

# Housing Element Rezoning Program: Citywide Housing Incentive Program 2024 Share Phase Outreach Summary



## Introduction

In March 2024, City Planning released several draft ordinances supporting the [Housing Element Rezoning Program](#) to commence the Share Phase of the adoption process. The proposed ordinances were informed by conversations with Angelenos throughout the Listen Phase of outreach. To learn more about the public engagement conducted during the Listen Phase, click [here](#) for the Listen Phase Outreach Summary. The ordinances include the Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) Ordinance, the Resident Protections Ordinance (RPO), the Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinance (HESMDO), and the Citywide Adaptive Reuse Ordinance (ARO). To learn more about the draft ordinances, visit our [webpage](#).



City Staff at Korean Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA) (5/2024)

In the Share Phase, City Planning released the draft ordinances and continued to receive feedback from Angelenos across the City. Specifically, staff engaged with interested parties by hosting live webinars, attending community events, distributing specialized LACP merchandise, launching a digital marketing campaign, and furthering partnerships with neighborhood groups and organizations. Additionally, City Planning met with local Community Based Organizations (CBOs) to amplify the voices of and gather feedback from those traditionally underrepresented in the planning process. This report provides a summary of the outreach and community engagement conducted with Angelenos during this Share Phase.

## Outreach and Engagement

Below is a summary of outreach activities conducted by City Planning to raise awareness of the three draft ordinances supporting the Housing Element Rezoning Program.



Part 1 video of a four part partnership between LACP and LA in a Minute (Posted on 3/18/24)

## Bilingual Webinars

After releasing the draft CHIP, Resident Protections, and Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinances, the City hosted interactive webinar events on the 2nd, 3rd, and 9th of April 2024 with just over 180 attendees. City Planning hosted one webinar designed for monolingual Spanish speakers and one webinar including live Korean translation. The webinars were conducted live on Zoom and the recordings were posted on the Department's [website](#) with the corresponding presentation slides for those unable to attend.

During the webinars, City Planning staff gave three presentations for each of the three draft ordinances. In the CHIP Ordinance presentation, City Staff provided background on the Housing Element Rezoning Program, a summary of the Listen Phase, and an overview of the CHIP programs. During the Resident Protections and Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinance presentations, attendees were provided with background information and an overview of the ordinances. A live Q&A session followed each presentation.



City Staff at Esperanza Community Housing Corporation (4/2024)

## Community-Based Organization (CBO) Partnerships

In Fall 2023, City Planning used [Regional Early Action Planning \(REAP\) Grant](#) funds from the Southern California Association of Governments to partner with CBOs for outreach efforts. The funding enabled City Planning to directly reimburse partners for providing translation services, transportation, childcare, and meals at outreach events where City Staff and CBO partners led attendees in interactive feedback sessions on the concepts associated with the CHIP. Due to the program's success, the City continued working with selected CBOs following the release of the draft Rezoning Program ordinances in Spring 2024.



City Staff at Esperanza Community Housing Corporation (4/2024)

Public engagement through CBO partnerships in Spring 2024 was geared towards gathering input on details of the draft ordinances. City Planning partnered with CBOs that advocate for communities historically underrepresented in the planning process. A list of CBOs we partnered with to coordinate events and associated event descriptions can be found in Appendix 1.1. At each event, attendees received a tote bag filled with specialized LACP merchandise including bandanas, postcards, magnets, water

bottles, and fact sheets. Across the five organizations the City met with, over 340 Angelenos were engaged through these collaborative CBO events. The American Planning Association Los Angeles Chapter recognized City Planning with an award of excellence in Public Outreach for this initiative.

### Meetings with Interested Parties

City Planning met with interested parties, including Neighborhood Councils and professional associations, upon request to answer questions on the ordinance through visual and verbal presentations followed by focused Q+A feedback sessions. Appendix 1.2 lists key groups and organizations that the City met with to present the ordinance and discuss feedback.



City Staff at AHLA Eastside membership meeting (4/2024)

### Community Events

City Planning additionally conducted outreach at CicLAvia Melrose and CicLAvia Venice during this period, offering resources on the ordinance, answering questions, and engaging an approximate total of 300 Angelenos. For each event, specialized LACP merchandise was distributed to participating members. The list of community events we attended during the Share Phase can be found in Appendix 1.3.



Merchandise Bags Offered at Community Events

### Digital Marketing Campaign

To get the word out on the draft CHIP Ordinance, City Planning launched a comprehensive digital outreach campaign including social media partnerships, boosted advertisements, and targeted social media posts. In particular, in a first for City Planning engagement, the Department partnered with a social media account, LA in a Minute, to make four videos breaking down the key concepts of the CHIP ordinance. LA in a Minute focuses on providing short and informative videos ranging from the history of Los Angeles to current events and notable places within the City. This partnership aimed to reach an audience that might otherwise be missed through traditional outreach channels, such as subscriber newsletters and neighborhood council meetings. As of this report's release, four videos have received just over 166k views. See Appendix 1.4 for a description and watchable link for each video. Moreover, the City released its *Let's Talk About the Citywide Housing Incentive Program* series. This series informed Angelenos on the CHIP strategies through informational slideshows. The slideshows were published in English and Spanish on the Department's social media accounts and can be viewed in Appendix 1.5. As of this report's release, three posts from the *Let's Talk About the*

*Citywide Housing Incentive Program* series have garnered over 330 interactions. Overall, by extending the Department's online reach, City Planning welcomed greater engagement and encouraged feedback from groups that have not previously participated in traditional outreach activities.

## **What We Heard - Summary of Input and Themes**

Below is a summary of what City Planning has heard thus far throughout the initial Share Phase for the CHIP, RPO and HESMDO. This summary was compiled based on feedback gathered from the previously described outreach activities as well as from just over 200 comments gathered via email and an open Google form on the City Planning website's Concept Explorer. Throughout this phase of outreach, staff also fielded inquiries from constituents through email and scheduled calls with members of the public as needed to answer questions and discuss concerns about the ordinances. Within the comments and feedback, the following common themes emerged.

- **Advance Equity in Housing**
- **Protect Vulnerable Populations and Neighborhoods**
- **Expand Affordability**
- **Environmental Considerations**
- **Location and Typology of Development**
- **Technical Revisions**
- **Enhance Design**

In Appendix 1.6, comments are grouped by the themes expressed by outreach participants. Some of the comments touch on multiple themes and are included more than once. This valuable input has and will continue to help to guide the draft of the Rezoning Program Ordinances.

### **Advance Equity in Housing**

Throughout the Share Phase, City Planning received feedback that Angelenos wanted to ensure the CHIP would advance equity in housing, advocating for maximizing affordable housing in higher opportunity areas with access to jobs, transit, and quality amenities. Additionally, comments suggested offering rent-to-own opportunities to facilitate equity and economic mobility. To further advance equity in housing, Angelenos supported prioritizing Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) objectives and undoing patterns of segregation. Comments called for expanding the eligibility of CHIP incentives in Higher Resource Areas, including in single family zones and Historic Areas, to create equitable citywide access to covenanted affordable housing.

## Protect Vulnerable Populations and Neighborhoods

Feedback raised concern that development could lead to increased rents and the displacement of low-income residents and other vulnerable populations. To combat this, comments suggested strengthening the Resident Protections Ordinance by requiring increased affordability, raising replacement requirements for Rent Stabilized units, strengthening a tenant's right to return, and giving displaced tenants choice when finding replacement housing. Participants emphasized the need to further engage with neighborhoods to discuss their unique input to ensure the Rezoning Program is effective and achieves its intended goals. Through increased engagement in this phase, the City heard specific suggestions that could aid seniors and individuals experiencing displacement pressures through the creation of specific incentives, design standards, or public benefit options that protect these populations. Additionally, comments were raised about the need to require community input during the development review process to ensure a project meets the community's needs. The City also heard concerns regarding access to Affordable Units in mixed-income projects, and application processes for Affordable Units. Feedback focused on the need for stronger marketing and outreach for these units, including working with CBOs and providing multilingual resources. Overall, Angelenos believe that increased outreach and public engagement can lead to desirable outcomes that actively reflect the needs of the community.

## Expand Affordability

City Planning heard a range of comments regarding the level of affordability for new housing developments. Angelenos advocated for increased affordability requirements for housing developments and deeper affordability levels in new affordable housing stock by including Acutely Low Income (ALI) as an income category when applying affordability and replacement requirements. Some feedback also recommended defaulting to Extremely Low Income (ELI) in certain replacement requirement scenarios. There was interest in expanding the City's affordable housing stock by counting replacement units in addition to affordable set aside requirements. There was also an interest in increasing middle income affordability for Moderate Income and Above Moderate Income Households. In particular, many advocated to further increase affordability requirements in areas experiencing gentrification and displacement pressures. While there was strong support for 99-year affordability covenants and even some interest in extending this affordability term longer, some concern was also expressed regarding the potential impact of longer covenant terms on the financial feasibility of new housing developments. Many also expressed a desire to see more mixed affordability in projects compared to seeing a single affordability category. However, some outreach participants believed the overall increase in housing, such as market-rate housing, should be prioritized over affordable housing. These participants believe that increasing the overall supply of housing will bring down rent prices as opposed to increasing affordable housing which is challenging to build. Lastly, some individuals were concerned that current market conditions, such as rising interest rates and building costs, would hinder the overall development of restricted affordable housing.

## Environmental Considerations

As the CHIP aims to increase affordable housing development and streamline development, many Angelenos and CBOs stressed that new development prioritizes health, safety, and environmental justice. This includes both protecting current environmental assets, especially open space in underserved communities, and preventing development from occurring on irremediable contaminated sites that pose hazards to human health. Groups like Esperanza Community Housing and Communities for a Community Better Environment (CBE) advocated for increased outreach with community members as they are most knowledgeable in identifying sites with previously hazardous use. These groups, like many other Angelenos, advocated to require public participation in the identification of environmentally hazardous sites. Additionally, these groups, alongside many other Angelenos, suggested excluding projects that are within a certain distance of an oil well from eligibility in the incentive programs, and ensuring the soil is tested for contamination and remediation for potential sites. Overall, comments received expressed the need to balance streamlining and strong environmental protections.

## Location and Typology of Development

Angelenos generally supported the increased development of affordable housing in Los Angeles, but there were varying ideas on where it should be developed. Many wanted to increase housing near transit and supported the Transit-Oriented Incentive Areas which codifies key elements of the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Affordable Housing Incentive Guidelines. Additionally, feedback received supported multi-family, mixed-use projects in Opportunity Corridor Incentive Areas and low-scale, missing middle typologies in Opportunity Corridor Transition Areas. Participants wanted to see multi-family projects on corridors and low-scale projects behind the corridors to provide a transition in terms of building scale, massing, and density. Commenters asked that the Corridor transition buffer be expanded, intensified, and applicable to single-family homes to permit more housing near transit corridors. However, some opposed development beyond the corridors and in single-family zones and only wanted increased housing capacity on identified Opportunity Corridors. Those who opposed development beyond the corridors and in single-family zones believed increased density would negatively impact key infrastructure such as open space, parking, roads, utilities, and schools.

## Technical Revisions

City Planning received recommendations for technical revisions to incentives from leading professionals and organizations in housing development. Some provided specific suggested revisions such as revising Site Plan Review thresholds and adopting a more permissive "Modification of Development Standard" incentive. Comments raised concerns regarding the prioritization of one to two-bedroom units in current developments and wished to see more incentives for multi-bedroom and family-sized units. Additionally, there were suggestions to tailor incentives to be better suited to smaller developers or mom-and-pop owners, smaller site development, and expand public benefit options to include Elder Care Sites and Affordable



Retail Spaces. Due to overall support in expedited and process-streamlined projects, participants expressed a desire for fewer waivers to undergo discretionary review and elimination of appeal procedures. Numerous Neighborhood Councils requested that time of ownership requirements be introduced into FBO incentives.

## Enhance Design

Generally, comments showed support for streamlined procedures and waivers; however, many Angelenos wanted to balance procedural changes with desirable design features. Many emphasized the need for ample parking, more open space, green space, and appealing housing developments that fit the context of the neighborhood. Including a desire for the protection and preservation of historical homes and buildings. A common theme heard both in this phase was the demand for designing for vulnerable populations through ADA accessibility and family-sized, multi-bedroom units. Generally, feedback received supported the increased density of projects but wanted to ensure these desirable design features were not lost, but other comments expressed concern that design could be used to limit development and access to opportunity. Commenters desired the removal of design limitations to make building housing more permissive in high opportunity areas.

## Next Steps

City Staff has released revised drafts of the CHIP, Resident Protections and Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinances based on feedback heard throughout the Share phase. The city is committed to continuing the engagement throughout the adoption process and members of the public are encouraged to review and provide written comments to [housingelement@lacity.org](mailto:housingelement@lacity.org). As a reminder, the Public Comment Period for this effort will close on Thursday, August 1, 2024. For more information on the Rezoning Program and the next phase of outreach, please click [here](#).

## Appendix

### 1.1 Community Based Organizations City Planning Staff Partnered With

Organization Name and Event Summary	Attendees	Date
<p><b>LA Forward</b></p> <p>LACP virtually presented concepts from the CHIP ordinance most relevant to the San Fernando Valley (SFV) at LA Forward’s SFV Community Convening &amp; Housing Ordinance Feedback Session.</p>	21	4/10/24
<p><b>Esperanza Community Housing Corporation</b></p> <p>LACP met with Esperanza at Mercado La Paloma to present CHIP and RPO concepts and engage in breakout activities in English and Spanish.</p>	30	4/17/24
<p><b>The Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA)</b></p> <p>LACP presented the draft CHIP and Resident Protections Ordinances and answered questions through a breakout group discussion in English and Spanish.</p>	60	4/24/24
<p><b>Abundant Housing LA (AHLA)</b></p> <p>LACP presented key concepts of the draft CHIP and Resident Protections Ordinances held in-depth breakout discussions in English and Spanish with AHLA’s Eastside membership meeting at the El Sereno Branch Library.</p>	16	4/27/24
<p><b>Korean Immigrant Workers Alliance (KIWA)</b></p> <p>LACP presented the draft CHIP, Resident Protections, and Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinances and facilitated a breakout group feedback session in Korean, English, and Spanish.</p>	217	5/4/24

## 1.2 Interested Parties City Planning Staff Engaged With

<b>Organization Name</b> <i>Note: The meetings below involved in person and virtual presentations by city staff followed by a Q&amp;A session.</i>	Attendees	Date
Los Angeles Business Council (LABC)	15	3/20/24
Alliance for Community Transit-Los Angeles (ACT-LA): Leadership of coalition members such as SAGE, KIWA, Esperanza	21	4/2/24
PlanCheck NC LA	60	4/13/24
Westside Regional Alliance of Council (WRAC) Land Use and Planning Commission	21	5/13/24
The American Institute of Architects (AIA) and Urban Land Institute (ULI)	32	5/15/24
San Pedro Joint Land Use and Planning Commission	11	5/22/24
Building Industry Association of Southern California (BIASC)	6	5/15/24
Central City Association of Los Angeles (CCA) Housing Land Use & Development Committee	15	5/29/24
Valley Industry and Commerce Association (VICA) Land Use Committee	15	6/11/24

### 1.3 Community Events City Planning Staff Attended

Event Name	Attendees	Date
CicLAvia Melrose	200	2/25/24
CicLAvia Venice	100	4/21/24

## 1.4 Videos from the LA in a Minute and Department Partnership

<b>Episode Name</b> <i>Note: The following statistics are sourced from Instagram and are up to date as of this report's release. Please be aware that Episode 4 was released less than 24 hours prior to the release of this report. The links provided will take you to Instagram.</i>	<b>Date Published</b>
<p><b><u><a href="#">Episode 1: Housing in LA Today</a></u></b></p> <p>Episode 1 provided the foundation for the series, informing others on the housing affordability crisis in Los Angeles.</p> <p>78.4K views   3,071 Likes   328 comments   716 shares</p>	<p><b>3/18/24</b></p>
<p><b><u><a href="#">Episode 2: Opportunity Corridors</a></u></b></p> <p>Episode 2 introduced individuals to the Opportunity Corridor program.</p> <p>32.4K views   675 Likes   83 comments   82 shares</p>	<p><b>4/23/24</b></p>
<p><b><u><a href="#">Episode 3: The Missing Middle</a></u></b></p> <p>Episode 3 discussed the history of low-scale, missing middle housing typologies in Los Angeles and how the CHIP plans to facilitate development.</p> <p>38.6K views   1,676 Likes   91 comments   352 shares</p>	<p><b>6/19/24</b></p>
<p><b><u><a href="#">Episode 4: Affordable Housing in LA</a></u></b></p> <p>Episode 4 focused on the Affordable Housing Incentive Program and how it would increase housing supply for all Angelenos.</p> <p>17.4K views   684 Likes   57 comments   78 shares</p>	<p><b>6/26/24</b></p>

## 1.5 Let's Talk about the Citywide Housing Incentive Program Series

<b>Episode Name</b> <i>Note: This series was posted on the Department's social media accounts including <a href="#">Instagram</a>, <a href="#">Facebook</a>, and <a href="#">X</a>. The links below will direct you to Instagram.</i>	<b>Date Published</b>
<b>Topic 1: What is the Housing Situation in Los Angeles?</b>  <a href="#">English</a> : 81 Likes   3 comments   16 shares   18 bookmarks <a href="#">Spanish</a> : 17 Likes   2 comments	<p style="text-align: center;">4/1/24 (English)</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4/23/24 (Spanish)</p>
<b>Topic 2: What are Opportunity Corridors?</b>  <a href="#">English</a> : 65 Likes   3 comments   29 shares   15 bookmarks <a href="#">Spanish</a> : 8 Likes   1 share	<p style="text-align: center;">4/25/24 (English)</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6/12/24 (Spanish)</p>
<b>Topic 3: What is the Opportunity Corridor Transition Area?</b>  <a href="#">English</a> : 57 Likes   2 comments   14 shares   8 bookmarks	<p style="text-align: center;">6/12/24 (English)</p>
<b>Topic 4: What is the Affordable Housing Incentive Program?</b>  <i>Access to the Instagram post will be available after 7/1/24.</i>	<p style="text-align: center;">7/1/24</p>

## 1.6 Public Comment

### ADVANCE EQUITY IN HOUSING

- Include single family zones in all strategies, but particularly in AHIP and Corridor Transition Areas
- Support for affordable housing in high opportunity areas
- Concern that the plan falls short of affirmatively furthering fair housing and undoing patterns of segregation
- Desire for rent to own properties and more typologies designed for ownership
- Concern that there will be inequitable access to affordable housing due to discrimination and racism
- Support for maintaining compliance with the state to prevent fines and builder's remedy
- Concern that Historic Areas are inaccessible

### PROTECT VULNERABLE POPULATIONS & NEIGHBORHOODS

- Support for higher replacement requirements (2:1 for demolished RSO units),
- Desire to strengthen a tenant's right to return to a comparable unit, meaning equivalent in size, bedroom count, and bathroom count. Goal of preventing the loss of family sized units
- Interest in giving displaced tenants a choice to find replacement housing within their community or a neighborhood of their choosing
- Desire to protect the housing status of elderly residents through the creation of specific incentives, design standards, and public benefit options
- Concern that more development will lead to displacement and increased rents for current low-income residents
- Desire for further engagement with neighborhoods be conducted to ensure the Ordinance is effective and achieves the intended goals
- Interest in requiring community input in the development process to ensure a project meets the community's needs
- Concern regarding access to newly created Affordable units in the Affordable and Accessible Housing Registry and desire for streamlined and low-barrier application processes for Affordable units
- Desire for stronger marketing and outreach requirements for Affordable Units in mixed-income projects, including working with CBOs and providing multilingual resources

### EXPAND AFFORDABILITY

- Support for creating deeper affordability in new affordable housing stock by including Acutely Low Income as a category in affordability requirements, assuming Extremely Low Income in certain replacement scenarios, and expanding incentives for lower income levels

- Support for expanding affordable housing stock by increasing replacement requirements and counting replacement units in addition to affordable set aside requirements
- Interest in more Moderate and Above Moderate middle income affordability
- Desire for more mixed affordability in projects
- General support for increasing the supply of affordable housing and maximizing incentives for affordable housing
- Requests for increased affordability requirements in areas experiencing gentrification and displacement pressure
- Desire for better advertising and local preference for affordable housing units
- Desire to prioritize the development of market rate units over affordable housing
- Concern that current market conditions will hinder development
- Support for 99-year affordability covenants, including some support for extending covenant affordability even further to 'in perpetuity'
- Some concern regarding the financial feasibility of longer affordability covenants

## **ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- Support of site exclusions from incentive eligibility due to environmental hazards
- Desire to exclude projects within 3200 feet of oil wells
- Desire to require public participation in the identification of environmentally hazardous sites
- Support for robust environmental study and public participation before approving projects on sites with heightened environmental justice concerns
- Recommendations for Phase I and Phase II assessments of environmentally sensitive sites
- Desire to protect current environmental assets, especially in environmentally sensitive areas
- Desire to prevent development on irremediable contaminated sites
- Interest in balancing streamlining with strong environmental protections

## **LOCATION & TYPOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT**

- Desire to expand and intensify the Opportunity Corridor Transition Area buffer zone
- Support for Opportunity Corridor and Transit-Oriented Incentive Areas
- Opposition and support for development in single family zones
- General support of more development and increasing housing stock
- Concerns of increased density in residential neighborhoods and resulting impact on infrastructure
- Support for missing middle typologies
- Desire to expand Opportunity Corridor requirements so that more corridors are eligible

## **TECHNICAL REVISIONS**

- Desire for more streamlining including through a Site Plan Review Amendment
- Support for a more permissive "Modification of Development Standard" incentive

- Interest in providing more family units or multi-bedroom units through incentives
- Desire to expand public benefit options to include Elder Care Sites and Affordable Retail Spaces
- Support for incentives better suited to smaller developers
- Interest in facilitating small site development and subdivision
- Desire for fewer waivers required to undergo discretionary review
- Requests to introduce time of ownership requirements in FBO incentives
- Concern about the definition of transit lines and frequency of transit on identified Corridors

## **ENHANCE DESIGN**

- Desire for more open space/ green space requirements
- Concern for mature tree canopy preservation
- Support of mixed-use developments on commercial corridors with access to grocery stores, shops, amenities, and jobs within the development
- Support for the building of more accessible housing
- Support for ensuring well-designed and appealing housing developments that fit the context of the neighborhood
- Support for the protection of historical districts
- Concern that design limitations can be exclusionary and limit development
- Interest in more parking requirements