

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 12:51 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please support option C-1 of SB 79. C-1 will be less disastrous to my neighborhood than other options which allow turning neighborhoods into dense urban cities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Craig Gatarz

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 10:41 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 an on-going basis. 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. I believe it is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life and the value of their property 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 made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4.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. Craig Gatarz 455 South McCadden Place Los Angeles, CA 90020 (Add Your Address)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joseph Fishkin

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 11:03 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. I hope someone in your office reads this. I live in Westwood. We've got some planned rail stations--very exciting! But only Option 3 will allow anybody to build apartments near them! They're planned, not yet existing, and I want people to actually be able to afford to live in my wonderful neighborhood. YES to more homes in my backyard, especially apartments. To make this happen, and make LA eventually become more affordable, you need to choose Option 3. Option 2 means perhaps a decade of delay before all the rail stations are complete before anyone can even begin to take advantage of SB79. (And option 1 is absolutely pathetic and will build very little housing, while putting Los Angeles in legal jeopardy, since it's flouting SB 79. Do not consider option 1.) Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goals—to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue. Sincerely, Joseph Fishkin

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Connie Boukidis

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 11:51 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Honorable Members of the City Council, I support Option C1 of the Citywide SB 79 Implementation plan because it provides the city the most flexibility. This option would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs, and low sea level areas until 2030 and will proactively "incentivize" eligible single-family and low-density neighborhoods to allow three-story apartment buildings with 4–16 units. Option C1 should expressly require and condition the following: 1. There will be no changes to the underlying zoning classification, the existing zone stays the same. Additionally, these incentives should be revoked if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2. All existing setback requirements of the underlying zone must be maintained without modification. 3. All property owners and residents currently or potentially affected by SB 79 must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes that would allow higher density apartments on their and their neighbors' property. This will ensure robust outreach beyond online notices. 4. Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZs) should not be treated differently based on the date or time of designation. Thank you,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Semel

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 03:43 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. Daniel Semel 409 N Las Palmas Ave 90004

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Anna Dower

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 03:43 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would

likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.  
Sincerely, Ms. Anna Dower

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Chris Dower

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 03:44 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would

likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.  
Sincerely, Mr. Chris Dower Council District 5

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Daniel Semel

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 03:45 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. Daniel Semel 409 N Las Palmas Ave 90004

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Jed White

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 02:51 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am a homeowner in an R1 neighborhood within .5 mile of an Expo line stop. Please adopt the plan that allows for the most dense housing as possible. I think that is Option C-2. Housing need is a critical emergency, and force once in your political careers I ask you to now kowtow to NIMBYs homeowners. They are a vocal minority. There are plenty of other homeowners like myself how want more dense housing. We must build more dense housing in a job centers like the westside, so that people don't have to commute from 20 miles away to get to their jobs.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 02:54 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** See attached letter from the Faith and Housing Coalition on SB 79 implementation, in strong support of option 3



**March 20, 2026**

Los Angeles City Council  
Los Angeles City Hall  
200 N. Spring St.  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Council File 25-1083 – Impacts of SB 79 (Wiener)**

**Dear Members of the Los Angeles City Council,**

We write in response to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning's February 18, 2026, report on implementation of SB 79, and to **strongly support the adoption of Option 3**, as recommended by the Department.

The Faith and Housing coalition exists to educate, organize, and mobilize churches and leaders to advance effective policy reforms that increase abundance, dignity, and community in our region. As a coalition of churches and faith leaders, we believe public policy should expand access to stable housing, protect vulnerable households, and enable families to remain rooted in their communities. Many of our members are themselves impacted by the housing crisis in our city: our coalition includes families with good jobs who cannot afford to live in their communities, individuals on disability in need of affordable entry-level rentals, and homeowners who are concerned that their children cannot afford to find housing in the city.

SB 79 implementation is one of the most important near-term opportunities to expand housing near high-quality transit, strengthen return on transit investments, and reduce displacement pressures over time. The City must act with urgency, and **Option 3 best balances ambitious housing outcomes with a locally administered implementation framework.**

**Option 3** is the strongest path to ensure that SB 79 implementation produces housing at the scale warranted by the [hundreds of billions](#) we have invested in Los Angeles' major transit. We especially support the option because it would allow significantly denser housing than currently exists in many of our city's high-opportunity areas. The City's identified Opportunity Stations are located not only near transit, but near jobs, parks, and other amenities. Opening up these neighborhoods is not only an effective strategy to build more housing and expand the citywide housing supply, but it also eases overall pressure on rents over time. Importantly, it is vital to stem and reverse gentrification and displacement in lower-income neighborhoods.

By contrast, the other options, particularly Option 1, would not serve the city's long-term housing needs. Not only is it unclear whether Option 1 will be sufficient under HCD guidance, but the Corridor Transition (CT) Program has thus far failed to yield meaningful housing production. LA City Planning's own [reporting on CHIP](#) last fall noted **[zero housing units had been proposed under the Program](#)**. The hundreds of thousands of Los Angeles renters who are severely

rent-burdened cannot wait until 2030 to build housing in our city - they need programs that will drive meaningful housing production today, and Option 1 would simply not do them justice.

For these reasons, **we strongly urge you to support Option 3**, which is the strongest path to ensure SB 79 implementation produces housing at the scale warranted around major transit investments, including in high-opportunity parts of the City.

Sincerely,

*Alex Dobbs*

Alex Dobbs  
Lead Organizer  
Faith and Housing Coalition  
[alex@faithhousingla.com](mailto:alex@faithhousingla.com)

*Thomas Irwin*

Thomas Irwin  
Director  
Faith and Housing Coalition  
[thomas@faithhousingla.com](mailto:thomas@faithhousingla.com)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Miracle Mile Residential Association

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 10:22 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** The Miracle Mile Residential Association supports Citywide SB 79 Implementation Option C1, which is the more equitable path forward for all Los Angeles communities. Option C1 would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs (Historic Preservation Overlay Zones), and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C1 also proactively "incentivizes" all qualifying single-family and low-density neighborhoods to allow 3-story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the 7-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79 and includes these incentives for neighborhoods near any rail stops that are not exempted. The MMRA's support for SB 79 Implementation Option C1 is conditioned on the following: 1 The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an "incentive" program, not a permanent rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods, allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed. 2 All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained. 3 A prohibition on demolishing residential housing and the displacement of rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects without proof of bona fide financing. 4 A sunset on entitlements and building permits, to prevent demolition solely as a form of land speculation. 5 A prohibition on aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raise local rents, speed up gentrification, and destroy neighborhood character. 6 All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications. Thank you for your attention to this vitally important matter. Greg Goldin President, Miracle Mile Residential Association

OFFICERS  
PRESIDENT  
GREG GOLDIN  
VICE PRESIDENT  
KARI GARCIA  
VICE PRESIDENT  
KIMBERLY KLEIN  
VICE PRESIDENT  
SAMANTHA FRIEDLAND  
TREASURER/SECRETARY  
JOSEPH STEINS  
EX OFFICIO  
JAMES O'SULLIVAN



BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
ALLAN TAYLOR  
HANA KAWANO  
KEVIN GLYNN  
MARY WOODWARD  
MITCHELL TANENBAUM  
MONTRESE CHANDLER  
PAULA YERMAN  
RIC STEWARD  
SABRINA SIMMONS  
TYLER LAMBERT-PERKINS

SINCE 1983  
POST OFFICE BOX 361295, LOS ANGELES CA 90036  
WWW.MIRACLEMILELA.COM INFO@MIRACLEMILELA.COM

March 20, 2026

Los Angeles City Council  
200 North Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File No. 25-1083  
Support Option C1 – Delay Implementation of SB 79

Dear Los Angeles City Council,

The Miracle Mile Residential Association supports Citywide SB 79 *Implementation Option C1*, which is the more equitable path forward for all Los Angeles communities. Option C1 would delay implementation of SB 79 in low-resource areas, high fire severity zones, HPOZs (Historic Preservation Overlay Zones), and low sea level areas until 2030. Option C1 also proactively "incentivizes" all qualifying single-family and low-density neighborhoods to allow 3-story apartment buildings with 4-16 units, rather than the 7-story apartment buildings mandated under SB 79 and includes these incentives for neighborhoods near any rail stops that are not exempted.

The MMRA's support for SB 79 Implementation Option C1 is conditioned on the following:

- 1 The proposed density changes must be clearly defined as an "incentive" program, not a permanent rezoning or upzoning of these neighborhoods, allowing the incentives to be withdrawn if SB 79 is amended or repealed.
- 2 All existing setback requirements of the underlying zoning must be maintained.
- 3 A prohibition on demolishing residential housing and the displacement of rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects *without proof of bona fide financing*.
- 4 A sunset on entitlements and building permits, to prevent demolition solely as a form of land speculation.
- 5 A prohibition on aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raise local rents, speed up gentrification, and destroy neighborhood character.
- 6 All affected property owners and residents must receive mailed notification of the proposed changes to ensure robust outreach beyond online notifications.

Thank you for your attention to this vitally important matter.

Greg Goldin  
President, Miracle Mile Residential Association



@MIRACLEMILELA



@MIRACLEMILERA



@MIRACLEMILEMMRA



## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shawn

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 09:30 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would

likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue. Sincerely, Mr Shawn Davis 1050 Ingraham St Apt 435 Los Angeles, CA 90017-1991 kilooscarfive@hotmail.com

## Communication from Public

**Name:** josh cretella

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 09:34 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By

doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Anthony Yang  
**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 09:39 AM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would

likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 09:46 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would

likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.  
Sincerely,

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ryan Rubin

**Date Submitted:** 03/20/2026 02:45 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By

doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Alexander Dobbs

**Date Submitted:** 03/21/2026 03:14 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear LA City Council, My name is Alex Dobbs and I am the Lead Organizer of the Faith and Housing Coalition. Los Angeles is in an acute housing crisis. Far too many Angelenos are experiencing homelessness, renters are severely cost-burdened, and homeownership is increasingly out of reach for families across the income spectrum. The City must act with urgency, and SB 79 implementation is one of the most important near-term opportunities to expand housing near high-quality transit, strengthen return on transit investments, and reduce displacement pressures over time. Option 3 best balances ambitious housing outcomes with a locally administered implementation framework. The City's identified Opportunity Stations are located not only near transit, but near jobs, parks, and other amenities. Decades of housing research show that enabling new homes in high-opportunity areas is among the most effective ways to reduce scarcity and moderate rent growth citywide. New housing in higher-cost neighborhoods also helps relieve pressure on lower-income neighborhoods by expanding overall supply and offering alternatives to households that would otherwise compete for limited existing homes. We cannot meaningfully reduce displacement pressures in lower-income neighborhoods without allowing substantially more housing in high-opportunity areas. Otherwise, we will continue the slow erosion of our naturally affordable housing stock in working-class neighborhoods. Option 3 is the strongest path to ensure SB 79 implementation produces housing at the scale warranted around the hundreds of billions we have invested in Los Angeles' major transit, especially in high-opportunity parts of the City. Thus, option 3 advances zoning fairness, supports the City's affirmative furtherance of fair housing obligations, and helps protect vulnerable tenants. By contrast, the other options, particularly Option 1, present significant legal and practical risks. First, it is unclear whether the allowed density and capacity assumptions would be sufficient under evolving HCD guidance and enforcement expectations. Second, the Corridor Transition Program has not yet demonstrated meaningful housing production. LA City Planning's own reporting on CHIP implementation noted zero housing proposals under the Corridor Transition Program as of last fall. Finally, because full SB 79 density would not take effect until

2030 under that approach, the City risks several years of minimal project activity, which could lead to land speculation in the very places where housing near transit is most needed. Therefore, I strongly urge the City Council to adopt Option 3. Thank you for your attention to this important matter

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Debbie Nussbaum

**Date Submitted:** 03/22/2026 04:59 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Westwood Hills Property Owners Association (WHPOA) supports option C1, which offers more communities more protection until 2030 when SB 79 will go into full effect. C1 makes all qualifying areas near transit eligible for three story developments rather than the seven-story allowed, C2 allows the same C1 three story developments but changes some areas near rail stops to allow seven story developments instead of three. C2 negatively impacts a lot of our Westside neighborhoods and the community of Westchester. According to the Planning Department, both options will satisfy Sacramento density requirements. C1 seems the more equitable option. Density is best added on corridors where there is already robust utilities, higher and newer electric grid supply, sewer system, and water pipe network. If upgrades are needed it's more cost effective to do upgrades where there are multiple new multi floor construction along a corridor, rather than a single property here and there is single family neighborhoods. Its cost effective for cities to build along business corridors. Planned growth along business corridors where single or 2 story building can be smartly replaced with mixed use building with business on the street level and residential on the additional floors. The City of Los Angeles during the Housing Elements exercise, submitted a good plan the met all the RHNA numbers by building density along corridors. Respectively yours, Debbie Nussbaum President - Westwood Hills Property Owners Association (WHPOA)

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 11:30 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 Option 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 sensitive 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 T

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Steven Peckman

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 10:02 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Los Angeles City Council, I support and ask you to support a modified Option C1 to facilitate local implementation of SB 79, with a key change: I strongly urge the City to exclude all HPOZs, regardless of when they were adopted. This approach better protects historic resources citywide, more evenly expands opportunities for contextual infill housing, and aligns with Los Angeles' broader planning efforts. I ask you to support this hybrid solution as it will secure the ability to increase construction of new housing in the City as required by SB79, while protecting our city's history as represented through its architecture. Such a measured response will ensure that the history of the people who lived here before us is not erased like is occurring at the federal level. A modified Option C1 will provide the City with time to develop a rational approach to implementing SB79 and protect historic resources. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brad Kane  
**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 10:15 PM  
**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** March 23, 2026 Re: Support of SB 79 Option C-1 with no exceptions Council File: 25-1083 Dear Members of the Los Angeles City Council: The South Carthay Neighborhood Association ("SCNA") strongly supports SB 79 Deferred Implementation Option C1 without any exceptions or exclusions since the City of Los Angeles satisfied all state affordable housing mandates before passage of SB 79. By delaying SB 79's implementation from July 1, 2026, to January 1, 2030, the City, in consultation with its residents, can develop an Alternative Plan addressing serious life safety and infrastructure issues, protecting sensitive areas, slowing gentrification, and preventing the loss of rent stabilized housing. At least one Council Member has already recommended sacrificing multiple historic preservation overlay zones ("HPOZs") rich in affordable housing and giving developers more than double the height incentives in exchange for simply for delaying SB 79's implementation to 2030. At the February 24, 2026, City Planning and Land Use Committee Meeting, Council Member Bob Blumenfield made a "Chair's Recommendation" to adopt Option C2 except for HPOZs created after January 1, 2015, such as the Carthay Square and Miracle Mile. First, the city still needs to conduct a state mandated safety/evacuation analysis mandated as in 2019. As the 2025 Palisades Fire demonstrated, the greater the density, the more difficult rapid deployment of first responders and timely evacuation of residents becomes. Second, according to the City Attorney, the required \$6 billion+ in infrastructure upgrades will be paid for by City taxpayers, not developers. Third, efforts to make housing more affordable should not squeeze working people out of the market or displace communities. City Council President Harris-Dawson recognized: "When I first took office, eight out of every ten residential units that went up for sale were bought by a corporation," Harris-Dawson said, referring to the area where Council Districts 8, 9 and 15 meet. He said those buyers used density laws to tear down houses and create multifamily units in neighborhoods where working people had once been able to afford a home. "They were totally now squeezed out of the market," he said. [https://www.westsidecurrent.com/news/corporate-buyers-have-been-squeezing-angelenos-out-of-the-housing-market-for-years-council-warns/article\\_21cdb2a4-ecd2-4fc5-a351-714a4d0a916e.html](https://www.westsidecurrent.com/news/corporate-buyers-have-been-squeezing-angelenos-out-of-the-housing-market-for-years-council-warns/article_21cdb2a4-ecd2-4fc5-a351-714a4d0a916e.html) Option C1 with no exclusions or exceptions is the best deferral option under serious consideration. Key Benefits of Option C1 • Deferred Implementation in Sensitive Areas with Historic Resources, Inadequate Infrastructure or Significant Public Safety Constraints until January 1, 2030. (SB 79 expressly only allows deferred implementation for HPOZs. The SCNA urges the city to do whatever it can to also defer implementation for sites on the National Register of Historic Places.) • Reduced Building Heights: C1 provides additional height incentives limited to three-story structures until January 1, 2030, rather than the five to seven story regime allowed under SB 79, Options C2 and Option C3. While Option C2 incentivizes five to seven-story buildings, the city can still remove the incentives, if SB 79 is amended. Under Option C3, the upzoning permanently allows five to seven story regimes, even if SB 79 is amended without changing other state laws. In sum, the SCNA supports SB 79 deferral Option C1 to buy time to figure out a long-term strategy to protect residents' life/safety; to delay SB 79's unfunded mandate of \$6 billion+ inefficient and unplanned city infrastructure upgrades; reduce gentrification, to prevent the displacement of longtime residents and the loss of rent stabilized units. In addition, the SCNA suggests that the City Council add the following protections to strengthen Option C1: (i) A prohibition on demolishing residential housing and the displacement of rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects without proof of bona fide financing. (ii) A prohibition on the aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raise local rents, speed up gentrification, and destroy neighborhood character without generating additional affordable housing. The City should notify all single family (R-1) and low density (R-2) property owners that their properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit significantly greater residential density, so they can participate in the drafting of the City's alternative plan. In addition, the letter shall provide the contact information to their state representatives so they may participate in any revisions to SB 79. Sincerely, Brad Kane President South Carthay Neighborhood Association Email: [bkane@kanelaw.la](mailto:bkane@kanelaw.la) Phone: (323) 697-9840



March 23, 2026

Re: Support of SB 79 Option C-1 with no exceptions  
Council File: 25-1083

Dear Members of the Los Angeles City Council:

The South Carthay Neighborhood Association (“SCNA”) strongly supports SB 79 Deferred Implementation Option C1 without any exceptions or exclusions since the City of Los Angeles satisfied all state affordable housing mandates *before* passage of SB 79. By delaying SB 79’s implementation from July 1, 2026, to January 1, 2030, the City, in consultation with its residents, can develop an Alternative Plan addressing serious life safety and infrastructure issues, protecting sensitive areas, slowing gentrification, and preventing the loss of rent stabilized housing.

At least one Council Member has already *recommended* sacrificing multiple historic preservation overlay zones (“HPOZs”) rich in affordable housing and giving developers more than double the height incentives in exchange for simply for delaying SB 79’s implementation to 2030. At the February 24, 2026, City Planning and Land Use Committee Meeting, Council Member Bob Blumenfield made a “Chair’s Recommendation” to adopt Option C2 except for HPOZs created after January 1, 2015, such as the Carthay Square and Miracle Mile.

First, the city still needs to conduct a state mandated safety/evacuation analysis mandated as in 2019. As the 2025 Palisades Fire demonstrated, the greater the density, the more difficult rapid deployment of first responders and timely evacuation of residents becomes.

Second, according to the City Attorney, the required \$6 billion+ in infrastructure upgrades will be paid for by City taxpayers, not developers.

Third, efforts to make housing more affordable should not squeeze working people out of the market or displace communities. City Council President Harris-Dawson recognized:

“When I first took office, eight out of every ten residential units that went up for sale were bought by a corporation,” Harris-Dawson said, referring to the area where Council Districts 8, 9 and 15 meet. He said those buyers used density laws to tear down houses and create multifamily units in neighborhoods where working people had once been able to afford a home. “They were totally now squeezed out of the market,” he said.

[https://www.westsidcurrent.com/news/corporate-buyers-have-been-squeezing-angelenos-out-of-the-housing-market-for-years-council-warns/article\\_21cdb2a4-ecd2-4fe5-a351-714a4d0a916c.html](https://www.westsidcurrent.com/news/corporate-buyers-have-been-squeezing-angelenos-out-of-the-housing-market-for-years-council-warns/article_21cdb2a4-ecd2-4fe5-a351-714a4d0a916c.html)

Option C1 with no exclusions or exceptions is the best deferral option under serious consideration.

Key Benefits of Option C1

- Deferred Implementation in Sensitive Areas with Historic Resources, Inadequate Infrastructure or Significant Public Safety Constraints until January 1, 2030. (SB 79 expressly only allows deferred

implementation for HPOZs. The SCNA urges the city to do whatever it can to also defer implementation for sites on the National Register of Historic Places.)

- Reduced Building Heights: C1 provides *additional* height incentives limited to three-story structures until January 1, 2030, rather than the five to seven story regime allowed under SB 79, Options C2 and Option C3.

While Option C2 incentivizes five to seven-story buildings, the city can still remove the incentives, if SB 79 is amended. Under Option C3, the upzoning permanently allows five to seven story regimes, even if SB 79 is amended without changing other state laws.

In sum, the SCNA supports SB 79 deferral Option C1 to buy time to figure out a long-term strategy to protect residents' life/safety; to delay SB 79's unfunded mandate of \$6 billion+ inefficient and unplanned city infrastructure upgrades; reduce gentrification, to prevent the displacement of longtime residents and the loss of rent stabilized units. In addition, the SCNA suggests that the City Council add the following protections to strengthen Option C1:

- (i) A prohibition on demolishing residential housing and the displacement of rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects without proof of bona fide financing.
- (ii) A prohibition on the aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raise local rents, speed up gentrification, and destroy neighborhood character without generating additional affordable housing.

The City should notify all single family (R-1) and low density (R-2) property owners that their properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit significantly greater residential density, so they can participate in the drafting of the City's alternative plan. In addition, the letter shall provide the contact information to their state representatives so they may participate in any revisions to SB 79.

Sincerely,



Brad Kane

President

South Carthay Neighborhood Association

Email: [bkane@kanelaw.la](mailto:bkane@kanelaw.la)

Phone: (323) 697-9840

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Henry Mantel

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 07:27 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** My name is Henry Mantel, I'm a resident of CD5, and I write to express my full-throated support for allowing the immediate and full implementation of SB79. Los Angeles is dealing with a housing crisis caused by the city's failure to legalize more housing development. The only way to solve this crisis and make LA more affordable is to legalize building more housing across LA, particularly near transit stations, which SB79 will do unless the council decides to delay implementation. Los Angeles cannot afford any more delays, the city desperately needs more housing. Please, do what is necessary to address the housing crisis and fully implement SB79.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 07:34 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** As a Los Angeles resident, I write to you regarding the implementation of SB 79, the Abundant & Affordable Homes Near Transit Act. I would like to express strong support for Option 3 in the Department of City Planning's recent report recommendations. This state law, which takes effect July 1, is critical to creating more affordable housing, meeting our city's RHNA goals, and providing options for Angelenos to get around our City without a car. Option 3 is the only option that ensures that the City of LA can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context, while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible. From a values perspective, this option also most fully advances the City's obligations to affirmatively further fair housing (AFFH), and it increases project feasibility in high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit and still allows for deferrals of eligible parcels. Moreover, Option 3 ensures that LA will remain in compliance with SB 79, regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis and calculations. It is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer to stand up in court. The report's other two options—particularly Option 1—will potentially expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed down one of these other paths and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today preserves City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals. It's worth highlighting that the Planning Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item, resulting in a chair recommendation for Option 2, which would still represent a significant upzoning around high-opportunity train stations. It is far more ambitious than Option 1, which includes so little upzoning that it would likely put the city in legal jeopardy. By

doubling down on the status quo of housing scarcity, it would also further the harm inflicted on the thousands of families struggling to find an affordable place to live. I would like to thank the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Scott Epstein

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 03:25 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Abundant Housing LA, Inner City Law Center, Streets for All, Housing Action Coalition, and YIMBY LA support Option 3 for SB 79 implementation.



ABUNDANT  
HOUSING LA



March 23, 2026

Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson  
Los Angeles City Hall Office  
200 N. Spring St Room 450  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Council File: 25-1083 – Impacts of SB 79 (Wiener)**

Dear President Harris-Dawson and Members of the Los Angeles City Council,

We, the undersigned organizations, write in response to the Department of City Planning's February report regarding the implementation of SB 79 and to support the adoption of Option 3 as recommended by the Department. We want to begin by recognizing the constructive work of the Department in developing a thoughtful framework to meet the City's obligations under SB 79, while advancing the City's commitment to Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH).

Los Angeles has continually shown a commitment to implement state law while adapting policies and programs to local contexts. The Planning Department's proposal reflects that vision. The report demonstrates a clear understanding that SB 79 presents an opportunity to further local goals, including focusing growth near transit and furthering fair housing. **Option 3, in particular, would ensure that the City of Los Angeles can further its goal of tailoring state policies to local context while implementing SB 79 in a manner that is legally defensible.**

Option 3 makes certain that Los Angeles will remain in compliance with SB 79 regardless of how the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issues guidance on capacity analysis. As HCD continues to clarify questions regarding floor area, density calculations and capacity analysis methodologies, it is critical that the City adopt an approach that provides sufficient legal durability and a reasonable compliance buffer. In Appendix A, we highlight some of the questions we have about the methodology used to calculate both SB 79 and local capacity.

In the current enforcement environment surrounding state housing laws, jurisdictions are expected to demonstrate that zoning capacity is realistic, legally defensible, and consistent with

state definitions. **Option 1, in particular, will likely expose the City to findings of noncompliance and risk litigation if state guidance diverges from local capacity assumptions.** It's worth highlighting that the Planning and Land Use Management Committee (PLUM) heard this item last month, resulting in a chair recommendation from Mr. Blumenfield for Option 2, which although less ambitious than Option 3, would still represent a significant upzoning around many high-opportunity train stations. Nevertheless, Option 3 creates the safest and best strategy for enacting a feasible local alternative plan while also accessing legally allowed deferrals.

By proactively adopting standards that clearly satisfy SB 79, the City retains substantial discretion over how transit-adjacent growth is shaped. If Los Angeles chooses to proceed with Option 1 and is later found out of compliance, SB 79 would take effect throughout all transit zones in the City and eliminate the City's ability to tailor implementation to neighborhood context. A durable, forward-looking implementation strategy today will preserve City Hall's ability to adopt strategies that further both state and local goals in the long term.

Moreover, Option 3 most fully advances the City's AFFH obligations, by increasing project feasibility in the greatest number of high-opportunity neighborhoods. Transit-rich areas—particularly in higher-resource communities—have historically been underutilized for multifamily housing. A robust implementation of SB 79 furthers the City's goals to increase access to opportunity, jobs, and transit. It would do this by providing more housing options within some of the most desirable neighborhoods of our increasingly unaffordable majority-renter city. The Planning Department's framework rightly demonstrates that compliance with SB 79, advancement of AFFH, and meeting the needs of residents in our majority-renter city are all mutually reinforcing goals.

Los Angeles has demonstrated leadership in implementing state housing law in a manner that centers equity, feasibility, and legal compliance. We are grateful to the Department of City Planning for its careful work on this proposal and strongly support adoption of Option 3 to ensure the City meets its obligations under SB 79 and AFFH in a durable and defensible manner.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

Azeen Khanmalek  
Executive Director  
Abundant Housing LA

Mahdi Manji  
Director of Public Policy  
Inner City Law Center

Marc Vukceвич  
Director of State Policy  
Streets for All

Jesse Zwick  
Southern California Director  
Housing Action Coalition

Zachary Pitts  
LA Director  
YIMBY Action

Cc: Mayor Karen Bass  
Councilmember Eunisses Hernandez (CD1)  
Councilmember Adrin Nazarian (CD2)  
Councilmember Nithya Raman (CD4)  
Councilmember Katy Young Yaroslavsky (CD5)  
Councilmember Imelda Padilla (CD6)  
Councilmember Monica Rodriguez (CD7)  
Councilmember Marqueece Harris-Dawson (CD8)  
Councilmember Curren D. Price, Jr. (CD9)  
Councilmember Heather Hutt (CD10)  
Councilmember Traci Park (CD11)  
Councilmember John S. Lee (CD12)  
Councilmember Hugo Soto-Martínez (CD13)  
Councilmember Ysabel J. Jurado (CD14)  
Councilmember Tim McOsker (CD15)

### **Appendix A: Technical Clarifications Requested**

1. Did the calculations of allowed floor area use SB 79's definition of FAR, or the Los Angeles Municipal Code definition?
2. Did the calculations of SB 79 capacity include potential bonus density and FAR achievable under the State Density Bonus Law (SDBL)?
3. How were stations such as Chinatown analyzed, where zoning may allow a higher number of units but significantly less floor area than contemplated under SB 79? How does that discrepancy affect capacity calculations?

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Leslie Andrew Ridings

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 04:04 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Councilmembers and staff, Downtown Los Angeles for All (DTLA4A), a grassroots pro-housing organization made up of residents of Downtown Los Angeles, submits this letter in strong support of Option 3 for SB 79 implementation. The letter argues that enabling meaningful housing density near transit is essential to restoring Los Angeles as an open, opportunity-rich city—one where access to jobs, mobility, and prosperity is not artificially constrained. It highlights how this approach advances equity, supports transit ridership, and strengthens Downtown Los Angeles as the shared economic heart of the region.



DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES FOR ALL

---

March 23, 2026

**Members of the Los Angeles City Council**

Los Angeles City Hall  
200 N. Spring Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**RE: Council File 25-1083 – Impacts of SB 79 (Wiener)**

Honorable Councilmembers:

We write in response to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning’s February 18, 2026 report on implementation of SB 79, and to strongly support adoption of **Option 3**, as recommended by the Department.

**At its core, SB 79 is about aligning Los Angeles’ land use policies with opportunity.** For too long, we have constrained housing in precisely the places where access to jobs, transit, and upward mobility is greatest. The result is a deeply distorted market—one where scarcity drives up costs, shuts out working families, and concentrates disadvantage rather than alleviating it.

**Option 3 begins to correct that imbalance.** By enabling substantially more housing near high-quality transit—especially in high-opportunity areas—it allows Los Angeles to function more like a dynamic, open city rather than a gated patchwork of exclusion. This is not simply about adding units; it is about restoring access to opportunity at scale.

**From a Downtown Los Angeles perspective, this matters enormously.** DTLA is the region’s economic and transit heart—a place where Angelenos from every neighborhood come to work, build businesses, and participate in civic life. When more people can live near transit across the region, more people can access Downtown efficiently and affordably. That means more customers for small businesses, more riders on our transit system, and a stronger, more resilient urban core. In a very real sense, expanding housing near transit citywide is an investment in Downtown Los Angeles as the shared center of gravity for the entire region.

**Just as importantly, this is a matter of manifest fairness and begins to correct decades of injustice perpetrated against Angelenos of color.** Los Angeles’ current housing patterns are not accidental—they are the product of decades of exclusionary zoning, redlining, and policy choices that restricted who could live where. Entire neighborhoods of opportunity were effectively walled off, while lower-income communities were left to absorb the pressures of scarcity.



---

DOWNTOWN LOS ANGELES FOR ALL

---

**SB 79—and Option 3 in particular—offers a meaningful step toward undoing that legacy.** By opening high-opportunity, transit-rich areas to more housing, the City can begin to reverse patterns of exclusion and expand access to neighborhoods that have long been out of reach. This is what it means to affirmatively further fair housing in practice: not just protecting existing residents, but ensuring that more people have the opportunity to live in places of access, mobility, and prosperity.

**Critically, Option 3 does this in a way that works with—not against—the realities of housing production.** Capital follows clarity, scale, and certainty. A framework that allows meaningful density near transit, without delay or fragmentation, is far more likely to attract the investment needed to actually deliver housing at the pace required. By contrast, more limited or phased approaches risk prolonging scarcity, inviting speculation, and failing to produce meaningful results in the near term.

The stakes are clear:

We can continue to limit access to our most connected, opportunity-rich neighborhoods; or we can choose to open them to present and future Angelenos.

We can continue to underutilize billions in transit investment; or we can allow Angelenos to fully realize the promise of a less car-dependent, walkable Los Angeles.

**We can continue patterns of exclusion; or we can begin to correct them.**

Option 3 is the path that aligns our policies with our values, our infrastructure, and our future. We urge you to adopt it.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Andrew Ridings  
Chapter Chair, Downtown Los Angeles for All  
A Chapter of Abundant Housing Los Angeles

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Sandy Hubbard

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 04:10 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** City Councilmembers, I certify that I am a resident of Los Angeles, a native to the City of L.A.

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 further require the following in conjunction with Option 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 sensitive 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. Respectfully,  
Sandy Hubbard For identification purposes only: NCVV board member and Valley Village Residents Association boardmember

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Bobby Garrity

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 04:23 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to voice my support for Option 3 for SB 79 implementation. Los Angeles is in a dire housing crisis. Rents are unaffordable, homeownership is inaccessible, and we have 40,000 people who sleep on the streets every night just in the City. To overcome the pains of our housing shortage, we need housing abundance. SB 79 is a step towards that, and of the implementation options staff has laid out, Option 3 is clearly the best. It is the most equitable, most feasible, and the one most in line with the spirit of the law. We need much more housing, and we especially need more housing near our transit stations. Please choose Option 3 for SB 79 implementation.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 04:24 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Clerk Patrice Lattimore, 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.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gail Ostergren

**Date Submitted:** 03/23/2026 05:33 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support Option C1 to facilitate local implementation of SB 79, with a key change: I strongly urge the City to exclude all HPOZs, regardless of when they were adopted. This approach better protects historic resources citywide, more evenly expands opportunities for contextual infill housing, and aligns with Los Angeles' broader planning efforts. It would also help mitigate impacts in neighborhoods like mine, the Miracle Mile HPOZ (adopted 2017), that are already home to numerous small-scale, rent-stabilized, historic multifamily buildings—exactly the type of housing the city needs more of. Historic neighborhoods are already experiencing increasing density through the addition of ADUs, which further burden narrow streets and inadequate existing street parking. The fact that an HPOZ was adopted after 2015 does not make it any less of an exemplar of the city's history than those designated at an earlier time nor any less worthy of protection.