

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sixto Sicilia

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 11:32 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Members of the City Council: 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. 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 further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 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 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be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and that if SB 79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, these incentive(s) be revoked. 4.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. 5. Since I regularly walk through Hancock Park and enjoy that park enjoy the nature-like environment and the beauty of the streets and historical homes I would like to add 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. In addition there are many added benefits to Historical neighborhoods such as psychological and Aesthetic benefits. • Wellbeing: Research suggests that living in or visiting areas with a rich historic built environment is linked to higher levels of life satisfaction, mental well-being, and social connectedness. • Aesthetics: The human-scaled, often unique architecture of historic areas offers a break from modern, monotonous, "anywhere-USA" developments, improving the overall aesthetic quality of life Dr. Sixto J. Sicilia 365 S. Mansfield Ave 90036 CD5

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 04:21 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. Kelley Avery 613 North June Street Los Angeles, CA 90004 Council District 5

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Kim H Cary

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 10:59 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 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. Kim Huffman Cary 520 S Rossmore Ave Hancock Park HPOZ Los Angeles, CA 90020

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 12:27 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Members of the City Council: 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. 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 further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 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 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) 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. 5. Since I regularly walk through Hancock Park and enjoy the nature-like environment and the beauty of the streets and historical homes, I would like to add 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. In addition there are many added benefits to Historical neighborhoods, such as psychological and Aesthetic benefits. • Wellbeing: Research suggests that living in or visiting areas with a rich historic built environment is linked to higher levels of life satisfaction, mental well-being, and social connectedness. • Aesthetics: The human-scaled, often unique architecture of historic areas offers a break from modern, monotonous, "anywhere-USA" developments, improving the overall aesthetic quality of life. Roberto Naranjo Lopez 365 S. Mansfield Ave 90036 CD5

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Evangeline Quiroz  
**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 02:42 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. Evangeline Quiroz 850 5th Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90005 - Wilshire Park

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 08:50 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Honorable Councilmembers and PLUM Committee: I am writing to support full implementation of Senate Bill 79, and to encourage the City to allow housing capacity near transit to align with the standards established by the law. If the City determines that a local implementation approach is necessary, it is critical that any such approach fully preserve SB 79–level capacity in transit-oriented areas, including locations such as the Bundy/Expo station. This comment focuses on three priorities that align with the City’s goals: certainty, homeowner choice, and housing production in high-opportunity transit locations. Certainty and Avoiding Repeated Rezoning A key benefit of SB 79 is that it establishes clear, consistent development standards. Reducing or phasing in that capacity risks creating a cycle of ongoing rezoning and prolonged uncertainty for homeowners, small property owners, businesses, and the housing market. Any local approach that limits near-term capacity will likely require additional rezoning before 2030, extending uncertainty and slowing reinvestment in communities. Growth Should Occur Where the City Has Already Planned for It The Bundy/Expo station area is precisely the type of location identified in the Housing Element for additional housing: High-opportunity census tracts Within walking distance of high-quality rail transit No Very High Fire Hazard or environmental constraints It is also governed by long-standing planning frameworks, including the Exposition Corridor Transit Neighborhood Plan and the West Los Angeles Transportation Improvement and Mitigation Specific Plan. Allowing full housing capacity in these areas does not introduce a new concept—it fulfills existing City planning policy and aligns land use with infrastructure investment. Homeowner Choice — Not Displacement Increasing zoning capacity does not require anyone to move. It expands options. Many homes near transit are aging structures that no longer meet the needs of current or future households. Allowing additional capacity gives owners the flexibility to remain, improve their property, redevelop, or sell based on their individual circumstances. Without these options, many property owners are effectively constrained by outdated zoning that no longer reflects current economic or housing conditions. Market-Driven, Incremental Change Redevelopment will occur gradually, based on market conditions and individual

decisions. Assemblage requires multiple willing sellers, financing, and time. This ensures that neighborhood change is incremental and responsive to real demand, rather than immediate or widespread. Limiting Capacity Restricts Housing Production If the City delays implementation while also limiting allowable capacity: Housing production is reduced Projects become financially infeasible Property owners cannot act Uncertainty is prolonged In effect, limiting capacity undermines the purpose of both SB 79 and any delay mechanism. Transit-Oriented Housing Supports Jobs and Sustainability The Bundy/Expo area is a major employment node, including companies such as Riot Games, Snap Inc., and numerous creative and technology firms. Providing housing near these jobs: Reduces commute distances Increases transit ridership Supports local businesses Improves air quality Maximizing Public Investment in Transit The Expo Line represents a significant public investment. Limiting housing near stations reduces its effectiveness. Transit-accessible land should accommodate the greatest number of residents possible. Conclusion Los Angeles has an opportunity to align housing capacity with transit, infrastructure, and long-standing planning goals. The City should move toward full implementation of SB 79. If a local implementation approach is pursued, it should ensure that housing capacity near transit is not reduced below what the law allows. Thank you for your consideration. Robert Bedard Los Angeles

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Wally Knox

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 10:22 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 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. Wally Knox 153 South Van Ness Avenue, Los Angeles 90004

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Eric Muhlheim

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 10:43 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 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! Eric Muhlheim 433 South McCadden Place Los Angeles, CA 90020

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Jurmain

**Date Submitted:** 03/18/2026 10:58 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 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. David Jurmain 861 5th Ave 90005