

Communication from Public

Name: Lionel Mares

Date Submitted: 10/24/2023 10:34 PM

Council File No: 21-1230

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Housing Element (CF 21-1230): Whereas the Housing Element and Community Plan Updates have sufficient zoning opportunities in commercial corridors, on public lands, and through Adaptive Reuse to meet State housing needs mandates, there is no need to divide and destroy existing residential neighborhoods by rezoning through overlays or other zoning devices of R1 zones or sensitive, rent-stabilized multi-family housing. Therefore, I oppose the Housing Element's proposed rezoning and densification of R1 and multi-family neighborhoods beyond what SB9 and ADU law allows. The San Fernando Valley and throughout Los Angeles have seen an explosion of land development and density with unintended consequences on our environment and the lack of open space and parks for recreation. Many people don't have access to open space and recreation. One of the issues that I have concerns about is public transportation. Public transportation needs to be improved before the city considers building more apartment complexes. The city of Los Angeles has an issue with traffic congestion and pollution, including over-population and homelessness. The issue with housing isn't the lack of housing but affordability and the cost of living. I urge the Mayor (Karen Bass) and the Los Angeles City Council to reconsider the Housing Element and not destroy single-family homes or destroy the character of single-family homes. Thank you!

Communication from Public

Name: Bill Pope

Date Submitted: 10/24/2023 08:27 PM

Council File No: 21-1230

Comments for Public Posting: Bill Pope's comments on DCP proposed Up-Zoning of Single-Family-Home neighborhoods. 1. I realize that California has a shortage of Mid-Price-Range Single Family houses being sought by the young professionals with families who will create the future jobs for the State's economy. California also a shortage of AFFORDABLE rentable housing units (apartments) for Service workers near their jobs. The ratio of these shortages is 5 to 1. It takes one Service Worker to meet the needs of every 5 professionals, so Mid-Price-Range Single-Family houses are actually the larger need. The State Legislator has passed several Housing Bills: Several of these Bills gradually allowed increasingly larger Auxiliary Dwelling Units (ADUs) to be built on R1 properties. SB-9 Part 1 allows Duplexes to be built on R1 properties in addition to ADUs, SB-9 Part 2 allows R1 lot splits and 2 to 4 housing units to be constructed on each new (half) lot. SB-10 allows cities to OPTIONALLY Up-Zone R1 properties for construction of 3, 4 or more-Story apartment buildings. However, none of these Bills require any AFFORDABLE housing. And SB-10 allows cities to place apartments on the only land on which Mid-Price-Level Single-Family-Houses sought by Professionals can be built. 2. Single-Family Homeowners, who comprise the majority of voters in City elections, know that Senate Bill 10, Up-Zoning R1 properties for construction of apartment buildings, is OPTIONAL. CA cities are not required to implement SB-10. However, doing so raises the market value of properties Wall Street REITs bought in foreclosure following the Housing Bubble burst in 2008 that they are still holding to sell to Developers. 3. The State's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), that the City claims required the above Up-Zoning, was not developed according to State Housing laws and appears intentionally inflated to enabled developers to build whatever they want wherever they want, and to provide the Real Estate industry with more luxury properties to sell. These industries funded the Bills' authors. See WIENER, SCOTT - FollowTheMoney.org and ATKINS, TONI - FollowTheMoney.org . 4. The LA Dept of City Planning (DCP) further inflated its RHNA and intends to Up-Zone for 1.4 Million additional housing units instead of the 230,947 needed to meet the State's already inflated requirement. It took 242 years to build LA's existing 1.3 Million housing units. And now DCP is

Up-Zoning to double that by 2029. Are they crazy. This is clearly DCP's attempt to justify Up-Zoning R1 neighborhoods. This needs to be audited by an outside firm. 5. R3 neighborhoods and transportation corridors are already zoned for 4-story or higher apartments and have the infrastructure for expansion. However, these areas are currently only built up to 1 or 2 stories. There is no need to Up-Zone Single-Family-Home areas from R1 to R3 until the unused R3 space on arterials is built out. 6. Therefore Up-Zoning of Single-Family-Home neighborhoods is completely unnecessary. Any continued attempt to do so appears to be a conspiracy to defraud Single-Family-Homeowners. Bill Pope

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/24/2023 11:04 AM

Council File No: 21-1230

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to oppose the building of 4-5 story apartment buildings in residential areas. Mayor Bass promised to work with residents before imposing changes that would affect them. Our neighborhoods were not built to support this kind of building. We as homeowners selected the areas we live in for why they are not what this would turn them into. There is not enough parking as it is, our sewer lines are fragile, and the homeowners and renters in these areas should not have to deal with this level of building, construction noise, and most importantly, the final result... lack of privacy, sunlight, and the environmental impact. Please work with professional urban planners to put more housing in the areas that sense. There are so many vacant office spaces along our corridors and under-utilized mini-malls where mixed-use buildings make sense. Please work with communities instead of imposing on them. Those areas would offer the same housing opportunities but without disturbing the residential area that are already in place. We chose this kind of community for our kids to grow up in. don't change it on us!!

Communication from Public

Name: K Stanley

Date Submitted: 10/24/2023 12:08 PM

Council File No: 21-1230

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to urge support for the rapid upzoning of Los Angeles via the city's rezoning process, including in exclusionary neighborhoods currently zoned only for single-family homes. "Residential streets" or "family neighborhoods" are frequently used as a euphemism for "single family-only" streets and neighborhoods. The terminology speaks to single-family preservationists' classism, the implication being that families worthy of quiet, safe streets are not families who live in multi-unit apartments or condos. Not only does this ignore the reality of Los Angeles – lots of families live in apartments and condos along busy roads, often because it is where they can afford to live. Almost nowhere else in the world is this distinction between the quality of life single-family homeowners can expect distinguished from the quality of life of apartment renters and condo owners. Residential means apartments (see: Paris). Residential means townhomes and rowhouses (see: London) and the multi-family German house model (looks like a single-family residence but houses a lot more people). Residential means duplexes (see: LA before redlining and single-family zoning). Residential means slowing speeds and enacting road diets along every road that has housing, including "arterial" roads (see: Barcelona's car-free streets and 20kmph aka 12MPH roads in London & Paris). Beautiful, dense, affordable housing should be allowed everywhere, not just on busy, polluted, and dangerous arterial roads. Because of the city's refusal to follow its own mobility and road safety plans -- slowing speeds, enacting road diets, and building safer sidewalks and protected bike lanes, and true BRT lanes -- arterials will remain polluted nightmares, and living along major roads will remain undesirable and unhealthy. We cannot and should not uphold a practice of housing apartheid, where everyone who cannot afford to rent or buy a multi-million-dollar home is stacked along the least desirable places to live, their bodies and housing used to barricade single-family enclaves like walled cities, forced to absorb the worst noise and particulate pollution of the city. Instead, we need to make it possible to build more dense, multi-family housing on quiet, less trafficked collector streets. Instead of fighting housing anywhere, we should be enacting policies that seek to make Los Angeles a more pleasant place to live, with robust opportunities for

homeownership everywhere. This means upzoning while simultaneously changing building codes to allow for the types of pleasant, greener housing ubiquitous in France, Austria, Germany, Singapore, and South American countries like Chile. Green building materials such as cross-laminated timber and straw, and building codes such as single-point access blocks and passiv haus standards should be promoted through tax subsidies and lower or eliminated permit fees. All parking requirements should be eliminated. All building fees which make condos more expensive to build than outsized single-family mansions should be eliminated, and policies and subsidies that encourage builders to construct for-sale homes at all income levels should be enacted. Opportunities for community-based ownership housing models, decoupled from the private housing market, should be promoted and funded via city funds (such as those from measure ULA). Good examples are: the subsidized Vienna housing model, which builds permanently affordable housing for 80% of working people, allowing long-term renters to save and be protected from inflationary rent raises for their entire lives, just like homeowners. Another is the German baugruppe housing model, which allows residents to design and construct buildings communally using one-percent-interest loans from their local governments. And extremely dense, new developments should be centered around green space, services, and shops, NOT polluted roads. (See the Clichy-Batignolles neighborhood in Paris.) All of these housing models put the resident's quality of life, rather than developer profits, at the forefront of design and planning. Dense, well-designed housing not only results in an abundance of desirable, affordable housing, but also greater walkability, social cohesion, shorter commutes, less pollution and pollution-related illnesses, and an overall higher quality of life and better cities. We already subsidize (mostly single-family) homeownership with favorable permit and tax rates (Prop 13, mortgage interest deduction, etc.) – we must subsidize new buildings, new homeownership, and long-term affordable rental opportunities at an even greater rate. In the face of necessary change, calls to maintain the status quo amount to regression, and LA cannot afford to slip backward. The working people of Los Angeles deserve to live dignified lives in safe, affordable, quiet, and abundant housing. Anything less is a failure.