

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jeffrey Hartsough  
**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2026 10:42 AM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** SB 79 and the City of Los Angeles The City ignored the implications of SB 79 as the bill worked its way through the legislative process. And now the City must figure out how to prevent the harm that SB 79 will bring to our City. 1) The City is a Charter City. The City needs to maintain its local control of how the City grows and develops. I recommend that the City sue the State to reclaim local control of land use and work with other Charter Cities to do the same. 2) Any plans to “implement” SB 79 must prevent changes that cannot be undone if and when SB 79 is amended or repealed. 3) Wording in the plan must be clear. For example, proposed density changes have used the words “rezoning” and “upzoning” to describe anticipated changes. Clarifications have stated that the changes are not “rezoning” or “upzoning” but only “incentives.” Please remove any use of the terms “rezoning” or “upzoning” from discussions, proposed rules, ordinances, etc. 4) Existing setback requirements of all underlying zoning must be maintained. 5) Transparency is important. Affected property owners and residents should know and understand how the proposed implementation of SB 79 will change their neighborhoods and the City. Every property owner and resident that will be affected by any changes proposed by SB 79 implementation must receive written notification of the changes and how the changes will impact them. As it stands, the implementation of SB 79 will diminish the quality of life in neighborhoods throughout the City. Minimizing the harm will be difficult. I wish you luck in addressing this external threat to the City.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Paola Pini

**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2026 01:54 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I supports 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. 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. Council File CF 25-1083

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sarah Colonna

**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2026 02:06 PM

**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. 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

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jason Pope

**Date Submitted:** 03/04/2026 04:54 PM

**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. 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 CLEARLY MARKED, MAILED NOTIFICATION** of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.