

Communication from Public

Name: Jay Lubow

Date Submitted: 03/24/2026 10:06 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 and would like to express strong support for Option 3. It is the best option to help our city build the housing that we so desperately need! 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: 03/24/2026 01:20 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Ronald Rosen

Date Submitted: 03/24/2026 03:58 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: A short note to support Option C-1 for the following reasons: 1. Phased Approach: C-1 gives the City an opportunity to evaluate how the integration of the smaller scaled housing projects can integrate compatibly with the neighborhoods and still provide the needed additional housing. 2. Assess Impacts Before Full Implementation. The City can review the physical impacts on the neighborhoods, the adequacy of the infrastructure such as sewers, water, and electricity, and determine the use of the local Metro by the residents in the impacted area 3. Evaluate Future Need after Five to Seven Years: Determine the need for further developments in or adjacent to the neighborhoods along proximately located commercial streets to meet the housing demand. 4. Adopt Architectural Mitigation Features. To reduce the perception of bulk on the streetscapes from the additional housing, require front facades to be modulated into two sections to break up the bulk and allow open balconies, covered porches, and other architectural projections and features without reduction in FAR. I think this can be a win win for all interested parties. Thank you.

Communication from Public

Name: LaTeira Haynes Zavala

Date Submitted: 03/21/2026 07:42 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I write in response to the Los Angeles Department of City Planning's February 18, 2026, report on the implementation of SB 79, and to strongly support the adoption of Option 3, as recommended by the Department. 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: Shannon Burghardt
Date Submitted: 03/23/2026 01:37 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 Shannon Burghardt

Communication from Public

Name: Kai Del Regno

Date Submitted: 03/24/2026 12:02 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I'm a resident of Sherman Oaks, I was born and raised in Los Angeles, I've lived here my entire life, and I worked for Rec and Parks for 5 years. I'm commenting on agenda item 4, in support of SB79 option 3 and in opposition to option 1. Option 3 is the option which will immediately provide much-needed housing in our city, distribute it most equitably, and provide the most low-income housing for the residents of our city. Option 1 is a joke of a proposition which will delay implementation of SB79 until 2030, and enable land speculation instead of housing development. The residents of LA deserve better from our elected officials than an option which would benefit Republicans in Congress by delaying housing construction until after the Census, and exclude vulnerable Americans in other states from the protections that we share in California. For these reasons I find option 3 to be the bare minimum.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/23/2026 06:11 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: See attached Letter indicating the Los Angeles New Liberals strong support for Option 3 on SB 79 Implementation



March 23, 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.

Dense housing around transit carries many benefits. First, Los Angeles remains in a severe housing shortage, with high rents, widespread cost burden, and rising pressure on households across the income spectrum. SB 79 implementation presents one of the clearest near-term opportunities to allow more homes and expand access to high-opportunity neighborhoods, moving the ball forward in addressing this broader crisis.

Second, Los Angeles’ elected leaders have an imperative to maximize the return on our public investments. Metro is in the midst of spending hundreds of billions to build out our rail infrastructure, yet [ridership remains well below its mid-2010s peak](#). To maximize the benefits of Los Angeles’s major transit investments, we must clear a pathway to building new housing around said investments.

Third, enabling more housing around transit would generate broader economic benefits beyond increased housing supply and transit use. Greater density and walkability can support small businesses and help revitalize commercial corridors around major stations. Expanding housing in these areas can also [strengthen the City’s tax base](#) and widen access to jobs and opportunity, with long-term benefits for economic mobility and regional productivity.

These goals are best served by adopting Option 3. By extending the height and density standards of the TOIA Program to all Opportunity Stations, Option 3 better matches the scale of the City’s housing shortage and transit ambitions. While the middle-scale housing contemplated under Option 1 is still an important part of Los Angeles’ broader housing strategy, areas surrounding major transit stops are precisely where the City should allow its highest-intensity housing growth.

We are also concerned that the Corridor Transition Program proposed under Option 1 has not yet demonstrated meaningful housing production in its first year of existence. As [LA City Planning reported](#) last fall in its CHIP implementation update, the **Corridor Transition Program had generated [zero](#)**

[housing proposals](#) at that time. Because full SB 79 density would not take effect until 2030 under that approach, the City risks several years of limited project activity in places where transit-oriented housing is most needed.

For these reasons, we urge the City Council to adopt Option 3. Los Angeles needs a transit-oriented growth framework that is legally durable, economically serious, and commensurate with both the city's housing shortage and its transit ambitions.

Sincerely,

Tyler Laferriere-Holloway
Chapter Lead
Los Angeles New Liberals

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 03/24/2026 10:41 AM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: Please add to CF 25-1083

Communication from Public

Name: The Empowerment Congress North Area Neighborhood Development Council (NANDC)

Date Submitted: 03/23/2026 09:58 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: Our CIS is on file but we add the following comments for your consideration. As we state in our CIS, our city has a Housing Element that was just approved and supported by the State that will add a huge amount of density to our city. SB 79 ignores the work of our Planning Department, adding unnecessary additional density into our single-family, older multi-family, historic districts and light industrial zones. Tomorrow at Council you will consider Item 4, and we ask that you delay implementation. This bill's random application makes the city vulnerable to budget-busting infrastructure needs in all of these neighborhoods. And undermines the hugely expensive effort that went into preparing the Housing Element. With the passage of Senate Bill 79 (SB 79), the City of Los Angeles must decide how it is going to implement the new legislation. The law's provisions are slated to go into effect July 1, 2026, but municipalities are given options to delay effectuation or create alternative plans of their own. Los Angeles is poised to delay effectuation of the bill in all areas of the city, including within HPOZs. Based upon our analysis, the implications of SB-79, and community input, NANDC supports Option C1, with a key change: we strongly urge the City to exclude all Historic Preservation Overlay Zones, regardless of when they were adopted. This cautious approach better protects historic resources citywide, more evenly expands opportunities for compatible infill housing, and aligns with broader planning efforts already underway in Los Angeles.

Communication from Public

Name: West Adams Heritage Association, Jean Frost

Date Submitted: 03/23/2026 10:09 PM

Council File No: 25-1518

Comments for Public Posting: RE: Opposition to California Senate Bill 79, Housing development: transit-oriented development: California Environmental Quality Act: public transit agency land; Item 4 at City Council, March 24, 2026 Our city has a Housing Element that was just approved and supported by the State that will add a huge amount of density to our city. SB 79 ignores the work of our Planning Department, adding unnecessary additional density into our single-family, older multi-family, historic districts and light industrial zones. Tomorrow at Council you will consider Item 4, and we ask that you delay implementation. We support Option 1 as amended. We 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. This bill's random application makes the city vulnerable to budget-busting infrastructure needs in all of these neighborhoods. And undermines the hugely expensive effort that went into preparing the Housing Element. With the passage of Senate Bill 79 (SB 79), the City of Los Angeles must decide how it is going to implement the new legislation. The law's provisions are slated to go into effect July 1, 2026, but municipalities are given options to delay effectuation or create alternative plans of their own. Los Angeles is poised to delay effectuation of the bill in all areas of the city, including within HPOZs Based upon our analysis, the implications of SB-79, and community input, NANDC supports Option C1, with a key change: we strongly urge the City to exclude all Historic Preservation Overlay Zones, regardless of when they were adopted. This cautious approach better protects historic resources citywide, more evenly expands opportunities for

compatible infill housing, and aligns with broader planning efforts already underway in Los Angeles. See our side-by side comparison of options. The West Adams Heritage Association (WAHA) opposes SB 79 which would impose irreparable harm on our historic communities. West Adams Heritage Association is a community-based organization of several hundred households and stakeholders. WAHA has been a community resource for over 35 years. WAHA routinely encourages comments on land use and planning policies in support of character neighborhoods and historic preservation. After taking numerous amendments, SB79 continues to inflict enormous damage on communities and needless oversight of cities. It allows massive overbuilding of market-rate units in return for a small percentage of affordable apartments, with no affordability requirement for developments under 10 units. Los Angeles has adopted multiple historic districts to conserve our built environment. But the result has also been the protection in many cases of older housing stock which contains naturally occurring affordable housing, both RSO units and non-RSO units. WAHA has a strong record of advocating for both affordable housing projects and initiatives along with historic preservation goals.



September 5, 2025

California State Assembly District 55
1021 O Street, Suite 5630; P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, California 94249-0055
via email

Honorable Assemblyman Isaac Bryan
Honorable Assemblyperson Sade Elhawary
And Honorable Members of the California State Assembly, Los Angeles Delegation:

RE: Opposition to California Senate Bill 79, Housing development: transit-oriented development: California Environmental Quality Act: public transit agency land

The West Adams Heritage Association (WAHA) opposes SB 79 which would impose irreparable harm on our historic communities. West Adams Heritage Association is a community-based organization of several hundred households and stakeholders. WAHA has been a community resource for over 35 years. WAHA routinely encourages comments on land use and planning policies in support of character neighborhoods and historic preservation.

After taking numerous amendments, SB79 continues to inflict enormous damage on communities and needless oversight of cities. It allows massive overbuilding of market-rate units in return for a small percentage of affordable apartments, with no affordability requirement for developments under 10 units.

Los Angeles has adopted multiple historic districts to conserve our built environment. But the result has also been the protection in many cases of older housing stock which contains naturally occurring affordable housing, both RSO units and non-RSO units. WAHA has a strong record of advocating for both affordable housing projects and initiatives along with historic preservation goals.

The West Adams area has over three dozen cultural monuments and eleven Historic Preservation Overlay Zones (HPOZ). Historic Cultural Monuments (HCM), and other duly designated historic properties should be exempt from SB79. Such Zones and properties represent the historic cultural history of our communities. . National Register designated sites, properties and districts should be exempt from SB79.

SB79 will erase the cultural history of our communities, negatively impact our health, and decrease our quality of life, and incentivize investors exploiting the situation for their own profit without addressing our real need for affordable housing as well as housing and resources for the homeless.

While the intent of SB 79 may be to address issues around the supply of housing, the bill's provisions further undermines local governance, circumvents local decision-making processes. Under the guise of helping transit riders find housing near transit, SB 79 is framed as a transit-oriented housing solution, but its real purpose is to strip local zoning protections and open up vast areas of low-density neighborhoods to high profit real estate development.

B79 does NOT require sufficient affordable housing or any housing for the homeless. The highest priority for any housing bill should be a substantial increase in housing for extremely low income (ELI) and very low income (VLI) renters as well as housing and services for the homeless. Rather than benefiting such individuals, families, and communities, SB79 will destroy their permanent and often affordable housing. The primary benefits of the bill will accrue to developers, land speculators, and financiers seeking to build new largely market-rate six to seven story apartments.

Moreover, the local control amendments are illusory: they preserve the same extreme density mandates and merely allow cities to shuffle their location while permanently upzoning single-family neighborhoods to multi-family. Even if a city wished to propose an "alternative plan", it would have only 60 days after enactment of the bill to submit it, an impossible timeline for meaningful planning or required public engagement. None of the new amendments have remedied the fundamental flaws of this bill. They have actually made them worse.

WAHA stands with Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils, Los Angeles City Attorney Hydee Feldstein-Soto, and more than 100 California cities that officially oppose SB79. SB79 should be stopped before it eliminates local control of land use, obstructs the City's ability to meet its housing commitment in the Los Angeles State certified Housing Element, including affordable housing goals, while simultaneously imposing an unfunded mandate of billions of dollars on our communities that can ill afford such costs; wastes millions of dollars and valuable resources already expended by Planning Departments across the State in creating the Housing Elements that comply with State and Federal standards. The Housing Elements already accomplish the goal of creating needed housing in a sensitive and sensible way, which SB79 does not do.

Please vote against SB79's negative impact on our residential communities and its undermining of the Los Angeles Housing Element, and please encourage your colleagues to do likewise.

Sincerely,

Roland Souza

Roland Souza, President
West Adams Association (WAHA)
c/o 1724 Westmoreland Blvd., LA, CA 90006
roland.e.souza@gmail.com

Communication from Public

Name: John Cahill
Date Submitted: 03/24/2026 09:45 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.