

Communication from Public

Name: Nancie and Tom Evoniuk

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 10:02 AM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: Hello! This whole sneaky project was planned WITHOUT the neighborhood Community in put! That alone should stop this greedy project from going forward. WHO okd this????? How could a PRIVATE DEVELOPER change the Road configuration without anyone knowing????? The fasttrack law has BIG loopholes. This project should be canned and applied for from the beginning again. They always ask for too much, and then we give them what THEY want in the end! We have tons of affordable housing now in Woodland Hills. The Woodland Hills C.C. is a vanity project for the few richest insiders, who will be the biggest winners, and the tone here with them is , “ I have no sympathy for any neighbors! “ And they could care less about burning down the neighborhood to get what they want! These are souless humans who only care about making money. Am I right? Sincerely, Tom and Nancie Evoniuk 4449 Saltillo Street, residents for 30 years

Communication from Public

Name: Michelle Waters

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 12:22 PM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: It has become clear that AB 2011, while conjoined with these newer laws, has created a huge unintended consequence in our area. Allowing projects on any Agricultural (A) or Residential (R) zoned parcel, located in a sensitive area on a street that's 70 feet wide, including in low-density, hillside neighborhoods in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones—severely heightens the wildfire risk and fire issues our community already bears due to narrow, winding, and oftentimes impassable streets. It is also contrary to AB 2011's initial goals and good planning policy. As an immediate need, the City must disallow parking by CUP in the A zone, especially in VHFHSZ in Hillside Areas. By supporting this ICO, the City and community can help cure unintended short- and long-term dire consequences.

Communication from Public

Name: Andrew Solomon

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 12:37 PM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: Re: Council File 26-0290 — OPPOSE I urge you to oppose Council File 26-0290. I believe this motion is not only bad housing policy, but an unlawful attempt to evade state housing law and interfere with a specific pending housing project. I serve on the West Hollywood Planning Commission, where I have been directly involved in implementing AB 2011, as amended by AB 2243, into our local zoning ordinance. We have discussed these changes at length in our Long Range Planning Projects Subcommittee. So I understand that AB 2011 can interact with local zoning codes in complicated and sometimes surprising ways. But that does not give cities license to change the rules when state law produces a project that local elected officials do not like. Los Angeles has allowed public parking in Agricultural and Residential zones under its zoning code for at least half a century. This motion itself acknowledges that allowing parking by CUP was well-intentioned and serves legitimate purposes. Yet suddenly, in February 2026, this longstanding zoning provision became an “IMMEDIATE NEED” requiring an emergency Interim Control Ordinance. What changed? Why now? What’s the urgency? What changed is that a developer proposed 398 homes at the Woodland Hills Country Club and qualified for streamlined approval under AB 2011, in part because AB 2243 expressly provides that parking can constitute a principally permitted use even when it requires a Conditional Use Permit. And the purpose here isn’t really a secret. Councilmember Blumenfield has publicly acknowledged the connection. In discussing this project, he stated: “If parking wasn’t allowed with a CUP in A zones, this project would not be qualified to use AB 2011.” I mean, it’s on his website. Nobody suddenly discovered an emergency caused by public parking in Agricultural zones. The supposed emergency is that a housing project qualifies for a state-law approval process that removes local political discretion. The proposed ICO invokes the City’s emergency land-use authority to prohibit a use that is not actually being proposed (public parking) for the purpose of affecting an entirely different use that is being proposed: housing. I believe that is an unlawful end-run around state housing law. This is essentially reverse spot zoning. AB 2011 establishes objective eligibility requirements so qualifying housing projects cannot be subjected to this kind of project-by-project political

interference. A city should not be able to accomplish indirectly, by rewriting an unrelated provision of its zoning code, what state law prohibits it from doing directly. If every time state housing law produces a project a councilmember opposes, Los Angeles searches its zoning code for the provision creating eligibility and then changes that provision, ministerial approval ceases to mean anything. Surely you have better things to do than play Whac-A-Mole with state housing law? The Legislature made a policy choice in AB 2011 and AB 2243. Los Angeles may disagree with that choice. If so, take that argument to Sacramento and ask the Legislature to change the law. But don't change the rules in the middle of the game to kill a particular housing project. Please oppose Council File 26-0290.

[Home](#) > [Articles](#)

02.13.26 UPDATE ON THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT THE WOODLAND HILLS COUNTRY CLUB

Posted on 02/13/2026

Last night I spoke with concerned residents about the proposed development at the Woodland Hills Country Club (WHCC). As I have outlined in previous postings ([here](#) and [here](#)) the developers are trying to take advantage of new state laws to build hundreds of housing units on the golf course in this very high fire severity zone without going through the regular city process, thus circumventing public review, environmental review and any Council discretion. The State sets the rules that the City must follow for certain land use decisions.

While my team and I are working with Senator Henry Stern on short and long term state level fixes to the unintended consequences of these new laws, I am also working on some creative ways for the City to extricate the WHCC proposal from this new state requirement that allows no review process.

The new state laws were signed by the Governor in October 2025, along with more than 40 housing related laws. Many of these laws are good and will make a positive impact on housing production. The ones that enable the WHCC proposal were not easily identifiable, headlined with unrelated topics such as community college housing. I only learned of these laws when I was told that the WHCC developers, days after the bills were signed, were applying to the City and citing these new laws to avoid the regular review process.

Then I immediately introduced a Council motion for the City Attorney to report about the true impact of these laws, whether or not the developer could legally use them to avoid our review process, and to outline any legal remedies to prevent them from doing so. This motion was introduced in December 2025 and can be seen [here](#).

Specifically, the problematic new state laws are AB 2243 and AB 893. These bills amended an older bill AB 2011 which allowed high density multi-family projects to be approved ministerially on commercial corridors. That concept is not a problem. However, the recently passed subsequent bills, which amended AB 2011, redefined specific terms and allowed a huge expansion of projects eligible for ministerial/no input review. Specifically, the amending bills allow developers to take advantage of this ministerial process even if their projects are in a hillside/high fire severity zone, far from stores, restaurants and multifamily apartments. These two bills also stripped out other protections that were in AB 2011 designed to prevent its misuse.

Here are some of the AB 2011 protections that were stripped by the new amending bills.

- Originally, sites within “Specific Plans” had to abide by their terms. (Specific Plans are local requirements that govern development in specific geographic areas). In the Woodland Hills hillside, development is guided by the Mulholland Specific Plan which doesn’t allow multi-family development and the Gerard Track Specific Plan. These plans have been in place for more than 25 years and revisiting them would potentially undo longstanding environmental and density protections. AB 2243 made these plans irrelevant by simply saying that any Specific Plan that is more than 25 years old doesn’t count for AB 2011 related projects.
- AB 893 redefined the definition of a “site” so the City could only consider the area of the parcel “being disturbed” by construction, not the entire project site, the golf course. And since the underlying bill, AB2011, only applies to projects less than 20 acres, while the golf course itself is approximately 87 acres, the project still qualifies for AB 2011 processing since the project is broken up into three sites, each cleverly about 19.86 acres.
- The original AB 2011 bill only applied to sites where office, retail, or parking are a ‘principally permitted use’ and do not require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The City allows office, retail and parking - parking requires a CUP - in A Zones (the zone of the golf course. So originally the golf course was not eligible for the AB 2011 ministerial case process. But AB 2243 eliminated the requirement for a CUP for parking to be considered a ‘principally permitted use’, which paved the way for the project to utilize the AB 2011 ministerial process.

So what are we doing about it? In addition to the motion I introduced in December, my staff and I have been digging deep to come up with creative solutions.

Consequently, this week I introduced three pieces of legislation-

- One is a **resolution** asking the state to clarify the definition of 'vacant site' to make it crystal clear that it applies to golf courses, even if they have a club house and minor development. The current State definition is ambiguous enough that the developers think they can claim that the course is not on vacant lands.
- Another is a **motion** directing key city departments to clearly define vacant land as including golf courses even if there is a club house and minor development. Because of the ambiguity in the State law I think the City can provide a clarifying definition. This is something I believe we can do quickly.
- And the last one that is a bit of a hail mary, a **motion** to pursue a 'street vacation' on Canoga where the site is located. The idea is to legally make the street smaller than the 70 feet minimum which triggers the bizarre definition of commercial corridor in the new state bills. This legal route can take a long time and time and has additional hurdles including potential costs. Some constituents hope that this will be easy — I don't know but am pursuing it at full speed to find out.

I am also considering an Interim Control Ordinance, which would take effect immediately, not to allow parking as a 'principally permitted use' in A Zones (Agricultural). If parking wasn't allowed with a CUP in A zones, this project would not be qualified to use AB 2011. Ultimately, the City would change the Zoning Code permanently. I'm still working though the legal ability of the City to do this.

One bit of good news is that the City Planning Department has paused the developer's application temporarily because certain documents are missing. This buys some time, but the new state laws give the City a 60 day shot clock to approve. This temporary pause is welcomed news, but it is very much a stopgap that enables us to get on with the project.

 **Jared Yates Sexton**

If you want to stay updated on next steps and how you can partner with my office on I information on our efforts, or to invite my team to a meeting to discuss questions, you (elizabeth.ene@lacity.org) and Communications Director Jake Flynn (jake.flynn@lacity.org)

Tags

[Blog](#)

woodland hills country club

land use

planning and land use

woodland hills

housing

CITY HALL OFFICE

200 N. Spring St. #465
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Tel: (213) 473-7003
Fax: (213) 473-7567

DISTRICT OFFICE

19040 Vanowen St.
Reseda, CA 91335
Tel: (818) 774-4330
Fax: (818) 756-9179

CONNECT WITH US



Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 01:28 PM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: I am a long time resident of Girard Tract. My home is opposite the Woodland Hills Country Club, which was purchased by developers who plan to build almost 400 homes on just the first 20 acres of the parcel. This is extremely dangerous. Existing homeowners are having their home owners insurance cancelled as no one wants to insure homes in a Very High Fire Zone. How can anyone possibly consider allowing developers to add density? It has become clear that AB 2011, while conjoined with these newer laws, has created unintended consequences. Allowing large scale projects on any Agricultural (A) or Residential (R) zoned parcel, located on a street that's 70 feet wide, including in low density, hillside neighborhoods in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones—severely heightens the wildfire risk our community already bears. It is also contrary to AB 2011's initial goals and good planning policy. For this reason, the Zoning Code should be amended to allow parking by CUP only in areas that can reasonably be expected to provide benefit and complement surrounding uses, like adjacent to or on commercial corridors. As an immediate need, the City must disallow parking by CUP in the A zone particularly in VHFHSZ in Hillside Areas. One of the only ways the city and community can help cure this unintended consequence is by supporting this ICO.

Communication from Public

Name: Jacob Pierce

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 02:23 PM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: Oppose to undermine AB 2011, an important state housing law



August 20, 2026

Councilmember Harris-Dawson
Los Angeles City Hall Office
200 N. Spring St Room 465
Los Angeles, CA 90012

OPPOSITION: CF: 26-0290 – interim control ordinance and proposed changes to parking permitting re: AB 2011 (Wicks)

Dear President Harris-Dawson and Members of the Los Angeles City Council,

I write, on behalf of Abundant Housing LA, to share our opposition to Council File: 26-0290, which would undermine the City's ability to create badly needed affordable and mixed-income housing. The motion attempts to block an active development application but, in so doing, would violate state law. The motion could also have broader implications and reduce development opportunities throughout Los Angeles.

LA is not currently on track to meet housing production numbers at any of the five income categories in the current Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle, which runs through October of 2029. It will take a variety of state and local tools to deliver the housing required to fulfill state obligations and serve working and middle-class families who desperately need more housing options. Assembly Bill 2011 (Wicks), passed in 2021 and amended in 2024, is one such tool. The Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act ensures by-right approval for affordable and mixed-income housing on qualifying commercial land, if the project fulfills objective standards and meets specified affordability criteria. The bill also requires that all developers using its provisions pay construction workers prevailing wage and provide health benefits.

Projects are able to use AB 2011 on specified types of parcels, including on ones where parking is a "principally permitted use." Under the law, as amended by AB 2243 (Wicks), parking uses shall be deemed principally permitted, regardless of whether a conditional use permit is required for their provision. The motion up for consideration pursues two avenues to attempt to prevent the use of AB 2011 at the specific site. The first directs City staff to draft an ordinance that would disallow public parking in the Agricultural Zone and prepare a report with recommendations to consider modifying allowable public parking in Residential Zones in sensitive areas.

The other key component of the motion's operative clause is to issue an interim control ordinance (ICO) disallowing the issuance of parking approvals and permits in the Agricultural Zone that are wholly or partially located in the Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or Hillside Areas. The motion says the ICO would last 45 days with opportunities for two extensions that could, combined, lengthen its duration to a full year. One issue for the City is that, in order to pass an ICO, the City must establish clear legislative findings that the urgency

ordinance is needed to prevent an immediate threat to public health, safety, or welfare. State laws governing these criteria are strict, as detailed in a six-page July 2023 letter, from Attorney General Rob Bonta's office addressed to cities and counties. Mr. Bonta's letter clearly states that local governments may not use urgency ordinances to circumvent state laws, including but not limited to AB 2011. The proposed regulatory changes have nothing to do with transportation or how parking is regulated. They have everything to do with attempting to block a housing project already vested under the Housing Crisis Act. As such, these changes will have no impact on the ability of the project to move forward and will only create legal risk, especially if the City attempts to leverage these rules against developers that have already submitted applications.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge your "no" vote on this item. Interfering with proposed projects does not only delay housing. It can imperil funding and sends a message to builders that, despite a historic housing shortage, the City is closed to business. To ensure affordable housing options at all income levels, we must plan for the future, allow state housing laws to expedite housing and be careful not to undermine state tools meant to build a more affordable California.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Azeen Khanmalek', with a stylized, flowing script.

Azeen Khanmalek
Executive Director
Abundant Housing LA

Communication from Public

Name: Marianne King

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 03:05 PM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: I support this Motion and ICO 100%. The definition of a commercial corridor under the Act is too broad and shortsighted and did not take into consideration the potential health and safety impacts of permitting high density multi-family developments in high fire hazard areas in the A and R zones. If amending our zoning code to prohibit parking by CUP in the A and R zones can protect us, then let's do it.

Communication from Public

Name: Charlene Mayumi Hoyer

Date Submitted: 08/20/2026 10:43 PM

Council File No: 26-0290

Comments for Public Posting: It has become clear that AB 2011, while conjoined with these newer laws, has created unintended consequences. Allowing large scale projects on any Agricultural (A) or Residential (R) zoned parcel, located on a street that's 70 feet wide, including in low density, hillside neighborhoods in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones—severely heightens the wildfire risk our community already bears. It is also contrary to AB 2011's initial goals and good planning policy. For this reason, the Zoning Code should be amended to allow parking by CUP only in areas that can reasonably be expected to provide benefit and complement surrounding uses, like adjacent to or on commercial corridors. As an immediate need, the City must disallow parking by CUP in the A zone particularly in VHFHSZ in Hillside Areas. One of the only ways the city and community can help cure this unintended consequence is by supporting this ICO. Fire safety and fire insurance affordability for resident property owners should be taken into consideration.