

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 06/09/2026 12:22 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to share my strong support for the Low-Rise Ordinance. First, I'd like to thank the recent public comment submissions for saying the quiet part out loud: the conflict over Expo/Bundy, and densification in general, isn't about the morality of single-family zoning, improving conditions for future Angelenos, or decreasing car-based pollution. First and foremost, the fierce opposition to the Low-Rise Ordinance in favor of massive 8-story luxury high-rises comes from a place of pure land speculation and gambling on a corporate developer buyout. These critics are attempting to dictate city-wide housing policy to maximize their private payouts at the expense of community livability. If a pocket of 20 homeowners near the Expo/Bundy station wishes to sell their properties, they are welcome to call a real estate agent and put them on the market this weekend. But the city shouldn't allow a small group of owners to hold an entire half-mile transit radius hostage—blocking smaller-scale housing options—while they wait for a hypothetical corporate mega-assemblage that may take decades to materialize. Treating neighborhood blocks purely as speculative investment portfolios is precisely what fueled our current affordability crisis. If those 20 homeowners want to hit it big, Las Vegas is only a four-hour drive away. For the rest of us, it's abundantly clear that Los Angeles is in desperate need of missing middle housing. Current high-density developments near transit are overwhelmingly dominated by small studio and one-bedroom units, leaving middle-class families with virtually no new housing options on the Westside. While critics claim missing middle housing doesn't "pencil out" under current economic conditions, zoning laws outlast market cycles. Economic conditions change fluidly. Rather than abandoning low-rise density, the city should introduce targeted incentives and fee waivers to ensure these family-friendly, multi-bedroom projects can actually be built. Furthermore, the argument that hyper-density inherently leads to better infrastructure ignores the baseline reality of city services on the Westside. In this very neighborhood, right by Stoner Park, residents recently had to resort to tactical urbanism just to paint basic crosswalks because the city cannot maintain baseline pedestrian safety. The city can't even manage a bucket of paint, yet we are supposed to believe it will seamlessly absorb thousands

of high-rise residents. Flooding these neighborhoods with luxury towers without fixing foundational infrastructure failures is a recipe for disaster, broadly, and even more liability lawsuits for the city, specifically. The Low-Rise Ordinance provides a vital path for incremental, family-friendly growth that can be executed by local builders rather than Wall Street real estate trusts. Please support the Low-Rise Ordinance and reject the pressure from speculative holdouts.

I am writing to share my strong support for the Low-Rise Ordinance.

First, I'd like to thank the recent public comment submissions for saying the quiet part out loud: the conflict over Expo/Bundy, and densification in general, isn't about the morality of single-family zoning, improving conditions for future Angelenos, or decreasing car-based pollution. First and foremost, the fierce opposition to the Low-Rise Ordinance in favor of massive 8-story luxury high-rises comes from a place of pure land speculation and gambling on a corporate developer buyout. These critics are attempting to dictate city-wide housing policy to maximize their private payouts at the expense of community livability.

If a pocket of 20 homeowners near the Expo/Bundy station wishes to sell their properties, they are welcome to call a real estate agent and put them on the market this weekend. But the city shouldn't allow a small group of owners to hold an entire half-mile transit radius hostage—blocking smaller-scale housing options—while they wait for a hypothetical corporate mega-assemblage that may take decades to materialize. Treating neighborhood blocks purely as speculative investment portfolios is precisely what fueled our current affordability crisis. If those 20 homeowners want to hit it big, Las Vegas is only a four-hour drive away.

For the rest of us, it's abundantly clear that Los Angeles is in desperate need of missing middle housing. Current high-density developments near transit are overwhelmingly dominated by small studio and one-bedroom units, leaving middle-class families with virtually no new housing options on the Westside. While critics claim missing middle housing doesn't "pencil out" under current economic conditions, zoning laws outlast market cycles. Economic conditions change fluidly. Rather than abandoning low-rise density, the city should introduce targeted incentives and fee waivers to ensure these family-friendly, multi-bedroom projects can actually be built.

Furthermore, the argument that hyper-density inherently leads to better infrastructure ignores the baseline reality of city services on the Westside. In this very neighborhood, right by Stoner Park, residents recently had to resort to tactical urbanism just to paint basic crosswalks because the city cannot maintain baseline pedestrian safety. The city can't even manage a bucket of paint, yet we are supposed to believe it will seamlessly absorb thousands of high-rise residents. Flooding these neighborhoods with luxury towers without fixing foundational infrastructure failures is a recipe for disaster, broadly, and even more liability lawsuits for the city, specifically.

The Low-Rise Ordinance provides a vital path for incremental, family-friendly growth that can be executed by local builders rather than Wall Street real estate trusts. Please support the Low-Rise Ordinance and reject the pressure from speculative holdouts.