



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 16-1468-S2

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, michael.sweeney@ernc.la

Mon, Apr 7, 2025 at 7:03 AM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or rResolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at empowerla@lacity.org.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Eagle Rock

Name: Michael Sweeney

Email: michael.sweeney@ernc.la

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(7) Nay(4) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 10/01/2024

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 04/07/2025

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 16-1468-S2

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 04/07/2025

Item Number:

Summary: (See attached pdf for full rationale) The ERNC strongly objects to the proposed ICO which would prevent homeowners from pulling building permits for their legal, conforming homes without going through a lengthy, expensive, and discretionary site plan review. The Code Amendments included in CF 16-1472-S7 & and the Interim Control Ordinance (ICO) in CF 23-1019 would down-zone our existing hillside communities and will prevent home-owners from getting building permits to renovate or improve their existing homes while also reducing the number of new ADUs constructed in Eagle Rock. For these reasons, we believe that the HCR code change as well as the ICO are fatally flawed

and Council must vote to formally rescind their approval: Lack of any outreach to the affected communities and homeowners regarding the 85% reduction in the threshold for Site Plan Review. Existing residential properties are down-zoned through the inclusion of non-assessable and excluded RFAR area as part of the "2,500 sf [...] inclusive of accessory structures" threshold articulated in the ICO. Unduly impacts the permitting and construction of ADUs that meet the current zoning requirements and current State Law. The sunset of the ICO is tied to a different threshold than what is included in the HCR code-change ordinance. We request that Council rescind the ICO and instruct the City Attorney to take no further action on the underlying HCR code-changes (approved as part of CF# 16-1472-S7) until out-reach to all of the NELA Neighborhood Councils can be conducted as part of our long-overdue Community Plan Update where all of the impacts of proposed changes such as this are analyzed for their impact on housing production and potential negative impacts on the City's adopted Housing Element.

Ref:MSG12165967

 **CIS in OPPOSITION to CF# 16-1468-S2.pdf**
236K



P.O. Box 41652
 Los Angeles, CA 90041
www.ernc.la info@ernc.la



**CITY OF
 LOS ANGELES**
 CALIFORNIA

2023-2025 ERNC Board

Executive Committee

Michael P. Sweeney	President
Alisa Sandoval	Vice President
Noah Segan	Treasurer
Natalie M. Freidberg	Communications
Kate Davis Caldwell	Secretary
Richard Loew	Past President

Board Members

Flor Chaidez	Fred Dresch
Laura Gonzalez	Margaret Irwin
Craig Hirsch	Amanda Matti
Andrew Jacobs	Neil Muntzel
Gina Elliott	Eden Greene
Max Baumgarten	Talha Aamir
Noah Segan	

**CIS IN OPPOSITION TO COUNCIL FILE
 #16-1468-S2 Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) / Junior
 Accessory Dwelling Unit (JADU) / Northeast Los Angeles
 Community Plan / Silver Lake-Echo Park-Elysian Valley
 Community Plan / Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones /
 Los Angeles Municipal Code / Amendment**

We declare that on October 1, 2024, a Brown Act noticed public meeting was held by the Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council (ERNC) at which a quorum was present. By a vote of 7-4, the ERNC adopted the following Community Impact Statement concerning Council File [#16-1468-S2](#):

The ERNC OPPOSES the prohibition on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Junior ADUs (JADUs) within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in the Northeast Community Plan Area proposed by this ordinance. It is unacceptable for changes that will reduce housing opportunities across an Community Plan area (and that disproportionately affect our community) to be adopted without any outreach to the affected Neighborhood Councils and communities by the Planning Department or by any of the Council Offices.

This Ordinance as written and adopted by Council is fatally flawed in the following ways:

1. It likely contravenes State law
2. It will maintain ongoing effects of historic residential segregation and will not further Affirmatively Fair Housing (AFH)
3. Its foreseeable effect is a reduction in the number of ADUs and JADUs which will drive up rents and prices for renters, property-owners, and prospective-buyers.
4. It is a significant change to the Northeast Community Plan without either the community outreach or environmental review required for General Plan updates.

For those reasons (elaborated on below), we request that Council immediately rescind their approval and instruct the Planning Department to do no further work on banning ADUs until it can be analyzed as part of the decades-late Northeast Community Plan Update process with real outreach, community engagement, and environmental review.

As representatives of

1. Contravention of California State law:
 - a. By reducing the opportunity for ADUs and JADUs, this ordinance likely contravenes both the letter and intent of State law which is intended to maximize opportunities for property owners to build and maintain ADUs as a mechanism to increase the overall housing stock.
 - b. AB 686 requires that all cities (including the City of Los Angeles) affirmatively further Fair Housing (AFFH) as part of their Housing Element update to reduce the ongoing impact and results of historic patterns of segregation such as “redlining”. This ordinance in conjunction with other anti-ADU measures the City of Los Angeles has already adopted including the Hillside Construction Regulations ([CF# 23-1019 & 16-1472-S7](#)), will reduce the number of units produced which will change the baseline assumptions in the Housing

Element and therefore make meeting the City's AFFH requirements more difficult if not impossible in Northeast LA.

2. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing
 - a. Significant portions of NELA's hillside neighborhoods (including much of Eagle Rock) are classified as "High Resource" areas by the State of California; In Los Angeles the boundaries of "High Resource" areas frequently correlate to those neighborhoods which were the beneficiaries of redlining and historic segregation. Due to the existing patterns of residential zoning in these areas, single-family residences, ADUs and JADUs are some of the only housing constructed in those portions of our neighborhoods due to down-zoning along the commercial corridors. Removing ADUs and JADUs from the equation will reduce housing options for renters in NELA and perpetuate the historic patterns of housing segregation.
 - b. The City's currently-adopted "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" (VHFHSZ) boundaries are not consistent or scientifically based (for example, the whole of the Eagle Rock Plaza shopping center is included within the VHFHSZ). Instead they disproportionately correlate to and encompass "High Resource" areas; by using the VHFHSZ as a binary criterion for where housing opportunity is allowed or restricted, this ordinance will do nothing to reduce the effect of historic patterns of residential segregation and thus nothing to advance the City's requirement to pursue and advance AFFH.
 - c. Because this reduction in ADU opportunities is not directly accompanied by rezoning for an equivalent number of units on other sites within those same "High Resource" neighborhoods, new housing opportunities will be reduced and raise rents and prices in those areas. This will maintain (not ameliorate) the effects of historic segregation and thus be non-compliant with the City's requirement for AFFH by disincentivizing development in "High Resource" portions of the Northeast LA Community Plan area.
3. Decreased options and increased costs
 - a. For renters, eliminating or drastically reducing the pipeline of new units of all types (dwelling units, ADUs, and JADUs) will drive up rents for those that do already exist. Price increases will affect not just those renters looking to move into the area directly affected by this ordinance; the pain will also be felt by those in the surrounding portions of the communities unaffected directly by this ordinance.
 - b. For current home-owners, reducing or eliminating the opportunity for ADUs and JADUs on one's property will prevent them from developing additional housing units that may more effectively fulfill their family's needs. Those units can be: traditional for-rent opportunities to offset their housing expenses; a unit for a senior family member; a unit for a young-adult or student; housing for a live-in caregiver, etc. ADUs are a critical, private-market initiative for individuals to fill real housing needs for their families and our communities that are even scarcer than typical market-rate rental housing (like senior housing). Also, the "typical" categories of housing (single-family, apartments, etc.) may not fully reflect the life-styles and preferences of multi-generational Angeleno families of today versus the early-twentieth century era that they were articulated.
 - c. For prospective home-buyers, an ADU on the property (or the ability to easily add one) changes the property's mortgage underwriting because the additional unit is an income opportunity. As a result, a property with an ADU or the potential for one may be easier for younger, less-affluent buyers to finance and thus to move into "High Resource" communities.
4. Northeast Los Angeles Community Plan
 - a. The NELA Community Plan was last updated in 1999 adoption and is long overdue for update. The current plan, its subsidiary specific plans, and the zoning have significant portions that are no longer enforceable due to changes in State law (eg, AB2097), voter initiatives (eg., Transit Oriented Communities), or other changes in the area. The plan also includes no discussion of issues that have gained in public attention and priority since the end of the twentieth century such as climate change or AFFH.
 - b. The current plan is predicated on maintaining the historic patterns of residential development from the eras where historic patterns of segregation were most prevalent; page I-10 explicitly lists "*planning and zoning actions to minimize encroachments of commercial, industrial, and multiple-residential uses into single-family residential areas*" as an "opportunity". This categorical separation of "single-family residential **areas**" as something separate, apart, and threatened by "multi-family residential **uses**" (which are lumped in with commercial and industrial) is a familiar dog-whistle in 20th century planning.
 - c. Where municipal infrastructure is identified in the plan as potentially an issue, the plan's uniform response is to down-zone and reduce the quantity of housing instead of updating or enhancing municipal infrastructure. This ordinance continues that same approach; what anecdotal evidence is provided is unrelated to future development however, restriction of future development is presented as some sort of solution to the only identified issues which are deficiencies in the municipal infrastructure and potentially illegal street-parking.
 - d. A change of this magnitude affecting an entire Community Plan areas should only be implemented as part of an overall plan update because that is the only mechanism that includes both community outreach and environmental review for the changes. Without analyzing and reviewing changes that reduce or redirect

housing production as part of a comprehensive Plan update, ordinances like this will continue to only echo and amplify only the voices and biases of the people who participated in the 1999 Plan update instead of reflecting the current and future residents of Northeast LA.

Please place this letter in the case file, and acknowledge its receipt via email to: executive@ernc.la. Thank you.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized initials 'MS' followed by a long, sweeping horizontal stroke that ends in a small hook.

Michael P. Sweeney
President, Eagle Rock Neighborhood Council