

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy Minicozzi
Date Submitted: 03/25/2026 04:39 PM
Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing in support of Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with 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 made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4.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.

Communication from Public

Name: Valley Village Residents Association

Date Submitted: 03/23/2026 08:24 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: The Valley Village Residents Association supports adopting C1 in the SB79 CIP, and opposes the adoption of C2. Our support of Option C1 is conditioned on the following: • All property owners and residents affected by SB 79 will receive by-mail notification of the proposed changes to their neighborhood to ensure robust outreach beyond online notices • Clarification is included that this is not a "rezoning" of neighborhoods but "overlay/incentive" zones that can be repealed if/when SB79 is updated • HPOZs qualify for deferral no matter what year they were established • All existing setback requirements of the underlying zone in impacted neighborhoods to remain the same as currently allowed
Respectfully, Tim Thornton VVRA President



VALLEY VILLAGE

RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Neighbors Working Together to Improve the Quality of Life
Valleyvillagera.com

March 23, 2026

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

RE: Council File 25-1083

Dear City Councilmembers,

The Valley Village Residents Association supports the Citywide Implementation Plan Option C1 instead of Option C2, and respectfully requests that City Council consider the broader impact that Option C2 will create across the large City of Los Angeles that we all treasure.

The City's state-approved Housing Element is better and more protective of our neighborhoods than SB 79's "one-size-fits-all" approach. There are many people and organizations that will continue to advocate for changes to SB 79 at the state level to allow protections for the unique characteristics of various neighborhoods. With that consideration, we believe that a measured implementation of SB79 should take place initially, allowing the City time to adjust Community Plans and work with communities to achieve the statewide and citywide goals of affordable housing.

We support the C1 option because it offers more protection for neighborhoods in the following ways:

- It will allow 3-story apartments with 4-16 units rather than 7 stories with insufficient infrastructure
- It defers Historic Preservation Overlay Zones, high fire areas, low resource areas, and areas with one-foot sea level rise until 2030, giving the City time to plan for appropriate resources in a methodical manner
- It will allow time for adjustments to be made to our Community Plans, which many neighbors in various communities have worked diligently on for years.

Our support of Option C1 is conditioned on the following:

- All property owners and residents affected by SB 79 will receive by-mail notification of the proposed changes to their neighborhood to ensure robust outreach beyond online notices
- Clarification is included that this is not a "rezoning" of neighborhoods but "overlay/incentive" zones that can be repealed if/when SB79 is updated
- HPOZs qualify for deferral no matter what year they were established
- All existing setback requirements of the underlying zone in impacted neighborhoods to remain the same as currently allowed.

Very truly yours,

Timothy M. Thornton, Jr.
President



Communication from Public

Name: Pilar Reynaldo

Date Submitted: 03/23/2026 09:53 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I strongly urge members of the Council to support option C1 to facilitate local Implementation of SB79. Most importantly please exclude all HPOZs, regardless of when they were adopted. I am a life long Angeleno who has witnessed a lifetime of Architectural erasure which has created a disjointed, fractured and soulless city. It is time to protect our limited Architectural gems which are irreplaceable. Every time I travel outside of the State or Country, i'm reminded of how good other places are at preserving old Architecture and tastefully working in new design to create visually interesting neighborhoods that feel welcoming. Los Angeles needs to start adaptively reusing our old buildings and giving them a new life. Help our City become somewhere people want to visit. Sincerely, Pilar Reynaldo Garvanza Resident.

Communication from Public

Name: Steve Simonian

Date Submitted: 03/24/2026 01:50 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I am in support of a common sense Approach C, Option1 (C-1), as described in the Planning Department recommendation letter of February 18, 2026, for the implementation of SB79 by the City of Los Angeles. In addition, I request that the City Council stand firm and further require the following in conjunction with Approach C-1: 1. Clarification that all properties within the boundaries of all HPOZs, City designated Historic Districts and sites/areas designated on the National Register of Historic Places will be fully protected from SB 79 development. As this protection may last for only three (3) years, the City must also allocate all necessary resources to immediately initiate the development of Alternative Plans to ensure these areas remain protected on-going. 2. Notification by mail to all single-family property owners currently or potentially affected by SB 79 that their single-family properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit higher density uses. Under SB79, close to 66% of single family properties may be reclassified with these incentives. It is unconscionable to initiate such a massive de facto "upzoning" without actively informing all affected individuals that their fundamental quality of life is at stake. 3. Assurance, by ordinance, that there will be no changes to zoning classifications (e.g, R-1, etc.) made by allowing the "incentives" in (2) above, and if SB79 is repealed or amended, in whole or in part, that these incentive(s) be revoked. 4. Stipulation that any City SB 79 implementation actions include written justification for the position that the action taken is exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) regardless of the Planning Department's interpretation that SB 79 implementation is exempt from the provisions of CEQA. A full CEQA analysis would likely disclose potentially significant impacts on air quality, transportation, and the City's aging infrastructure systems. Thank you, Steve Simonian 837 S. Bronson Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90005

Communication from Public

Name: Erik Larsen

Date Submitted: 03/25/2026 09:16 AM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: Los Angeles needs more housing NOW. We need to stop pretending we are some small beach town, and act like what we are - the 2nd largest city in the country and a major world metropolis. The easiest way to do that would be to allow greater density along existing and future transit corridors. We have invested billions of dollars in our rail system, yet so many stations are surrounded by a sea of single family homes, undercutting its usefulness. SB79 attempts to fix this situation, and should be allowed to be implemented fully. Limiting the height of buildings around transit stations does a disservice to the vast majority of Angelenos in order to serve the interests of loud, privileged minority of homeowners. Everywhere else in the world has figured this out, and builds accordingly. It is quite frankly embarrassing to see our elected officials trying to limit the implementation of SB79, which is already a conservative change compared to just about anywhere else in the world. I have lived in other countries and places, and all the things that naysayers believe will happen as a result of implementing SB79 have just not been the case in my experience. Greater density around transit stations will vastly improve the lives of countless Angelenos moving forward.

Communication from Public

Name: Robert Cresswell

Date Submitted: 03/25/2026 12:00 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: I support Option C1 to help implement SB 79 locally, with one key change: I urge the City to exclude all HPOZs, no matter when they were adopted. This better protects historic resources, expands options for housing that fits neighborhoods, and supports Los Angeles' broader planning goals. We must build more housing while not allowing developers to overrun LA's historic resources in a narrow pursuit of their profit. Without sensible protection, we will get overrun by cookie-cutter 5+1 boxes.