



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

---

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 25-1083

---

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>  
Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>  
To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, jesslund@gmail.com

Wed, Mar 18, 2026 at 11:02 PM

A Neighborhood Council Community Impact Statement (CIS) has been successfully submitted to your Commission or City Council. We provided information below about CISs and attached a copy of the CIS.

We encourage you to reach out to the Community Impact Statement Filer to acknowledge receipt and if this Community Impact Statement will be scheduled at a future meeting. Neighborhood Council board members are volunteers and it would be helpful if they received confirmation that you received their CIS.

The CIS process was enabled by the to Los Angeles Administrative Code §Section 22.819. It provides that, "a Neighborhood Council may take a formal position on a matter by way of a Community Impact Statement (CIS) or written resolution." NCs representatives also testify before City Boards and Commissions on the item related to their CIS. If the Neighborhood Council chooses to do so, the Neighborhood Council representative must provide the Commission with a copy of the CIS or rResolution sufficiently in advance for review, possible inclusion on the agenda, and posting on the Commission's website. Any information you can provide related to your agenda setting schedule is helpful to share with the NC.

If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *listed on the Commission's agenda*, during the time the matter is heard, the designated Neighborhood Council representative should be given an opportunity to present the Neighborhood Council's formal position. We encourage becoming familiar with the City Council's rules on the subject. At the Chair's discretion, the Neighborhood Council representative may be asked to have a seat at the table (or equivalent for a virtual meeting) typically reserved for City staff and may provide the Neighborhood Council representative more time than allotted to members of the general public. They are also permitted up to five (5) minutes of time to address the legislative body. If the CIS or resolution pertains to a matter *not listed on the agenda*, the designated Neighborhood Council representative may speak during General Public Comments.

We share this information to assist you with the docketing neighborhood council items before your board/commission. If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at [empowerla@lacity.org](mailto:empowerla@lacity.org).

\*\*\*\*\* This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. \*\*\*\*\*

### Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: P.I.C.O.

Name: Jessica Lund

Email: [Jesslund@gmail.com](mailto:Jesslund@gmail.com)

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(12) Nay(4) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 03/18/2026

Type of NC Board Action: For

### Impact Information

Date: 03/19/2026

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 25-1083

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: The PICO Neighborhood Council 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 7/1/ 2026, to 1/1/2030, 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. Key Benefits of Option C1 • Deferred Implementation in Sensitive Areas with Historic Resources, Inadequate Infrastructure or Significant Public Safety Constraints until 1/1/30. (SB 79 expressly only allows deferred implementation for HPOZs. The PICO NC 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. In addition, PICO NC suggests that the City Council strengthen Option C1 by: (i) Prohibiting demolishing residential housing and displacing rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects without proof of bona fide financing. (ii) Prohibiting the aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raises local rents, speeds up gentrification, and destroys neighborhood characters without generating additional affordable housing. The City should notify 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 to participate in amendments to SB79.



**PICO NC CIS 25-1083 SB 79- Option C1 3-18-2026 FINAL .pdf**  
255K



PRESIDENT  
Lisa Kaye

VICE  
PRESIDENT  
Jared Bogda

TREASURER  
IRA KLEIN

COMMUNICATIONS  
DIRECTOR  
Monique Carrabba

SECRETARY  
Jessica Lund

March 18, 2026

To: City Council Members, LA Planning Commission  
CIS In Support of SB 79 Option C-1  
Council File: 25-1083

The PICO Neighborhood Council 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-ecd2-4fe5-a351-714a4d0a916c.html](https://www.westsidecurrent.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 PICO NC 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 PICO NC 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 PICO NC 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,  


Lisa Kaye  
President, PICO NC

PRESENTED BY: PICO NC General Board  
SECONDED BY: David Riva  
YES: 12 NO: 4, ABSTAIN: 0, RECUSAL: 0  
ON THIS DATE: March 18, 2026

