

Communication from Public

Name: Luis A Moreno

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 12:13 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: ATTN: PLUM Committee members Please support Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP ordinance that rezones LA without regard to the Exhibit D “options” that would open up single-family neighborhoods. In its report, the LA City Planning Department clearly states that it has found enough zoning to meet the State’s mandate for housing without rezoning our single-family areas. The City Planning Commission also saw fit to recommend the adoption of Draft #3. Here are some facts to consider:

- The City continues to communicate a misleading message related to R1 single-family zoning stating that R1 is restricting development on 70% of LA’s land. However, when pressed, the Planning Department stated clearly on Chapter 4, page 210 of the Housing Element, that 35% of LA land was not developable beyond R1 due to topography or other environmental concerns. This left only 45% of single-family zones, less than half of the city land, developable. And State law allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. Single-family zones are contributing to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs. Single family areas continue to do their part.
- Pro-development groups say rezoning single-family neighborhoods is a social justice issue when, in fact, allowing apartments in single family neighborhoods is an attempt by large land investors/developers to increase the value of their R1 real estate holdings by deregulating single-family neighborhoods to allow more density. Allowing apartments in single-family neighborhoods will not right the wrongs of redlining that prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. People need the opportunity to buy affordable homes so they can build generational wealth. Ending single-family zones forces more people to remain renters.
- The Draft has a comprehensive plan for adding housing in all our high-resource areas on our commercial corridors. If planned correctly, new, vibrant neighborhoods could be created here in each of our communities and new, affordable, attached single-family homes “for sale” should be included in these developments that abut single-family neighborhoods. We must help families who have lost hope of becoming homeowners to achieve that goal. Please move Draft #3 forward as presented. Thank you. Luis A Moreno Jr 1441 N Ogden Drive, Los Angeles

CA 90046 Spaulding Square HPOZ

Communication from Public

Name: Sharon Polansky
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 08:29 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Protect our single-family neighborhoods!

Communication from Public

Name: Alexandra Lee Carcieri

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 08:34 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I ask the committee to take seriously the need to comply with Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing by requiring deeply affordable housing in meaningful numbers across our City. Moderate income units are not affordable to most renters in Los Angeles, instead we must prioritize deeply affordable housing like ALI, ELI, VLI units through this program. We ask the Committee to Expand the Mixed Income Incentive Program and the Affordable Housing Incentive Program to apply to single family zoned parcels in high opportunity areas. We ask that you adopt Option #1 from the City Staff report. As it stands, excluding single family zoned parcels maintains exclusionary zoning. This will limit the effectiveness of the MIIP, and directly undermines the goal of increasing affordable housing opportunities in high opportunity areas. We need affordable housing everywhere, in every neighborhood. Los Angeles has a mandate from the State and Federal governments to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH), which requires local agencies to take deliberate action that alleviates and combat disparities from past patterns of segregation. The incentive program in its current state does not meet this requirement. We must deliberately create affordable housing across the City with the highest possible affordability, in order to combat the devastating impacts of past segregation. We ask that the ordinance requires public participation before approving projects in areas of heightened environmental justice concerns. Specifically, in areas that appear in the 80th percentile or higher of the CalEnviroScreen map, the City should hold community meetings to hear from local community members about potential hazards and health concerns.

Communication from Public

Name: ROBERT TEPPER
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 08:51 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Protect our single-family neighborhoods!

Communication from Public

Name: Sandy Hubbard, NCVV boardmember

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 12:01 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: CIS: Consistent with previously filed CIS's and letters on this topic, the Neighborhood Council Valley Village (NCVV) supports Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP Ordinance, as presented by the Planning Department, without support for the Exhibit D "options" that would open up single-family neighborhoods. (The Planning Department in its report clearly states that they have found enough zoning to meet the State's mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas.) The latest vote was taken on October 30th at a duly-noticed NCVV board meeting, with a unanimous vote of 13-0 to support CHIP Draft #3, without the Exhibit D options. The E/W, N/S corridors in Valley Village have been planned for growth for many years now, and with the state's changes in law, we expect substantial growth near the Orange Line, as well as potentially quintupling housing on every single-family home plot going forward because of the ministerial ability to build duplexes and ADUs/jADUs. NCVV is supportive of all types of housing, while firmly believing that good housing requires good planning for all communities. Quality of life is important to all people. Citing *Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 848, 858, the Court stated "It is within the power of the Legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well balanced as well as carefully patrolled" as long as the City does not violate the State's general laws. In this regard, the City of Los Angeles has the ability to determine that single-family neighborhoods provide beauty, as well as space and a healthy environment for its residents. We encourage you to support CHIP draft 3 as originally submitted to the public by Planning, without someone's sly addition of Exhibit D.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 12:50 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: We SUPPORT Draft #3 of the Housing Element CHIP Program that preserves R1 communities and OPPOSE Exhibit D options to up zone R1 neighborhoods. Our infrastructure is stretched to the limit, as it is, and we need to protect the integrity of our neighborhoods, among other reasons. PLEASE and THANK YOU.

Communication from Public

Name: Ray

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 01:15 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: While we continue to debate the ongoing housing crisis in our city, you cannot support blanket up zoning of all R1 neighborhoods. It defies any logic that allowing multifamily units to be built on single home lots will increase affordability. Developers will clearly cherry pick the largest lots and further destroy the neighborhoods we cherish. The current homeowner will be the only winner (if they move or have another home). Four units built on a lot in a pricey part of town are never going to go for "cheap"? And where will all the cars go? The kids to school? The traffic? The housing crisis should be handled with care and planning, and opening the flood gates to development anywhere is NOT the way to go. Instead, please support Housing Element CHIP Draft #3 to preserves R1 neighborhoods and prohibits the upzoning options presented in Exhibit D. I further oppose Exhibit D and request it NOT be considered. Instead, I support CHIP Draft #3 to preserve single family housing and neighborhoods. This is an issue that can be revisited at some point in the future when we see what housing is created by a sensible initial steps.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 02:32 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: As a resident and urban environmentalist, I want the council to start allowing affordable housing development in single-family zoned areas (which currently disallow that development while taking up over 70% of LA City residential space) and ensure that public participation is prioritized where developments may occur in areas that have more environmental hazards and other environmental justice impacts.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 02:32 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: In the recent national election, all saw the dangers of governmental actions being perceived to be OVER-REACH. Faith in government was lost and a sweep of elected offices took place fueled by those who feel disenfranchised. Those who have invested their savings and have worked hard to buy a house or condominium in Los Angeles did so under the belief that they were investing in a community and a City where there were rules that governed land use that established a framework for their behavior and the behavior of others around them. While developers proclaim the need for certainty, why doesn't a Los Angeles homeowner deserve the same certainty? Who wants to sit around and wait for the property next door or behind them to suddenly become the location of a massive apartment building blocking out the daily sunlight, killing their garden, rendering solar panels a cruel illusion? The City should value its stable neighborhoods and work with those neighborhoods to plan where density is best located. Do not leave that to a game of roulette where the developers get to choose whose sunlight is stolen, whose privacy is lost and whose tree buffers are killed for construction. Well planned neighborhoods are places where people WANT to live. Our middle class neighborhood is a diverse community. The people who live here work very hard to live here. Many are already considering giving up on Los Angeles and moving elsewhere. I fear for the City because I believe that a measure that opens up the single family neighborhoods to development will be the message to many that it is indeed time to leave LA. The City is already family UN-friendly with challenged schools, homeless issues and other challenges. Treating our area as though it is an area of unlimited resources when our schools are already at capacity is troubling. Will the proposed rezoning of R1 neighborhoods be the straw that broke the camel's back and will hasten the City's transformation into a city of the very rich and the working (and homeless) poor with families and those well-off enough to flee in retirement taking off for more hospitable cities? Have decision makers considered the importance of creating space for families and those who want to have a home that is not existing under the shadow of an adjacent property? There is adequate zoning capacity to move forward with the CHIP Draft 3 without options in exhibit D. It is time to do REAL PLANNING

with the City investing the needed resources to make sure that all community plans are up-to-date and are designed to provide needed housing as a result of planning done with community input at the community level -- not by the Housing Element.

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broide
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 03:45 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Many who follow the current housing challenges faced in Los Angeles question a number of issues that go largely undiscussed that contribute to housing availability and rising housing costs that outpace earnings. They include: a poorly regulated/enforced short-term rental program that operates in violation of the program's rules and removes units from the housing market, failure to pursue policies that create disincentives for intentionally leaving housing units vacant (vacancy tax), pursuing state action to better coordinate the processes by which developers obtain funding for low income housing (different sources have different deadlines which appears to create many unnecessary challenges for those seeking to build), establishment of a successor agency to redevelopment agencies that had provided much of the funding for low income housing in the past, financing and tax credit programs for affordable/low-income projects that meet specified criteria, greater availability of Section 8 housing vouchers, development of land trust models and expansion of funding sources for and promotion of cooperative housing developments. It is well known that large numbers of low-income units are unlikely to be built without government intervention. While ED 1 projects are providing many incentives for affordable housing development, larger scale efforts are needed to meet the existing and future needs. In addition, real estate speculation plays a role in rising housing costs when flippers (particularly those with all cash offers) compete with individual and family homebuyers for properties. REITs and other investment groups that offer their investors 10-20% annual earnings cannot do so without accelerating increases in the cost of housing – whether the increases are the result of rent increases or the result of the constant buying and selling of properties. A related discussion related to current RHNA goals assigned to cities should take place with local electeds. While many have questioned the data used to calculate RHNA housing goals (see Embarcadero Institute study <https://embarcaderoinstitute.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Double-counting-in-the-Latest-Housing-Needs-Assessment-Sept-2020.pdf>), the more recent impacts of COVID should usher in questions related to the punitive nature in which the Housing Element's Builder's Remedy can be triggered. Cities that have approved Housing Element plans and mapping can approve housing projects to meet the state's goals. However, they do not build those projects. In Los Angeles, projects approved in this housing cycle have gone unbuilt due to factors well beyond the control of government. When the RHNA goals were established, the impacts of the COVID pandemic were unknown. Since that time interest rates soared many times above those that existed prior to COVID. The costs of labor and materials vastly increased. Some building materials became unavailable – regardless of cost. Insurance policies for projects became difficult and remain difficult to obtain in many areas. Approved plans were shelved – some temporarily and some permanently. Lenders became skittish seeing the change in both living and working patterns during and after the worst of the pandemic. And still, municipalities are held responsible to meet goals that, if not revisited, are setting cities up to fail. At the very least, the threat of Builder's Remedy should be removed via legislation for those cities who have done their due diligence to develop approved plans in the current housing cycle. Please see attached for additional comments.

Why upzoning of R1 neighborhoods in the Housing Element is a very bad idea
Misleading information about housing and zoning is everywhere

Current efforts to upzone R1 neighborhoods have been based on the misleading and dishonest characterization that over 70-75% of LA's land is zoned R1—thus suggesting that to meet housing goals, R1 zoning must be changed. (And, with ADUs, Jr. ADUs, and SB 9, R1 zones have already been modified to allow for higher density -- up to 6-8 units on a single lot under SB 9.) It must first be clarified that it is 70-75% of LA's **residentially zoned land** that is zoned R1, not all of LA's land.

It is additionally false to suggest that nearly three-quarters of LA's land is limited for housing development because it is zoned R1, because that fails to acknowledge that **a large portion of that land, 35% of it, CANNOT be developed for higher uses.** It is located in the hillsides of the Santa Monica Mountains that connect the LA Basin with the San Fernando Valley and in other hillside communities, in high fire severity zones, in coastal tidal areas and additional sensitive locations where adding density is not possible. The City's own Housing Element document acknowledges the 35% exemption buried on page 210 of Chapter 4.

"Much of the city's single-family zoning is in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas of the city. In fact, approximately 35% of the parcels of the city's single-family zoning are in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) or areas with vulnerability to Sea Level Rise (SLR) exposure."

Both the City and the media, including the LA Times, Daily News and LAist, have failed to acknowledge and report on this important distinction.

In fact, taking this 35% figure into account, less than half of LA's developable residential land (45.5%) is zoned R1.¹ Yet, the City and housing density advocates, continue to target R1 neighborhoods knowing full well that the Housing Element program provides more than adequate capacity to meet housing goals, including the furthering of fair housing objectives with ample properties available on commercial corridors, through transit oriented and affordable housing incentive programs, via adaptive reuse, with the construction of ADUs, SB 9 projects, etc.

As the Staff Report notes, there is no need to implement upzoning of R1 properties as a Housing Element overlay. There are more than ample opportunities for the development needed to meet the ambitious state goals. (Note that those goals are based on now-outdated population projections made prior to the Covid pandemic and knowledge of its full impacts that has led to population decreases.)

Among the worst consequence of a blanket upzoning of R1 neighborhoods as outlined in the proposed Single-Family Consideration options, is that this approach allows developers and speculators to cherry pick where new density goes—rather than having deliberate planning done at the Community Plan level where it belongs, where best placed, and where infrastructure can best be delivered to meet the needs of the new residents. Deliberate planning ensures that negative impacts can be minimized or avoided.

Many of those advocating for R1 broad upzoning in the Housing Element have **no idea** that upzoning in the Housing Element would tie the City's hands and make it difficult, if not impossible, to fine tune the measure to address any unintended negative impacts as the State would view such efforts to be downzoning and would require equivalent upzoning elsewhere to make up for any zoning corrections attempted.

¹ It is LESS than 45.5% because the Planning Dept. has not provided an answer to the question as to what percent of LA's land is residentially zoned. When that figure is known, the total percent of R1 zoned developable land can be calculated.

Many of those advocating for upzoning R1 properties are also unaware that upzoning can be done if needed in the future, via the Community Planning process where the areas to be upzoned can be identified based upon sound planning principles and a public input process in an open, community-based, organized and transparent manner – not by opening up communities to opportunistic developers who are not planners and whose goals do not include the planning of livable, sustainable, viable communities.

Developers do not have the skills or interest to take on that task nor are they inclined to do so. They are in business to generate profits. REIT and corporate goals formulated to generate high rates of returns for investors should not be the forces that shape our neighborhoods and city and often contribute to rent increases that exceed the CPI and residents' earnings. (When investors are offered 10-20%+ earnings, those profits can only be generated through ongoing rent increases and/or through the sale or flipping of properties at vastly increased prices.)

The approach suggested in the Single-Family Consideration options presented in Exhibit D represents the abandonment by the City of its responsibility to do planning. It is the City's duty to create a framework that balances all interests and does not abandon its responsibility to current and future residents to ensure that livable communities are the end result of the Housing Element program – **not** the production of housing alone.

Rezoning land does nothing to ensure affordability. And the trickle-down theory of economics applied to the housing market has not been proven to produce affordable housing in any city studied.

The approach suggested in the Single-Family Consideration options presented in Exhibit D represents the abandonment by the City of its responsibility to do planning. It is the City's duty to create a framework that balances all interests and does not abandon its responsibility to current and future residents to ensure that livable communities are the end result of the Housing Element program – **not** the production of housing alone.

Studies document that blanket upzoning often undermines housing affordability and fails to lower housing costs.

--Professor Patrick Condon's study of the Vancouver housing market in his book: Broken City: Land Speculation, Inequality, and Urban Crisis, notes "If adding new density, new "supply", brought down prices, Vancouver should have the cheapest housing in North America. It has the most expensive." He further notes that what is being labeled a 'housing crisis' -- is actually an affordability shortage. In Vancouver it was documented that upzoning does not solve the problem and that, in fact, it worsens it by fueling speculation and driving up land prices.

--Tim Redmond in 49 Hills writes: "So the model of the government getting out of the way and allowing the private market to work its magic by the old rules of supply and demand isn't working, hasn't worked, and won't work. It can't – unless we fundamentally change the rules of the speculative late-state Capitalism urban housing market."

--The Harvard Business Review in "The Market Alone Can't Fix the U.S. Housing Crisis" comes to a similar set of conclusions and notes that upzoning essentially transfers wealth to landowners along select corridors, while displacing existing affordable housing for small businesses and renters, leading to gentrification. Upzoning gives away land value to developers without effectively addressing housing affordability.

The Review notes:

"The most extreme version of "trust the market" housing policy is the common refrain — popularly associated with the "Yes in My Backyard" (or YIMBY) cause — that zoning rules are a primary, if not the primary, cause of the present housing crisis. YIMBYs call for the reform or abolition of zoning rules that prevent construction of duplexes, triplexes, and other multi-family housing, along with rules on minimum lot sizes and parking requirements. This cause is commonly captured in the slogan "legalize housing." The idea is to get out of the market's way and let the drive for profit solve the problem.

Profit considerations, however, mean that more liberal zoning rules are at most necessary, but not sufficient, to increase the supply of housing. Just because private developers can build housing does not mean they will. Liberalization of zoning regulations appears to increase the supply of housing, but the effect is rather modest. Summarizing the findings of a co-authored paper, [Yonah Freemark](#) of the Urban Institute — a leading researcher on land-use reforms — told an interviewer, "[W]e found the average upzoning would result in a 0.8% increase in housing supply in the short- to medium-term after the change, three to nine years after the upzoning." That is not nothing, but hardly lends strong support to the cause of zoning reform."

"The country's housing crisis will not be solved through simple deregulation of zoning laws and building codes — it requires ambitious public action. Federal, state, and local governments must pursue stronger public governance of housing markets, undertake systematic planning, and build homes themselves."

The production of low-income housing requires government support in the form of financing and tax incentives. One of the main sources financing low-income housing production was lost when Community Redevelopment Agencies were done away with during a past State budget crisis. The long process to obtain approvals from assorted different low-income housing funding sources suggests that local governments and the State need to better coordinate the deadlines and agency reviews related to the processing of project applications which often face uncoordinated application deadlines and funding expiration dates.

The recent passage of LA County's ballot Measure A will provide funds to help support affordable housing construction (among other goals). Los Angeles' earlier passed Measure ULA, the luxury home tax, also raises money for affordable housing and homelessness initiatives.

.....

The [CHIP draft #3](https://planning.lacity.gov/plndoc/Staff_Reports/2024/09-26-2024/CPC_2023_7068_CA_CPC_2024_387_CA_CPC_2024_388_CA.pdf) (https://planning.lacity.gov/plndoc/Staff_Reports/2024/09-26-2024/CPC_2023_7068_CA_CPC_2024_387_CA_CPC_2024_388_CA.pdf) does NOT recommend the blanket rezoning of R1 properties and has the strong support of United Neighbors' network of communities across very different economic, ethnic and geographic areas the City.

In approving Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance, the City Planning Commission passed on to PLUM and the City Council consideration of the CHIP and other Housing Element Ordinances. Accompanying the documents will be Exhibit D - "Single-Family Considerations" in the Planning Dept's staff report (pages 830-895 of the 2050 page CHIP program, Exhibit D). The City Planning Commission did not vote to support Exhibit D. Many of those testifying in the audience urged them to do so.

United Neighbors from across the City support Draft 3 of CHIP and strongly oppose the upzoning of R1 properties via the Housing Element.

Communication from Public

Name: Patricia Lamkie
Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 04:24 AM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: I support Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP ordinance that rezones Los Angeles without regard to the Exhibit D “options” that would open up single-family neighborhoods for development. It is recommended by both the LA City Planning Department and the City Planning Commission. The Planning Department’s report clearly states that it has found enough zoning to meet the State’s mandate for housing without rezoning our single-family areas. Patricia Lamkie 1408 North Orange Grove Ave Los Angeles CA 90046 SPAULDING SQUARE HPOZ

Communication from Public

Name: Ronald M

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 05:17 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to protect single-family neighborhoods throughout Los Angeles and in support of Draft #3 of the CHIP/Housing Element Rezoning ordinance without the Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open single-family neighborhoods to rezoning and redevelopment. The Planning Department, in its report, clearly states that they have identified enough opportunities throughout our city to rezone to meet the State’s mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. Here are some facts to consider. 1. The Department of City Planning has already acknowledged that rezoning single-family neighborhoods is not necessary to achieve the City's ambitious housing goals CHIP set out to reach. 2. State law already allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. Single-family zones do and will continue to contribute to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs. 3. An unholy alliance of housing ideologues and greedy corporate investors and developers are collaborating to rezone R1 neighborhoods. Allowing apartment buildings in single-family neighborhoods will not right past wrongs that prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. Individuals need the opportunity to buy single-family homes so they can build generational wealth. Ending single-family zones will take away upward economic mobility from current and future generations of Angelenos. 4. Draft # 3 without Exhibit D options already includes a comprehensive plan for adding housing in all our high resource areas on our commercial corridors. If planned correctly new, vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each of our communities that include new affordable single-family homes for sale along corridors that abut existing single-family neighborhoods. We must help families, who have lost hope of owning their own home, achieve that goal. Please respect the diversity of housing which makes Los Angeles the remarkable city that it is. Please vote to Approve Draft #3 without the options contained In Exhibit D. Respectfully,

Communication from Public

Name: Ronald M

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 05:19 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to protect single-family neighborhoods throughout Los Angeles and in support of Draft #3 of the CHIP/Housing Element Rezoning ordinance without the Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open single-family neighborhoods to rezoning and redevelopment. The Planning Department, in its report, clearly states that they have identified enough opportunities throughout our city to rezone to meet the State’s mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. Here are some facts to consider. 1. The Department of City Planning has already acknowledged that rezoning single-family neighborhoods is not necessary to achieve the City's ambitious housing goals CHIP set out to reach. 2. State law already allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. Single-family zones do and will continue to contribute to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs. 3. An unholy alliance of housing ideologues and greedy corporate investors and developers are collaborating to rezone R1 neighborhoods. Allowing apartment buildings in single-family neighborhoods will not right past wrongs that prevented people from buying homes. Instead, it keeps more people as renters. Individuals need the opportunity to buy single-family homes so they can build generational wealth. Ending single-family zones will take away upward economic mobility from current and future generations of Angelenos. 4. Draft # 3 without Exhibit D options already includes a comprehensive plan for adding housing in all our high resource areas on our commercial corridors. If planned correctly new, vibrant neighborhoods can be created in each of our communities that include new affordable single-family homes for sale along corridors that abut existing single-family neighborhoods. We must help families, who have lost hope of owning their own home, achieve that goal. Please respect the diversity of housing which makes Los Angeles the remarkable city that it is. Please vote to Approve Draft #3 without the options contained In Exhibit D. Respectfully,

Communication from Public

Name: Michael Bertolucci

Date Submitted: 11/19/2024 06:05 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: ATTN: PLUM Committee members I am writing to urge you to vote to approve Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP ordinance without the seven "options" to open up single-family neighborhoods. Anything that upzones our neighborhoods should happen with we the stakeholders' input through Community Plans and not this way with none of us involved. Most importantly, the LA City Planning Department clearly states it can meet its state housing obligation without opening up single-family neighborhoods. Kind regards, Michael Bertolucci 1363 N Orange Grove Ave Los Angeles, CA 90046 Spaulding Square HPOZ