

# SHERMAN OAKS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

PO BOX 5223

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIFORNIA 91423

February 19, 2026

To: Honorable Bob Blumenfield, Chair  
Planning and Land Use Management (PLUM) Committee  
Los Angeles City Council  
200 N. Spring Street, Room 395  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Proactive Negotiation and Implementation of Senate Bill 79 (Transit-Oriented Development)

Council File: [25-1083](#)

Dear Councilmember Blumenfield,

On behalf of the Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association (SOHA), I am writing to formally address the City of Los Angeles's strategy regarding [Senate Bill 79 \(SB 79\)](#). While we recognize the state's housing objectives, the City's current "straight-line" compliance approach risks permanently undermining the character and infrastructure of our local communities without a fight.

## 1. Alarm Regarding the City's Eagerness to Comply

There is a growing and palpable sentiment of apprehension among stakeholders regarding the City's perceived enthusiasm for SB 79. Specifically, the [Planning Department](#) appears to be moving forward with implementation with a level of zeal that suggests a "rubber-stamp" mentality rather than a critical evaluation.

To be blunt: the City seems all too happy to implement this legislation as written. This posture of undue deference to state directives—potentially to secure favor or funding—comes at the direct expense of advocating for tailored local solutions. We observe an

absence of significant resistance or proactive negotiation regarding the bill's most damaging aspects. This is not merely a procedural concern; it is a question of whose interests the City truly represents.

## 2. Failure to Explore Local Alternatives

The City's "compliance-first" energy overlooks the "local flexibility" explicitly granted by the statute. Other jurisdictions are investigating the Local Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Alternative Plan permitted under [Section 65912.161](#). This provision allows cities to reallocate density to commercial corridors while protecting residential cores. Instead of championing this tool, the City's current path suggests a refusal to explore any option beyond straightforward, uncritical compliance.

## 3. Infrastructure Gaps and Safety Risks

The motion introduced by Councilmember Traci Park in Council File 25-1083 identifies the need for a comprehensive report on the bill's impact on the City's infrastructure and utility systems. SB 79 threatens to place significant strain on already aging systems— from power and water to emergency evacuation routes. Our community remains skeptical that the Planning Department is genuinely prioritizing the \$1 billion+ in modernization costs estimated to support such extreme densification.

## 4. Protection of Single-Family Neighborhoods

SB 79 allows for 55- to 75-foot buildings (roughly 5 to 7 stories) in areas currently zoned for single-family homes. United Neighbors has demonstrated that a single bus stop could trigger a density radius that generates over [40,000 potential housing units](#). We seek clear assurances that the City will utilize its February 2026 report to outline specific protections for:

- Historic Districts (HPOZs): Which face "by-right" upzoning.
- Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones: Where densification poses a direct threat to public safety.

- Infrastructure-Constrained Corridors: Where the current grid cannot support a massive population influx.

## Conclusion

The Sherman Oaks community seeks a strategy that genuinely prioritizes the welfare of Los Angeles residents over state-level optics. We formally request that the PLUM Committee:

1. Direct the Planning Department to prioritize a Local TOD Alternative Plan under Section 65912.161.
2. Challenge the "Straight-Line" Implementation and demand a strategy that aggressively utilizes local autonomy.
3. Schedule public hearings across all regions of the City to allow for robust community input.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our points.

Sincerely,

Thomas Glick  
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association