



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

## Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 26-0489

1 message

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

Fri, May 22, 2026 at 3:42 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: Greater Valley Glen

Name: Joanne DAntonio

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

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(14) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 05/04/2026

Type of NC Board Action: Against Unless Amended

### Impact Information

Date: 05/22/2026

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 26-0489

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 05/04/2026

Item Number:

Summary: The Greater Valley Glen neighborhood council is absolutely against selling any park land for any reason. Our city is park poor and the mayor is advocating for increasing park land. Changing proposed revisions to Section 594, Control and Management of Recreation and Parks Lands (See page 59) to allow sale of park land makes no sense. See attached substantiation of this position that originated from our Parks, Medians, and Improvement Committee and which was voted unanimously by the full Board to oppose this motion unless there is an amendment to remove this section that would revise Section 594 to allow park land sale is removed.



Greater Valley Glen Council CIS to CF 26-0489 opposing sale of park land.pdf

57K

LA Charter Reform Commission Report includes a recommendation to allow Recreation and Parks to sell or transfer land that is not being used as a park through streamlined processes. The Commission Report sets forth proposed revisions to Section 594, Control and Management of Recreation and Parks Lands (See page 59). The document is now open for public comment, with the suggestion that comments be submitted “as soon as possible.” As of April 17, 2026, over 50 (fifty) Community Impact Statement submittals appear on the City website<sup>1</sup>.

The Parks, Medians and Improvements (“PMI”) Committee moved that the Greater Valley Glen Council (GVGC) **submit a CIS to oppose the proposed amendment to Section 594 – Control and Management of Recreation and Park Lands and this was passed unanimously by the full Board.** PMI Committee notes that the City of Los Angeles is “under-parked” – by any measure – compared to other cities. The mission should be to find ways to deploy unused property in ways that increase green space, provide habitat, and improve the quality of life in our neighborhoods. Our position aligns with numerous studies and reports as outlined below. It also aligns with significant City programs and Plans.

- Trust for Public Land<sup>2</sup> data indicates that Los Angeles ranks 88<sup>th</sup> out of 100 largest US cities. In peer cities, 100% of residents in San Francisco live within a 10-minute walk of a park. In New York, it’s 99%, and it’s 98% in Chicago. In Los Angeles, it’s 64%. In Los Angeles 13% of city land is dedicated to parks. For comparison, in New York, it’s 21%, in San Diego, 23%. Lo Angeles spends approximately \$111 per resident annually on its park system, significantly lower than the average of ~\$4200 - \$300 in cities like Minneapolis or Washington, DC.
- Los Angeles consistently ranks near the top for the rate at which it has added pavement. Typical impermeable coverage is estimated at 60 – 70%. In highly urbanized pockets, impervious surfaces can cover 60 – 90% of land area, significantly higher than the national average for urban areas – between 30 – 50%.
- Accelerate Resilience L.S. recently published a report of a parcel-level analysis of every paved surface across Los Angeles County. The LA Times featured this twice since mid-February 2026<sup>3</sup>. The study found that nearly half of the county’s

---

<sup>1</sup> See [https://reformlacherter.lacity.gov/neighborhood-council-information#:~:text=The%20Council%20File%20for%20the,used%20to%20express%20personal%20opinion s.](https://reformlacherter.lacity.gov/neighborhood-council-information#:~:text=The%20Council%20File%20for%20the,used%20to%20express%20personal%20opinion s.;); accessed 4/17/2026.

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.tpl.org/parkscore> and <https://www.tpl.org/city/los-angeles-california>

pavement is considered “non-core”. Los Angeles County recently set an official target to remove and replace 1,600 acres of pavement with natural landscapes over the next 20 years<sup>4</sup>. This is the first explicit de-paving target from a major U.S. public agency.

- Mayor Karen Bass released a Climate Action Plan on April 16, 2026. Objective 6 is to enhance and connect green spaces and ecosystems<sup>5</sup> across the city.

---

<sup>3</sup> See <https://www.latimes.com/environment/story/2026-02-16/nearly-half-of-l-a-countys-pavement-may-be-unnecessary-new-map-finds#:~:text=Now%2C%20for%20the%20first%20time,Advertisement>

<sup>4</sup> See <https://ourcountyla.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/Final-2025-OurCounty-Plan.pdf>, p. 52 and others.

<sup>5</sup> See [https://plan.mayor.lacity.gov/sites/g/files/wph2176/files/2026-04/MayorBassClimateActionPlanforLosAngeles\\_2026\\_1.pdf](https://plan.mayor.lacity.gov/sites/g/files/wph2176/files/2026-04/MayorBassClimateActionPlanforLosAngeles_2026_1.pdf), page 48 et seq.