

Communication from Public

Name: Eric Prestin

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 11:57 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Alyssa Prestin

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 11:59 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Suzanna Prestin

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 11:59 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Clayton Becker

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 04:39 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: My name is Clayton Becker and I am writing to oppose this motion and to support SB 79 in the strongest possible terms. I am 27 years old, and a PhD candidate and teaching fellow at UCLA. Housing, and the politics of housing, are my primary areas of expertise. Part of me simply wanted to ask "How dare you?", but instead I felt I should explain why this is such a backwards idea in the first place. The research is practically unanimous, and I mean this literally, that the foundational problem that the United States, California, and Los Angeles face is a severe and persistent lack of housing (see e.g. Colburn and Page-Aldern 2020; Bailey 2022; Kushel et al. 2023; Greenaway-McGrevy and Phillips 2023; Liu et al. 2022; Asquith et al. 2019; Li 2022) and that exclusionary zoning restrictions are one of, if not *the* primary reason for this shortage (see e.g. Freemark 2023; Mast 2023; Glaeser and Gyourko 2018; Mast 2024 for just a few of the many dozens of studies demonstrating this exact same thing). SB 79 is the most important piece of housing legislation brought forward in California in my lifetime, in more than a quarter century. The fact that Los Angeles would even consider opposing this transformational piece of legislation is reprehensible on its face. The best chance we've have in a quarter century to help solve our housing, homelessness, transit, traffic, and climate goals all in one go and you're considering officially opposing it. Unbelievable. I regret that I am unable to attend the meeting where this issue will be discussed, as it is scheduled for 10am on a Tuesday, and like most people my age, I have a job. In this particular instance, that job involves teaching thirty some undergraduate students about how American politics works as the sole instructor for our Summer Session C Introduction to American Politics Course. It just so happens that the last lecture of our course is about what makes local politics tick. Because you see, this is also something I know quite a lot about. The people who you are most likely to hear from at your meeting, which almost by definition excludes everyone who works for a living and cannot take time off to appear before you, are not representative of the community as a whole. They are older, Whiter, wealthier, and more likely to be homeowners than the general public (Sahn 2025; Dynes et al. 2022; Gray 2022; Ellickson 2022; Anzia 2022; Einstein, Glick, and Palmer 2019). As Sahn demonstrates, the median age of a

commenter is 23 years older than the median age of the community as a whole. They are nearly a whole *me* older than the average Angeleno. They are also, as a wealth of research demonstrates, not unlikely to be influenced by exclusionary motivations (Trounstein 2018; Rothstein 2017; Reny and Newman 2018). My own research, which is being presented at the Local Political Economy Conference in just a few week's time, demonstrates that near 1 in 4 White respondents over the age of 50 (those who you are most likely to be hearing from) are willing to explicitly admit to being concerned that new housing will bring non-White people to their neighborhood when given cover to do so using survey experimental techniques. I don't believe these are the types of concerns that you want to be privileging in the City of Los Angeles. Everything about this proposal to oppose SB 79 is backwards, from what I assume you must think about its effects, to the reasons you must think people have for supporting or opposing this piece of legislation, to the people whose opinions should matter the most to you through this process. The very act highlights one of the fundamental problems of the local control that you are ostensibly seeking to protect here. Many of those who would most benefit from the housing that would be constructed if SB 79 becomes law, those who would live in it, are unable to speak for themselves in this proceeding because they do not yet live here. They are not yet your constituents, and you seem intent on preventing them from becoming so. This is why we need laws like SB 79. This is why these decisions can't be made solely at the local level. Because while you may conceptualize your role as being responsible solely for your district, or for the city of Los Angeles more generally, you have a no less pressing responsibility to people elsewhere in the state, elsewhere in the nation, elsewhere in the world. You have a responsibility to ensure that people fleeing violence in other countries, escaping policies in red states that seek to erase them, or merely arriving here for a job, will arrive here to find a Los Angeles with sufficient ability to house them. What you are considering doing completely abdicates that responsibility.

Communication from Public

Name: marie

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:07 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I request the City Council unanimously approve the Resolution to Oppose SB 79 (Council File 25- 0002-S19). High density housing is a danger in an infrastructure that is already at capacity in single family neighborhoods. These dangers will affect not only those currently residing in these neighborhoods but also the incoming.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:25 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Josh Cretella

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:26 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Los Angeles has been in a housing crisis for decades. SB79 would provide the ability of the city to seriously start addressing the housing deficit, by removing restrictions to allow denser housing near public transit. Los Angeles has an underrated, yet vast transit network, serving millions of riders a week. Increasing housing production near transit would allow our citizens, friends and neighbors access to new housing opportunities closer to their jobs, reducing the need for grueling 1+ hour commutes to work each day. Ride the 720 Rapid bus after 10 PM from one side of the city to the other and you'll see people leave work in Westwood and take the bus almost the entire route to east of Downtown, sometimes only to connect to yet another bus to get them home. SB79 is an opportunity to build a city that works, where people have more freedom (and financial freedom) to live closer to jobs, families and friends. SB79 would help address the severe lack of affordable homes we have available for people who have been displaced in Altadena. Opponents use scare tactics, claiming traffic will rise, neighborhoods will become "dirty" and "historic character and neighborhood composition will change." We should see these excuses as nothing less than the gutter racism that drove previous discriminatory policies like redlining, which excluded Black, Brown and other minority groups from suburbs on the West Side and in the SFV. These critics are more nuanced, hidden behind well-meaning language, claiming to not oppose housing outright, just housing that isn't *truly affordable*, pushing for some kind of soon-to-appear magic wand or lever-like solution that will somehow fix deep structural problems without changing the status quo (or their block, at least). In a city as multicultural as Los Angeles, this ends up reaffirms the same segregationist policies of the sundown towns enforced by redlining -- wealthy naysayers and opponents have effectively sealed their neighborhoods off a vast majority of Angelenos. It must end. We must act like we are in a housing crisis. It's deeply shameful that Mayor Bass, who claimed to be pro-housing during the election, is secretly opposing this bill in Sacramento. It's even more so that the Council, which makes nods and gestures towards supporting development (more often than not now doubling down on the 'social justice language' in their anti-housing messaging), is on the same side of bad-faith actors and neighborhood associations who

drive the opposition to this bill. Shame on City Council members Lee and Park for introducing this measure after tens of thousands of families were displaced from the Palisades, Malibu and Altadena. The lack of action by the council is one of the major factors housing costs continue to rise and displace people. Shame on City Council member Park for supporting this bill while her own citizens and neighbors were displaced by climate change, many who will be unavailable to return to their neighborhoods and homes because of these rising costs. Her opposition to this bill is mind-boggling in light of the fires. Please oppose this motion. Let us hope our state government passes SB79 this week. I hope the state continues to take harsh legal action against cities like Los Angeles and its affiliated suburbs who continue to oppose badly needed housing.

Communication from Public

Name: Jane Demian

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:27 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I request that the LA City Council oppose SB 79. I oppose it because: 1) building new developments near transit will displace existing low income tenants, many of whom live in RSO housing. It will impact tenants living in communities of color because that is where developers find lower priced parcels. We have already seen tenant displacement through Executive Directive 1. Tenant protections were added to ED1 almost as an afterthought. Tenant displacement, even with relocation fees, will prevent tenants from finding alternate housing that they can afford and will exacerbate homelessness. 2) We have a housing AFFORDABILITY problem. Upzoning parcels near transit will increase the value of all those parcels and raise the price of housing overall. The number of units of extremely low income housing built under SB 79 would be very limited, somewhere around 7%. Yes, we have a homelessness problem, but building more housing for people whose incomes are \$80-100,00 a year does not solve the housing AFFORDABILITY problem. 3) Building around transit theoretically assumes that people who live near transit will actually use transit. Public transit in Los Angeles County is fraught with security issues. Personally, I will not take public transit at night, and I won't feel safe walking alone from the train station to my home. Even during the day, public transit may be unsafe and unsanitary. People in LA drive cars, even those without cars use Uber or Lyft. The developments under consideration will build without enough parking for tenants, which means that tenants will park their cars on the street and will have to vie for street parking. 4) Our local City Council and Planning Commission must adhere to LA City's Housing Element to make decisions about what housing is appropriate for the city. Imposing state directives means that the City relinquishes its decision-making for local issues, is forced to plan and fund upgrades to water, electrical, plumbing to support increased density near transit while navigating a budget deficit. Please oppose SB 79. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Arthur Tesser

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:50 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing.

Communication from Public

Name: Henry Mantel

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:53 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge this Council to support SB79. As a tenants' rights attorney in Los Angeles, I have seen just how terrible this housing crisis is and how much suffering it is causing. Not only are our neighbors ending up on the street because there's nowhere for them to go, but they're also staying in dilapidated and infested homes because there are no other options, working multiple jobs just to afford the rent, or moving out of the city entirely. Allowing for more multi-family housing is the only way we can solve this crisis and revitalize our city by making LA more affordable to all. Please, support SB79. If LA is to be a true sanctuary city for our immigrant and LGBTQ neighbors, then we need to actually build places for those communities to live and thrive in our city. If we don't, then we're a sanctuary for no one but rich people and landlords.

Communication from Public

Name: nancy tesser

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 06:13 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing as a concerned resident to urge you to vote YES on Council File 25-0002-S19, the resolution opposing California Senate Bill 79 (SB 79). As a 50-year resident of Encino, I STRONGLY OPPOSE allowing seven-story apartment buildings to be built directly next to single-family homes, dramatically altering the character of neighborhoods like Encino. This bill encourages high-density development without ensuring the necessary infrastructure, public services, and community input are in place to support such sweeping changes. Our communities are not opposed to housing solutions—we recognize the urgent need for more affordable housing across Los Angeles. However, SB 79 takes a one-size-fits-all approach that disregards thoughtful planning, local voices, and neighborhood integrity. Sustainable growth must be balanced with infrastructure capacity, traffic safety, environmental impact, and the preservation of the unique qualities that make Los Angeles neighborhoods livable. I respectfully ask for your leadership and support in protecting our neighborhoods by OPPOSING SB 79.

Communication from Public

Name: Robert Newman

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 06:31 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: NO on SB 79...Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19 Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing.

Communication from Public

Name: Stephanie

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 06:45 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 06:45 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose bill 79.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 07:08 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Chris Schaper

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 08:15 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: SB 79 is a vital step for Los Angeles. Building more housing near transit is one of the best ways to cut traffic, clean our air, and make the city more affordable. It means fewer long car commutes, better use of our Metro system, and more homes where people already live and work. I'm an LAUSD teacher. I know so many teachers who are burdened by long commutes. They can't afford to live close to their schools. SB79 can help teachers and students live near transit Voting against SB 79 isn't just about housing—it's voting against real climate policy. LA can't hit its goals without smarter growth. SB 79 is extremely important: more homes near transit, less traffic, cleaner air, and a more livable city.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 08:31 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 09:08 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Please vote NO to this legislation. It will make our community more dense than it already is. Parking availability is already difficult and this will make it worse

Communication from Public

Name: Steven

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 10:09 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I am asking the council to Vote YES to file number 26-0002-s19 Sb 79 would allow multistory housing in my neighborhood without any plans for appropriate infrastructure, parking and complete disregard for my neighborhood and any other neighborhood in Los Angeles Your YES vote will indicate opposition to this senate bill by the City of Los Angeles Thank you Steven rouff

Communication from Public

Name: Scott Fisher

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 10:11 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Dylan

Date Submitted: 08/18/2025 04:44 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I encourage city council to support SB-79. Alone, higher density housing increases tax revenue, decreases homelessness, and keeps Los Angeles growing both culturally and economically. Better yet, density near transit stations increases the effectiveness of LA Metro, increasing its support for expansion as a sustainable method of transportation.

Communication from Public

Name: JT

Date Submitted: 08/18/2025 07:11 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: My husband commutes to his job in Santa Monica from Encino every day. It's already a log jam of a commute, taking a full hour. Adding high density housing along a main transportation route and near the freeway will simply add even more traffic and more travel time, to an already very stressful commute.

Communication from Public

Name: Jonah Henry

Date Submitted: 08/18/2025 07:38 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: As a young person experiencing housing insecurity, I strongly support SB 79 and strongly oppose this City Council resolution. Transit-oriented development represents one of the greatest opportunities that our city has to simultaneously solve the housing shortage, fight the climate crisis, reduce economic disparities, and alleviate car traffic. Our local housing and transit agencies have had decades to create the market conditions and zoning policies necessary to foster this positive transformation; instead, they have proven themselves completely incapable of delivering any policy that would compromise our status quo of car-centric urban planning, suburban sprawl, and exclusive and unaffordable single-family residential neighborhoods. When given the opportunity, local agencies have consistently refused to upzone single-family parcels for higher-density development, which most experts have concluded is the only real solution to closing the gap between housing supply and demand. Though I am usually someone who believes in local control, in this instance I believe that in order to create any substantial progress on housing in Los Angeles, we must allow the state government to intervene. Continuing to leave this issue in the control of our local agencies will result in decades more of the same inaction, while low-income households will continue to suffer and the planet will continue to heat up. I am disappointed but not surprised to see that the City Council is considering a resolution to oppose SB 79, which will likely influence how many Assemblymembers representing the Los Angeles area vote on the bill. I strongly urge you to vote no on this opposition resolution and to instead pass a resolution supporting SB 79.

Communication from Public

Name: Ellie

Date Submitted: 08/18/2025 08:35 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: marianne king

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 10:47 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmembers, Please stand up for local land use control and send a message loud and clear to our state legislator's that the City of Los Angeles is in OPPOSITION to SB 79, period. Our Housing Element (HE) Ordinance was just finalized in Feb 2025 (and unanimously approved by you after strong debates and long hearings). Within this HE are many incentives for developers to provide higher density housing in high opportunity areas. We need to give the HE a chance and not have the state do our planning with their distracting and disruptive "one ups". SB 79 will take away our local land use planning forever, it's as simple as that. It is a punitive mandate with no end in sight. Developers will go for the least expensive parcels within 1/2 mile of transit, which will be the removal of single family homes and single family zones and build massive multi-family buildings, make lots of money, then be gone. Meanwhile we will be stuck with haphazard development, where little change will occur to our underutilized commercial and multi-family properties but our single family neighborhoods will be destroyed. We will lose more single family homes within 1/2 mile of transit, many of which are relatively affordable today. This pattern will continue. Next will be within 3/4 mile, etc, Maintaining single family homes is critical to provide a variety of housing and to keep SF prices in check. Many young families desire single family homes instead of apartments or condos. Let see how we do with our HE many incentives to build in our commercial and multi-family zoned areas. We always have an opportunity to change things next HE cycle. And insult to injury, the state is not paying a dime for this high density mandate, all the associated costs (i.e. infrastructure, water, electricity) will be the mess they leave us with. Please respect the hard and thoughtful work that the Planning Department has done and uphold the Housing Element.

Communication from Public

Name: Laura Sheehan

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 11:17 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 03:24 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I am a resident of Colfax Meadows for the 33 years. I chose to live here and now retire here because the neighborhood is friendly and quiet. The tree lined streets and array of eclectic homes makes taking walks in the neighborhood a joy. SB79 will destroy all that. There is no place for a 6 story apartment building to be built amongst single family homes. It doesn't help the neighborhood. It does the opposite. The added population, cars and trash will make the streets less safe to walk and for the children to play. SB79 makes no allowance for parking or for the infrastructure to accommodate the new population added to our streets. Parked cars will be lining our streets instead of trees. Trees that provide noise abatement, shade and are part of a healthy environment will be cut down to make way for concrete boxes to tower over us. The house next door to me sold to a multi unit developer one year ago. The property still sits untouched, unoccupied. I think it is safe to say that they are waiting for SB79 to pass so they can put up a 6 story structure and destroy our neighborhood, take away my right for privacy. If I was able to go around and ask every senator, every assembly person, the mayor and the governor if they would approve a 6 story apartment building going up next door to them I am sure their answer would be NO So please vote NO on SB79 because my life, my home are equally as important as theirs.

Communication from Public

Name: Adam Wright

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 03:29 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19 Adam Wright
4900 Dempsey Ave, Encino, CA 91436

Communication from Public

Name: Randy orlik

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 03:30 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate

Communication from Public

Name: Veronica Sabbaghi
Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 03:53 PM
Council File No: 25-0002-S19
Comments for Public Posting: I oppose senate bill 79!

Communication from Public

Name: Richard Mirisch
Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:07 AM
Council File No: 25-0002-S19
Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to support item 44

Communication from Public

Name: Amit Parekh

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:43 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Los Angeles City Council to support SB79. Our city and state are facing a severe housing crisis, and we cannot afford to delay meaningful action. SB79 will promote smart, sustainable growth around our transit infrastructure, helping address both affordability and climate goals. Los Angeles needs forward-looking housing solutions—not policy decisions guided by NIMBY resistance. Please vote in favor of SB79 and stand up for a more livable, affordable future for our city.

Communication from Public

Name: Brett William Hollenbeck

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 05:48 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Please oppose moving forward on this motion. SB79 is an important bill that will address our housing crisis in the most appropriate way possible - by orienting new housing around transit. Building more housing near transit reduces traffic, lowers the cost of living, and improves quality of life for all Angelenos. Support SB79 and oppose this motion.

Communication from Public

Name: Jatin
Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 07:09 AM
Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly urge the council to SUPPORT SB79. Research has shown that SB79 will result in increased tax revenue for the city, in a time when it faces a budget shortfall. SB79 legalizes more homes near major transit stops (which does NOT include the Palisades). This means more ridership for a transit system that the city has voted to fund with billions of tax dollars. In addition, recent research from the NYU Furman Center, which is one among many, many other similar studies, has shown that allowing the increase of housing supply is the single biggest driver of housing affordability. Los Angeles' extremely restrictive housing market is pricing out many people, and SB79 offers a way to right that wrong. The city council should be doing all it can to SUPPORT SB79.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 07:24 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Peter Silberg

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 08:19 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Dr. Jeremy Cholfín

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 08:20 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Zachary Steinback

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 09:23 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: It is crazy that in 2025 there is a motion from Los Angeles to oppose SB79. We are in the middle of a 50-year housing slump that has pushed both home ownership and rental prices to unaffordable levels. People who grew up here are leaving because they can't afford it, and people aren't coming because it's too expensive. The dream of LA and California is that you can come here, work hard, and build a life for yourself. From the Gold Rush until today, we have been a beacon of light for people looking for a better life. To look at the prices of housing and think we need to stop more from being built is an act of self-sabotage. We need more housing and we need it now. SB79, by allowing more housing near public transit, is the beginning of restoring the California Dream. Opposing this is embarrassing for the city of Los Angeles and all that we say we stand for. If people can't afford to live here, they don't get to have all the benefits that LA and California claim to offer. I cannot state how strongly I oppose this motion. I urge you to vote against it and to stand with your constituents who are desperate for solutions to our city's insane cost of living. Supporting SB79 is the right decision, and it is the representation your community deserves.

Communication from Public

Name: Adam

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 10:19 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Please don't oppose SB 79, we are in a housing crises and need it to help us get out of this problem!

Communication from Public

Name: Faith Golden

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 11:54 AM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose the bill allowing high density apartment buildings in residential neighborhoods. There is plenty of available land in suitable areas that will not impact single family neighborhoods that can alleviate the housing crisis. I don't know who came up with this idea but significant amounts of time and money have been spent opposing this bill. Obviously someone will gain tremendously by ruining single family neighborhoods. The lining the pockets of council members or whoever is going to gain from the passage of this bill is unfairly taking advantage of homeowners who are trying to preserve a way of life that has been the backbone of California since its inception. Apartment buildings can be put in areas currently zoned for them. I have seen many going up in the San Fernando valley that do not encroach on single family home neighborhoods. This is as it should be. Vote NO on this destructive bill!!! Faith M Golden MA

Communication from Public

Name: Maxim Kislik

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:04 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I oppose SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing.

Communication from Public

Name: K. Kato

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:09 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Please vote YES to support opposition on SB 79. The misnamed "Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act" DOES NOT create meaningful affordable housing. SB 79 takes away the recently enacted LA Housing Element which is our own plan to insure housing near transit. The ramifications of SB79 are not well thought out and I believe this could lead to the downfall of our state. Never has such a consequential bill been brought forth. Instead of a Master Plan, this is a master FREE FOR ALL to developers, investment groups, and financiers.

Communication from Public

Name: Maxwell VerKuilen

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:14 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Councilmember Park and LA City Councilmembers, As a Sawtelle resident, I strongly urge the council to support SB79 and vote against the resolution to oppose it. Los Angeles faces a critical housing shortage that is burdening residents with high housing and rent costs. SB79 serves as a useful tool to provide much needed housing, reduce homelessness, boost transit ridership on systems that face funding fiscal cliffs, and provide the City with additional property tax revenues to address ever-growing spending deficits. Opposing SB79 would mean more Angelenos experiencing homelessness and decreasing the City's future revenues. Furthermore, areas recently affected by wildfires are far from the areas that SB79 would impact, as the bill only applies to areas within one half mile of a bus rapid transit or rail stop. To protect the financial health of the city and promote the well-being of Los Angeles residents, I urge the council to support SB79.

Communication from Public

Name: Maryam J

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:35 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19 Maryam Jones 23941 Archwood St, West Hills, CA 91307

Communication from Public

Name: Linda Gravani

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:49 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I support city council's opposition to this Senate Bill

Communication from Public

Name: James Daquino

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 12:59 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Samuel Alcorn

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 01:04 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: SB 79 would result in much-needed housing around the transit stops on the lines we've spent billions of dollars to install. Every day, when I take the train to work in downtown LA, I pass by station after station surrounded by low-rise apartments, single-family houses, and mostly-empty surface parking lots. This is no way to build a world-class city, especially considering the attention that will be coming to LA with the World Cup and the Olympics. By opposing SB 79, the City of Los Angeles would be sending a clear message to the rest of the world: "You are not welcome here." This is not to mention the ameliorative effects this bill would have on so many other fronts: increased property tax revenue (see the analysis from Streets for All), decrease in carbon emissions, improvement of quality of life for all Angelenos, et c. As someone who works in LA, lived in the city for many years, and wants the opportunity to live there once again, I respectfully urge you to express support for SB 79 as a City Council. Sam Alcorn, Pasadena

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 01:22 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to urge the council to support SB79. Overall, homelessness is a large problem in Los Angeles. This means that the city should build more homes than the current pace, and if there is fewer homes being built, homelessness will still be an issue. The lack of adequate development around transit stops means that the transit stations are not being used to their full potential. For example, the Grand Avenue Arts/Bunker Hill station has a parking lot and numerous roads just outside the area instead of an apartment building. In addition, having lower density housing is more cost efficient than lower density housing due to having less infrastructure per person that is needed. SB79 allows one major opportunity to fix this problem. Upzoning land in a half-mile radius of Bus Rapid Transit, light, heavy, and commuter rail stations allows the bill to have more housing within the transit system where Los Angeles residents have noted in to fund. This leads to more housing near jobs and services, and this is not in conflict with Los Angeles's Housing element plan but to accelerate the upzoning. Passing SB79 is more than just housing policy, since this is a environmental, moral, and fiscal duty. Please vote to support SB79 to give Los Angeles the tools necessary to solve the housing crisis.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 01:29 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I live in West Hills (in Council member Lee's district) and I fully support SB79. I wish it went further but in the meantime, it's the right legislation to fight LA's massive housing unaffordability. It legalizes mid-rise homes near major transit with clear minimums (up to 75'ft/120'du/acre within 1/4 mile of Tier 1 stops), requires on-site affordability, blocks demolition of rent-controlled homes, and adds HAA enforcement in high-resource areas starting 2027. Cities retain objective design standards and can adopt a local TOD alternative plan that matches SB79's capacity. This is the right trade: more homes near transit, stronger tenant protections, and better climate and mobility outcomes. Please adopt a support position on SB79.

Communication from Public

Name: Kristin Glushon

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 02:00 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Sara

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 02:19 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 02:22 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are:
1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing.
2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element.
3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences.
4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit.
5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing. Vote YES on CF 25-0002-S19

Communication from Public

Name: Lindsey

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 02:43 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Good afternoon, Councilmembers, I'm here to strongly urge this Council to publicly support SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. This bill is exactly the kind of statewide leadership Los Angeles should be championing. It will make it possible to build more affordable homes near our Metro stations and bus corridors, reduce traffic and emissions, and help working families stay in the city they love. Right now, I hear the Council giving a lot of space to loud NIMBY voices. But the reality is that the majority of Angelenos are struggling with unaffordable rents, overcrowding, and crushing commutes. Your constituents need more housing choices near transit—not more delays. SB 79 addresses those needs directly. It cuts red tape, ensures affordability, and helps us meet our housing goals in the right places. Los Angeles cannot solve its housing crisis in isolation, and silence from the Council on this bill sends the wrong message. I'm asking you to stand up for your constituents and take a public position in support of SB 79. This is your opportunity to lead, not follow, and to make clear that Los Angeles is serious about housing affordability, sustainability, and equity. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: Varant Majarian

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 02:53 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: Dear Councilmember Raman and Mayor Bass: I urge you to OPPOSE SB 79. My specific issues with SB 79 are: 1. SB 79 does not increase the supply of AFFORDABLE housing. 2. SB 79 preempts each community's carefully planned Housing Element. 3. SB 79 disregards infrastructure and environmental consequences. 4. SB 79's incentivizes market-rate construction which targets the tenant group least likely to use public transit. 5. California needs affordable multi-family and single-family housing; SB 79 steamrolls over that in favor of incentivizing market-rate housing.

Communication from Public

Name: Brendan

Date Submitted: 08/17/2025 03:06 PM

Council File No: 25-0002-S19

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the Council to reject Councilmember Park's motion opposing SB 79. This legislation is an important step toward addressing California's housing crisis and ensuring that our state meets its legal and moral obligation to plan for adequate, affordable housing. Opposing SB 79 sends the wrong message to Angelenos who are struggling with rent, homelessness, and lack of housing options. Instead of spending political energy fighting against state-level efforts, the City should focus on constructive collaboration and creating real pathways for housing production that benefit all residents. Blocking SB 79 does not solve the crisis—it only prolongs it. I strongly oppose this motion and ask the Council to stand with solutions, not obstruction.