



BOB BLUMENFIELD

Councilmember, Third District

December 9, 2025

Re: Proposed Project at the Woodland Hills Country Club

Dear Neighbor:

There are few issues that can bring a community closer together than development, especially when a proposed project is in an environmentally sensitive area and can significantly alter the fabric of a neighborhood. An application of this magnitude was recently submitted for a high-density multi-family project to be located on the property currently owned by the Woodland Hills Country Club. This project has raised many concerns in the community, and I want to be clear about where I stand.

In short, this proposed project takes advantage of new state laws that may have made it impossible to get proper environmental review and community input. It is deeply concerning that these changes, which could affect our district and many areas throughout the City and State, have happened with little scrutiny or local awareness.

My office was approached by the owners of this site years ago to request my support for various necessary entitlements needed for a large scale project like this. At that time, the project needed a zone change and general plan amendment, among other accommodations. I refused to support it flat out, because this is the sort of project that needs a full public vetting process. Just recently, I found out that the developer is now attempting to use newly passed State laws to obtain streamlined approvals for the project ministerially, meaning the City would have no discretion to review the project, no authority to require CEQA and that the project would not be appealable by the community or my office.

As shocking as it sounds, this is what seems to be happening. The state bill being used is AB 2011, which was amended by AB 2243 and AB 893. In a nutshell, AB 2011 allows high density multi-family projects ministerially along commercial corridors. The subsequent bills which amended the underlying bill were signed by the Governor just a few weeks ago in October. These bills redefined specific terms and aspects of AB 2011. These changes include:

- Defining a commercial corridor in an overly broad way that includes Canoga Avenue along which the Woodland Hills Golf Course sits.
- Removing the protections afforded in specific plans that are over 25 years old, effectively circumventing the goals and requirements of the Mulholland Scenic Parkway Specific Plan and the Girard Tract Specific Plan.

- Creating a loophole in single family zoning by allowing that zoning to be ignored as long as parking is a permitted use which, of course, applies in the case of the golf course.

Here is what AB 2011, AB 2243, AB 893 specifically enables:

- Projects may be located in single-family zones as long as they meet all other eligibility criteria. In Los Angeles, parking is allowed in single-family zones with an approved Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Because AB 2011 permits these projects on sites where parking is allowed as a principally permitted use—even if a CUP is required—projects can proceed in single-family zones.
- Allows sites that are less than 20 acres or less to take advantage of AB 2011, because even if a site is greater than 20 acres, only the part of the site where the project is located counts toward the 20 acres.
- If the project site is in a Specific Plan that does not allow multi-family housing, then the site is not eligible for this State Bill. However, if the Specific Plan is over 25 years old then this eligibility criteria does not apply.
- Very High Fire Severity Zone limitations only apply if the site is vacant. Planning staff will determine whether the site meets the definition of “vacant” per the State law.
- Projects may be able to use the closest, most intense density. In this case, the closest most intense density is C1.
- Commercial Corridor is defined by width of street, not the zone, uses, or existing conditions.

I fully support multi-family housing, and I have supported affordable housing and permanent supportive housing sites in each community in my district. I also think that the stated intention of AB 2011, to streamline development along commercial corridors is a good one. Building dense housing in appropriate locations is why I fought so hard to get the Warner Center 2035 Specific Plan through- so we have a designated urban commercial core where large scale developments like this are welcome and approved through a simple administrative clearance process. But, even the Warner Center was required to develop a full EIR - even if individual projects were not.

I can't help but feel as if the developer went behind our backs to Sacramento to forge the path they wanted. They seem to have lobbied Sacramento to surgically amend bills to avoid public and environmental scrutiny and get their project approved 'by right' pursuant to newly enacted State law. The amendments that were written fit this project like a glove, and the changes almost feel as if they were written with this project in mind. Wittingly or unwittingly, State legislators voted for an extreme measure that takes away local control around development and in this specific case eliminates local discretion for this massive project. While these bills were not as highly publicized as SB 79, the net effect is arguably bigger than SB 79. I fear the impacts of these bills may not have been known by everyone in the State legislature when they were adopted.

While there are specific criteria that must be met to use AB 2011 and the developer's application is currently under review with the City Planning Department to make sure these criteria are

being met, there is not a mechanism for discretionary review. This is especially concerning given that the project is in a Very High Fire Severity Zone.

If the interpretation of these bills is as bad as we fear, the application could be deemed complete in a few days. And then further approvals would be fast tracked with little to no ability for input or amendments. While I am shocked that this could be the reality for this site, I believe it is important to share the truth as we understand it.

This week I will introduce a motion seeking clarity from the City's land use experts and attorneys to officially answer all the questions about this application. While I fear the worst, **if there is a way to get the public input, and CEQA review that a project of this size should be required to do, I will pursue it.**

As more clarity and information become available, I will continue to share updates with you. Serving you and providing the highest level of constituent service is my top priority as a City Councilmember. You can contact my Planning Director Elizabeth Ene at elizabeth.ene@lacity.org with any questions or concerns about this location and proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bob Blumenfeld". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

BOB BLUMENFIELD
Council President Pro-Tempore
City of Los Angeles

BB:ee