

Communication from Public

Name: Calla Wiemer

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 11:25 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support greater housing density in the interest of affordability and efficient mobility. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Evan Norrington

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 10:55 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, My name is Evan Norrington, I work as a housing navigator in Los Angeles, and I'm a member of the California Chapter of the American Descendant of Slavery Advocacy Foundation. I am here in support of agenda items 2, 3, and 4. Regarding Item #2, I urge this committee to adopt the Exhibit D option in the City Planning Department's report, to upzone R1 neighborhoods. Per the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the 2021-2029 Housing Element found that current zoning regulations in Los Angeles would result in insufficient housing production to meet state mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals. Currently, Los Angeles council district eight has seen a sharp decline in commercial space, and a sharp incline in permanent supportive housing developments. Currently there are four within a 2 mile radius, and in close proximity to elementary schools, senior homes, and liquor stores. Without the upzoning of single family residential zones, Los Angeles citizens, especially ADOS and Black American families will bear the brunt of the negative impacts of the density and tourism gentrification that has already began pricing us out of our neighborhoods that have long been in decline due to the immense lack of economic investment. ADOS citizens are overrepresented in homelessness, and make up 65% of those who are rent burden. I urge this committee to vote yes on items 2, 3, and 4. Without the upzoning of R1 neighborhoods, stronger anti-displacement measures, and rent protections our homelessness crisis will increase. Sincerely, Evan Norrington
ADOSAF California Chapter

Communication from Public

Name: Larry Boring

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 10:57 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: ATTN: PLUM Committee members Please support Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP ordinance that rezones LA without regard to the Exhibit D “options” that would open up single-family neighborhoods. In its report, the LA City Planning Department clearly states that it has found enough zoning to meet the State’s mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. The City Planning Commission also saw fit to recommend the adoption of Draft #3. Here are some facts to consider: • The City continues to communicate a misleading message related to R1 single-family zoning stating that R1 is restricting development on 70% of LA’s land. However, when pressed, Planning Department stated clearly on Chapter 4, page 210 of the Housing Element, that 35% of LA land was not developable beyond R1 due to topography or other environmental concerns. This left only 45% of single-family zones, less than half of the city land, developable. And State law allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. Single-family zones are contributing to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs. Single family areas continue to do their part. • Pro-development groups say rezoning single-family neighborhoods is a social justice issue when, in fact, allowing apartments in single family neighborhoods is an attempt by large land investors/developers to increase the value of their R1 real estate holdings by deregulating single-family neighborhoods to allow more density. Allowing apartments in single-family neighborhoods will not right the wrongs of redlining that 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 forces more people to remain renters. • The Draft has a comprehensive plan for adding housing in all our high-resource areas on our commercial corridors. If planned correctly, new, vibrant neighborhoods could be created here in each of our communities and new, affordable, attached single-family homes “for sale” should be included in these developments that abut single-family neighborhoods. We must help families who have lost hope of becoming homeowners to achieve that goal. Please move Draft #3 forward as presented. Thank you. Larry D Boring 1428 N Orange Grove Avenue W

Hollywood, Calif. 90046 Spaulding Square HPOZ

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Moran

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 10:46 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to urge you to vote to approve Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP ordinance without the seven "options" to open up single-family neighborhoods. Anything that upzones our neighborhoods should happen with we the stakeholders' input through Community Plans and not this way with none of us involved. Most importantly, the LA City Planning Department clearly states it can meet its state housing obligation without opening up single-family neighborhoods. Thank you. Michael Moran 1428 N Orange Grove Avenue W Hollywood, Ca. 90046 Spaulding Square HPOZ

Communication from Public

Name: Alyssa Boyle

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 10:38 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Protect our single-family neighborhoods!

Communication from Public

Name: Michelle

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 08:32 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Allowing apartment buildings of any size in single family neighborhoods is unnecessary and imposing on quiet streets. The additional traffic is consequential to the safety of neighbors who walk on the streets that have no sidewalks. Outside every apartment complex mattresses and furniture are left un picked up. Apartment building should only be built on major streets such as Ventura Blvd., White Oak, Balboa Blvd, etc. I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Protect our single-family neighborhoods!

Communication from Public

Name: Christian Ashley Fauria

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 09:00 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I want to comment on the PLUM Committee to support the DRAFT VERSION # 3 of the Housing Element /CHIP Ordinance which preserves R1 SINGLE FAMILY ZONING -- without adoption of the Exhibit D options included in the PLANNING Dept. report. I want to please ask you to not destroy our beautiful single family home neighborhoods and not allow rezoning that would allow these ugly structures like the one at the corner of my 183200 block of San Jose Street. These structures will ruin our neighborhoods, the one at the corner of my home everyone calls "monstrosity". And that it is. Please vote to protect our neighborhoods. These problems you are trying to solve should not be solved upon the backs of those of us who cherish our dwellings and environment. We do not want apartment type housing being built. This is a criminal grab. with ugly intrusive intents. PLEASE PROTECT OUR SINGLE-FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS. THANK YOU. RF

Communication from Public

Name: Johnny Dodd
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 09:04 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: "I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Protect our single-family neighborhoods!"

Communication from Public

Name: Karen Carsello
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 09:06 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: "I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Protect our single-family neighborhoods!"

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 09:16 AM

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 Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open single-family neighborhoods to rezoning and redevelopment. 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 City's ambitious 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 ideologues and greedy corporate investors and developers are collaborating to rezone R1 neighborhoods. Allowing apartment buildings in single-family neighborhoods will not right past wrongs that prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. Individuals need the opportunity to buy single-family 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. Please 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, Windsor Village Resident

Communication from Public

Name: Christian Ashley Fauria

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 09:18 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: DON"T DO IT. it will ruin the neighborhood. if this is approved we will move to another State.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 04:26 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: R1 zonings are a necessary part of “the American Dream” of private home ownership with some land in back of the house. There are other ways to provide housing by building units in the European style with businesses on the ground floor. I am seeing that done in many places in Los Angeles County. That provides housing and walkable communities. Consider using every street which already has shops etc. on them.

Communication from Public

Name: jim Oliva

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 07:46 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Good morning, I live at 3467 Beethoven Street, one half block from Palms BL. we have lived here since 1987, and love our little single family community neighborhood. we bought this house that we had rented for 12 years in 1998 because we looked around the west side and realized that we lived in a nice unique area. close to shops, freeways and the beach. we loved everything about this location. no large apartment or commercial buildings. it was a family neighborhood where people took walks, the kids were safe and people were friendly. now we have learned that the city is moving forward with a development plan that will change the look and feel of this area. i have never lived in an apartment my whole life and never lived near one. i don't like the concentration of lots of cars, buildings and people in an area. i feel that the city is trying to change our neighborhood like some other areas that will make this area like a overbuilt metropolis. there are plenty of places for people to live now that the state has allowed every home owner to add an ADU. plus all the busy streets around here that are constantly building high apartments and mix use buildings. i have spoken to people about the new complexes and they tell me, "They are asking so much for rent" so maybe the city should consider requiring all the new apartments on Venice, and Overland etc. to charge less. allowing developers to come into our small quiet neighborhood and start replacing single family homes with apartments on a small narrow street like Palms, just doesn't make any sense, except for the builders that don't or wont be living here. they will create a mess and change our lives forever, and they will still be living somewhere else in their mansions i suspect. we Support Draft #3 of the Housing Element CHIP program that preserves R1 communities, and OPPOSE Exhibit D options to upzone R1 neighborhoods. please don't allow them to make our beautiful area and streets to become the next Overland Bl, or Normandy St. where its unrecognizable as a safe quiet place to live. Thank you very much, Jim and Tina Oliva

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 09:35 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: We strongly support Draft #3 . We oppose the blanket upzoning of R1 neighborhoods. In future it may be necessary to upzone a select special number of properties, but this should be done by professional planners. Please do not permit developers to become our City planners. Such an outcome to your vote will make this an unlivable, dysfunctional City. Thank you for your attention
Regards, Margaret Healy Board member WSSM - Westwood
South of Santa Monica HOA

Communication from Public

Name: Century Glen Neighborhood Association
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 11:43 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: Century Glen Neighborhood Association SUPPORTS Draft 3 of Housing Element/CHIP Ordinance (Without Exhibit D Options)
See attached letter

Council File Number: 21-1230-S5

PLUM Committee: Nov 19th, 2024

Position: SUPPORT for Draft #3 of Housing Element/CHIP Program without Exhibit D Options

As an active member of United Neighbors, Century Glen Neighborhood Association SUPPORTS the Planning Department's Draft # 3 CHIP Program without rezoning R1 parcels. We support the Planning Department's findings that draft 3 meets 100% of the requirements set by the State of California, and as such no need to further upzone single family parcels. We further present 4 facts in lieu of 4 falsehoods that have been presented to the public and the Commission. These 4 facts are in support of our position to protect single family neighborhoods:

1. 72% of Los Angeles is zoned for single family homes. False! The **FACT** is: 72% of residentially zoned land in LA is zoned for R1, however **35% of it cannot be developed for higher density** due to being located in high hazard severity zones and other sensitive areas. See Chapter 4 Page 210 of the Housing Element General Plan:

Additional details with respect to ecologically sensitive or hazardous areas, including high risk for fire and sea level rise, as well as impacts on communities of color, should also be noted. Much of the city's single-family zoning is in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas of the city. In fact, approximately 35% of the parcels of the city's single-family zoning are in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) or areas with vulnerability to Sea Level Rise (SLR) exposure.¹⁰ In addition, the prevalence of single-family housing in Los Angeles means that this component of the housing stock exists across nearly all communities in the city, including many established Black communities and communities of color.

Table 4.30: Existing Conditions Analysis: Share of Residential Land Zoned for Single-Family Residential Use by TCAC/HCD Resource Category

Resource Category	Percent of Residentially Zoned Land Restricted to Single-Family Housing*	Percent of Residentially Zoned Land that Allows Multi-family Housing**
Citywide	72%	28%
Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence	95%	5%
Highest Resource	81%	19%
High Resource	74%	26%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	51%	49%
Moderate Resource	74%	26%
Low Resource	54%	46%
High Segregation & Poverty	18%	82%

*Single-family residential use includes all zones in which residential uses are restricted to one-family dwellings (as well as accessory dwelling units).

**Includes all other zones where residential uses are permitted, including Commercial (C) zoned parcels, which generally allow 100% residential uses.

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2020; U.S. Census

2. The State of California mandates that 50% of the Low income housing inventory is obtained from single family neighborhoods. False! The FACT is: The exception allows the cities to utilize their Commercial Corridors to accommodate ALL of the low income units. See California Code Section 65583.2(h):

California Government Code Section 65583.2(h)

The program required by subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 65583 shall accommodate 100 percent of the need for housing for very low and low-income households allocated pursuant to Section 65584 for which site capacity has not been identified in the inventory of sites pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) on sites that shall be zoned to permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use by right for developments in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower income households during the planning period. These sites shall be zoned with minimum density and development standards that permit at least 16 units per site at a density of at least 16 units per acre in jurisdictions described in clause (i) of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (c), shall be at least 20 units per acre in jurisdictions described in clauses (iii) and (iv) of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) and shall meet the standards set forth in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (5) of subdivision (b). At least 50 percent of the very low and low-income housing need shall be accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted, **except that a city or county may accommodate all of the very low and low-income housing need on sites designated for mixed use if those sites allow 100 percent residential use and require that residential use occupy 50 percent of the total floor area of a mixed-use project**

3. If the City upzones R1s then you ensure and increase the SUPPLY of additional units to avoid BUILDERS REMEDY. False! The **FACT** is: Upzoning only gives the developers the ability to act as City Planners, as they will cherry pick which parcels yield the most profit, not in the interest of serving the community.

4. Upzoning alone ensures increased housing supply. False! The **FACT** is: the high cost of construction, refusal of insurance companies to insure in California, and high interest rates are the real culprits of the housing shortage.

Sincerely,

Sheida Ashley, President
Century Glen Neighborhood Association/Tract 7260

Communication from Public

Name: Honor Vandever

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 11:45 AM

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 Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open single-family neighborhoods to rezoning and redevelopment. 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 City's ambitious 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 ideologues and greedy corporate investors and developers are collaborating to rezone R1 neighborhoods. Allowing apartment buildings in single-family neighborhoods will not right past wrongs that prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. Individuals need the opportunity to buy single-family 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. Please 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, Honor Vandever OWNER 738 South Lorraine 90005 Windsor Village

Communication from Public

Name: Sheida Ashley
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 11:47 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: As a homeowner and a community leader I SUPPORT the Draft 3 of Housing Element/CHIP Ordinance (Without Exhibit D Options) See attached letter

Council File Number: 21-1230-S5

PLUM Committee: Nov 19th, 2024

Position: SUPPORT for Draft #3 of Housing Element/CHIP Program without Exhibit D Options

As an active member of United Neighbors, Century Glen Neighborhood Association SUPPORTS the Planning Department's Draft # 3 CHIP Program without rezoning R1 parcels. We support the Planning Department's findings that draft 3 meets 100% of the requirements set by the State of California, and as such no need to further upzone single family parcels. We further present 4 facts in lieu of 4 falsehoods that have been presented to the public and the Commission. These 4 facts are in support of our position to protect single family neighborhoods:

1. 72% of Los Angeles is zoned for single family homes. False! The **FACT** is: 72% of residentially zoned land in LA is zoned for R1, however **35% of it cannot be developed for higher density** due to being located in high hazard severity zones and other sensitive areas. See Chapter 4 Page 210 of the Housing Element General Plan:

Additional details with respect to ecologically sensitive or hazardous areas, including high risk for fire and sea level rise, as well as impacts on communities of color, should also be noted. Much of the city's single-family zoning is in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas of the city. In fact, approximately 35% of the parcels of the city's single-family zoning are in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) or areas with vulnerability to Sea Level Rise (SLR) exposure.¹⁰ In addition, the prevalence of single-family housing in Los Angeles means that this component of the housing stock exists across nearly all communities in the city, including many established Black communities and communities of color.

Table 4.30: Existing Conditions Analysis: Share of Residential Land Zoned for Single-Family Residential Use by TCAC/HCD Resource Category

Resource Category	Percent of Residentially Zoned Land Restricted to Single-Family Housing*	Percent of Residentially Zoned Land that Allows Multi-family Housing**
Citywide	72%	28%
Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence	95%	5%
Highest Resource	81%	19%
High Resource	74%	26%
Moderate Resource (Rapidly Changing)	51%	49%
Moderate Resource	74%	26%
Low Resource	54%	46%
High Segregation & Poverty	18%	82%

*Single-family residential use includes all zones in which residential uses are restricted to one-family dwellings (as well as accessory dwelling units).

**Includes all other zones where residential uses are permitted, including Commercial (C) zoned parcels, which generally allow 100% residential uses.

Source: TCAC/HCD Opportunity Area Map, 2020; U.S. Census

2. The State of California mandates that 50% of the Low income housing inventory is obtained from single family neighborhoods. False! The FACT is: The exception allows the cities to utilize their Commercial Corridors to accommodate ALL of the low income units. See California Code Section 65583.2(h):

The program required by subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 65583 shall accommodate 100 percent of the need for housing for very low and low-income households allocated pursuant to Section 65584 for which site capacity has not been identified in the inventory of sites pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) on sites that shall be zoned to permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use by right for developments in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower income households during the planning period. These sites shall be zoned with minimum density and development standards that permit at least 16 units per site at a density of at least 16 units per acre in jurisdictions described in clause (i) of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (c), shall be at least 20 units per acre in jurisdictions described in clauses (iii) and (iv) of subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) and shall meet the standards set forth in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (5) of subdivision (b). At least 50 percent of the very low and low-income housing need shall be accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted, **except that a city or county may accommodate all of the very low and low-income housing need on sites designated for mixed use if those sites allow 100 percent residential use and require that residential use occupy 50 percent of the total floor area of a mixed-use project**

3. If the City upzones R1s then you ensure and increase the SUPPLY of additional units to avoid BUILDERS REMEDY. False! The **FACT** is: Upzoning only gives the developers the ability to act as City Planners, as they will cherry pick which parcels yield the most profit, not in the interest of serving the community.

4. Upzoning alone ensures increased housing supply. False! The **FACT** is: the high cost of construction, refusal of insurance companies to insure in California, and high interest rates are the real culprits of the housing shortage.

Sincerely,

Sheida Ashley, President
Century Glen Neighborhood Association/Tract 7260

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 01:02 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: We are strongly opposed to blanket upzoning of R1 and also opposed to Alternative D. We do not want to see developers be our City planners. Thank you for your attention to my input.
Regards, Margaret Healy and Charles Healy Longtime residents of West Los Angeles Margaret Healy, Board member of WSSM HOA

Communication from Public

Name: Jordan W.

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 01:54 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Hello, My name is Jordan Williams, a pharmacy technician whose family currently resides in the greater Los Angeles area ; and member of the California Chapter of the American Descendant of Slavery Advocacy Foundation. I am here in support of agenda items 2, 3, and 4. Regarding Item #2, I urge this committee to adopt the Exhibit D option in the City Planning Department's report, to upzone R1 neighborhoods. Per the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the 2021-2029 Housing Element found that current zoning regulations in Los Angeles would result in insufficient housing production to meet state mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals. Currently, Los Angeles council district eight has seen a sharp decline in commercial space, and a sharp incline in permanent supportive housing developments. Currently there are four within a 2 mile radius, and in close proximity to elementary schools, senior homes, and liquor stores. Without the upzoning of single family residential zones, Los Angeles citizens, especially ADOS and Black American families will bear the brunt of the negative impacts of the density and tourism gentrification that has already began pricing us out of our neighborhoods that have long been in decline due to the immense lack of economic disinvestment. In Los Angeles, ADOS and Black Americans at-large are only 8% of the total population, and make up 34% of our total population. Also, ADOS citizens are overrepresented in homelessness, and make up 65% of those who are rent burden. I urge this committee to vote yes on items 2, 3, and 4. Without the upzoning of R1 neighborhoods, stronger anti-displacement measures, and rent protections our homelessness crisis will increase. Sincerely, Jordan Williams
ADOSAF California Chapter

Communication from Public

Name: Laurie Levine

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 02:03 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am a member of the South Robertson Neighborhoods Council. I am writing to you on behalf of myself and many of my neighbors. I live in a cute little community of Spanish Houses that are about 100 years old. I love this community because it is family oriented. I have lived in my house in Reynier Village for more than 60 years. I have watched old ranch style houses from the original settlers be torn down to create Reynier Park. These original settlers were the Rainers from France. They had a working farm here at one time. it was a shame to see it go. Please stop allowing the destruction of single family homes that are being replaced by massive apartment buildings that are ALL 1 bedroom or singles, and have barely or no parking for all the new tenants. This is a working class neighborhood. Many people here need to drive their cars or work trucks to their customers home to fix things....plumbing and heating etc. Most of my neighbors do not take public transportation. We have developers snapping up single family homes that are trying to build mc mansion size apartment complexes with 70 + units where 3 small single family homes are. I forgot to mention this is on a small cul de sac called Helms Place with less than 20 homes on it. My neighbors and I know the city needs new housing. we are open to small developments that fit the neighborhood. The projects/developments that we could support would include a 2-3 story development that has at least some 2 bedroom units and they must provide parking. Our streets are already overcrowded with cars of people who do not live or work around here. We do not want to see the destruction of any of our local single family communities. With all the singles and 1 bedrooms being developed where will families live? Bachelor pads can't even house 2 people. Please STOP allowing the destruction of all these old homes that still house families!!!! We need family oriented neighborhoods, and we don't need overpriced single units. It will not help the housing shortage! Thank you, Laurie Levine

Communication from Public

Name: Roy Nwaisser

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 02:46 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: ALICIA FROHMADER

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 02:56 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: Elissa Diaz

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 01:22 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Please find public comment attached on behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce.



LOS ANGELES AREA

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

November 19, 2024

Los Angeles City Councilmembers
200 North Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Citywide Housing Incentive Program (21-1230-S5) at PLUM Committee – Agenda Item 2

Good afternoon Councilmembers. On behalf of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce (Chamber), representing a broad spectrum of businesses large and small in the Los Angeles region, we submit this public comment to advocate for greater housing production to address our region's severe housing affordability crisis.

The Chamber submitted a letter with 7 other organizations with our recommendations for the proposed Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP). As Los Angeles is in the midst of a severe housing crisis, our coalition is focused on ensuring that the CHIP maximizes the potential for creating new housing in LA at all income levels.

We thank the Department of City Planning for their collaboration and appreciate that many of our recommendations were incorporated into the current version of the CHIP. The Chamber strongly urges that the Committee preserve these provisions as you consider and vote on the CHIP.

In addition to the recommendations outlined in the coalition letter, the Chamber would like to underscore the importance of ensuring the financial feasibility of the CHIP to fully realize the vision of this program. To support feasibility, the Transit Oriented Incentive and Opportunity Corridor programs should be revised to a single tier system by eliminating the increased affordability requirements for the High Medium and High Market Tiers. FAR incentives should be increased to support the economic viability of projects.

Thank you for your consideration. For any questions, please contact Elissa Diaz, Senior Public Policy Manager, at ediaz@lachamber.com.

Communication from Public

Name: Western States Regional Council of Carpenters
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 03:36 PM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: Western States Regional Council of Carpenters support SB4 objectives



WESTERN STATES REGIONAL COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS

Sean Hartranft
President

Frank Hawk
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Frank Zambrano
Vice President



November 19, 2024

59 Spokane, WA
82 Great Falls, MT
96 NW Millwrights
196 Pile Drivers, WA
206 Seattle, WA
213 Los Angeles, CA
323 So. Los Angeles, CA
360 So. Puget Sound, WA
425 No. Puget Sound, WA
503 Portland, OR
541 Eugene, OR
555 Colorado
562 Long Beach, CA
619 San Diego, CA
635 Boise, ID
661 Sylmar, CA
714 Buena Park, CA
721 Whittier, CA
743 Bakersfield, CA
801 Utah
805 Camarillo, CA
808 Idaho Falls, ID
909 Ontario, CA
951 Riverside, CA
971 Reno, NV
1136 Kettle Falls, WA
1243 Fairbanks, AK
1281 Anchorage, AK
1319 New Mexico
1607 Millwrights
1912 Arizona
1977 Las Vegas, NV
2520 Pile Drivers & Divers, AK
2761 McCleary, WA
2851 La Grande, OR
2949 Roseburg, OR

Honorable John Lee
Chair, Planning and Land Use Committee
Los Angeles City Council
200 N Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Letter Supporting the Objectives of SB 4

Dear Chairperson Lee,

The Western States Regional Council of Carpenters is committed to preventing the exploitation of all construction workers while incentivizing the production of affordable housing. That is why we championed SB 4 in Sacramento alongside our allies in the faith-based and affordable housing communities, many of which are included in the attached list of supporters. We are enthusiastic about building housing with our faith-based allies in a manner that ensures non-union construction workers are respected, and not exploited by bad contractors, when working in places of worship.

Our shared strategy for SB 4 was to achieve two critical objectives: (1) ensuring that projects on properties owned by religious organizations are developed with high quality standards and a well-supported construction workforce receiving fair wages and healthcare benefits and (2) accelerating affordable housing construction by easing zoning regulations while preserving local jurisdictions' oversight of neighborhood-appropriate design and scale.

As such, we are in strong support of the City's recommendation to create an alternative pathway under the FBO to facilitate smaller, neighborhood-scale projects that promote new homeownership opportunities for those in need. This proposed modification encourages developers to build alternative housing types, such as townhomes, tiny homes, or modular homes, which would support homeownership pathways. And, crucially, no construction workers will be driven into poverty as a result. Instead, workers will be uplifted, housing will be built, and religious groups will continue to promote thriving communities.

We urge the Committee to adopt this recommendation to achieve a balanced outcome that supports the objectives of SB 4 while encouraging community-scale building incentives in the FBO.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Frank Hawk
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Senate Bill 4 – Affordable Housing on Faith Lands Act

SUPPORTERS

- Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH) (Sponsor)
- Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing (SCANPH) (Sponsor)
- Jewish Public Affairs Committee of California (JPAC) (Sponsor)
- California Conference of Carpenters (Sponsor)
- Inner City Law Center (Sponsor)
- United Way of Greater Los Angeles
- Los Angeles Family Housing
- Housing Action Coalition
- Many Mansions
- Abundant Housing Los Angeles
- Peninsula Solidarity Cohort
- Making Housing and Community Happens
- Move LA
- East Bay Housing Organizations
- East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
- MidPen Housing Corporation
- Firm Foundation Community Housing
- San Pedro United Methodist Church
- San Francisco Foundation
- YIMBY Action
- Grow the Richmond
- Mountain View YIMBY
- Napa-Solano for Everyone
- Northern Neighbors
- Peninsula for Everyone
- Progress Noe Valley

- San Francisco YIMBY
- Santa Cruz YIMBY
- Santa Rosa YIMBY
- SLOCo YIMBY
- South Bay YIMBY
- South Side Forward
- Urban Environmentalists
- People for Housing Orange County
- How to ADU
- Generation Housing
- PATH (People Assisting the Homeless)
- City of Emeryville
- City of Berkeley
- Muslim Public Affairs Council
- Multi-Faith Action Coalition
- St. Francis Center of Redwood City
- San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR)
- Santa Monica Forward
- Active San Gabriel Valley
- Merritt Community Capital Corporation
- Walnut Creek Homeless Task Force
- Union Station Homeless Services
- Jewish Free Loan Association
- IKAR
- Venice Community Housing Corporation
- Jewish Family & Community Services

East Bay

- Hadassah Southern California
- South District of the California-Pacific Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church

- Multifaith Voices for Peace and Justice
- First Congregational Church of Berkeley, United Church of Christ
- Claremont United Church of Christ
- Institute of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas
- Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Redwood City
- Unitarian Universalists of San Mateo
- Congregational Church of San Mateo
- Destination: Home
- Novin Development
- First Congregational Church of Palo Alto, United Church of Christ
- The People Concern
- Faith and Community Empowerment
- San Gabriel Valley Consortium on Homelessness
- Jewish Federation of the Sacramento Region
- Housing Opportunities Made Easier
- LA Voice
- Peninsula Sinai Congregation
- California YIMBY
- All Home

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 03:50 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 Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open single-family neighborhoods to rezoning and redevelopment. 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 City's ambitious 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 ideologues and greedy corporate investors and developers are collaborating to rezone R1 neighborhoods. Allowing apartment buildings in single-family neighborhoods will not right past wrongs that prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. Individuals need the opportunity to buy single-family 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. Please 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, Windsor Village Resident
800 block of Lorraine Blvd

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 04:33 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I agree with Encino Property Owners Association

Communication from Public

Name: D. Denell Gibson

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 03:05 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Good Afternoon, My name is D. Denell Gibson, Hyde Park resident and State Coordinator for the California Chapter of the American Descendant of Slavery Advocacy Foundation. I am writing in support of agenda items two. I urge this committee to adopt the Exhibit D option in the City Planning Department's report, to upzone R1 neighborhoods. Per the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the 2021-2029 Housing Element found that current zoning regulations in Los Angeles would result in insufficient housing production to meet state mandated Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals. In Los Angeles, ADOS and Black Americans at-large are only 8% of the total population, but make up 34% of our homeless population. ADOS citizens continue to be overrepresented in homelessness, making up 65% of those who are rent burden, and forced to survive without viable policy intervention. Currently, Los Angeles council district eight has seen a sharp decline in commercial space, and a sharp incline in permanent supportive housing developments. Currently there are four within a four mile radius, and in close proximity to elementary schools, senior housing complexes, and liquor stores. Without the upzoning of single family residential zones, Los Angeles citizens, especially ADOS and Black American families, will bear the brunt of the negative impacts of the density and tourism gentrification that has already began pricing us out of our neighborhoods that have long been in decline due to the immense lack of economic disinvestment. I urge this committee to vote yes on items two, three, and four. Without the upzoning of R1 neighborhoods, stronger anti-displacement measures, and rent protections our homelessness crisis will increase. Best Regards, D. Denell Gibson State Coordinator ADOSAF California Chapter