

Communication from Public

Name: Tom Materna

Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 08:26 AM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I support the Citywide Implementation Option C2, which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three-story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. But why does the Planning department still call it an up zoning not an incentive? My support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Council File CF 25-1083

Communication from Public

Name: Darcy Wilding
Date Submitted: 03/04/2026 08:37 AM
Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I support the Citywide Implementation Option Implementation Option C2 which would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C2 also proactively “incentivizes” qualifying single-family neighborhoods to allow three story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the seven-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79. This option would still permit SB 79 compliant developments near existing rail stations. The Planning Department clearly stated that rezoning/upzoning was not the intent of the C2 option. Our support for C2 is expressly conditioned on the following: 1. The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an “incentive” program, not a rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3. All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.