

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Elsie A  
**Date Submitted:** 02/06/2024 03:46 AM  
**Council File No:** 23-1086

**Comments for Public Posting:** Case Number CPC-2023-582-CU-DB-HCA-PHP; Environmental Case Number ENV-2023-583-CE Hi, I live on Regent and Veteran at 3671 Veteran. I studied Society & Environment at UC Berkeley and also worked at the Green & Healthy Homes Initiative, where I learned about the importance of mature trees and tree canopy for cool cities. I now work at The Climate Registry where I'm learning about the environmental commitments the City of LA is making. I have a question or two regarding the Kelton Avenue Project half a block from my apartment. I'm all for affordable multifamily housing but how will this project contribute to replacing all the tree canopy lost to developers over the decades, how will it mitigate the strain it'll put on the already overcrowded parking situation in my neighborhood, and how will it do both these things while providing a meaningful way towards more affordable housing? "From 2001 to 2022, Los Angeles lost 70.0 kha of tree cover, equivalent to a 50% decrease in tree cover since 2000, and 18.3 Mt of CO2e emissions." (Source: Global Forest Watch) "USC Dornsife researchers say mass-produced dwellings and home expansion have reduced residential green cover as much as 55 percent" (Source: Ian Chaffee via USC) It's technically the moral duty of city planners to bring back trees and tree cover to the neighborhood if you want healthy neighborhoods and to get ahead of the effects of inevitable climate disruption. LA needs to achieve its emissions reduction and land surface temperature reduction goals, which it won't do with more hulking, boxy cement slabs surrounded solely by cacti and non-native trees providing zero shade. NASA agrees, as they literally partnered with the City to conduct this study to try to teach its officials about the importance of trees in reducing the heat island effect. Also, it will help us achieve our rainwater capture goals as well as a number of other economic and non-economic benefits.  
<https://appliedsciences.nasa.gov/what-we-do/projects/utilizing-nasa-earth-observations-evaluate-impact-tree-coverage-urban-heat>  
If the developers provided and could demonstrate a tangible value to the surrounding neighborhood then all these clearly angry neighbors of mine would appreciate this project a great deal more. There's already so much noise from the freeway (which could be blocked by trees, but isn't) and I would accept the (probably) several years of construction noise if this project was actually doing something revolutionary by providing value rather than a net-negative to the neighborhood like all the other developers contributing to the housing crisis and demolishing all mature tree canopy. All I've seen from the updates is more and more green outdoor space being removed from the project. Are you city planners or are you developers' puppets? Why are there so many units in the building if they can't accommodate for parking? That's 43 units, only 33 spaces, and if there's an overflow of even 20 cars that would be a pretty huge deal for our neighborhood. I struggle already to make a left safely onto veteran from regent every day, and my neighbors and guests drive around for a long time looking for parking. This project should be 30 units, 30 parking spots, 15+ low density, 100% rent controlled units because rent shouldn't even exist, add 3 public EV charging spots, and add as much green space and tree canopy as possible. I would accept a strain on parking and noise if at minimum 50% of the building was reserved for low income units. '1/4 of base units' isn't enough when the situation we're in is as dire as it is. I'd be happy if this building was actually going to chip away meaningfully at the colossal housing crisis and tree canopy loss issue. None of my friends can find affordable housing and I'm struggling to afford everything myself. It is unbearably hotter each summer, rent is going up, cost of living is going up, but wages aren't. Please don't be beholden to developers - be on the right side of history: work for the people and the climate. Best Regards, Elsie Andreyev

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 02/06/2024 03:52 AM

**Council File No:** 23-1086

**Comments for Public Posting:** Case Number CPC-2023-582-CU-DB-HCA-PHP; Environmental Case Number ENV-2023-583-CE Hi, I live on Regent and Veteran at 3671 Veteran. I studied Society & Environment at UC Berkeley and also worked at the Green & Healthy Homes Initiative, where I learned about the importance of mature trees and tree canopy for cool cities. I now work at an emissions reporting organization in LA where I'm learning about the environmental commitments the City of LA is making. I have a question or two regarding the Kelton Avenue Project half a block from my apartment. I'm all for affordable multifamily housing but how will this project contribute to replacing all the tree canopy lost to developers over the decades, how will it mitigate the strain it'll put on the already overcrowded parking situation in my neighborhood, and how will it do both these things while providing a meaningful way towards significantly more affordable housing? "From 2001 to 2022, Los Angeles lost 70.0 kha of tree cover, equivalent to a 50% decrease in tree cover since 2000, and 18.3 Mt of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions." (Source: Global Forest Watch) "USC Dornsife researchers say mass-produced dwellings and home expansion have reduced residential green cover as much as 55 percent" (Source: Ian Chaffee via USC) It's technically the moral duty of city planners to bring back trees and tree cover to the neighborhood if you want healthy neighborhoods and to get ahead of the effects of inevitable climate disruption. LA needs to achieve its emissions reduction and land surface temperature reduction goals, which it won't do with more hulking, boxy cement slabs surrounded solely by cacti and non-native trees providing zero shade. NASA agrees, as they literally partnered with the City to conduct this study to try to teach its officials about the importance of trees in reducing the heat island effect. Also, it will help us achieve our rainwater capture goals as well as a number of other economic and non-economic benefits. <https://appliedsciences.nasa.gov/what-we-do/projects/utilizing-nasa-earth-observations-evaluate-impact-tree-coverage-urban-heat> If the developers provided and could demonstrate a tangible value to the surrounding neighborhood then all these clearly angry neighbors of mine would appreciate this project a great deal more. There's already so much noise from the freeway (which could be blocked by trees, but isn't) and I would accept the (probably) several years of construction noise if this project was actually doing something revolutionary by providing value rather than a net-negative to the neighborhood like all the other developers contributing to the housing crisis and demolishing all mature tree canopy. Why are there so many units in the building if they can't accommodate for parking? That's 43 units, only 33 spaces, and if there's an overflow of even 20 cars that would be a pretty huge deal for our neighborhood. I struggle already to make a left safely onto veteran from regent every day, and my neighbors and guests drive around for a long time looking for parking. This project should be 30 units, 30 parking spots, 15+ low density, 100% rent controlled units because rent shouldn't even exist, add 3 public EV charging spots, and add as much green space and tree canopy as possible. I would accept a strain on parking and noise if at minimum 50% of the building was reserved for low income units. '1/4 of base units' isn't enough when the situation we're in is as dire as it is. I'd be happy if this building was actually going to chip away meaningfully at the colossal housing crisis and tree canopy loss issue. None of my friends can find affordable housing and I'm struggling to afford everything myself. It is unbearably hotter each summer, rent is going up, cost of living is going up, but wages aren't. All I've seen from the updates is more and more green outdoor space being removed from the project. Are you city planners or are you developers' puppets? Please don't be beholden to developers - be on the right side of history: work for the people and the climate. Best Regards, Elsie Andreyev