



clerk CIS <clerk.cis@lacity.org>

Your Community Impact Statement Submittal - Council File Number: 24-0490 - Agenda Item Number: 8

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

Wed, Jun 12, 2024 at 4:23 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 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 Resolution 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.

***** This is an automated response, please DO NOT reply to this email. *****

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Mid City West

Name: Sara Griebe

Email: sgriebe@midcitywest.org

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(14) Nay(7) Abstain(1) Ineligible(0) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 06/11/2024

Type of NC Board Action: Against

Impact Information

Date: 06/12/2024

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 24-0490

City Planning Number:

Agenda Date: 06/11/2024

Item Number: 8

Summary: The Mid City West Neighborhood Council (MCWNC) strongly opposes your motion to re-impose Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) review to 100% affordable housing projects proposed under Mayor Bass's Executive Directive 1 (ED1). Since its enactment in December 2022, ED1 has resoundingly succeeded in getting more affordable housing projects proposed and built in Los Angeles. The City has received plans for more than 14,000 new units of affordable housing - more than several previous years' plans combined. The MCWNC enthusiastically supports making

ED1 permanent and expanding upon its success to build the housing working Angelenos desperately need. ED1 has been so successful because the guaranteed 60-day timeline for approval of 100% affordable plans that fulfill ED1 criteria provides a strong incentive for developers to propose 100% affordable projects. However, your motion to re-impose HPOZ review on ED1 projects will mean that no ED1 projects will be proposed or built in HPOZs. The entire point of ED1 is that 100% affordable projects will not be hampered by red tape from the City. In conclusion, the MCWNC strongly opposes this motion. We urge you to withdraw it and work to strengthen ED1, rather than undercutting it.

Ref:MSG10514689



Passed Opposition to CF 24-0490.pdf

972K



**BOARD OF DIRECTORS
2023 - 2025**

Sara Griebe
Chair

Lauren Borchard
First Vice Chair

Aimee Garcia
Second Vice Chair

Henry Mantel
Secretary

Valerie Washburn
Treasurer

Cindy Bitterman
Shem Bitterman
Shelby Blecker
Craig Brill
Hunter Burgarella
Ramiro Castro Jr.
Tedd Cittadine
Chris Dower
Amy Goldenberg
Ellie Goralnick
Andrea Guttag
Andrew Herman
Brent Kidwell
Christian La Mont
Charles Lindenblatt
Lynda La Rose
David Mann
Arianna Miskin
Christina Mondy
Terence Mylonas
Matthew Peskay
Clark Raustiala
Sam Roseme
Michael Schneider
Robert M. Shore
Sandra Sims
Nick Starr
Julian Stern
J. Keith van Straaten
Don Whitehead
Xcevio Zuluaga



June 11, 2024

**POSITION: OPPOSE
Council File: 24-0490**

Motion passed 14 yea; 7 nay; 1 abstain

To Councilwoman Katy Yaroslavsky
CC: City Council

The Mid City West Neighborhood Council (MCWNC) strongly opposes your motion to re-impose Historic Preservation Overlay Zone (HPOZ) review to 100% affordable housing projects proposed under Mayor Bass's Executive Directive 1 (ED1).

Since its enactment in December 2022, ED1 has resoundingly succeeded in getting more affordable housing projects proposed and built in Los Angeles. The City has received plans for more than 14,000 new units of affordable housing - more than several previous years' plans combined. The MCWNC enthusiastically supports making ED1 permanent and expanding upon its success to build the housing working Angelenos desperately need.

ED1 has been so successful because the guaranteed 60-day timeline for approval of 100% affordable plans that fulfill ED1 criteria provides a strong incentive for developers to propose 100% affordable projects. However, your motion to re-impose HPOZ review on ED1 projects will mean that no ED1 projects will be proposed or built in HPOZs. The entire point of ED1 is that 100% affordable projects will not be hampered by red tape from the City.

As HPOZ review can take years of meetings and re-designs and require approvals from multiple entities, your motion would undercut this goal of building more affordable housing. One neighbor with enough time and money can drag the entire process out, raising the local cost of living and rent, thereby pushing LA City residents into homelessness — and recent City history confirms this. In practice, this means that 100% affordable projects under ED1 simply



will not be proposed in HPOZs, and your motion will amount to a de facto ban.

This would be an especially egregious outcome for the Mid City West area, in which several of our wealthiest neighborhoods are HPOZs:



Your motion will reestablish and entrench that legacy, and confirm the suspicions of many that the purpose of the HPOZs is exclusion. Your motion will mean that ED1 projects will not be built even in the parts of Hancock Park, Windsor Square, or Carthay Circle where multi-family housing is currently allowed. As you may know, the historical legacies of these neighborhoods is not simply their architecture — these were the neighborhoods that actively excluded and segregated against Jews, African-Americans, and other minorities until only a few decades ago. Single-family zoning and historical overlays were used extensively in Los Angeles to maintain exclusionary patterns after redlining became illegal. By disallowing ED1 projects even where these neighborhoods allow multi-family housing, your motion would reestablish and entrench that exclusionary legacy.



We appreciate your background in environmental protection and your priorities in fighting climate change. We remind you that the City will not meet its climate goals without reducing dependency on driving and encouraging more people to walk, bike, and take public transit.

With the Metro D Line extension set to open in the Miracle Mile soon, we should be building much more transit-oriented affordable housing along the Wilshire corridor — and not actively discouraging that housing from being built.

Finally, we are disappointed and demoralized by having our elected leaders tell us variations of “we do not have a housing crisis; we only have an affordable housing crisis” or “we need more housing but it has to be affordable” — only to see them move the goalposts and side with NIMBYs once a concrete plan for more affordable housing is in front of them or, worse yet, already in action. We remain hopeful that you will withdraw your motion and not play into the hypocrisy we have seen time and time again.

In conclusion, the MCWNC strongly opposes this motion. We urge you to withdraw it and work to strengthen ED1, rather than undercutting it.