

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Demetra Edwards

**Date Submitted:** 10/03/2023 12:29 PM

**Council File No:** 21-1230

**Comments for Public Posting:** Motion: I live in Westchester on 85th Place, where my husband and I bought our first and only home in 2011. Our daughter now attends our local elementary school down the street. We worked really hard to find a place near my place of work where we could afford to live when we bought our home. Our neighbors live in a duplex where they have been for nearly 20 years. But now our community is threatened unnecessarily. The Housing Element and Community Plan Updates have plenty of zoning opportunities in commercial corridors, public lands and through Adaptive Reuse to meet state mandates. There is no need to rezone, through overlays or other zoning devices, R1 zones or sensitive, rent stabilized multi-family housing. As stakeholders of The Westchester Playa Neighborhood Council we oppose the Housing Element's proposed rezoning and densification of R1 and multi-family neighborhoods beyond what SB9 and ADU laws allow. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely,  
Demetra Edwards

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Richard Nemec

**Date Submitted:** 10/02/2023 08:57 PM

**Council File No:** 21-1230

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a longtime resident on Mar Vista Hill, I urge you to re-think current proposals to impose multi-family zoning in long-established single-family home areas of the city like ours. There are better ways to address the affordable housing crisis.  
--Richard Nemec, 310-977-7190 12075 Palms Los Angeles, CA 90066

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jan

**Date Submitted:** 10/03/2023 09:21 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230

**Comments for Public Posting:** We are writing to express our concerns with various elements of the Housing Element, which we strongly oppose as we believe they would have a dramatic and negative effect on our neighborhood. 1) We are opposed to rezoning R-1 lots (currently single family homes) along Olympic Blvd and on Fox Hills Drive north of Olympic to allow for 5 story apartment buildings. R-1 lots along Olympic are not suitable for rezoning as their lot sizes do not allow for alleyways behind the multi-family dwellings they would allow if rezoned. Thus, there would be no way for trash trucks to service those buildings. Trash pickup for multi-family buildings on either Olympic or the side streets would create significant and potentially dangerous traffic and parking issues. Vehicle access to these buildings for residents would be similarly problematic, as traffic on Olympic is heavy and often high-speed (as evidenced by the number of accidents caused by speeding there over the past year). Fox Hills Drive, unlike Olympic Blvd or other alternatives, is not a major traffic corridor, so it is puzzling why it would have been chosen as a candidate for upzoning. Instead of the above, we support limiting upzoning to commercial corridors only. Pico Blvd and Santa Monica Blvd would be better alternatives to Olympic and Fox Hills North, which we would hope the City would consider. 2) We strongly oppose TOC projects being built in single family home neighborhoods, in particular in our neighborhood, between Pico and Santa Monica near Century City. Although we understand the rationale of increased—and affordable—housing near public transportation, we believe the TOC program, if such projects are allowed to be built in neighborhoods such as ours, will create more problems than it will solve. The neighborhoods between Pico and Santa Monica Blvd are low density, with mostly single family homes, some R-2 duplexes and some multiunit buildings--concentrated primarily on a limited number of streets (Fox Hills south, Almayo, Missouri). The streets are narrow and parking is limited (with permit parking already). The multiunit buildings that do exist in this area were built with the 45 ft height restriction and provide parking for their residents within the building. In contrast, TOC projects allow for much larger buildings (6 stories vs 45 ft height limit), smaller setbacks (even against R-1 lots) and require developers to provide little parking within the building for

residents. These neighborhoods do not have sufficient infrastructure to support this increase in density, and as far as we know, the City is not addressing these infrastructure issues in their planning. Where will these new residents park? On our streets, if they are allowed to obtain residential parking permits. Even though there is a finite amount of physical space for parking spaces in our neighborhood, which is already near capacity, apparently there is no limit to the number of permits the City will issue. Is this an oversight in the planning process? Developers are benefiting from the TOC guidelines to build oversized condo buildings which will be extremely profitable for them, while reducing the livability of the neighborhood for its current residents. The current residents of these neighborhoods (property owners who pay property taxes vs renters) will pay the price—all in exchange for allegedly gaining 1 or 2 low income housing units (sometimes where 10 or 12 such affordable rental units currently exist and which will be eliminated with the TOC project). For single family homeowners with TOC buildings being built adjacent to their properties, the results will be dramatic—a 65 ft high vertical wall built 10 ft from property lines, resulting in a lack of privacy, increased noise, reduced sunlight, and potentially damage to trees bordering properties. Again, whereas the thinking behind the plan to build more housing near public transportation centers is understandable, we do not believe it should be at the expense of destroying established residential neighborhoods. Why do such projects need to ruin the livability of these neighborhoods when alternatives exist? What do we support as alternatives? Why can't more housing be added to commercial corridors? Why not as part of mixed-use developments with access to grocery stores, shops, amenities, and jobs within the development? Why not focus on converting underutilized offices and hotels into housing or mixed-use developments? Both Santa Monica Blvd and Pico Blvd are better sites for this sort of development than the areas City Planning is now considering, in our view.