

Communication from Public

Name: June Martin. Homeowner

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 03:58 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the Housing Element WITHOUT Appendix D options.

Communication from Public

Name: Karl Gluck

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 04:10 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose expanding building incentives into R-1 Concentrating density along our corridors allows economies of scale by developers that will hopefully translate to more affordability of the resulting units

Communication from Public

Name: Tracy Thrower Conyers/Concerned For Westchester Playa

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 05:17 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I represent over 1,000 active and engaged constituents in the city's gateway to LAX - Westchester/Playa. We strongly urge you to adopt the CHIP Ordinance without R-1 options. Developer-driven arguments highlight the supposed fairness of densifying R-1 areas, but there are many reasons we don't need to (and shouldn't yet) go to this extreme: EQUITY & JUSTICE

CONSIDERATIONS:

- Protecting Starter Homes: encouraging high-rise developments in R-1 areas depletes starter home inventory, making it harder for Angelenos to transition from renters to homeowners (developers often target affordable R-1 properties for demolition, further compounding this issue)
- Middle-Class Stability: families have invested their life savings and energy into R-1 neighborhoods; altering their character without meaningful outreach undermines community trust and stability
- Focused Densification: concentrating new developments along corridors fosters thoughtful, community-driven planning (focused development can blend NEW townhomes, starter homes, and multi-family units while preserving R-1 zones for families)
- Preserving Multi-Generational Housing: high-rise developments primarily offer studios and one-bedrooms, ignoring the needs of families and multi-generational households
- Public Transit Alignment: corridors already align with public transportation, reducing reliance on cars (densifying R-1 neighborhoods, where transit options are limited, incentivizes car use, undermining sustainable planning goals and promotes pollution)
- High-resource areas have ample corridors for densification without compromising aspirational R-1 neighborhoods
- R-1 is contributing its fair share with ADU and SB-9 upzoning
- Density developers seek to build apartment buildings, not condos, preventing more and more Angelenos from building wealth through home ownership as opportunities grow more restricted and more expensive

SUPPLY

CONSIDERATIONS:

- State Mandates: despite harsh state density mandates, city planning reports confirm sufficient capacity exists along corridors to meet statutory requirements
- Affordable Housing Preservation: existing R-1 neighborhoods provide naturally affordable housing. Replacing them with market-rate units does little to address affordability issues
- Adaptive Reuse: corridors are ideal for adaptive reuse projects,

creating more housing without destroying established neighborhoods

AFFORDABILITY CONSIDERATIONS:

- Vancouver has already tried the experiment of densification to bring home prices down and found it to be an abysmal failure; why do we need to repeat the same mistakes?
- Concentrating density along our corridors allows economies of scale by developers that will hopefully translate to more affordability of the resulting units
- Why blight R-1 with high rises when we can't even expect a respectable number of affordable units?

CITY GOVERNMENT CONSIDERATIONS:

- The corridors make the most sense in terms of focusing precious city budget dollars on infrastructure improvements
- Building density in R-1 neighborhoods without walkability makes no sense if we're truly moving toward a carless culture in LA
- It makes no sense to subject our city to inevitable litigation when damaged single family homeowners sue because their light and privacy have been diminished and the value of their homes have dropped, particularly when there is still an alternative with the corridors (litigation that will be all the more successful for homeowners since we don't yet "need" R-1 to meet our housing obligations)

Low rise R-1 neighborhoods present important aspirational housing opportunities and strong connected, committed communities. It's not time to talk yet about obliterating these mature communities with developer "middle fingers". It makes the most sense to build density on the corridors. Keep the development narrowly focused while we experiment with new configurations to find the most successful density formula.

Tracy Thrower Conyers, Broker, JD

www.concernedforwestchesterplaya.com

Communication from Public

Name: Toni Wolf

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 05:17 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Hello I am appalled that you are doing this to our community I have lived here since 1965 and have always loved my little community of Westchester. With all the apartments, High rises behind some residence etc. is just not right. We the people seem to have no rights- We sign petitions, go to community meetings and you get around this some how. We have nice homes that are being be-little by big contractors and governed by politicians that don't care. PLEASE STOP

Communication from Public

Name: Cindy Ruiz

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 06:42 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I OPPOSE expanding building incentives into R-1 areas. Density is not affordability. Concentrating density along transit corridors MAY result in more affordability of a small number of the resulting RENTAL units. There is more than enough property for new construction and reuse along existing corridors to build high-rise RENTALS to meet realistic projections for housing needs. If real wages decrease and inflation of the cost of goods and services continues over the next several years, the result may be empty market-rate, high-rise RENTAL properties. Preserving R-1 areas of properties available for HOMEOWNERSHIP and rental is a more appropriate use of space and resources, and preserves neighborhoods designed for families.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 06:59 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I SUPPORT Draft #3 of the Housing Element WITHOUT Appendix D options. Density should be placed on our commercial corridors where new vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each high-resource community, while protecting existing single-family neighborhoods, RSO multifamily neighborhoods, HPOZs that are the historic heart of our city, and our vulnerable communities in high fire and coastal zones. There is plenty of capacity in L.A. to meet our housing needs and at the same time preserve a wide range of housing options. All of us will be part of the solution to create affordable housing in L.A. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Elaine Albert

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 07:02 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I SUPPORT Draft #3 of the Housing Element WITHOUT Appendix D options. Density should be placed on our commercial corridors where new vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each high-resource community, while protecting existing single-family neighborhoods, RSO multifamily neighborhoods, HPOZs that are the historic heart of our city, and our vulnerable communities in high fire and coastal zones. There is plenty of capacity in L.A. to meet our housing needs and at the same time preserve a wide range of housing options. All of us will be part of the solution to create affordable housing in L.A.

Communication from Public

Name: Julian Payne

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 07:16 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose expanding building incentives into R-1 Concentrating density along our corridors allows economies of scale by developers that will hopefully translate to more affordability of the resulting units Best regards Julian Payne

Communication from Public

Name: Richard and Dori Raser

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 07:31 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose expanding building incentives into R-1 Concentrating density along our corridors allows economies of scale by developers that will hopefully translate to more affordability of the resulting units. We are not robots. Thank you, Richard and Dori Raser 6451 W 83rd St Westchester, CA 90045

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 09:44 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose expanding CHIP builder incentives into R-1 zones. Here's why: - Public transportation is on the corridors, not in the R-1 neighborhoods. - We shouldn't incentive density in locations that will require cars. - Vancouver has already shown that densifying residential neighborhoods does not make housing more affordable. - State law already allows ADUs and 4 units on R-1 lots and that hasn't resulted in improved affordability. Why spoil our mature R-1 neighborhoods with highrises when that will result in only a few affordable units? Put the high-rises where they belong: along the commercial zones with other tall buildings.

Communication from Public

Name: Donna Stillo

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 10:11 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 02:03 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to protect single-family neighborhoods throughout Los Angeles and in support of Draft #3 of the CHIP/Housing Element Rezoning ordinance without the included the Exhibit D "options" (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open up single-family neighborhoods to needless development. The Planning Department, in its report, clearly states that they have identified enough opportunities throughout our city to rezone to meet the State's mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. Here are some facts to consider. 1. The Department of City Planning has already acknowledged that rezoning single-family neighborhoods is not necessary to achieve the housing goals CHIP set out to reach. 2. State law already allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. Single-family zones do and will continue to contribute to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs. 3. An "unholy alliance" of housing-at-any-and-all-costs-any-time-anywhere ideologues using an inflammatory narrative and greedy investor / developers seeking to increase the value of their R1 real estate holdings by deregulating single-family neighborhoods to allow more density are collaborating to re-zone R1. Allowing apartments in single-family neighborhoods will not right the wrongs that in the past prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. People need the opportunity to buy affordable homes so they can build generational wealth. Ending single-family zones will take away upward economic mobility from current and future generations of Angelenos. 4. Draft # 3 without Exhibit D options already includes a comprehensive plan for adding housing in all our high resource areas on our commercial corridors. If planned correctly new, vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each of our communities that include new affordable single-family homes for sale along corridors that abut existing single-family neighborhoods. We must help families, who have lost hope of owning their own home, achieve that goal. You are deciding on an existential issue affecting hundreds of thousands of Angelenos. I ask you to respect the diversity of housing which makes Los Angeles the remarkable city that it is. Please vote to Approve Draft #3 without the options contained In Exhibit D. Respectfully, Jay 512 N Gower 90004

Communication from Public

Name: Myron Levin

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 02:05 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D

Communication from Public

Name: marianne king

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 02:12 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: After reviewing the Amended Appendix 5: Rezoning Program Assumptions Draft Annual Progress Report Table C - AHIP Faith Based Organizations (November 14, 2024) CPC-2023-7068-CA For City Council consideration, the following are items of concern for the Chatsworth Community: 22167 Bryant – zoned RE11 – existing SFD in SF neighborhood – proposed density of 25 units 8654 Winnetka – zoned RA – existing SFD in SF neighborhood – proposed density of 214 units 10001 Mason – zoned RS – existing SFD next to a church site and SF neighborhood – proposed density of 18 units The above single family dwellings should be removed from the AHIP list as they are not on church sites. 9453 Wilbur – zoned A2 but shows it as P zone- existing church and parking lot – proposed density of 5 units- should be a lot more – site is 35,668 sf The above site can hold a lot more density than 5 units- density should be increased accordingly.

Communication from Public

Name: Patti Jo Wolfson
Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 01:09 PM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D.

Communication from Public

Name: Patti Jo Wolfson

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 01:25 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D.

Communication from Public

Name: Judith S Brown

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 01:30 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I SUPPORT Draft #3 of the Housing Element WITHOUT Appendix D options. Density should be placed on our commercial corridors where new vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each high-resource community, while protecting existing single-family neighborhoods, RSO multifamily neighborhoods, HPOZs that are the historic heart of our city, and our vulnerable communities in high fire and coastal zones. There is plenty of capacity in L.A. to meet our housing needs and at the same time preserve a wide range of housing options. All of us will be part of the solution to create affordable housing in L.A. Judy Summers Brown Bentley Ave Los Angeles

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 01:47 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to protect single-family neighborhoods throughout Los Angeles and in support of Draft #3 of the CHIP/Housing Element Rezoning ordinance without the included the Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open up single-family neighborhoods to needless development. The Planning Department, in its report, clearly states that they have identified enough opportunities throughout our city to rezone to meet the State’s mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. Here are some facts to consider. 1. The Department of City Planning has already acknowledged that rezoning single-family neighborhoods is not necessary to achieve the housing goals CHIP set out to reach. 2. State law already allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. Single-family zones do and will continue to contribute to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs. 3. An "unholy alliance" of housing-at-any-and-all-costs-any-time-anywhere ideologues using an inflammatory narrative and greedy investor / developers seeking to increase the value of their R1 real estate holdings by deregulating single-family neighborhoods to allow more density are collaborating to re-zone R1. Allowing apartments in single-family neighborhoods will not right the wrongs that in the past prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. People need the opportunity to buy affordable homes so they can build generational wealth. Ending single-family zones will take away upward economic mobility from current and future generations of Angelenos. 4. Draft # 3 without Exhibit D options already includes a comprehensive plan for adding housing in all our high resource areas on our commercial corridors. If planned correctly new, vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each of our communities that include new affordable single-family homes for sale along corridors that abut existing single-family neighborhoods. We must help families, who have lost hope of owning their own home, achieve that goal. You are deciding on an existential issue affecting hundreds of thousands of Angelenos. I ask you to respect the diversity of housing which makes Los Angeles the remarkable city that it is. Please vote to Approve Draft #3 without the options contained In Exhibit D. Respectfully, Georgea Fenady 444 N Gower Street LA CA 90004 Larchmont

Village _____

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Schenk

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 09:28 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I SUPPORT Draft #3 of the Housing Element WITHOUT Appendix D options. Density should be placed on our commercial corridors where new vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each high-resource community, while protecting existing single-family neighborhoods, RSO multifamily neighborhoods, HPOZs that are the historic heart of our city, and our vulnerable communities in high fire and coastal zones. There is plenty of capacity in L.A. to meet our housing needs and at the same time preserve a wide range of housing options. All of us will be part of the solution to create affordable housing in L.A.

Communication from Public

Name: Patricia Del Junco

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 11:02 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I SUPPORT Draft #3 of the Housing Element WITHOUT Appendix D options. Density should be placed on our commercial corridors where new vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each high-resource community, while protecting existing single-family neighborhoods, RSO multifamily neighborhoods, HPOZs that are the historic heart of our city, and our vulnerable communities in high fire and coastal zones. There is plenty of capacity in L.A. to meet our housing needs and at the same time preserve a wide range of housing options. All of us will be part of the solution to create affordable housing in L.A. Please do NOT ruin the single family housing neighborhoods we have fought to preserve. This is a totally different feel than multi family units. We have paid for and sought out this single type environment to raise our kids...it is not your right after the fact to remove our choices!

Communication from Public

Name: Paul Kelson

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 11:18 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D.

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy Levin

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 12:00 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D.

Communication from Public

Name: Margaret Alexander
Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 12:19 PM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: Please protect single family areas

Communication from Public

Name: South Carthay Neighborhood Association

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 12:26 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: The South Carthay Neighborhood Association (“SCNA”) supports the Housing Element's proposed rezoning and densification of underutilized commercial corridors without adversely affecting vulnerable R1 and multi-family neighborhoods beyond the requirements of existing state and local zoning laws. The SCNA urges the City to advance Draft #3 of the CHIP without any of the Exhibit D Options. The Housing Element and Community Plan approved by the City Planning Commission provides the City with ample room for this increased housing to be built on our underutilized commercial corridors, public land and through adaptive reuse, without imposing overbuild and density within existing residential neighborhoods. The City through existing overlays or other zoning devices have created the opportunity to build affordable units on a large scale without adversely impacting current R1 and HPOZ zones designated for sensitive, low-income, rent stabilized-existing multi-family housing and the increased building of affordable ADU units in single-family residential areas which may also contribute to the increase in available housing. In fact, current law allows property owners to add two auxiliary dwelling units to each single-family zoned property (R-1) or greater density property.



November 16, 2024

Karen Bass
Los Angeles City Mayor
City Hall
200 N. Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90012
Email: karen.bass@lacity.org

Re: Council File # 21-1230-S5
Support For Draft #3 of the CHIP without any of the Exhibit D Options.

Dear Mayor Bass,

The South Carthay Neighborhood Association ("SCNA") supports the Housing Element's proposed rezoning and densification of underutilized commercial corridors without adversely affecting vulnerable R1 and multi-family neighborhoods beyond the requirements of existing state and local zoning laws. The SCNA urges the City to advance Draft #3 of the CHIP without any of the Exhibit D Options.

The Housing Element and Community Plan approved by the City Planning Commission provides the City with ample room for this increased housing to be built on our underutilized commercial corridors, public land and through adaptive reuse, without imposing overbuild and density within existing residential neighborhoods. The City through existing overlays or other zoning devices have created the opportunity to build affordable units on a large scale without adversely impacting current R1 and HPOZ zones designated for sensitive, low-income, rent stabilized-existing multi-family housing and the increased building of affordable ADU units in single-family residential areas which may also contribute to the increase in available housing. In fact, current law allows property owners to add two auxiliary dwelling units to each single-family zoned property (R-1) or greater density property.

Please let us know where you stand on this issue as soon as possible. We will follow up shortly with a phone call to your office, or I may be reached at (323) 697-9840.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Brad Kane". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Brad" and last name "Kane" clearly distinguishable.

Brad Kane
President
South Carthay Neighborhood Association

Cc: Council Member Katy Yaroslavsky (councilmember.yaroslavsky@lacity.org)

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/16/2024 12:55 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: "I support Draft #3 of the CHIP Ordinance without any options from Exhibit D"