

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Bruce P

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 06:44 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am against appendix D. Keep single family home communities as they are. Don't cause over crowded communities and traffic nightmares. Keep high density apartments out of single family home communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Shiva S.  
**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 07:01 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:** Maxim Kislik

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 07:13 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support Draft 3 of the CHIP Ordinance without options in Exhibit D. Forcing more people to walk without proper sidewalks on busy streets, as is the case in our neighborhood is unsafe.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Gordon Morris

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 12:40 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support of the Housing Element CHIP Draft #3 that preserves R1 neighborhoods and prohibits the upzoning options presented in Exhibit D. Oppose Exhibit D. The City quietly acknowledges that 35% of R1 zoned land cannot be developed for higher uses -- which means that less than 45% of LA's developable residential land is zoned R1. That is a very different picture from a reference nearing 3/4 of all land as reported in the media. And, it is hoped that all agree that it is bad policy to seek to increase density where public safety is placed at risk.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 06:33 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am for draft #3 which preserves R1 zoning and opposed to amendment D, which will significantly impact the destruction of trees and biodiversity. Thank you.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 07:20 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** Don't believe the developer fronts, and their Yimby rhetoric about racism in single family neighborhoods and their WAR on single family homes and why they must go...in the name of 'equity' They line up at hearings in Sacramento and Los Angeles and anywhere else this subject comes up. Ask yourself ..why are they all young white dudes? The Lost Boys... Many are not from California, and many grew up in single family homes.. like their leader/warrior on single family homes, privileged Scott Wiener, who grew up in a SF home in a toney suburb of New Jersey and comes up with bills to destroy SF communities, calling them all.. "Racist, immoral, wasting space" Are Wieners parents "racist, immoral, wasting space"? Truth is, working class, ethnic, and south LA communities of color fought all the Wiener bills. As a Leimert Park leader said: "Sacramento politicians throw that word 'Equity' around to justify voting for Wieners horrible bills.. but our Single Family Homes ARE our 'Equity' and his bills will destroy that" And the city will destroy that and many communities if they buy into the phony developer front white dude Yimbys spewing that 'equity' and 'discriminatory housing' (disgustingly exploiting a horrible history in housing for the developers they work for), is why single family neighborhoods must end, now. 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 including 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 rezoning opportunities throughout our city to meet the State's mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. 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. 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:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 07:49 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:** Debbie

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 08:24 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support the Draft #3 of the Housing Element/CHIP Ordinance, as presented by the Planning Department, without Exhibit D “options” that would open up single-family neighborhoods to rezoning. Shadow Hills is a special Equestrian neighborhood with specific needs and changing this zoning would make it more dangerous for the people that live here and destroy one of the last areas around here that it is safe to have animals. The Planning Department in its report clearly states that they have found enough zoning in other areas to meet the State’s mandate for housing without the need to rezone our single-family areas. There is NO NEED to change our zoning.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 08:29 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** There has been a great deal of misleading information about zoning and efforts to link LA's housing and homelessness challenges to the existence of R1 neighborhoods. The public has been incorrectly led to believe that adequate housing fails to be built because of the amount of R1 zoned land in LA -- often quoted at 70+% of LA's land. Note that it is not 70+% of ALL land, it is 70+% of all RESIDENTIALLY zoned land. Most importantly, what that figure also fails to acknowledge is that a large portion of that R1 zoned land CANNOT be developed for more dense uses. It is the land in the high fire severity zones of the SM Mountains and other ranges and high fire severity zones throughout the City. It includes the land in the high tide zones at the coast and areas adjacent to sensitive biological resources. The City quietly acknowledges that 35% of R1 zoned land cannot be developed for higher uses -- which means that less than 45% of LA's developable residential land is zoned R1. That is a very different picture from a reference nearing 3/4 of all land as reported in the media. And, it is hoped that all agree that it is bad policy to seek to increase density where public safety is placed at risk. The City has clearly demonstrated that it can meet and exceed the housing goals assigned to it by the State in the current Regional Housing needs Assessment (RHNA ) planning cycle without upzoning single family neighborhoods. The City Planning Commission adopted the Planning Dept's recommendations to approve the Housing Element CHIP program draft #3 which preserves R1 neighborhoods without upzoning. However, Exhibit D remains in the PLUM packet and housing advocates continue to lobby for it and the upzoning of R1 areas. If in the future, the City were to need to add new zoning capacity and desired to make zoning changes to R1 areas, that effort would be more appropriately done via the Community Planning process with transparency and public participation to identify the best places for such upzoning where infrastructure can best meet the needs of a growing population and negative impacts reduced or eliminated. Blanket upzoning via the Housing Element would allow for developers and speculators to cherry pick any R1 property for multi-family construction without regard to adjacent homes, neighborhood integrity, infrastructure availability, etc. This would essentially permit developers to become our City's planners based

upon their incentive to generate profit -- not to plan for sustainable, livable communities. The City cannot abandon its duty to plan for a livable Los Angeles for all Angelenos -- families, the young and old. Its responsibility is to oversee thriving, balanced communities -- not merely to incentivize the construction of housing units.

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 08:42 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** There has been a great deal of misleading information about zoning and efforts to link LA's housing and homelessness challenges to the existence of R1 neighborhoods. The public has been incorrectly led to believe that adequate housing fails to be built because of the amount of R1 zoned land in LA -- often quoted at 70+% of LA's land. Note that it is not 70+% of ALL land, it is 70+% of all RESIDENTIALLY zoned land. Blanket upzoning via the Housing Element would allow for developers and speculators to cherry pick any R1 property for multi-family construction without regard to adjacent homes, neighborhood integrity, infrastructure availability, etc. This would essentially permit developers to become our City's planners based upon their incentive to generate profit -- not to plan for sustainable, livable communities.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Joan Roberts Hickman  
**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 08:46 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:** Corinne Mesner  
**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 08:50 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:** Kaivan Harouni  
**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 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:**

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 07:37 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** We support only Draft #3 without Option D. These large structures should not be built in residential neighborhoods and there is significant space in more commercial areas for high density housing.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Karen S.

**Date Submitted:** 11/18/2024 07:40 AM

**Council File No:** 21-1230-S5

**Comments for Public Posting:** I support Housing Element CHIP Draft #3 that preserves R1 neighborhoods and strongly oppose Exhibit D. I am a native Angeleno and want to keep the city safe and livable without compromising public safety. Thank you