



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Angela Sherick-Bright	
			Anthony J Braswell	
			Casey Maddren	I strongly support Item 13-C. In an emergency like the one LA is currently facing, local agencies must have the freedom to consider the needs of local residents, rather than compliance with State laws that do not take into account the massive environmental and logistical challenges that we face in the aftermath of the fires.
			Catherine Roberts	I am in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements. The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process. We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.
			Courtney C Small	I am in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements. The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process. I thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities. Courtney Carol Small



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Courtney C Small	<p>The Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization stands with United Neighbors in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.</p> <p>The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.</p> <p>We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.</p> <p>Courtney Carol Small Board Member of the Sunset Square Neighborhood Organization</p>
			Deborah S Cabrera	<p>THIS IS THE TIME TO THINK ABOUT HELPING OUR NEIGHBORS! COMMUNITIES NEED THE SUPPORT TO REBUILD THEIR HOMES AND NEIGHBORHOODS THE WAY THEY WANT NOT A TIME TO GIVE DEVELOPERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE ANY THING FROM THEM! DEVELOPERS WILL HAVE PLENTY OF WORK JUST DOING THINGS THE WAY THE COMMUNITY WISHES TO DO! HAVE A HEART! HELP THOSE WHO HAVE LOST EVERYTHING! THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO TAKE MORE AWAY BY ALLOWING COMMUNITYS TO HAVE EXTRA PAIN OF GREEDY DEVELOPERS!!!</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Doniece Watkins	<p>CURRENT FIRES IN SOUTHERN CALIF, CLMATE CHANGE, PRESIDENT'S VISIT</p> <p>To Board of Supervisors All Californians know high winds due to "Climate Change" may spark and set of fires in populated city locations and within or forests. It is no secret President Trump has a low regard for California and less for Governor Nesom. Nonetheless of how he sees this state and our governor I watch the news of his arrival in Southern California to tour the cities that had burned (still burning). It is disheartening to learn he only visited Pacific Palisades. Why not visit the other cities, those citizens were waiting to meet with him as well! Why I am writing elected officials in California regarding this visit is to let you know my disapproval on the demands placed on Governor Newsom and the other elected officials for the State of California prior to receiving federal aid.</p> <p>1. What does Voter ID Cards have to do with "Climate Change" and "Fires that spread due to extremely high winds? The State Election Officials have implemented "WHERE'S MY BALLOT" which I have used since its inception. If Californians are concerned that their ballots are not counted, they should make use of this process. I know when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Election information is mailed b. Sample and Official Ballots are mailed c. When the Registrar's office received my Official Ballot returned via the use of 'drop boxes" AND d. When my ballot has been counted <p>2. Voting in person at official Polling Locations each voter MUST show ID. If a driver's license or other official ID is not appropriate why would this Voter ID Card suffice??</p> <p>The second stipulation is to release water from Northern California. The release of this water is not for use in Southern California. Again, what does providing water to the farmers in the middle of this state have to do with these extreme Santa Ana winds and the fires that have resulted due to it? Pres Trump tried to withhold federal funds from the extreme fires California experienced when he was in office before. Our Governor was able to obtain federal monies to fight those fires. Please stand up and together for the betterment of and to obtain much needed federal funding the citizens of this state deserve. Thank you, Doniece Watkins</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Emily Loughran	Thank you for helping to protect the character of the areas that were devastated by fire. It would be grossly unfair and divisive to exploit this opportunity and add density to areas where people have lost their homes and where it may indeed be wholly inappropriate due to the now obvious high fire danger. Communities need to rebuild. Thank you for this thoughtful measure.
			Fran Offenhauser	Allow neighborhoods to recover. Do not add to their woes with misguided attempts to build apartments where they had homes
			Gregory Goldin	<p>The Miracle Mile Residential Association is in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.</p> <p>The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.</p> <p>We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.</p> <p>Greg Goldin President, Miracle Mile Residential Association</p>
			Jan Moore	<p>As a life long resident of the North Hollywood/Valley Village community, I am in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.</p> <p>The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.</p> <p>I thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Janet Reichmann	13-C I fully support what the Supervisors have crafted and commend them for focusing in on victims of the horrendous fires. The State should not rush in to fulfill their desire for density at the time when cherished neighborhoods are turned to toxic ash. It's an outrage to even consider the areas might be subject to Builder's Remedy structures. Return the lost neighborhoods to their original concepts be they the Palisades or the extraordinary Altadena. These rebuilt neighborhoods should not be attracting developers and fulfilling RHNA numbers. Hopefully 13-C will be recognized as a restoration, not a chance for cashing in on a tragedy.
			Joanne Dorfman	I support the written framework of the Fire Recovery efforts, letter to Gov Newsom, and section # 30, as we must not build such dense area in high fire zones. I support this measure to rebuild quickly, and safely.
			John Russum	Please record my support to request suspension of the Builder's Remedy and exemption of RHNA and SB 35 requirements as an emergency measure to help ensure preservation of community character during the rebuilding of neighbors ravaged by the recent fires. Thank you.
			Joseph C Steins	<p>United Neighbors is in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.</p> <p>The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process. Thank you.</p> <p>We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.</p> <p>Joseph C Steins</p>
			Karen J Gilman	We support the motion put forth by the Board of Supervisors on item 13-C! We are residents of the Larchmont Village area and always assert that community input must be gathered, democratically, before any changes can be made to existing policy! Thank you for considering this!
			Laurie Kelson	
			Linda Murata	I support Agenda #13-C.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Maria Hernandez	Based on the conversations, it would make sense that Regional Planning should be a part of Public Works. Having 2 separate departments with one operating at a disadvantage (i.e. staffing, funding, etc.) performing similar work is not efficient.
			Maria Pavlou Kalban	<p>United Neighbors is in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.</p> <p>The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.</p> <p>We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.</p> <p>Maria Pavlou Kalban Chair, United Neighbors</p>
			Mary L Jack	<p>As a concerned resident of Los Angeles County, I support the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.</p> <p>The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.</p> <p>I thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Michele Shapiro	I am in support of 13-C as a homeowner in Valle Village.
			Michelle Unger	I am in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements. The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process. We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.
			Robert V Anderson	We support the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.
			Robin L Rudisill	I strongly support this item. I'm very worried about trying to meet the RHNA goals for L.A. while at the same time rebuilding over ten thousand structures. The state HCD must relax those RHNA requirements for the foreseeable future. Such a huge demand will drive up the cost of building materials and labor, besides the fact that it's simply not possible as the needed materials and labor will likely not be available! And if we don't meet the RHNA goals, at some point we'll be subject to builder's remedy. Not OK. And of course developers will attempt to use builder's remedy in the Coastal Zone too. Definitely not OK. Good work LA County Staff!!
			Roslin Castell	Why the focus on building? When we can deploy solar_powered mobile living structures that retinal scan for employment verification and scurry. Temporary structures outside of libraries and other public bickering spaces. Moved in the face of disasters. Solar, fire-resistant panels. Maybe if you give us half of the 12 million annually wasted on armed guards at library we will eben be able to make them fly by mid next year.
			Sandy Hubbard	Strongly in favor of the Supervisors' emergency motion that requests relief from the State's housing mandates, in order to rebuild the fire-affected communities as complete communities and not subject to the whims of political ideology or additional hurdles in this great time of need.
			Susan Lee	Altadena needs help and protection from corporate mega builders who don't care about Altadena.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Favor	Terry Tegnazian	It is important that the County pursue exemption from SB35 requirements, RHNA goals and pursues the suspension of Builder's Remedy in the current Housing Element cycle. With the extent of damage from the Palisades and Eaton fires, and amount of rebuilding needed, it is more than reasonable to expect that the cost of building materials and the demand for labor will impact the cost of construction and project production not only in the fire-damaged zones, but across the County (and beyond). Please adopt your emergency motion and particularly the language in Item 30 that references suspension of Builder's Remedy, RHNA, SB 35 requirements, etc.
			Theresa M Tippit	
			Walter Dominguez	
		Oppose	Alex Hager	This is not the time to suspend state laws that make it easier to build much needed housing. This item needs to be struck completely. This is not the time to suspend ADUs and bring back parking minimums. We have an opportunity to build more sustainably and stronger.
			Andrew Slocum	Oppose unless items under 30 C are removed
			Azeen Khanmalek	Oppose sub-item 30
			Blake Durham	



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Oppose	Brianna Egan	<p>I oppose Sub-Item 30 which is a motion from Supervisors Barger and Horvath that would ask the Governor and state legislature to suspend vitally important state housing laws – including the Housing Crisis Act, Housing Accountability Act, Transit-Oriented Housing, Lot Splits, and State Density Bonus Program – in fire impacted communities for 5 years. These laws were designed to streamline the production of new housing to address our state's prominent and ever-growing housing crisis.</p> <p>The suspension of these laws would put renters at even greater risk during a housing crisis exacerbated by the fire and make it more difficult for long-time residents of impacted communities to return. Suspending these key housing laws would lead to delays of approvals and would set back the ability for homeowners to choose how they would like to rebuild, including limiting their ability to add additional units that could allow them to have a more financially viable rebuild.</p> <p>This is the opposite of what we should be doing: The communities of Palisades and Altadena are different in terms of their economic and racial makeup as well as geographical and natural risks. It's important that these communities and their residents have the ability to determine how they would like to rebuild. That could include building with more wildfire-safe materials, building a fourplex where there was a single-family residence, or building small apartment complexes that are hardy and defensible to house the community and support generational wealth. I question the true origins of this motion and why the desire to "retain neighborhood character" means we should freeze neighborhoods in amber or limit the ability to build back stronger, safer, and better.</p>
			Camille Guiriba	<p>I'm writing in opposition to elements of this motion that undermine state policy that is meant to increase housing production and support affordability in our communities. Specifically,</p> <p>Item 30d. Which requests the state to suspend state density bonus law</p> <p>Item 30e. Suspension of SB330</p> <p>Item 30f.i. Suspension of obligation to fulfill RHNA</p> <p>Item 30g. Suspension of obligation for 90 day review of ADU applications</p> <p>Item 30i. Suspension of HAA</p> <p>Item 30k Temporary suspension of Government Code section 65852.24 Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act of 2022.</p> <p>Item 30l Temporary suspension of Government Code sections 65912.100 through 65912.140 Middle Class Housing Act of 2022</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Oppose	Charles Burton-Callegari	<p>Dear Supervisor Barger,</p> <p>I ask that you delete sub-item 30 from Item 13-C.</p> <p>We should be helping residents rebuild and stay on their land. Sub-item 30 would do the opposite.</p> <p>Sub-item 30 has language that is too broad-- if the intent is for it to apply to areas in Altadena impacted by the Eaton fire, that should be specified.</p> <p>However, even in Altadena, the policies you're asking for would increase the cost of rebuilding and make it harder for residents to, for example, build an ADU while they recover financially to rebuild their primary home. In an emergency situation, we should be taking steps to help people stay on their land and recover, not co-opt a disaster to suspend needed land use laws.</p> <p>If you suspend state laws that facilitate new housing in places like commercial zones or parking lots, you make housing more expensive. If you suspend the Housing Crisis Act, you are denying renters their right to return. If you suspend the State Density Bonus Program, you are taking away one of our most important tools in delivering deed-restricted housing units. If you reinstate parking minimums, you are driving up the cost of housing. The needlessly broad language gives a very strong appearance of ulterior motives to use this disaster to undo existing land use law. Our only motive should be to help residents rebuild their residences, communities, and financial situations-- we should not be taking away tools they can use to recover.</p> <p>None of the policies sub-item 30 is asking for will help people stay on their land and rebuild their homes; all of them will make it harder and more expensive to rebuild.</p> <p>Please delete sub-item 30 from Item 13-C.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Charles Burton-Callegari Los Angeles, 90028</p>
			Charles Iantorno	<p>Items in #30 should be removed, specifically those in the letter submitted by YIMBY Los Angeles. That any councilmember would consider taking action to make housing construction harder during this crisis is alarming and confusing. Let's make it easier to build, not harder. Especially after these devastating fires.. how is that not common sense?</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

			The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:	
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
13-C.		Oppose	Chester Li	Subitem 30: We should not in a time of crisis turn our backs on those who need housing the most. We must continue to uphold state housing laws to ensure fair housing is implemented.
			Eduardo Bravo	
			Eileen M Hiss	As a resident of LA County, I am in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements. Please do not mix rebuilding after a disaster with RHNA. The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. Cities have been given the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and preserving community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not crush the process. We were allowed in TODAY to our housing sites. PLEASE do not crush our communities with a FREE FOR ALL FOR DEVELOPERS & BUILDERS!!! THEY DO NOT LIVE HERE!!!
			Eric Dasmalchi	Clause 30 should be stricken in its entirety. These state regulations are essential to ensuring homeowners have the flexibility to rebuild in a way that works for them. If that means adding more housing and less parking, the county should welcome that, not seek to limit it.
			Eric Gamonal	I strongly oppose the proposal unless amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. We cannot undermine efforts to increase housing development at this critical time.
			Greg Chasen	I strongly oppose the proposal unless amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. We cannot undermine efforts to increase housing development at this critical time.
			Greg Wasik	this is a horrible and not well thought our proposed law which will in fact put more restrictions on development and slow things down.
			Guo Chen	We don't need have more roadblocks for housing construction during this critical time.
			Henry Fung	I ask that the Board of Supervisors reject all recommendations of item #30 of this agenda and return it to the Department of Regional Planning for further vetting. Regional Planning management appears to be using this opportunity



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

to ask the legislature reject all of the state housing laws passed in the past five years to streamline housing production. The stated purpose is to keep community character, but the community's character is in the people that live there, not in the buildings they live in.

There is already streamlining under the county's prerogative for people who build "like to like" with one queue for those properties that have little or no change in existing plans and those who want to use this opportunity to do more.

Outside of the few parts of Altadena which are Very High Fire Severity Zones, there is no reason to ban community members who need to use SB 9 to stay in the community, to split their lots because they are underinsured or need financial assistance to continue living there. The same goes with using density bonus to build higher density development on commercial corridors such as Lincoln, Fair Oaks, and Lake. If property owners want to rehouse the thousands of people displaced in quality new housing of which a portion is deed restricted affordable, they should be welcomed with arms, not stymied with addition regulation and bureaucracy.

Regarding Housing Element reporting and RHNA, these units are irreparably removed. The Housing Element identified central Altadena, near the intersection of Lake and Altadena Drive, as the location where much of the site inventory for housing to meet Altadena's RHNA needs should go. That need is more acute now and does not go away. Reporting of LA County's progress on the Housing Element is critical to let state and federal lawmakers know how it is meeting the challenge of tens of thousands more displaced and homeless residents. It is more critical that the County report this information on time.

Specific to ADU approval, the 90 day timeline needs to remain as many residents may choose to build an ADU and then their main home later. Currently they may choose to have a temporary trailer or other structure until the main home is completed, but that is a sunk expense that has no value once that lease for the trailer expires. With an ADU, they can choose to build something quickly immediately, with a pre-fab standard plan, and take their time to rebuild the main house and avoid construction cost inflation and high cost of labor as many others compete to work there. These ADUs will also provide necessary housing for the labor force who will be imported in to rebuild Altadena and other fire ravaged communities. Existing County short term rental ordinances ban rentals under 30 days of ADUs so it will mitigate the concern of hotels being placed in residential neighborhoods.

Specific to AB 2097, SB 6, and AB 2011, Altadena has always had underused commercial strips. The shopping center at Lake and Altadena, where Rite Aid is, is in a decades old structure. If the property owners want to modernize them, or convert them into needed workforce housing, they should be welcomed to do so. The same goes for parking, and the state laws are specifically designed to avoid unnecessary parking requirements. Business



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

--	--

	<p>owners should be free to determine how much parking is needed for the type of business they do. Note that the County already has an inclusionary housing ordinance which would apply to all new multi family housing development, and would apply to commercial zoned properties repurposed to homes.</p> <p>Ultimately, I am reminded of two supervisor comments on the process. One is Supervisor Barger, saying that all funds have strings attached - in reference to working with the Trump Administration on funds to rebuild. The state government and state legislature also have many funds coming to Los Angeles County, and unlike President Trump tying in unrelated issues like voter identification and Central Valley water to federal aid for wildfires, the state has a vested interest in insuring that more homes are built as rapidly as possible countywide, including in the burned areas of Altadena away from the very high fire severity zones. The County's housing crisis just got much worse, and we need to work quickly to get people out of their cars, hotel rooms, and basements and into modern homes near jobs, schools, and transit. It is people who create community character, not buildings and parking lots.</p> <p>And also I am reminded of Supervisor Mitchell about running things through policy committees. This should have been vetted in a policy committee where people and advocates can thoughtfully discuss the implications of these requests. While Regional Planning management are thinking about the amount of work piled on to their existing duties for the million unincorporated residents, this should have been discussed more broadly among the subject matter experts in the board staff and the housing community, before being placed on a Friday night agenda. Instead, the Board will be receiving dozens of comments objecting to this, and the department will not look good in the eyes of the state Department of Housing and Community Development responsible for enforcing housing element laws, or of Governor Newsom who still has a goal of building 3.5 million new homes statewide by 2025.</p> <p>I urge the Board of Supervisors to send the entire line #30 back to DRP and to a cluster meeting for further discussion as to what measures are appropriate to move forward in a five signature letter and which aren't, and for board members to dialogue with state legislators as to what measures are appropriate to allow those who want to build like for like to do so, those who want to sell out to do so without being taken advantage of, and those who would like to or need to build more units on their property to stay in the community to do so as well.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>
Hon Cohan	This is going to slow down permitting even more! we need more houses!!
John Gregorchuk	You cannot cut the only state laws that cut red tape... This is insanity: I strongly oppose the proposal unless amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. We cannot undermine efforts to increase housing development at this critical time.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

Kiersten Stanley	<p>I STRONGLY OPPOSE the sections that call for suspending Housing Element and density requirements for the new RHNA cycle while we rebuild. We need to rebuild smarter, better, and in a way that allows for greater equity, access, and inclusion. We also need to ENSURE that multi-family housing lost in the fires is replaced fully or even built to a higher density to allow more families to live in and return to their homes. Finally, we need to allow SB 9 and SB 1123 to apply to ALL lots not in Very High Fire Severity Zones -- this will give multi-generational families (particularly working-class families in Altadena) better options for rebuilding homes with adequate space and bedrooms for all of their occupants. My cousin works for an insurance company that places victims of disasters in housing paid for by their claims. She said it is ALWAYS difficult to place multi-generational households who live in cramped, overcrowded homes within Los Angeles because building codes do not allow for equivalent, multi-generational housing that is affordable to working and middle class families. We need to acknowledge that overcrowding in single family homes happens and PROMOTE housing policies, such as SB 9 and SB 1123, that allow those families to grow IN PLACE on their land by building more rooms and structures. DO NOT SUSPEND THE LAW!</p>
Kimberly Slipski	<p>We believe that parts of this request would be detrimental to the current housing crisis that was existent before the Eaton fire, and is now at risk of severely intensifying because of the mass destruction and displacement.</p> <p>My husband and I are Altadena residents who lost our home in the fire, and now have a baby on the way. We worry for our ability to return to Altadena and one day be able to afford to buy a house for our family in the community we love and have been so important to us, as supply, demand, and restrictions continue to make Altadena and surrounding areas even more inaccessible than they were before - including to many families who want to rebuild, and especially those who have brought so much diversity in our area.</p> <p>We are equally as passionate as our neighbors about Altadena's beautiful history, community and character, however we do believe in giving the community choice in how they rebuild and how they can afford to rebuild. Suspension of key components of legislation including the State Density Bonus Law, Housing Crisis Act takes away residents' choice and options of designing, modernizing, and increasing resiliency, access, affordability and the community's ability to thrive coming out of this disaster.</p> <p>We believe there is great opportunity for Altadena to design parts of its community that meet the needs and desires of single-family, historic, and less dense homes, and at the same time develop and advance parts that continue to expand and meet the needs of a passionate community of families, small business owners and more. While it has been stated that solutions such as duplexes and ADUs would theoretically still be supported, there is no accountability that they would not be held to subjective standards that have restricted these types of developments in the past in this community, nor that the staffing issue related to ADU approvals would actually be prioritized, rather than be used as an excuse to slow and stifle plans to build all together.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>We support all requests that do not hinder the speed and ease of development and rebuilding of our beautiful community. Unfortunately we believe the part of this motion that requests to temporarily suspend legislation that allows for increased flexibility and homeowners' options in rebuilding would do just that.</p> <p>Thank you so much for your consideration.</p>
L B	<p>Everything in 13-C is excellent apart from item 30. Item 30 must be amended, or scrapped entirely. If the County wanted to double down on the mistakes that got us here, this would precisely be it. Specifically, 30 e.i. which asks to suspend SB 330 for five years in fire-impacted communities. SB330 is a wide-ranging bill that covers a bunch of topics. A blanket suspension of SB 330 would make rebuilding slower and more costly. This is exactly what you do not want, I would hope. If SB330 is suspended... the county would be able to downzone, applicants wouldn't be able to vest projects with a preliminary application, projects could be delayed indefinitely with no limit on the number of hearings, the county would be able to take as long as they want to determine if an application is complete</p> <p>30 e.ii asks for local flexibility on objective design standards (requirements in SB 330) to retain the character of the community. While somewhat understandable, allowing subjective design standards will make it harder and more time consuming to rebuild.</p> <p>30 g) Asks for a suspension of the 90 day deadline for approving ADUs in fire-impacted areas.</p> <p>Are you trying to expedite rebuilding or not?</p> <p>30 h) Asks for a suspension of AB 2097 in fire-impacted areas.</p> <p>From what I can tell, none of Altadena is covered by AB 2097, but if it were, there is zero reason to suspend it. Requiring more parking for fire rebuilds would just increase costs and decrease feasibility of rebuilding.</p> <p>30 i) Asks to suspend the Housing Accountability Act in fire-impacted areas.</p> <p>Why would you ever want to do that? Unless you want to be able to deny rebuilding projects without facing consequences.</p> <p>At precisely the moment when Los Angeles County faces the worst housing crisis in its history, one of the worst in the developed world, our political leadership, who were voted in to develop effective public policy, are now trying to roll back protections streamlining housing production. This is quite frankly shameful. The County government seems to want discretionary zoning powers and the ability to enforce your exclusionary zoning without bonus for affordable housing. This policy is completely misguided at best, and bad-faith and malicious at worst.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>Again, very shameful. And it will directly hurt the fire impacted homeowners by limiting what they can rebuild on their property compared to before the fire, lowering their property value.</p>
Ling Hung	
Michael Hang	
Mitch Solomon	<p>To the Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly express my deep disapproval for the proposals found in "Los Angeles County Recovery Efforts and Building Urgency into Implementation of Long-Term Disaster Support". In particular, I would like to focus on my Supervisor Kathryn Barger and ask to consider your constituents here.</p> <p>I have lived in Los Angeles for 30 years, the last nine in Eagle Rock. It is shocking the failure to address the needs for unhoused, under-housed (where people are displaced and forced to live in places that cannot comfortably fit them) and for young people generally. There is nothing you don't know: the rents and prices to own are exceedingly high.</p> <p>The proposals you are pushing are a mess that will only make our current problems worse. Suspending the HAA, the Housing Element Law, the Density Bonus Law, the commercial-corridors upzoning laws, the parking-reductions-near-transit law, the 5-hearing limit and objective-standards definition of SB 330 are all NIMBY fantasies. Meanwhile you are decidedly avoiding actual solutions for the state to upzone, to remove CEQA barriers, or do anything else to facilitate dense housing development in the safest parts of L.A. County.</p> <p>The state itself will probably keep you from getting this NIMBY arrogance from happening. The insurance companies will surely reject it. There is no joy from me to side with insurance companies that are doing active damage to people who have lost their loved ones and homes. But you adding to the trauma by all but enforcing the longterm skyrocketing inflation that is undermining our great city is not acceptable.</p> <p>Please consider these ideas that would help people whose houses were destroyed.</p> <p>*Let people build and live in ADUs before main houses, so fire victims can get housed sooner.</p> <p>* In non-very-high-fire-severity areas, streamline SB 9 lot splits to help people pay for rebuilding their houses.</p> <p>*Remove design standards that delay permitting for main houses, ADUs, and SB 9 homes.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>* Do keep safety standards, most obviously fire resistance but also earthquake protections in particular.</p> <p>*Encourage and streamline use of density bonus, to get more desperately needed housing.</p> <p>We cannot continue to lose citizens, most especially the lifeblood of Los Angeles for 150 years, the young aspirational people who set roots and move the dynamism of our city. Pricing working class and middle class families out of the county as a whole is a financial, electoral and spiritual disaster in the making. We are already in the process of losing four seats at minimum in Congress after 2030. I work in an entertainment business that is not only losing jobs hand over fist but in our Zoom era is all but guaranteeing that creatives and union workers both move away and stay away.</p> <p>Urging you to take this opportunity to improve the lives of so many that have lost so much in this tragedy. Stop burying your heads in the sand. Build more housing - healthier, denser, environmentally improved, safer and yet more attractive aesthetically and for true diversity. We are in pain but doing just more of the same is a recipe for future disaster. We in Los Angeles have the keys to make America a far healthier, more wealthy and stronger country than ever before. People want to be here, to look to the future, to lead. Please gather a much better plan to get there quickly, with understanding and simply better than this proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mitch Solomon</p>
<p>Mitch Solomon</p>	<p>To the Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>I am writing to strongly express my deep disapproval for the proposals found in "Los Angeles County Recovery Efforts and Building Urgency into Implementation of Long-Term Disaster Support". In particular, I would like to focus on my Supervisor Kathryn Barger and ask to consider your constituents here.</p> <p>I have lived in Los Angeles for 30 years, the last nine in Eagle Rock. It is shocking the failure to address the needs for unhoused, under-housed (where people are displaced and forced to live in places that cannot comfortably fit them) and for young people generally. There is nothing you don't know: the rents and prices to own are exceedingly high.</p> <p>The proposals you are pushing are a mess that will only make our current problems worse. Suspending the HAA, the Housing Element Law, the Density Bonus Law, the commercial-corridors upzoning laws, the parking-reductions-near-transit law, the 5-hearing limit and objective-standards definition of SB 330 are all NIMBY fantasies. Meanwhile you are decidedly avoiding actual solutions for the state to upzone, to remove CEQA barriers, or do anything</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

else to facilitate dense housing development in the safest parts of L.A. County.

The state itself will probably keep you from getting this NIMBY arrogance from happening. The insurance companies will surely reject it. There is no joy from me to side with insurance companies that are doing active damage to people who have lost their loved ones and homes. But you adding to the trauma by all but enforcing the longterm skyrocketing inflation that is undermining our great city is not acceptable.

Please consider these ideas that would help people whose houses were destroyed.

*Let people build and live in ADUs before main houses, so fire victims can get housed sooner.

* In non-very-high-fire-severity areas, streamline SB 9 lot splits to help people pay for rebuilding their houses.

*Remove design standards that delay permitting for main houses, ADUs, and SB 9 homes.

* Do keep safety standards, most obviously fire resistance but also earthquake protections in particular.

*Encourage and streamline use of density bonus, to get more desperately needed housing.

We cannot continue to lose citizens, most especially the lifeblood of Los Angeles for 150 years, the young aspirational people who set roots and move the dynamism of our city. Pricing working class and middle class families out of the county as a whole is a financial, electoral and spiritual disaster in the making. We are already in the process of losing four seats at minimum in Congress after 2030. I work in an entertainment business that is not only losing jobs hand over fist but in our Zoom era is all but guaranteeing that creatives and union workers both move away and stay away.

Urging you to take this opportunity to improve the lives of so many that have lost so much in this tragedy. Stop burying your heads in the sand. Build more housing - healthier, denser, environmentally improved, safer and yet more attractive aesthetically and for true diversity. We are in pain but doing just more of the same is a recipe for future disaster. We in Los Angeles have the keys to make America a far healthier, more wealthy and stronger country than ever before. People want to be here, to look to the future, to lead. Please gather a much better plan to get there quickly, with understanding and simply better than this proposal.

Sincerely,
Mitch Solomon



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	Qiao Lao	Don't throw up more obstacles to building. We need it fast more than ever.
	Rachel P Bracker-Naor	strongly oppose the proposal unless amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. We cannot undermine efforts to increase housing development at this critical time. Additionally, there should not be exceptions to laws preventing natural gas in homes. They pose a serious danger to individual and community health.
	Raquel Centeno	As a resident of Los Angeles, I am highly opposed to this proposal unless it can be amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. While I am sympathetic to the goals for disaster support within this proposal, ultimately it will undermine large scale efforts at increasing housing supply. We still need more housing development in LA County, especially after disasters like these fires when people need to find new homes. I will be incredibly disappointed if the Board does not amend this proposal to remove the exemptions outlined in item 30.
	Shaun Nestor	I strongly oppose the proposal unless amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. I work directly with housing providers on a daily basis with a mission of bring more housing online, and I have unique expertise related to holding costs for owners that will be stifled ultimately making housing unaffordable.
	Siem Yohanes	I strongly oppose the proposal unless amended to remove the requested exemptions from state law outlined in item 30. We cannot undermine efforts to increase housing development at this critical time.
	Xavier Alexis Rivas	While the motion by supervisors Hovath and Barger has many important fire rebuild related items, it also contains poison pills that will slow down permits across the board, including for the fire rebuild. At a time when speed of permits is critical, this motion includes a request to absolve the county from permit and housing accountability and allow the County to not follow state housing laws that streamline desperately needed housing and permits. Specifically, item 30 of the motion should be repealed or significantly modified. Now is a time to rise to the challenge to streamline permitting, not attempt to circumvent the few state laws that streamline permits. Now is a time when all LA County residents need more housing, and need all levels of government to focus on accelerating permitting of new housing, both in the fire impacted areas, and elsewhere. Failure to do so will only prolong the already dire housing shortage in LA County, and the state of California.
	Other	Joseph May
		We are in favor of agenda item 13-C, however we believe that there are a number of shortcomings in section 30 that will make rebuilding more difficult. This section should be removed from the Resolution until it can be modified to fix these issues

		Item Total	65	
Grand Total			65	

To the Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly express my deep disapproval for the proposals found in "Los Angeles County Recovery Efforts and Building Urgency into Implementation of Long-Term Disaster Support". In particular, I would like to focus on my Supervisor Kathryn Barger and ask to consider your constituents here.

I have lived in Los Angeles for 30 years, the last nine in Eagle Rock. It is shocking the failure to address the needs for unhoused, under-housed (where people are displaced and forced to live in places that cannot comfortably fit them) and for young people generally. There is nothing you don't know: the rents and prices to own are exceedingly high.

The proposals you are pushing are a mess that will only make our current problems worse. Suspending the HAA, the Housing Element Law, the Density Bonus Law, the commercial-corridors upzoning laws, the parking-reductions-near-transit law, the 5-hearing limit and objective-standards definition of SB 330 are all NIMBY fantasies. Meanwhile you are decidedly avoiding actual solutions for the state to upzone, to remove CEQA barriers, or do anything else to facilitate dense housing development in the safest parts of L.A. County.

The state itself will probably keep you from getting this NIMBY arrogance from happening. The insurance companies will surely reject it. There is no joy from me to side with insurance companies that are doing active damage to people who have lost their loved ones and homes. But you adding to the trauma by all but enforcing the longterm skyrocketing inflation that is undermining our great city is not acceptable.

Please consider these ideas that would help people whose houses were destroyed.

*Let people build and live in ADUs before main houses, so fire victims can get housed sooner.

* In non-very-high-fire-severity areas, streamline SB 9 lot splits to help people pay for rebuilding their houses.

*Remove design standards that delay permitting for main houses, ADUs, and SB 9 homes.

* Do keep safety standards, most obviously fire resistance but also earthquake protections in particular.

*Encourage and streamline use of density bonus, to get more desperately needed housing.

We cannot continue to lose citizens, most especially the lifeblood of Los Angeles for 150 years, the young aspirational people who set roots and move the dynamism of our city. Pricing working class and middle class families out of the county as a whole is a financial, electoral and spiritual disaster in the making. We are already in the process of losing four seats at minimum in Congress after 2030. I work in an entertainment business that is not only losing jobs hand over fist but in our Zoom era is all but guaranteeing that creatives and union workers both move away and stay away.

Urging you to take this opportunity to improve the lives of so many that have lost so much in this tragedy. Stop burying your heads in the sand. Build more housing - healthier, denser, environmentally improved, safer and yet more attractive aesthetically and for true diversity. We are in pain but doing just more of the same is a recipe for future disaster. We in Los Angeles have the keys to make America a far healthier, more wealthy and stronger country than ever before. People want to be here, to look to the future, to lead. Please gather a much better plan to get there quickly, with understanding and simply better than this proposal.

Sincerely,
Mitch Solomon



January 27, 2025

Supervisor Kathryn Barger
Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
500 West Temple Street, Room 383
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Subject: Opposition to Policies Hindering Development and Housing Growth in Los Angeles County – Response to "LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECOVERY EFFORTS AND BUILDING URGENCY INTO IMPLEMENTATION OF LONG-TERM DISASTER SUPPORT"

Dear Supervisors Barger and Horvath,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to any proposed policies or initiatives outlined in the "LOS ANGELES COUNTY RECOVERY EFFORTS AND BUILDING URGENCY INTO IMPLEMENTATION OF LONG-TERM DISASTER SUPPORT" document that may hinder the progress of much-needed housing development within Los Angeles County. We urge the Board of Supervisors to ensure that all efforts align with the County's long-term objectives of increasing housing supply and streamlining the development process, rather than creating obstacles that would delay or deter critical projects. It is imperative that the County remains steadfast in supporting both State and County housing goals to provide affordable and accessible housing for all residents.

As you are aware, Los Angeles County has made significant progress in addressing the housing crisis through innovative policies and proactive measures. It is disappointing to see proposals that may undermine these efforts, effectively rolling back years of dedicated work aimed at providing housing solutions for our communities. The need for expeditious rebuilding and development is critical, especially in the wake of recent disasters that have affected countless residents and businesses.

We firmly believe that all rebuilding projects should be fast-tracked and that, if the County cannot efficiently manage the workload, the use of qualified third-party plan checkers should be allowed to prevent unnecessary delays. Streamlining the permitting process is essential to ensuring that affected communities can rebuild and recover without undue hardship.

Additionally, we stress the importance of maintaining Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) commitments despite the recent fires in Altadena. The unfortunate occurrence of natural disasters should not be used as a justification to forgo the County's broader housing objectives and if anything, further amplifies the need for housing abundance.. Meeting RHNA targets is crucial to addressing the ongoing housing crisis, and we urge the County to remain committed to fulfilling these obligations.

Specifically, we oppose the requested waivers outlined in item 30 of the proposed motion, which seek to temporarily suspend critical housing development regulations, including:

- Suspension of SB35 and any other bills that reference SB35 such as SB9.
- Suspension of State Density Bonus Law/Government Code 65915
- Suspension of SB 330/Government Code section 66300/Housing Crisis Act of 2019
- Suspension of the obligation to fulfill any RHNA and extension of the Housing Element Annual Progress Report deadlines.
- Suspension of the 60-day timeframe for approving ADUs in fire-impacted communities.
- Suspension of Government Code sections 65852.24, 65912.100-65912.140, and 65913.11

Should any policies or actions be introduced that we believe would significantly impede housing development or limit the ability to rebuild efficiently, we will not hesitate to escalate our concerns to the Governor's office, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the Attorney General's Housing Strike Force, or pursue any legal means necessary, including initiating lawsuits. It is imperative that we work together to create a housing-friendly environment that prioritizes the needs of residents and the economic vitality of our region.

We appreciate your leadership and commitment to fostering sustainable growth and recovery in Los Angeles County. We urge you to consider the long-term implications of any decisions that could jeopardize our collective efforts to address the housing crisis effectively.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to your support in ensuring that Los Angeles County continues to prioritize and facilitate responsible housing development.

Sincerely,

Andrew Slocum,

Volunteer Lead

YIMBY Los Angeles



January 27, 2025

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
500 W. Temple Street, Room 383
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Oppose Sub-Item 30 in the [Barger/Horvath motion](#) on wildfire response (Item 13-C on 1/28/25 BOS Public Hearing agenda)

Dear Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors,

We write today to strenuously object to sub-item 30 in the [Barger/Horvath motion](#) on wildfire response (agenda item 13-C on the 1/28/25 BOS agenda). We appreciate the overarching aim of the Barger/Horvath motion to cut red tape in order to address public safety and health, repair infrastructure, and rebuild communities impacted by the wildfires. Now is indeed the time to move quickly to repair and rebuild. **However, we are dismayed by sub-item 30, which requests the state legislature to suspend a wide array of vitally important state housing laws for fire impacted areas. Such an action is completely counterproductive to the task of rebuilding fire impacted communities in a sustainable, equitable, and resilient manner.**

Among the state laws that sub-item 30 would suspend are: the Housing Crisis Act, which provides renters with a right to return; the State Density Bonus Program, which is one of California's important tools for delivering deed-restricted housing units; the Housing Accountability Act, which requires approval of projects that comply with zoning and objective standards; state laws that facilitate new housing in commercial and parking zones; and much more. The suspension of these laws would put renters at even greater risk during a housing

crisis exacerbated by the fire, bog down rebuilding efforts in expensive and risky discretionary processes, reduce the County's capacity to build badly needed housing, and make it more difficult for long-time residents of impacted communities to return.

We all wish that the wildfires hadn't raged through cherished historic communities, claiming lives and destroying homes. But attempting to freeze impacted communities in time will not help them rebuild. The truth is that some residents will not choose to return to communities like Altadena because of trauma associated with the fires or because they find it easier to build a life elsewhere. Some property owners will not be able to afford to rebuild given the costs of remediation, insurance, stricter building codes, etc., without being able to make greater use of their land. The next version of Altadena and other impacted communities will not look exactly like the version before the fires. But the exact built form of these communities is much less important than the people that make them so special. The state housing laws referenced in sub-item 30 are assets to the rebuilding process; they provide protections for renters and needed flexibility for property owners to build the next iteration of these treasured communities.

Rather than suspending state housing laws for fire impacted communities, the County should instead be looking for ways to facilitate residents' return and streamlining the production of infill development, particularly in more urbanized portions of impacted communities. One way to help defray the costs of rebuilding, while adding badly needed new housing would be to implement policies to facilitate lot splits allowed under SB9 and SB684/SB1123. Such policies can help displaced homeowners return to their communities by adding value to their land. More broadly, **it is absolutely critical that LA County do as much as possible to streamline housing production outside of high fire severity hazard zones.**

Specifically, we recommend the Board Supervisors to adopt the following broader reforms:

- Take emergency action to expedite and waive any discretionary review for rebuilding fire-affected homes, including ADUs, duplexes, and lot splits that are allowed by state laws such as SB 9 and SB 1123.
- Take emergency action to expedite and waive discretionary review for all multi-family housing not in fire hazard severity zones throughout the unincorporated County.
- Adopt procedures to allow for self-certification of certain permits and inspections both for rebuilding and for other housing projects.
- Hire or contract with third party permit engineers and inspectors to speed up housing development and rebuilding.
- Waive all fees associated with housing entitlement or permit applications.

Please reject sub-item 30 in agenda item 13-C, which would have a devastating impact on our ability to rebuild and make renters and homeowners whole. Thank you for your attention to this matter. We stand ready to work with you to design strategies that help the County rebuild in an equitable and resilient manner.

Sincerely,

Scott Epstein
Director of Policy and
Research
Abundant Housing LA



Michael Schneider
CEO
Streets For All

Mahdi Manji
Director of Public Policy
Inner City Law Center



Chris Rhie
Co-Lead
Urban Environmentalists LA

Andrea Swann
CEO
Southern California
Obtainable Housing

Zennon Ulyate-Crow
Chapter Leader
YIMBY Los Angeles

Leora Tanjuatco Ross
California Director
YIMBY Action

Rafa Sonnenfeld
Senior Manager
YIMBY Law

Joel John Roberts
CEO
PATH Ventures

Katie Hill
CEO
Union Station Homeless
Services

Los Angeles Housing Production Institute's comments on Section 30 of the Long Term Disaster Support Resolution (Agenda Matter 13-C).

We strongly support LA County working with the state to ensure that state law barriers are removed so that fire-damaged communities can quickly rebuild. However, the current proposed resolution contains some asks that would be counterproductive to this goal. We recommend that Section 30 be struck from the current resolution and reintroduced in the future after necessary modifications have been made.

Review of Specific Asks:

30 a) asks the state to exempt rebuilds from solar, battery storage, and all-electric requirements.

- We think this is reasonable to speed up reviews and lower rebuilding costs. The resolution proposes that applicants will be encouraged to voluntarily comply with these standards, and we support this.

30 c.i.) Asks to suspend SB35 and SB9 in Very High Fire Severity Zones.

- Others are incorrectly reporting that SB35 and SB9 already don't apply in VHFSZ's, but that is not correct.
- We think this is a reasonable ask

30 c.ii.) Asks to "extend the exemption for replacement housing" in SB35.

- We do not understand what this means. There do not appear to be any replacement housing requirements in SB35. Perhaps this was being confused with another law?

30 c.iii.) Asks to remove the requirement for public meetings for SB 423 projects in fire-impacted areas.

- We support this and believe that this is a good idea that will help speed up rebuilding that chooses to utilize SB35/SB423

30 d.i.) Asks to suspend Density Bonus law to allow for like-for-like rebuilds.

- We strongly oppose this. Nothing in Density Bonus law would prevent like-for-like rebuilds. DB is an optional program that developers can choose to opt into.

30 d.ii.) Asks to suspend ground floor commercial requirements in Density Bonus law (and other state-law rebuilds).

- We believe this was a drafting error, as there are no ground floor commercial requirements in Density Bonus law.

30 e.i.) Asks to suspend SB 330 for five years in fire-impacted communities.

- We believe that this is a very harmful ask. SB330 is a wide-ranging bill that covers a many topics. A blanket suspension of SB 330 would make rebuilding slower and more costly. If SB 330 is suspended, applicants would not be able to vest projects with a preliminary application and project approvals could be delayed indefinitely with no limit to the number of hearings

30 e.ii) Asks for local flexibility on objective design standards (requirements in SB 330) to retain the character of the community.

- While we understand the impulse behind this, we are concerned that allowing subjective design standards will make it harder and more time consuming to rebuild.

30 e.iii) Asks for “more flexibility in timing” of replacement units.

- We agree that it is important for the state to make changes to SB8/SB330 for fire-impacted rebuilding. For example, income determinations will be unnecessary and will slow down rebuilding.
- Our recommendation is that SB8 and the State Density Bonus replacement requirements should be replaced with a requirement that all tenants displaced by the fire have a right to return at their prior rental rate.

30 f.i.) Asks to suspend RHNA obligations for units that were allocated to fire-impacted areas.

- While we think some RHNA flexibility is warranted, and we support exempting entirely-VHFSZ cities like Malibu from RHNA completely, we believe that within unincorporated LA County, the county may be able to reallocate RHNA units from Altadena to elsewhere in the unincorporated County

30 f.ii.) Asks for a deadline extension for the 2024 RHNA progress report, and asks for a permanent later deadline for larger jurisdictions.

- We respect that a temporary extension may be necessary because of resource prioritization, however we oppose a permanent change to the deadline that would apply more broadly

30 g) Asks for a suspension of the 90 day deadline for approving ADUs in fire-impacted areas.

- This does not accurately reflect the current state law, which requires that ADUs be approved in 30 days, not 90 days.
- We oppose this ask.

30 h) Asks for a suspension of AB 2097 in fire-impacted areas.

- We strongly oppose suspending AB 2097 in fire-impacted areas
- However, it does not appear like any fire-impacted areas in Altadena are impacted by AB 2097 anyway

30 i) Asks to suspend the Housing Accountability Act in fire-impacted areas.

- We strongly oppose any suspension of the Housing Accountability Act, as doing so would slow down the rebuilding process

30 j) Asks to suspend no-net-loss provisions of 65863 for rebuilds on HE sites in fire-impacted areas.

- We support this ask. Complying with HE no-net-loss findings requirements could slow down rebuilding.
- However, we believe that the requirement to ensure adequate HE sites should be delayed rather than completely suspended.

30 k & l) Ask to suspend SB 6 and AB 2011 in fire-impacted areas

- We strongly oppose this ask.
- We do not believe that there are any good reasons to prohibit SB 6 and AB 2011 projects in fire-impacted areas that are not within a VHFSZ.

30 m) Asks to suspend 65913.11 in fire impacted communities.

- We strongly oppose this ask and believe that there is zero justification for it.

29 f) Asks to waive Housing Element minimum-density requirements for rebuilding projects

- We strongly support this and believe that it should be included in the letter to the state

- If someone wants to rebuild a single-family home, state law shouldn't force them to build an apartment building

United Neighbors is in complete support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, item 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.

The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and *preserving* community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.

We thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.

Maria Pavlou Kalban
Chair, United Neighbors

January 28, 2025

County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors
Agenda for January 28, 2025

RE: Agenda Item #13-C, items 29 and 30

I am in support of the Board of Supervisor's emergency motion, items 29 and 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, to request suspension of Builder's Remedy, and exemption of RHNA, and SB 35 requirements.

The RHNA mandate is required of cities in order to accommodate housing that the state supposedly needs. It was not intended to apply to cities that have lost massive amounts of housing due to a natural disaster. In an emergency, such as this, cities need the tools to rebuild their lost communities and stabilize the lives of its residents. This is not the time to punish them for not meeting state housing goals and allowing Builder's Remedy to apply. The rebuilding of whole communities and *preserving* community character is crucial for the residents who have lost everything. State laws should not hinder the process.

I thank the Supervisors for their support of these communities.

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

For identification purposes:
Neighborhood Council Valley Village, LUC Chair
Valley Village Residents Association, PLU Chair

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



CELEBRATING 20 YEARS OF SERVICE

Tony Braswell, President
Jake Yocham, Vice President
Dorothy Apple, Treasurer
Marc Woerschling, Secretary
Carol Kiernan Convey
Alice Hart
Ginny Hatfield
Sandy Hubbard
Suzanne Lewis
Ernie Mérian
John Moser
Jenna Powers
Christyn Saracino
Paulette Stokes
Maribel Ulloa-Garcia

**NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL
VALLEY VILLAGE**

P.O. Box 4703
Valley Village, CA 91617
www.myvalleyvillage.com

STUDENT COMMITTEE

Beckett Block
Christian Bryan
Adrien Faubert
Madeline Hookom
Alina Laaly
Nathan Minton
Dylan Reaves
Wyatt Wade
Jerry Yang

January 27, 2025

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
Submitted Comments
January 28 Meeting
Agenda Item #13-C, items 29 and 30

Dear Distinguished Supervisors:

The Board of Neighborhood Council Valley Village is an elected body within the City of Los Angeles that represents more than 25,000 stakeholders Valley Village, located in the Southeast San Fernando Valley.

We would like to express our support for the emergency motion in items 29 and 30 of the Recovery Ordinance, requesting suspension of Builder's Remedy and exemption of RHNA and SB 35 requirements.

As you know, the state's RHNA mandate is focused on increasing housing inventory in cities across the state. The legislation is not intended to apply to cities that have lost housing due to a natural disaster. In this current fire-related emergency declaration we feel strongly that new construction and greater density should not be used to meet state imposed RHNA goals. We urge you to support this emergency motion – and preserve character of the communities that have been devastated by the fires.

Thank you for your consideration of our request and your support for our stakeholders.

Sincerely,

Anthony J. Braswell
President NCVV

