not less in many instances making these small lots nearly unbuildable. How is this EVEN REMOTELY FAIR???? If my home burns down I can only replace it for less than half it's size. I'm a property owner I pay over 100k in property taxes annually and LA City has no mitigation plan for fires except to do this? Totally UNFAIR. Why not take A FRANCTION of the HUGE GIGANTIC FUNDS FOR THE HORRIBLE AND USE IT TO TRIM DOWN OUR MOUNTAINS AND HILLS SO WE DON'T HAVE SUCH HI FIRE RISK????

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nick Collins

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:25 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Nick Collins, Estates

Specialist



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Vahé Alexander  
**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:25 AM  
**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation, Vahé Shaghzo

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Lasman

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:25 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. By removing basement exemption allowances and reducing Floor Area allowances for sloped lots, the ordinance is massively reducing how much can be built on these properties. Based on case studies completed, this amounts to 50% or more in reductions to allowable RFA on many properties, but the notices that have been sent regarding the ordinance mentioned absolutely nothing about reductions to floor area. Reducing basements has no beneficial impact on Wildlife. It is clear that this is simply an anti-development ordinance using environmentalism as a shield. Requiring Site Plan Review entitlements for any property with a Wildlife Resource or more than 6,000 sf of floor area is a massive waste of resources and will further congest the Planning Department. Ordinances should not be based around requiring additional discretionary entitlements. It is currently taking 12+ months to process many discretionary entitlements through City Planning - this is only going to further congest the process and add costs to homeowners. I implore you to engage an architect to complete 50+ case study property analyses to actually understand the impacts of this ordinance. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to

reign in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets. With Appreciation,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Nicole

**Date Submitted:** 06/20/2023 11:26 AM

**Council File No:** 14-0518

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the PLUM Committee, I write to you today to urge you to vote NO on agenda item 19 as it is written or to delay a vote on the item to allow time for outreach and conversation about amendments that will lead to a bill that protects our environment without inequitable depression of home prices. The loss of native wildlife and the erosion of our planet is our biggest existential crisis right now. We applaud the work of Councilmembers Yaroslavsky and Raman that tackle these issues via their Wildlife Protection Ordinance but have serious concerns about unintentional consequences that will disproportionately impact low income homeowners and people struggling in building trades. We know that there is currently a battle surrounding the Wildlife Ordinance with fans of mansionization pushing to squash it entirely, harming our environment, and another group pushing to quickly and covertly pass it as written, harming homeowners and people involved in construction trades. I am writing to you today in hopes that a compromise can be reached. The idea that we have to choose between protecting our planet and protecting homeowners is a false choice. It is being proposed that basements, which do not impact wildlife, be eliminated completely from properties in hillside zones. Additionally, as written the ordinance punishes owners of sloped lots. These homeowners tend to be lower earners with smaller homes. Many of these homeowners have their life savings tied up in their land value and capping below ground buildable square feet - that does not harm wildlife in a meaningful way - would be devastating to their property values and put many of them in challenging financial positions. We recognize the language was included in an effort to curb mansions and the intention was to rein in millionaire land developers, however that will not be the impact. Without amendment, we will have another well intentioned bill that puts the responsibility of protecting our environment on lower and middle class people while the wealthy continue to find ways to build their mansions. Additionally, we are in the middle of a housing crisis and regulating buildable square footage that doesn't meaningfully further an environmental agenda will not help us create the living space needed to drive housing prices and rents down while getting people off of the streets.