



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

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

1 message

LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

Thu, Apr 30, 2026 at 11:22 AM

Reply-To: LA City SNow <cityoflaprod@service-now.com>

To: Clerk.CIS@lacity.org, paula.ncwpdr@gmail.com, CPC@lacity.org, APCWestLA@lacity.org

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.

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

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Westchester-Playa

Name: Paula Gerez

Email: Paula.ncwpdr@gmail.com

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(17) Nay(0) Abstain(3) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 04/14/2026

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 04/30/2026

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: Area Planning Commission - West Los Angeles, City Planning Commission, City Council and Committees

Council File Number: CF 25-1083


City Planning Number:

Agenda Date:

Item Number:

Summary: The Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa (WPDR) formally objects to the inclusion of SB 79 placeholder areas in the most recently released iteration of the Community Plan Update (CPU). In 2024, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Mayor Bass' Office, and Council District 11 (Councilwoman Traci Park) committed to providing clear, parcel-level zoning as part of the WPDR CPU. Instead, large portions of the plan area have been left blank or undefined, with the apparent intent of deferring zoning outcomes to SB 79. This is unacceptable and represents a significant departure from prior commitments made to our community [and a failure to adhere to the "measurable and

verifiable" zoning standards required by the Los Angeles Department of City Planning's own Housing Element goals.] The use of SB 79 placeholders strongly suggests an attempt to pre-emptively codify SB 79 zoning into the Community Plan, rather than adopting the promised zoning framework developed through the CPU process. This creates a serious risk to the community; if SB 79 is amended, delayed, or overturned, WPDR could be permanently locked into zoning that was never publicly vetted, debated, or approved through our Community Plan. [Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Community Plan must analyze the environmental impacts of a "stable and finite" project description; by using speculative placeholders, the Planning Department risks an inadequate environmental review that fails to account for the true density and infrastructure needs of these undefined areas.] Community Plans are intended to provide certainty, transparency, and long-term guidance for land use [as mandated by Article V, Section 554 of the Los Angeles City Charter]. Leaving zoning areas undefined undermines the integrity of the CPU process and erodes public trust. Notably, no other Senate Bills are referenced or embedded in the CPU, including SB 9. There is no justification for treating SB 79 differently.

 **CIS_CPU_CF_25_1083.pdf**
31K

The Neighborhood Council of Westchester Playa (WPDR) formally objects to the inclusion of SB 79 placeholder areas in the most recently released iteration of the Community Plan Update (CPU).

In 2024, the Los Angeles Department of City Planning, Mayor Bass' Office, and Council District 11 (Councilwoman Traci Park) committed to providing clear, parcel-level zoning as part of the WPDR CPU. Instead, large portions of the plan area have been left blank or undefined, with the apparent intent of deferring zoning outcomes to SB 79. This is unacceptable and represents a significant departure from prior commitments made to our community **[and a failure to adhere to the "measurable and verifiable" zoning standards required by the Los Angeles Department of City Planning's own Housing Element goals.]**

The use of SB 79 placeholders strongly suggests an attempt to pre-emptively codify SB 79 zoning into the Community Plan, rather than adopting the promised zoning framework developed through the CPU process. This creates a serious risk to the community; if SB 79 is amended, delayed, or overturned, WPDR could be permanently locked into zoning that was never publicly vetted, debated, or approved through our Community Plan. **[Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Community Plan must analyze the environmental impacts of a "stable and finite" project description; by using speculative placeholders, the Planning Department risks an inadequate environmental review that fails to account for the true density and infrastructure needs of these undefined areas.]**

Community Plans are intended to provide certainty, transparency, and long-term guidance for land use **[as mandated by Article V, Section 554 of the Los Angeles City Charter]**. Leaving zoning areas undefined undermines the integrity of the CPU process and erodes public trust. Notably, no other Senate Bills are referenced or embedded in the CPU, including SB 9. There is no justification for treating SB 79 differently or allowing it to supersede the Community Plan process.

Accordingly, the WPDR Neighborhood Council demands the following actions:

1. Immediate removal of all SB 79 placeholder references from the WPDR Community Plan Update.
2. Replacement of all affected parcels with the specific zoning classifications promised to the community, including maintaining Single-Family (R1) parcels as R1 and preserving R2 zoning where previously committed **[ensuring that the City's "New Zoning Code" (Chapter 1A) is applied transparently to every parcel.]**
3. Affirmation that SB 79 will not be codified, referenced, or embedded within the WPDR CPU, consistent with how other state legislation is treated in the Community Plan.

WPDR has participated in the CPU process in good faith for years. The Planning Department must honor its commitments and ensure that the Community Plan reflects actual, adopted zoning, not speculative or contingent legislation. Anything less compromises both the process and the community **[by creating "spot zoning" by reference, which lacks the comprehensive analysis required for a legally defensible Long Range Land Use plan.]**