

Communication from Public

Name: Julio Rodriguez

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 08:42 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Hello My name is Julio Rodriguez and I am a resident of the city of LA, specifically I live in Pacoima. I am commenting to support the council in rezoning high resource single family zoning to multiple family zoning. Frankly, I think it may be a good idea to remove single family zoning in all of LA because of the housing crisis we are currently in. Earlier last year my family and I were harassed out of our home for 10 years when our landlord passed away and the property was inherited by her daughter. We went from paying 2428 (not including utilities) for a 4 bedroom house to paying 3600 (including water but not electricity) for a 3 bedroom house. My family and I are now rent burdened and are struggling to save money. We need more housing to make prices go down and to do that we need to rezone single family areas.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 09:17 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Draft #3 and Exhibit D in the Housing Incentive Program Please do not approve this uncalled for zoning change. I am a homeowner located about ¼ mile north of the proposed area for multi-family zoning for the 5-story, 322-unit buildings with only 150 parking spaces. Noted in your Exhibit D is expressed concern about “protecting existing residents from displacement.” What do these words mean? Does “protecting” mean protecting residents from overflow parking of hundreds of cars that have no spaces on the proposed site because of inadequate parking? Does it mean protecting the immediately adjacent six medical buildings, surgical center and hospital from residents using their parking spaces they don’t have? Does it mean protecting Chaminade High School a few hundred yards away? That’s what this is about. Or do we have no say about this? Does “displacement” mean some residents decide to sell because they don’t like the 322-unit project, or the next project, or the next, then move? This community is not an aging community ready to be bulldozed or changed, which used to be necessary before a zoning change could occur. I, for one, rented an apartment, then lived in a townhome, then lived in a smaller home, now live in a larger home, which took many years to accomplish. So, those of us who sacrificed many years of their lives to live here now must be just fine with another group that is probably younger now being placed by the government into our community? There must be other areas in the valley where this already multi-zoned project can be built. Please DO NOT APPROVE multi-resident zoning change in our single-family neighborhood.

Communication from Public

Name: Mia Marano

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 09:49 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods. Please correct the Letter of Determination. Exhibit D, for Draft #3 was not recommended, yet the record shows that it is.

Communication from Public

Name: Sandy Hubbard

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 05:07 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: 10/29/2024 Dear Director Bertoni, When the Staff Report for Draft #3 of the Housing Element was presented to the Planning Commission, it reinforced the recommended action to rezone our commercial corridors without the need to impact further single-family neighborhoods beyond the 4 units per lot state law currently allows. At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods but included an Exhibit D section within the report as a fully studied presentation of "options" in that rezoned single-family neighborhoods. I was taken by surprise at seeing the Exhibit D "options" section, learning of it only a few days before the Commission hearing. It appeared deep in the 2000-page Draft report. You explained at the CPC hearing that these options were not vetted by the public and were not necessary to meet RHNA or AFFH and therefore not part of your Planning Staff recommendation. At the September hearing, the Commission approved your staff report without the addition of Exhibit D Options. However, when the Letter of Determination was issued by the Commission, Exhibit D is now clearly marked Recommended by the Planning Commission--which it was NOT. I sat through the 8+ hour meeting, and the outcome is clearly recorded on the City's video channel. The Commissioners clearly decided not to add Exhibit D "options" to their approval of Draft #3, instead pointing out that they would accept the initial report's recommendations, which did not approve Exhibit D. And yet, this designation has been applied to the Exhibits page. Once again, someone in the Planning Department is apparently trying to circumvent the public in a manner that can only be questioned. I think it's your duty to find out who that is, and appropriate action should be taken. At minimum, we need the Letter of Determination corrected for the record. All of us at the hearing heard the discussion and the final vote taken by the Commission. This is more than simply incorrect wording, but at minimum, this extra misleading phrase should be removed. We find this to be a very disturbing error and would appreciate your immediate correction of the record, and an investigation launched as to how and when it was applied to this page. Looking forward to your response. Respectfully, Sandy Hubbard 11911 Magnolia Blvd., Unit 10, Valley Village, CA

91607 sandy@magazinec.com For identification purposes:
Neighborhood Council Valley Village PLU Committee Chair
Valley Village Residents Association board member United
Neighbors member

10/29/2024

Dear Director Bertoni,

When the Staff Report for Draft #3 of the Housing Element was presented to the Planning Commission, it reinforced the recommended action to rezone our commercial corridors without the need to impact further single-family neighborhoods beyond the 4 units per lot state law currently allows.

At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods but included an Exhibit D section within the report as a fully studied presentation of "options" in that rezoned single-family neighborhoods.

I was taken by surprise at seeing the Exhibit D "options" section, learning of it only a few days before the Commission hearing. It appeared deep in the 2000-page Draft report. You explained at the CPC hearing that these options were not vetted by the public and were not necessary to meet RHNA or AFFH and **therefore not part of your Planning Staff recommendation**. At the September hearing, the Commission approved your staff report without the addition of Exhibit D Options.

However, when the **Letter of Determination** was issued by the Commission, Exhibit D is now clearly marked **Recommended by the Planning Commission**--which it was NOT. I sat through the 8+ hour meeting, and the outcome is clearly recorded on the City's video channel. The Commissioners clearly decided not to add Exhibit D "options" to their approval of Draft #3, instead pointing out that they would accept the initial report's recommendations, which did not approve Exhibit D. And yet, this designation has been applied to the Exhibits page.

Once again, someone in the Planning Department is apparently trying to circumvent the public in a manner that can only be questioned. I think it's your duty to find out who that is, and appropriate action should be taken. At minimum, we need the Letter of Determination corrected for the record. All of us at the hearing heard the discussion and the final vote taken by the Commission. This is more than simply incorrect wording, but at minimum, this extra misleading phrase should be removed.

We find this to be a very disturbing error and would appreciate your immediate correction of the record, and an investigation launched as to how and when it was applied to this page. Looking forward to your response.

Respectfully,

Sandy Hubbard

11911 Magnolia Blvd., Unit 10, Valley Village, CA 91607

sandy@magazinec.com

For identification purposes:

Neighborhood Council Valley Village PLU Committee Chair

Valley Village Residents Association board member

United Neighbors member

Communication from Public

Name: Lourdes Cather

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 06:19 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Draft #3 and Exhibit D in the Housing Incentive Program I am writing to you to let you know the reasons why protecting Single Family neighborhoods is important to me as a homeowner of a single family home. I have safety hazards and monetary losses concerns. Our Fire department and LAPD are understaffed and not currently ready to handle additional people from multi-story projects. They are already struggling to handle the people currently living in our neighborhoods. Emergency phone numbers are not promptly answered because of lack of staff and there are very long waits on the phone lines. I am already afraid to go places now, even in the daytime. There will be traffic gridlock and accidents. All this will have a very negative impact on our home property values. A good example is the Woodlake High Rise Apt. Project (Case#: ADM-2024-5202-DB-PHP-VHCA, 7566 N. Woodlake Avenue, West Hills, Ca) which is only 1/2 mile south of our house. This is the proposed high-rise apartment project, which is 322 units, about 600+ residents but only 150 parking spaces with NO visitor parking. Where will all the residents and visitors park? The streets in the residential areas will be packed with cars that have no parking spaces where they live. Also, it is about 200 yards from Chaminade High School. Please DO NOT APPROVE multi-story projects in single family neighborhoods.

Communication from Public

Name: Celeste Wolfe

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 03:49 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: When the Letter of Determination from the Commission was released a week and half ago, it stated the Commission supported the Planning's staff recommendation to approve Draft #3 of CHIP WITHOUT the options to rezone single family neighborhoods. However the Letter Of Determination (prepared by the Planning Department) states The Commission "recommends Exhibit D." RED FLAG!!! ****The Commission never recommended Exhibit D**** When PLUM looks at exhibit D they will see the FACTUALLY INCORRECT STATEMENT: "Commission recommends it". That needs correcting. ***Exhibit D is not part of the recommendation.*** Draft #3 of the CHIP program is supported by the Commission with no recommendation for Exhibit D. That must be made clear. Respectfully, Celeste Wolfe/Century Glen

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 03:55 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods. Please correct the Letter of Determination. Exhibit D, for Draft #3 was not recommended, yet the record shows that it is.

Communication from Public

Name: Leslie Elkan

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 03:56 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: 10-29-24 For the past year and a half my husband and I, lifelong residents of Los Angeles, have followed closely as United Neighbors has worked tirelessly with dozens of high-resource communities to map out where more density could be added in each community (not identified by Planning maps) to more than meet the zoning capacity for our housing needs. Everyone was informed in October 2023 that single-family zones were off the table and this was reconfirmed at a meeting with Deputy Director Arthi Varma and Deputy Mayor Freeman in January 2024. We were pleased when Draft #2 removed the needless density overlays in single-family and focused on our underutilized commercial corridors, repurposing existing buildings, and utilizing public land that we have long advocated for. When the Staff Report for Draft #3 of the Housing Element was presented to the Planning Commission, it reinforced the recommended action to rezone our commercial corridors, etc. without the need to impact further single-family neighborhoods beyond the 4 units per lot state law currently allows. At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods but included in the report, perhaps due to pressure from pro-development groups, a fully studied presentation of “options”; in Exhibit D that rezoned single-family neighborhoods. We were taken by surprise at Exhibit D “options” and learned of it only a few days before the Commission hearing. It appeared deep in your 2000-page Draft report unbeknown to most of us except the pro-housing people. These options were not vetted by the public and were not necessary to meet RHNA or AFFH and, therefore, not part of the Planning Staff recommendation. At the September hearing, the Commission approved your staff report without the addition of Exhibit D Options. However, when the Letter of Determination was sent by the Commission, Exhibit D was clearly marked Recommended by the Planning Commission, which it was not. During an eight-hour hearing, this Exhibit was discussed by the commissioners and they decided not to add Exhibit D “options” to their approval of Draft #3. We request that the Letter of Determination be corrected for the record. Everyone at the hearing heard the discussion and the final vote taken by the Commission. This is simply incorrect wording. We find this a

very disturbing error and would appreciate correction of the record. Looking forward to this being corrected. Respectfully,
Mark and Leslie Elkan Encino, CA 91436

Communication from Public

Name: Mexican-born Immigrant

Date Submitted: 10/25/2024 04:56 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: I am writing to protect what is left of single-family neighborhoods (as anyone can now build 8 units in an SFR lot) throughout Los Angeles and in STRONG support of Draft #3 of the CHIP/Housing Element Rezoning ordinance without including the Exhibit D options that would open up R1 neighborhoods to needless massive development. The Planning Department, in its report, clearly states that they have identified enough rezoning opportunities throughout our city to meet the State's mandate for housing without the need to rezone R1 areas.

1. The Department of City Planning has already acknowledged that rezoning R1 neighborhoods is not necessary to achieve the housing goals CHIP set out to reach.
2. State law already allows a duplex and two ADUs on each and every residential property. R1 zones do and will continue to contribute to the housing inventory with thousands of ADUs.
3. Allowing apartments in R1 neighborhoods will not right the wrongs that in the past 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. Renting an apartment in a single family neighborhood doesn't do that. 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. I support the Approval of Draft #3 of the CHIP as recommended by the City Planning Commission, without the options contained In Exhibit D.

Communication from Public

Name: Anonymous

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 09:58 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: As a member of the Woodland Hills Community 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 included the Exhibit D “options” (Council File 21-1230-S5) that would open up single-family neighborhoods to needless development. 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 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. Allowing apartments in single-family neighborhoods will not right the wrongs that in the past 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 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. You are deciding on an existential issue affecting hundreds of thousands of Angelenos. I ask you to respect the diversity of housing which makes Los Angeles the remarkable city that it is. Please vote to Approve Draft #3 as recommended by the City Planning Commission, without the options contained In Exhibit D. Respectfully, Woodland Hills Neighbor.

Communication from Public

Name: Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 11:45 AM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: Director Bertoni, The Letter of Determination regarding Draft #3 of the CHIP program has an error. The Planning Commission supported the Planning Department's staff report but did not recommend Exhibit D. However, the Letter of Determination recently sent out has Exhibit D as "recommended by the Planning Commission". This is an error that must be corrected before PLUM committee members meet, probably in November. Draft #3 of the CHIP program is supported by the Commission with no recommendation for Exhibit D. That must be made clear. Respectfully, Courtney Small, Board Member Sunset Square Neighborhood Organizaion

Communication from Public

Name: Skei Saulnier

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 12:09 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods. Please correct the Letter of Determination. Exhibit D, for Draft #3 was not recommended, yet the record shows that it is.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 12:41 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods. Please correct the Letter of Determination. Exhibit D, for Draft #3 was not recommended, yet the record shows that it is.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 12:43 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods. Please correct the Letter of Determination. Exhibit D, for Draft #3 was not recommended, yet the record shows that it is.

Communication from Public

Name: Jonathan Hafter
Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 01:17 PM
Council File No: 21-1230-S5
Comments for Public Posting: At the September Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department staff report recommended Draft #3 with no rezoning of single-family neighborhoods. Please correct the Letter of Determination. Exhibit D, for Draft #3 was not recommended, yet the record shows that it is.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 10/29/2024 01:57 PM

Council File No: 21-1230-S5

Comments for Public Posting: No to housing woodlake/saticoy