

Communication from Public

Name: Nina Litvak

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 08:26 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB 79 by the City of Los Angeles. Approach C-1 is a judicious approach that allows lower-rise, lower-density, missing-middle, multi-family buildings to be built as offsets in eligible single-family residential areas. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Requirement that all properties impacted by SB 79 development need to have plans and proof of financing before a demolition permit can be issued. And that the approval process for plans under SB 79 not allow for any "remodels" that then turn into full demolitions. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB 79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and that if SB 79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. - Nina & Sal Litvak, 90036, Council district 5

Communication from Public

Name: Ruth Sugerman
Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 10:09 PM
Council File No: 25-1083
Comments for Public Posting: I think C-1 is the best choice to preserve single family and historic preservation neighborhoods but with flexibility. If we have no single family neighborhoods, people who want to buy a house will move out of Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: David Gerber

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 10:19 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Thank you, David Gerber 607 S. McCadden Place Hancock Park

Communication from Public

Name: Gary Ichihara

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 10:20 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Sincerely, Gary Ichihara 968 5th Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90019

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 11:49 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Maureen Eisenberg 308 N. McCadden Place Los Angeles 90004 Hancock Park CD 5

Communication from Public

Name: Concerned citizen

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 05:38 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Las Palmas Avenue 90004

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 05:55 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Karen Cowan 674 S June St Los Angeles, CA 90005

Communication from Public

Name: Catherine White
Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 06:58 PM
Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.

Communication from Public

Name: Lauren Muhlheim
Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 08:04 PM
Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Lauren Muhlheim 433 S. McCadden Place, LA, CA 90020

Communication from Public

Name: Janet Soffeer

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:54 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems Janet Soffer

Communication from Public

Name: Greg Goldin

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 04:50 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. 5. A ban on all demolition permits related to SB 79 entitlements without bonafide proof of financing in place ahead of any permits issued. Without guarantees that actual housing will be built, land speculation, which the city council recently acted to investigate, will ensue. Thank you, Greg Goldin Los Angeles, CA 90036

Communication from Public

Name: Ann Rubin

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 05:18 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: Dear City Council Members, The Carthay Circle Neighborhood Association respectfully requests your support for City Planning Department's Approach C-1 (CF #25-1083) -- that must include delayed effectuation for ALL local historic resources (HPOZs and HCMs), until our city can better plan to accommodate the extreme requirements imposed by the state. Carthay Circle Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) is one of many historic neighborhoods at risk in the transit station target zones. Established in 1922 as Carthay Center by J. Harvey McCarthy -- Carthay Circle is regarded as a foundational model for planned communities in Southern California, and -- 100 years later -- this accounts for our neighborhood being added to the National Register of Historic Places. We are a small neighborhood of a little over 400 properties, including single-family homes, duplexes, and multi-tenants -- designed in revival styles by a long list of recognized architects and builders such as Paul Williams, Horatio Bishop, Irving Gill, Louis Korn, and Lewis Arthur Smith, as well as a school, a church, pocket parks, monuments to California historical figures, pedestrian walkways, and underground utilities. Our famous Carthay Circle Theatre was demolished in 1969 and inspired the preservation movement in LA. A replica now exists as a restaurant at Disneyland, imagine that. The whole of Carthay Circle is greater than the sum of our parts, and thusly recognized by the visionary founders of our HPOZ in 1998. We are the *caretakers* for the next generations of Los Angelenos. Looking at the map in the City Planning SB 79 report, we are shocked at the scale of likely loss of historic resources, while land values will soar. LA will not look like LA. No one wants to see the destruction of established, rooted communities and historic resources that tell the LA story. Most of our oldest neighborhoods are more diverse and affordable than the city as a whole -- for both renters and property owners. SB 79 does not provide for planning, design, or parks and open space -- necessary for a livable city. No great city builds a subway or lightrail and then destroys its past and neighborhoods near the transit stops. We may not have 200-300 year old buildings like other regions of our country, but we have our history and architectural and cultural heritage embedded in the HPOZs and HCMs, not to mention the National Register designations and

eligible resources. We don't have to make this tradeoff while adding density and increasing true affordability. Approach C-1 is the more responsible option at this time, with the July 1 effectuation date looming just ahead. In addition, we ask our City Council to act on these 2 important items to help return us to saner, smarter planning and to avoid irreparable harm: -- please press our mayor to work with other cities in pushing back on SB 79 and make our case in Sacramento for a legislative remedy and instruct our mayor to use all the tools -- please establish a strong anti-demolition ordinance to deter land speculators from clearing lots with no immediate plans to build replacement housing, as this destroys existing housing and displaces people; we already live with an abundance of chain-link lots in our neighborhoods It's deeply regretful that the City of Los Angeles has lost local planning control because of SB 79. We are now in a real fix. We ask you to adopt Approach C-1. Thereafter, we must immediately work on a long-range solution for maintaining our treasured historic neighborhoods located in the transit target zones. Thank you, Ann Rubin On Behalf of the Carthay Circle Neighborhood Association

Communication from Public

Name: Gail

Date Submitted: 03/15/2026 05:00 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option 1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB 79 by the City of Los Angeles. Approach C-1 is a balanced approach that allows lower-rise, lower-density, missing-middle multi-family buildings to be built as offsets in eligible single-family residential areas

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:48 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.

Communication from Public

Name: saul newman

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:44 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. saul newman 400 n highland

Communication from Public

Name: Christopher Markus

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:52 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Christopher Markus 314 S. June St. LA, CA 90020

Communication from Public

Name: E Fincher

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:11 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure E. Fincher

Communication from Public

Name: Richard Azar

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:15 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Richard Azar 634 S. June Street Los Angeles, CA 90005

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:16 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. bunia newman 400 n highland ave hancock park los angeles, 90036 council district

Communication from Public

Name: Linda Sanoff

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:24 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Thank you. Linda and Gerald Sanoff
515 N June Street 90004

Communication from Public

Name: Marlene Tsuchii Dalston

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:27 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:35 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Jen Crittenden 208 S. McCadden Place LA 90004

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 03:37 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to express my profound opposition to the upzoning strategies presented in the February 18, 2026, City Planning report regarding SB 79 implementation. The debate between Options C1, C2, and C3 is built on misleading grounds. These options present a false choice for Sawtelle, masking a strategy of Municipal Mercantilism that targets our neighborhood as a Growth Machine to increase property taxes while shielding the wealthiest portions of Council District 11. The Planning Department's own data reveals the absurdity of this proposal: the Expo/Bundy TOD zone already possesses a zoned capacity of 94,797 units, nearly six times the 17,045 units required by SB 79. The station is already 100% eligible for delayed effectuation. To suggest we must now choose a Maximum Density approach for our remaining low density blocks is a bad-faith argument. Further upzoning isn't about state compliance; it is about exploiting a historically diverse neighborhood to create housing credits for wealthier parts of the district. The High Opportunity designation used to justify this is a textbook bait and switch. The state's algorithms see opportunity because of proximity to Silicon Beach jobs, but they ignore the physical reality. Our interior residential blocks have no streetlights, few stop signs, and even fewer ADA-compliant curb ramps. Our zoned school, Brockton Elementary, has a 6/10 rating, and our only green space, Stoner Recreation Center, is functionally privatized. Primary sources, including New West Charter School's own petitions and operational manuals, confirm the park is utilized for their athletic activities and PE four days a week, leaving the public resource-rich on paper but resource-poor in practice. This policy shift also ignores the Studio/One-Bedroom Trap. When zoning is loosened without guardrails, developers gravitate toward high-churn, high-profit units. This creates Asset Class Housing owned by large management firms that treat our neighborhood as an extractive asset rather than a community foundation. This does nothing for the families who need 3- or 4-bedroom missing middle housing to build long-term roots. Furthermore, the Equity arguments used to push Options C2 and C3 utilize data as a weapon. Advocates use Opportunity Maps to paint the city as a fortress of wealth, yet they bypass the life-and-death reality of California geography. Nearly 50% of the single-family land in Los Angeles is shielded from density by

Fire Zone exemptions. While wealthy hillside enclaves with 10/10 schools are protected, Sawtelle – a neighborhood with a history of eclecticism born from redlining – is told it must densify further. Real equity would mean requiring the wealthiest neighborhoods to absorb their share of density through infrastructure-safe Gentle Density rather than dumping 7-story mandates on a flat basin that has already absorbed the bulk of Westside growth. How is this area justified as High Opportunity when the city refuses to invest in its safety or preserve its parks for public use? If the City Council intends to force SB 79 density onto the flats to avoid the political difficulty and infrastructure challenges of the hills, this needs to be acknowledged and addressed before more rounds of densification are applied to the flats as though it was always a foregone conclusion. I formally request that the 100% exemption for Expo/Bundy be recognized as a permanent, binding condition that precludes any additional mandatory upzoning of the remaining single-family parcels in the Expo/Bundy TOD.

Communication from Public

Name: Marsue MacNicol

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 09:14 AM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option 1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB 79 by the City of Los Angeles. Approach C-1 is a balanced approach that allows lower-rise, lower-density, missing-middle multi-family buildings to be built as offsets in eligible single-family residential areas. And thank you for all of the work that you do.

Communication from Public

Name: Julie Ann Kim

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 10:02 AM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB 79 by the City of Los Angeles. Approach C-1 is a judicious approach that allows lower-rise, lower-density, missing-middle, multi-family buildings to be built as offsets in eligible single-family residential areas. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Requirement that all properties impacted by SB 79 development need to have plans and proof of financing before a demolition permit can be issued. And that the approval process for plans under SB 79 not allow for any "remodels" that then turn into full demolitions. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB 79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and that if SB 79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Julie Kim 403 S. Orange Dr. 90036. CD5

Communication from Public

Name: Beth Braen

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 11:16 AM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB 79 by the City of Los Angeles. Approach C-1 is a judicious approach that allows lower-rise, lower-density, missing-middle, multi-family buildings to be built as offsets in eligible single-family residential areas. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Requirement that all properties impacted by SB 79 development need to have plans and proof of financing before a demolition permit can be issued. And that the approval process for plans under SB 79 not allow for any "remodels" that then turn into full demolitions. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB 79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and that if SB 79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Thank you, Beth Braen, 90036, Council District 5

Communication from Public

Name: Roger Schroeder

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 12:27 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB 79 by the City of Los Angeles. Approach C-1 is a judicious approach that allows lower-rise, lower-density, missing-middle, multi-family buildings to be built as offsets in eligible single-family residential areas. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Requirement that all properties impacted by SB 79 development need to have plans and proof of financing before a demolition permit can be issued. And that the approval process for plans under SB 79 not allow for any "remodels" that then turn into full demolitions. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB 79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and that if SB 79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Roger Schroeder 90036 (Council District 5)

Communication from Public

Name: Ken Kristensen

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 01:39 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Ken Kristensen 639 N McCadden Place, LA, CA 90004

Communication from Public

Name: Cynthia Chvatal
Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 01:39 PM
Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.

Communication from Public

Name: Joanne Freed

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 01:46 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Joanne Freed 627 N Cherokee

Communication from Public

Name: Ben Duncan

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 01:51 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: Hello. My name is Ben Duncan. I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Thank you for your attention to this important issue. Benjamin and Helen Duncan 500 N Las Palmas Avenue LA CA 90004 323-494-1644

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 01:54 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Royya 639 N Las Palmas Ave Los Angeles, 90004

Communication from Public

Name: Tim Paulson

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 01:56 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Tim Paulson 509 N. June St. Los Angeles, CA 90004

Communication from Public

Name: HANCOCK PARK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:01 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing on behalf of the Hancock Park Homeowners Association, as it's President, in support of Approach C, Option 1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. The HPHOHA represents the 1200 homes located within the Hancock Park Historic Overlay Protection Zone (HPOZ) in Greater Wilshire area of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.

Communication from Public

Name: Jin Pak

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:03 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Thank you. Jin PaIK, Eugene Pak
645 N Lillian way Los Angeles Ca 90004

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Gene Wegmann

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:17 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.

Communication from Public

Name: Dr Ron Greeno

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:24 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Drs. Ron Greeno and Anne Billingsley 330 S Las Palmas Ave. Los Angeles 90020

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/17/2026 02:35 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems.