

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Craig

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 10:03 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Planning Commission President Lawshe and Members of the City Planning Commission: I am writing to oppose the provision within the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance) that would reduce required side and rear yard setbacks. While we recognize the City's obligation to comply with state law, reducing rear and side yard setbacks to four feet is neither required nor necessary to achieve SB 79's housing density. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79's development objectives. These recommended reductions maximize lot coverage at the expense of basic protections. The Planning Department's responsibility is to safeguard public well-being and neighborhood safety and stability—not to facilitate development patterns that undermine them. Reducing setbacks to four feet would have several serious negative impacts:

- ? Solar access: Greater than 2 story structures such as apartment buildings right next to single family homes will likely block sunlight to homes sitting in the shadow of such a large building. Many SFH have rooftop solar installed at significant up front cost, with the expectation such systems will produce power and offset their monthly energy costs. Still others also have battery backup connected to their solar array to maintain power during power outages. Shading such arrays unfairly denies such homeowners access to the sunlight needed to power these arrays. Reducing the setback only makes this problem more difficult to resolve.
- ? Fire safety: In a city where wind-driven fires are always a possibility, it is unconscionable that a four-foot rear and side setback are being recommended. Four-foot separations limit defensible space between structures, increasing the risk of fire spread and constrains the emergency access for firefighting equipment.
- ? Earthquakes, mudslides and rescue operations: A minimum five-foot setback is required to allow for a bobcat / small tractor to access the sides and rear of properties. (Ultra compact bobcats are not sufficient to meet public safety and rescue needs.)
- ? Urban tree canopy and environmental health: Approximately 90% of the City's tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within four-foot setbacks which due to exiting criteria must be paved. The size of the building and the hardscape around it will contribute to the urban

heat island effect, resulting in higher temperatures. ? Private open space and quality of life: In a climate that supports year-round outdoor living, reducing adjacent apartment house setbacks will unnecessarily diminish quality of life for all residents. These are not abstract planning considerations; they directly affect how residents live day to day. While we appreciate the proposal to maintain 15-foot front yard setbacks, this does not address the areas of greatest impact. Front yards already benefit from the buffer of streets and sidewalks. The most significant points of interface between new development and existing homes occur along rear and side property lines—precisely where the greatest reductions are proposed. These reduced setbacks are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and five-foot side yards in multi-family zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. The department's reliance on Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) standards to justify 4 ft setbacks is misplaced. ADUs are intended as small, secondary units—not multi-family buildings with substantially greater occupancy, intensity, and risk. The proposed reduction ignores the fact that many neighborhoods are park poor and lack access to open space for residents. We also wish to express concern regarding the lack of direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. This absence of transparency undermines public trust in the planning process. The City must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. Finally, we request this SB 79 implementation ordinance be expressly tied to, and automatically updated and/or rescinded to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, Craig Rich  
CD5, 90064

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Christopher Oldre

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 10:06 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Sirs and Mesdames: I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance): 1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. Such reductions are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. Serious negative impacts will result from such reduction: Fire safety: the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts. Urban tree canopy and environmental health: approximately 90% of the city’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to “exiting” criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures. Open space and quality of life: private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. 2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened. 3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, Christopher Oldre 11154 Montana Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90049

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Ann Grasmick

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 11:04 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Sirs and Mesdames: I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance): 1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. Such reductions are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. Serious negative impacts will result from such reduction: Fire safety: the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts. Urban tree canopy and environmental health: approximately 90% of the city’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to “exiting” criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures. Open space and quality of life: private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. 2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened. 3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, Ann Grasmick Denslow Ave

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 11:40 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Sirs and Mesdames: I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance): 1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. Such reductions are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. Serious negative impacts will result from such reduction: Fire safety: the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts. Urban tree canopy and environmental health: approximately 90% of the city’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to “exiting” criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures. Open space and quality of life: private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. 2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened. 3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration. LN Dalkeith Avenue, Los Angeles

## Communication from Public

**Name:**

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 11:41 AM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Sirs and Mesdames: I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance): 1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. Such reductions are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. Serious negative impacts will result from such reduction: Fire safety: the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts. Urban tree canopy and environmental health: approximately 90% of the city’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to “exiting” criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures. Open space and quality of life: private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. 2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened. 3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Tina Gittelson

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 12:12 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Council Members: I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance): 1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. Such reductions are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. Serious negative impacts will result from such reduction: Fire safety: the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts. Urban tree canopy and environmental health: approximately 90% of the city’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to “exiting” criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures. Open space and quality of life: private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. 2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened. 3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, Tina Gittelson Westwood Hills

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Debbie Nussbaum

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 03:50 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Subject: OPPOSE Planning Dept. Recommendation to CPC-2026-1797-CA / Low Rise Ordinance Dear Sirs and Mesdames: I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance):

1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet.
  - Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives.
  - Such reductions are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4.
  - Serious negative impacts will result from such reduction:
    - o Fire safety: the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts.
    - o Urban tree canopy and environmental health: approximately 90% of the city’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to “exiting” criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures.
    - o Open space and quality of life: private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. The City doesn’t have enough local parks for residents to enjoy open space and recreation. Reducing rear yard setbacks makes the lack of local parks even more problematic and antifamily.
2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened.
3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79.

Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, Debbie Nussbaum - President- Westwood Hills Property Owners Association (WHPOA) Howard Nussbaum 516 Cashmere Terrace Los Angeles, CA 90049 CD5

**Subject: OPPOSE Planning Dept. Recommendation to CPC-2026-1797-CA / Low Rise Ordinance**

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

I am writing with the following comments on the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance):

**1. Setbacks – I OPPOSE reduction** in required side and rear yard setbacks to only 4 feet.

- Available studies indicate that **maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79's** development objectives.
- Such reductions are **inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC)** standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and 5-foot side yards in multifamily zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4.
- **Serious negative impacts** will result from such reduction:
  - **Fire safety:** the proposed 4-foot separations limit defensible space between buildings, increasing risk of fire spread and impeding fire-fighting efforts.
  - **Urban tree canopy and environmental health:** approximately 90% of the city's tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within the 4-foot setback, which due to "exiting" criteria must be paved — leading to an urban heat island effect with higher temperatures.
  - **Open space and quality of life:** private open space is a critical element in overall climate control and quality of life for all residents, especially given the paucity of public open space. The City doesn't have enough local parks for residents to enjoy open space and recreation. Reducing rear yard setbacks makes the lack of local parks even more problematic and antifamily.

**2. Notification – REQUIRE direct public notification** to affected property owners and residents. The city must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. The absence of transparency undermines public trust, which is already seriously weakened.

**3. Future Implementation – TIE implementation** to future changes: this SB 79 implementation ordinance must be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Debbie Nussbaum - President- Westwood Hills Property Owners Association (WHPOA)  
Howard Nussbaum  
516 Cashmere Terrace  
Los Angeles, CA 90049  
CD5

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Brad Kane

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 04:15 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** May 11, 2026 Re: SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance) Opposition to Reduced Backyard Setbacks Request For Greater Public Notification / Participation CF 25-1083 CPC-2026-1797-CA Dear City Planning Commission President Lawshe and Members of the City Planning Commission: The South Carthay Neighborhood Association (“SCN”) strongly opposes the provision within the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance) that would reduce required side and rear yard setbacks. While the City is obligated to comply with state law, reducing rear and side yard setbacks to four feet is neither required nor necessary to achieve SB 79’s housing density. Similarly, maintenance of existing 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. These recommended reductions maximize lot coverage at the expense of basic health and safety protections. The Planning Department’s responsibility is to safeguard public health and safety, including fire safety, climate resilience, and quality of life—not to facilitate development patterns that undermine them. Reducing setbacks to four feet would have several serious negative impacts:

- Fire safety: In a city where wind-driven fires are always a possibility, it is unconscionable that a four-foot rear and side setback are being recommended. Four-foot separations limit defensible space between structures, increasing the risk of fire spread and constrains the emergency access for firefighting equipment.
- Urban tree canopy and environmental health: Approximately 90% of the City’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within four-foot setbacks which due to "exiting" criteria must be paved. The size of the building and the hardscape around it will contribute to the urban heat island effect, resulting in higher temperatures.
- Private open space and quality of life: In a climate that supports year-round outdoor living, reducing adjacent apartment house setbacks will unnecessarily diminish quality of life for all residents. These considerations directly affect how residents daily lives. While the SCNA appreciates the proposed maintenance of 15-foot front yard setbacks, this does not address the areas of greatest impact. Front yards already benefit from the buffer of streets and sidewalks. The most significant points of interface

between new development and existing homes occur along rear and side property lines—precisely where the greatest reductions are proposed. These reduced setbacks are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and five-foot side yards in multi-family zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. The department's reliance on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) standards to justify 4 ft setbacks is misplaced. ADUs are intended as small, secondary units-not multi-family buildings with substantially greater occupancy, intensity, and risk. The SCNA also wishes to express deep concern regarding the lack of direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. This absence of transparency undermines public trust in the planning process. The City must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use, including but not limited to all single family (R-1) and low density (R-2) property owners that their properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit significantly greater residential density, so they can participate in the drafting of the City's alternative plan. In addition, the letter shall provide the contact information for their state representatives so they may participate in any revisions to SB 79. In addition, we request this SB 79 implementation ordinance be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. In addition, the SCNA suggests that the City Council add the following protections to strengthen Option C1: (i) A prohibition on demolishing residential housing and the displacement of rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects without proof of bona fide financing. (ii) A prohibition on the aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raise local rents, speed up gentrification, and destroy neighborhood character without generating additional affordable housing. Finally, the SCNA looks forward to continued active constructive engagement as this process proceeds. Sincerely, Brad Kane President South Carthay Neighborhood Association Email: [bkane@kanelaw.la](mailto:bkane@kanelaw.la) Phone: (323) 697-9840



May 11, 2026

Re: SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance)  
Opposition to Reduced Backyard Setbacks  
Request For Greater Public Notification / Participation  
CF 25-1083  
CPC-2026-1797-CA

Dear City Planning Commission President Lawshe and Members of the City Planning Commission:

The South Carthay Neighborhood Association (“SCN”) strongly opposes the provision within the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance) that would reduce required side and rear yard setbacks.

While the City is obligated to comply with state law, reducing rear and side yard setbacks to four feet is neither required nor necessary to achieve SB 79’s housing density. Similarly, maintenance of existing 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79’s development objectives. These recommended reductions maximize lot coverage at the expense of basic health and safety protections. The Planning Department’s responsibility is to safeguard public health and safety, including fire safety, climate resilience, and quality of life—not to facilitate development patterns that undermine them.

Reducing setbacks to four feet would have several serious negative impacts:

- **Fire safety:** In a city where wind-driven fires are always a possibility, it is unconscionable that a four-foot rear and side setback are being recommended. Four-foot separations limit defensible space between structures, increasing the risk of fire spread and constrains the emergency access for firefighting equipment.
- **Urban tree canopy and environmental health:** Approximately 90% of the City’s tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within four-foot setbacks which due to "exiting" criteria must be paved. The size of the building and the hardscape around it will contribute to the urban heat island effect, resulting in higher temperatures.
- **Private open space and quality of life:** In a climate that supports year-round outdoor living, reducing adjacent apartment house setbacks will unnecessarily diminish quality of life for all residents.

These considerations directly affect how residents daily lives.

While the SCNA appreciates the proposed maintenance of 15-foot front yard setbacks, this does not address the areas of greatest impact. Front yards already benefit from the buffer of streets and sidewalks. The most significant points of interface between new development and existing homes occur along rear and side property lines—precisely where the greatest reductions are proposed.

These reduced setbacks are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and five-foot side yards in multi-family zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. The department's reliance on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) standards to justify 4 ft setbacks is misplaced.

ADUs are intended as small, secondary units-not multi-family buildings with substantially greater occupancy, intensity, and risk.

*The SCNA also wishes to express deep concern regarding the lack of direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. This absence of transparency undermines public trust in the planning process. The City must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use, including but not limited to all single family (R-1) and low density (R-2) property owners that their properties may be reclassified with incentives to permit significantly greater residential density, so they can participate in the drafting of the City's alternative plan. In addition, the letter shall provide the contact information for their state representatives so they may participate in any revisions to SB 79.*

In addition, we request this SB 79 implementation ordinance be expressly tied to, and automatically updated to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79.

In addition, the SCNA suggests that the City Council add the following protections to strengthen Option C1:

- (i) A prohibition on demolishing residential housing and the displacement of rent stabilized tenants for incentivized projects without proof of bona fide financing.
- (ii) A prohibition on the aggregation of multiple lots to prevent the construction of large luxury towers, which raise local rents, speed up gentrification, and destroy neighborhood character without generating additional affordable housing.

Finally, the SCNA looks forward to continued active constructive engagement as this process proceeds.

Sincerely,



Brad Kane  
President

South Carthay Neighborhood Association

Email: [bkane@kanelaw.la](mailto:bkane@kanelaw.la)

Phone: (323) 697-9840

## Communication from Public

**Name:** David Oliver

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 04:56 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** I am writing to oppose the provision within the proposed SB 79 Implementation Ordinance (the Low-Rise Ordinance) that would reduce required side and rear yard setbacks. While we recognize the City's obligation to comply with state law, reducing rear and side yard setbacks to four feet is neither required nor necessary to achieve SB 79's housing density. Available studies indicate that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would not preclude achieving SB 79's development objectives. These recommended reductions maximize lot coverage at the expense of basic protections. The Planning Department's responsibility is to safeguard public well-being and neighborhood safety and stability—not to facilitate development patterns that undermine them. Reducing setbacks to four feet would have several serious negative impacts: ? Fire safety: In a city where wind-driven fires are always a possibility, it is unconscionable that a four-foot rear and side setback are being recommended. Four-foot separations limit defensible space between structures, increasing the risk of fire spread and constrains the emergency access for firefighting equipment. ? Earthquakes, mudslides and rescue operations: A minimum five-foot setback is required to allow for a bobcat / small tractor to access the sides and rear of properties. (Ultra compact bobcats are not sufficient to meet public safety and rescue needs.) ? Urban tree canopy and environmental health: Approximately 90% of the City's tree canopy exists on private property. Meaningful tree planting and retention are not feasible within four-foot setbacks which due to exiting criteria must be paved. The size of the building and the hardscape around it will contribute to the urban heat island effect, resulting in higher temperatures. ? Private open space and quality of life: In a climate that supports year-round outdoor living, reducing adjacent apartment house setbacks will unnecessarily diminish quality of life for all residents. These are not abstract planning considerations; they directly affect how residents live day to day. While we appreciate the proposal to maintain 15-foot front yard setbacks, this does not address the areas of greatest impact. Front yards already benefit from the buffer of streets and sidewalks. The most significant points of interface between new development and existing homes occur along rear and side property lines—precisely where the greatest reductions are proposed. These reduced

setbacks are inconsistent with existing Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) standards, which require a 15-foot rear yard and five-foot side yards in multi-family zones such as RD1.5, R3, and R4. The department's reliance on Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) standards to justify 4 ft setbacks is misplaced. ADUs are intended as small, secondary units-not multi-family buildings with substantially greater occupancy, intensity, and risk. The proposed reduction ignores the fact that many neighborhoods are park poor and lack access to open space for residents. We also wish to express concern regarding the lack of direct public notification to affected property owners and residents. This absence of transparency undermines public trust in the planning process. The City must notify by mail all residents and property owners of this major change in land use. Finally, we request this SB 79 implementation ordinance be expressly tied to, and automatically updated and/or rescinded to reflect, any future revisions to, postponement of, or repeal of SB 79. Thank you for your consideration.

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Andrea Leon-Grossmann

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 06:40 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear Members of the City Council, Please see the attache letter from the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water for your review. Thank you, Andrea Leon-Grossmann



May 11, 2026

**RE: Council File 25-1083 — SB 79 Implementation Ordinance**

Dear Members of the Los Angeles City Council and Planning Commission,

On behalf of the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW), we urge the City of Los Angeles to pursue a far more equitable, climate-resilient, and community-protective implementation of Senate Bill 79.

Los Angeles is facing overlapping crises: housing instability, climate vulnerability, infrastructure stress, displacement, and deepening inequality. These challenges cannot be addressed through blanket upzoning strategies that prioritize speculative growth while failing to protect existing communities.

EJCW supports a housing future that is affordable, sustainable, and rooted in environmental justice. However, the current direction of SB 79 implementation raises serious concerns that must be addressed before the City adopts permanent zoning changes that will reshape neighborhoods for decades.

First, implementation must include strong anti-displacement and affordability protections. Across California and the country, communities have repeatedly been told that simply increasing market-rate housing supply will eventually improve affordability. Yet evidence increasingly shows that supply alone does not guarantee equitable outcomes for low-income households, particularly in high-cost cities like Los Angeles. Without meaningful safeguards, speculative land value increases near transit often result in the displacement of renters, seniors, immigrants, and working-class families, the very residents most dependent on transit access.

The City must ensure that any SB 79 implementation includes:

- Preservation of existing rent-stabilized and naturally affordable housing
- Strong tenant protections and anti-harassment enforcement
- Meaningful deeply affordable housing requirements
- Community-serving infrastructure investments
- Environmental review and cumulative impact analysis in vulnerable communities

We are also deeply concerned by proposals to dramatically reduce side and rear setbacks to as little as four feet. As noted by community stakeholders and land use advocates, these reductions create serious fire safety, emergency access, public health, heat island, and tree canopy concerns. At a time when California is confronting worsening climate-driven disasters, including urban fires, heat waves, and flooding, Los Angeles should not be weakening the physical resilience of neighborhoods.

In particular, EJCW urges the City to **explicitly exempt FEMA-designated flood plains and high flood-risk areas from automatic SB 79 upzoning triggers.**

This concern has repeatedly been raised with City Planning yet remains insufficiently addressed. Climate resilience cannot be treated as an afterthought. Increased density in flood-prone areas places future residents, surrounding communities, and emergency systems at risk.

We also urge the City to address an overlooked but critical issue: **rooftop solar access and energy equity**.

Los Angeles has invested heavily in distributed rooftop solar as part of its climate goals and clean energy transition. Yet broad upzoning near transit corridors could unintentionally undermine existing rooftop solar systems through increased shading from taller developments. Many working- and middle-class homeowners who invested in solar did so based on existing neighborhood conditions and local climate goals encouraging distributed renewable energy.

The City should evaluate solar access impacts as part of SB 79 implementation and explore mitigation measures such as solar access protections, shadow studies, and context-sensitive height transitions. Climate policy should not undermine other climate policy.

EJCW also remains concerned about transparency and public participation. Residents deserve meaningful notice and engagement regarding major zoning changes affecting their neighborhoods, infrastructure, environmental conditions, and long-term housing stability. Public trust cannot be built through rushed implementation processes that minimize community input.

Finally, we urge the City to prioritize implementation approaches that preserve local flexibility and accountability rather than adopting the broadest possible interpretation of SB 79. **Housing policy must center human outcomes, not simply unit counts.**

Los Angeles needs housing solutions that protect people from displacement, reduce climate vulnerability, preserve community stability, and expand genuine affordability. Equity must be more than a slogan attached to transit-oriented development. It must be embedded into every part of implementation.

We respectfully urge the City to revise the SB 79 implementation ordinance to incorporate stronger environmental justice, affordability, climate resilience, and community protection measures before moving forward.

Sincerely,

**Andrea León-Grossmann**

On behalf of the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water (EJCW)

## Communication from Public

**Name:** L. Tauber

**Date Submitted:** 05/11/2026 09:51 PM

**Council File No:** 25-1083

**Comments for Public Posting:** Please keep the Original Ordinance that is already in place. 'Has-Served-My-Community-Well' - the individual homeowners. The Original Ordinance has not in the past or has yet to fail or incumber an existing homeowner in the area. Thank you for your consideration in regard to this matter. L. Tauber