

Communication from Public

Name: Jonah Paten

Date Submitted: 04/05/2021 10:51 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: Los Angeles badly needs more housing, particularly more affordable housing, and a key part of that is making that happen is keeping the cost of building housing as low as possible. If passed, this motion would potentially limit wood construction in urban areas without fire hazards where it is perfectly safe, as part of a blatant astroturf campaign from the concrete industry. In doing so, it will drive up costs and make new construction less sustainable, as concrete is simply more expensive and more polluting than timber. The Motion will also harm the environment and the housing crisis while providing absolutely no benefit to anybody. Instead of adding pointless restrictions at the obvious request of an unsustainable industry afraid of competition, the Council should move to allow mass timber construction within Fire District 1 to make new construction more sustainable and allowing affordable housing to be built for cheaper and helping resolve LA's housing crisis. LA should lead on this issue, not fall behind.

Communication from Public

Name: Elisa Visick

Date Submitted: 04/05/2021 06:44 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: I support the use of wood/mass timber in urban areas because it is safe, affordable, and modern. Please do not limit the use of wood construction in non-wildfire zones and please allow the use of mass timber in existing Fire District 1 areas. Mass timber is safer and better performing in earthquakes than concrete and should be permitted in Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: Joshua Job

Date Submitted: 04/05/2021 09:56 PM

Council File No: 19-0603

Comments for Public Posting: Mass timber and engineered wood can easily achieve performance comparable in real world settings with proper architecture and design to that of concrete. Any rules restricting its use, which is carbon negative rather than concrete's intense carbon emissions, will only serve to slow adoption of better, cheaper, more environmentally friendly, and frankly more beautiful architecture in Los Angeles, and drive up costs for everyone. The proposal in question is just rent-seeking by concrete producers who want to use government largesse to get richer on the backs of the public by throwing up unnecessary barriers to competition and should have been rejected out of hand immediately when it was first brought up in discussion.