

Communication from Public

Name: BALDWIN HILLS ESTATES HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Date Submitted: 08/17/2021 10:20 AM

Council File No: 21-0002-S18

Comments for Public Posting: Baldwin Hills Estates HOA submits the attached SB9 analysis and urges Council to approve motion to OPPOSE SB9. Notwithstanding the deficiencies of the upzoning methodology in SB9 which are detailed in the attached, it is crucial for the City to recognize that while additional housing capacity is warranted and that will likely require SOME element of zoning change, the City must engage in this process at the local level, as is the norm. Land Use details are justifiably Local Affairs requiring Home Rule. This localized process allows the City to utilize its own departments, allow them to consider the complex details of our own city, AND allows the City's residents to participate in self-determination. This essential function of city government must not be ceded and a large basis for the Chief Legislative Analysts recommendaton to oppose. We are responsible to the state to produce housing, at various income levels, via RHNA. The Planning Department, via the Housing Element is formulating a methodology to acheive the targeted housing. It is unnecessary, and the creation of conflict with that plan, for the State to mandate a widespread, one-size fits all method. Crenshaw District is not Westwood, as Los Angeles is not Carmel. The issue at hand is maintenance of our ability to recognize the housing need, while not losing sight of our city's situational differences as far as needs and impacts. Current City policy, and a stated concentration of the forming Housing Element acknowledges the need to truly create affordable units, whereas as SB9 contains no provision to return truly affordable housing while granting upzoning. the Housing Element draft identifies the need to: "Focus majority of additional capacity in Higher Opportunity Zones", "Protect ecologically sensitive, sea rise, and VHFHSZ areas" (of particular concern to BHE as we are in a VHFHSZ and have had a catastrophic urban wildfire), "Protect communities vulnerable to displacement and housing pressures". The Element refines the need for rezoning to note the most appropriate "Potential Rezoning Areas" as: "Areas near jobs and transit", "Regional Center", "Commercial and Residential Corridors", and "Transitional residential areas off commercial boulevards". Similarly nuanced Land Use policy formation is recommended in the advancing PLUM and LACP joint report. LACP has also created an "Equity Division" to give special attention to the special circumstances in certain

community groups and areas. All of these acknowledgements and structures afford the ability to truly plan in a considerate and holistic fashion. Allowing the state to mandate a one-size fits all policy throws out all of these acknowledgements, policies, and capabilities. It renders moot much of the effort and learning about nuance, and disables us from being able to continue to advance smart planning practices adopted with the participation of the city's stakeholders. There is no doubt that L.A. must build. It already does so far better than most of the state. Even the need to build more, should not have us lose sight of the many pros and cons, the impacts, the differences in geography, and the way to best plan with specificity and consideration. We agree with the need to build but urge the Council to facilitate that through the robust and capable local process. SB9 provides no answer to truly affordable housing, and shows no consideration for the nuanced considerations which the City is already accommodating in its own process. That local process and self-determination should be protected from such disruption. Thus we implore the Council to approve the motion and actively OPPOSE SB9. Please see the attached statement for analysis of the bill's specific details. Thank You, Baldwin Hills Estates Homeowners Association



May 29, 2021

TO: Los Angeles City Councilmembers

FROM: Baldwin Hills Homeowners Association, Inc. (BHEHOA)

RE: Opposition of Senate Bill 9

On behalf of its 3500+ resident members, Baldwin Hills Estates Homeowners Association, Inc. (BHEHOA) firmly opposes SB9 as written, and encourages elected representatives to oppose or seek substantial amendment to the bill. The negative impacts of this bill, which are substantial, outweigh its benefits, while its stated result is unaddressed. SB9 is not a "duplex bill". It allows conversion of single units into FOUR units at a minimum, or 6/8 units should a city be unable or unwilling to limit ADU/JrADU provisions. That constitutes a massive upzoning of millions of plots, when no real analysis has shown that the state's zoned capacity need be increased by almost 20 million units, all market-rate, in R-1 areas. Our main concerns are as follows:

I. Affordable Housing - While this bill touts affordability as its substantial goal, it has absolutely no actual provision for affordable housing, whether that be in requiring affordable units themselves, a significant fee contribution to affordable housing funding, or even rent level covenants. The state's own Housing Assessment study shows that there is not a shortage of higher-priced, market-rate housing, while the stark shortfalls exist in truly affordable, lower-income housing. Trickle-down price filtering in housing is a dubious effect, especially considering the negative impacts of upzoning. The real way to create affordable housing is to incentivize its construction and fund affordable housing directly.

II. Increased Speculation and Gentrification - What the bill WILL do is induce real estate speculation and exacerbate gentrification in areas such as ours in South Los Angeles, which have a high concentration of minority and below average income level residents. Unlike the previously proposed SB50, which acknowledged this consequence, SB9 contains no overall relief for "sensitive communities."

In allowing one single-family plot to be redeveloped into four, or potentially eight, market rate units, the bill creates a climate wherein speculative interests, even huge interests that commoditize housing such as Blackstone, find large development value in existing homes. Up-zoning increases land costs. This destabilizes long-standing communities by rendering resident members at a disadvantage to buy in their own neighborhoods. Such is particularly true in a minority community where deep-pockets and access to beneficial financing are a historical challenge. As more modest single-family homes are demolished in favor of smaller, HIGHER square-foot cost dwellings; larger occupant households such as families, find adequate traditional homes in shorter supply, thereby driving up the cost of those homes as well. The

limitations on demolition are truly minor. The bill WILL induce gentrification and indirect displacement of family units.

The bill's attempt to combat wholesale changes in blocks by simply disallowing one owner from applying the allowances to two contiguous lots is of little effect when one may do so on lots separated by only one non-owned lot, and when the bill may be applied cumulatively by different investors. On a macro level, channeling development capital into lucrative projects which contain no affordable provision, only makes the options which actually include affordable housing less likely to be elected.

III. Building Density Consequences - In the meantime, all single-family neighborhoods will be negatively impacted by real effects of density. By its allowances, the bill will encourage oversized buildings, out of character with almost all single-family neighborhoods. To maximize potential, buildings will be built just against the reduced minimal 4-foot side and rear setbacks, which conflict with existing standards, and they will be built as tall as possible. These conditions reduce the benefits of privacy, sunlight, greenery, views, yard space, permeable surface, lower heat island effect, and wildlife. These quality-of-life benefits are widely prized by citizens, and a large part of home purchase, which includes a vested interest in areas and their changes.

IV. Infrastructure Burden - While the bill may allow for fees, that collection does not practically enable localities to effectively upgrade large systems to eliminate triggered excessive burden. In many areas of cities such as Los Angeles this infrastructure is already antiquated and over-burdened. This includes water, sewer, power, street capacity, communications, even schools and emergency services. Locally determined growth is better able to place some needed density without broad, unmitigated infrastructure burden. Growth along corridors and in commercial settings allows greater ability to maintain adequate infrastructure

V. Parking and Traffic - Allowing units to be built, with one parking space per or no parking, only worsens a shortage of parking that is a real issue in central Los Angeles. All areas, including ours on a hill removed from transit, do not utilize public transportation and will have a significant number of vehicles. This is especially true in more modest income areas characterized by larger household size. Even in neighborhoods close to transit, where zero parking would be provided, these larger households still have cars. Residents of newly created under-parked units will clearly increase demand for, and difficulty finding, street parking. An unavailability of street parking is both inconvenient and presents a safety risk when requiring walking distances at night.

Inasmuch as many single-family neighborhoods are not directly adjacent to transit or job centers, increasing density in those only increases traffic and miles driven. Local streets are not so equipped, and the increase adds to both inconvenience and the proliferation of pollution, a major problem. Smart planning seeks to reduce traffic by specifically concentrating density near transit or along arteries, not to increase traffic by placing density in more remote neighborhoods.

VI. CEQA and other environmental protections - Some situations carry greater environmental impacts from development than others. Localities are able to determine if particular sites warrant CEQA analysis. A categorical exemption from CEQA disables protections which at times may be warranted. Similarly, the bill is ambiguous in establishing unequivocal exemption and protection for vulnerable Hillside and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones, where significant increases to density carry large risks. Our neighborhood has experienced a disastrous urban fire with both huge property damage and loss of life. Allowing a provision which ministerially brings density into designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity

Zones, with evacuation and fire-fighting challenges, is a clear public safety risk. The basic “existing building code’ related provisions of the bill DO NOT eliminate this risk.

VII. Loss of local self-determination - In general, one-size-fits-all, state-level land use bills eliminate the traditional and valuable ability for localities and community members to consider a site’s or neighborhood’s individual situation. To then participate in customizing growth in a smart, lower impact, holistic fashion. Planning is best done at the local level, especially if constituents are to have input in their own destinies. Some cities need added density more than others, or one city may seek to provide housing in a different pattern than another based upon conditions and priorities. While the state should promote housing allocations, it is best to allow flexibility in accomplishing them. If the state simply insisted on locally established housing elements which truly address each area’s housing allocation (eg RHNA), utilizing both incentive and penalty, the state could promote housing, yet not disable a locality from placing gains in a more contemplated fashion which addresses an area’s unique characteristics.

Los Angeles has capacity to grow, with specifics determined by a new Housing Element, the reformulation of Community Plans, ReCode L.A., Specific Plans, CPIO, enactment of TOC policies, refinement of ADU processes, encouragement of residential development along corridors, allowance for conversion of commercial use to residential use, small lot subdivision, and conditional use allowances. Unlike some areas, Los Angeles has already largely increased its zoned capacity and has mechanisms (plus the State Density Bonus) to build actual affordable units. The city can address housing need as required by RHNA while maintaining an advanced local process, which enables citizens and local officials input on details. It can follow through on a requirement to build and perhaps upzone, but maintain the ability to decide where. We have a sophisticated Planning Department and process, which we should be able to use and engage with on a local level, where we live. This participation is essential for those in a diverse metropolitan area, which is already one of the few most dense in the nation and faces the challenges that come with that.

In summary, the small benefit of building unneeded market-rate units to rely upon trickle-down pricing by en masse upzoning of all single-family plots equally, does not warrant the negative impacts. Especially to such a drastic extent of allowing four, or even eight units, where one exists, and a dramatically decreased minimum allowable lot size. Localities and the state have many alternative methods to build housing and more effectively improve affordability. If we indeed strive to increase housing, we must do so in a considerate, targeted fashion. This bill amounts to a large concession to building interests, with costs to residents, and gains not nearly commensurate. Its allowances will be engaged in by larger interests, not typical local residents. We support the application of other means to create smart housing truly addressing affordability. We should not provide density concessions which DO NOT actually directly address the stated goal of affordable housing. So, we are firmly in opposition to SB9, and encourage our representatives to also oppose as written, while promoting alternatives.

Sincerely,

Teresa Humphrey, President
Baldwin Hills Estates Homeowners Association

Communication from Public

Name: Brenda Ashby - Homeowner Crenshaw Manor

Date Submitted: 08/17/2021 11:14 PM

Council File No: 21-0002-S18

Comments for Public Posting: I support the Paul Koretz motion in opposition to SB 9 (Atkins) and also encourage City Council members to ADOPT the motion to oppose SB 9. This bill offers NO affordable housing, it increases speculation and gentrification, it has serious building density consequences, it does not add funds to upgrade infrastructure, it does not allow units to be built with enough or any parking spaces, and CEQA and other environmental protections are no longer required. Sacramento has failed to fund affordable housing to the tune of \$1B a year for the last ten years. Causing cities the inability to develop affordable housing. This occurred because of the demise of redevelopment funds. There are hundreds of miles of underutilized commercial corridors that the City of Los Angeles could use to add affordable housing if the State-funded affordable housing. Cities know best where to add housing. Using commercial corridors could greatly improve the vitality of our city, and these are areas that must be addressed first before bills like SB 9 are considered. We should use public lands that are now underutilized. This is where you build 100% affordable housing. SB 9 is unusable for the average homeowner that wishes to split their lot but would rarely qualify for the loan required to build 4-units of modest size. This loan by today's \$300 sq ft price tag makes it nearly a \$1M loan to build 4.800 sq ft units. This is only for developers. SB 9 does not even mandate affordable housing, does not require infrastructure improvements, or public input. Developers should not be allowed to determine our cities. This bill would create more market-rate housing and cause displacement and gentrification in communities of color. This bill is an assault on single-family neighborhoods and that is unjust. Sacramento should take the blame for failing to produce affordable housing. We have worked hard to acquire our homes and should not be penalized for Sacramento's misgivings. I am firmly in opposition to SB 9 and encourage the City Council members to also oppose this bill as written.

Communication from Public

Name: Crenshaw Manor Community Association

Date Submitted: 08/17/2021 09:52 PM

Council File No: 21-0002-S18

Comments for Public Posting: Crenshaw Manor Community Association supports the Paul Koretz motion in opposition to SB 9 (Atkins)-21-0002-S18, which is up for a recommendation to ADOPT. The goal of this bill is to increase market-rate development to assume that the housing produced will be available to those at risk of displacement. We have found this premise to be false. Market-rate housing often goes to those currently residing outside the community, while current residents suffer from low affordability. We are firmly in opposition to SB 9 and encourage the City Councilmembers to also oppose this bill as written. Please see the attached opposition letter.



CRENSHAW MANOR
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION



August 17, 2021

TO: Los Angeles City Councilmembers

FROM: Crenshaw Manor Community Association (CMCA)

RE: Opposition of Senate Bill 9 (21-0002-S18) and Senate Bill 10 (21-0002-S21)

Crenshaw Manor Community Association (CMCA) represents the collective voice of over 936 homeowners and approximately 2,500 residents. We support the Paul Koretz motion in opposition to Senate Bill 9 (Atkins) and Senate Bill 10 (Wiener). The goal of these two bills is to increase market-rate development to assume that the housing produced will be available to those at risk of displacement. We have found this premise to be false. Market-rate housing often goes to those currently residing outside the community, while current residents suffer from low affordability. We are firmly in opposition to SB9 and SB10 and encourage the City Councilmembers to also oppose these bills as written.

There are no residentially zoned parcels that can receive up zoning utilizing Senate Bill 10 without prompting redevelopment within our community. We gladly facilitate discussion to ease the development of our underutilized commercial zones that have been battered by COVID-19's devastating economic losses. We are concerned about increased density's effect on the current lack of investment in our schools, parks, & utility infrastructure. The current state of community infrastructure is eroded and cannot be further stressed. In recent years, an increase in infill development has strained the aging underground pipes and our streets, resulting in random car-consuming sinkholes on multiple occasions. The roads or transportation signs have not been updated as necessary for public safety. **Our local police department does not have the resources to manage essential patrols and mitigate nuisances resulting from increased density. Senate Bill 9 assumes that transit will be a viable transportation option and reduces automobile parking requirements, yet auto usage is at a record high; most households have 3 or 4 cars.** These have become particularly precarious circumstances with the onset of COVID-19, the need for social distancing, and our municipal fiscal crisis. Finally, **we are very concerned about maintaining the neighborhood's historical character, parking impacts, crime and safety, and the lack of a community input process.** Our community has a distinct original design that residents have invested in and are determined to maintain for the sake of our children, elders, and families that utilize our streets and sidewalks for leisure. **We are mostly a built-out community.** Increased density brings increased opportunity for crime to hide under increased noise and increased turnover in residents. During a natural disaster, evacuation could be problematic if there are too many cars on the road.

We feel the state is wrong to impose a top-down one size fits all zoning code, particularly so at a time of suppressed public engagement due to the COVID-19 pandemic. These proposals are significant bills that would have incredibly impactful effects on the way we live and travel. We would like to see increased outreach on behalf of the legislature and a full committee process

with full deliberation. Furthermore, unlike some bad actor cities, Los Angeles has made an honest effort at accommodating market-rate housing growth with actions such as TOC, Small Lot Subdivision, & ADU law. Many of our neighbors have invested in ADUs, and we are grateful to accommodate the housing opportunity. We want our city to continue to plan for growth as appropriate for each neighborhood's environment, demography, and economy.

Sincerely,

Crenshaw Manor Community Association
cmca@crenshawmanor.org