

Communication from Public

Name: Nancy Russell

Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 09:21 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: In regards to Council File No. 25-1083, I oppose the reduction of rear and side yard setbacks, the lack of notification, and that adopted SB 79 incentives shall be rescinded if and when SB 79 is repealed or amended. Below is a copy of the email that I sent to the Planning Commission and others outlining in more detail the reasons for my opposition. 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 I 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. I 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, I 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,
Nancy Russell Resident of Council District 5/zip code 90064

Communication from Public

Name: Robin Rudisill

Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 05:07 PM

Council File No: 25-1083

Comments for Public Posting: May 10, 2026 Honorable Members of the City Planning Commission, I'm a Venice resident writing to urge you to reject the setback reductions proposed in the SB 79 Implementation (Low-Rise) Ordinance. I understand the City must comply with state law — but reducing rear and side yard setbacks to four feet is not actually required by SB 79. Research shows that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would still allow the density SB 79 calls for. What's being proposed goes beyond legal obligation, and I think it's worth asking: who does it actually serve? I'm very concerned about the impacts. Fire safety tops my list of concerns. We live in a city where wind-driven fires aren't a hypothetical — they're a recurring reality. A four-foot separation between structures is, in my view, unconscionable. It limits defensible space, accelerates fire spread, and makes it harder for firefighting equipment to reach the back of a property when every minute counts. Emergency access more broadly is also at stake. A minimum five-foot setback is needed to get a bobcat or small tractor to the sides and rear of a property — equipment that's essential not just for fire response but for earthquake recovery and mudslide rescue. Compact alternatives simply don't meet those needs. Our tree canopy is something I care deeply about. About 90% of L.A.'s urban tree canopy sits on private property. At four feet — which under current rules must be paved — there's no room to plant or retain trees. More hardscape means more heat. This isn't a minor aesthetic issue; it's a public health issue. Quality of life matters too. Los Angeles has a climate that lets people actually live outdoors year-round. Cramming buildings to within four feet of property lines affects how real people experience their homes every single day. I'd also note that while I appreciate keeping the 15-foot front yard setback, front yards already benefit from the buffer of streets and sidewalks. The real friction between new development and existing homes happens along rear and side property lines — exactly where the deepest cuts are proposed. I'm also troubled by the legal inconsistency here. Current LAMC standards require 15-foot rear yards and 5-foot side yards in multi-family zones like RD1.5, R3, and R4. Borrowing ADU setback standards to justify four feet doesn't hold up — ADUs are small secondary units, not multi-family buildings with significantly greater occupancy, intensity, and risk. Many of the

neighborhoods most affected are already park-poor, with residents who have little access to open space as it is. One more concern: affected property owners and residents received no direct notification about this change. That's a serious lapse. A land use change of this magnitude deserves mailed notice to every impacted resident and property owner. Anything less erodes public trust in the process. Finally, I'd ask that this ordinance be explicitly tied to SB 79 itself — written so that any revision, delay, or repeal of the state law automatically triggers a corresponding update or rescission of this ordinance. Please give these concerns the weight they deserve. For the Love of Los Angeles and our precious Coast, Robin Rudisill Council District 11 Venice 90291

May 10, 2026

Honorable Members of the City Planning Commission,

I'm a Venice resident writing to urge you to reject the setback reductions proposed in the SB 79 Implementation (Low-Rise) Ordinance.

I understand the City must comply with state law – but reducing rear and side yard setbacks to four feet is not actually required by SB 79. Research shows that maintaining 15-foot rear yard setbacks would still allow the density SB 79 calls for. What's being proposed goes beyond legal obligation, and I think it's worth asking: who does it actually serve? I'm very concerned about the impacts.

Fire safety tops my list of concerns. We live in a city where wind-driven fires aren't a hypothetical – they're a recurring reality. A four-foot separation between structures is, in my view, unconscionable. It limits defensible space, accelerates fire spread, and makes it harder for firefighting equipment to reach the back of a property when every minute counts.

Emergency access more broadly is also at stake. A minimum five-foot setback is needed to get a bobcat or small tractor to the sides and rear of a property – equipment that's essential not just for fire response but for earthquake recovery and mudslide rescue. Compact alternatives simply don't meet those needs.

Our tree canopy is something I care deeply about. About 90% of L.A.'s urban tree canopy sits on private property. At four feet – which under current rules must be paved – there's no room to plant or retain trees. More hardscape means more heat. This isn't a minor aesthetic issue; it's a public health issue.

Quality of life matters too. Los Angeles has a climate that lets people actually live outdoors year-round. Cramming buildings to within four feet of property lines affects how real people experience their homes every single day. I'd also note that while I appreciate keeping the 15-foot front yard setback, front yards already benefit from the buffer of streets and sidewalks. The real friction between new development and existing homes happens along rear and side property lines – exactly where the deepest cuts are proposed.

I'm also troubled by the legal inconsistency here. Current LAMC standards require 15-foot rear yards and 5-foot side yards in multi-family zones like RD1.5, R3, and R4. Borrowing ADU setback standards to justify four feet doesn't hold up – ADUs are small secondary units, not multi-family buildings with significantly greater occupancy, intensity, and risk. Many of the neighborhoods most affected are already park-poor, with residents who have little access to open space as it is.

One more concern: affected property owners and residents received no direct notification about this change. That's a serious lapse. A land use change of this magnitude deserves mailed notice to every impacted resident and property owner. Anything less erodes public trust in the process.

Finally, I'd ask that this ordinance be explicitly tied to SB 79 itself – written so that any revision, delay, or repeal of the state law automatically triggers a corresponding update or rescission of this ordinance.

Please give these concerns the weight they deserve.

*For the Love of Los Angeles
and our precious Coast,*

Robin Rudisill
Council District 11
Venice
90291

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 05:18 PM

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: 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.

Communication from Public

Name: Alan Estes
Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 05:26 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 stability—not to facilitate development patterns that undermine them. Reducing setbacks to four feet would have several serious 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 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 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. 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. 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.

Communication from Public

Name:

Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 06:33 PM

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: ? 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, Heide Woo zip: 90064

Communication from Public

Name: Richard Shaw

Date Submitted: 05/10/2026 12:34 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. I also oppose the lack of notification. Also, any adopted SB 79 incentives should be rescinded if and when SB 79 is repealed or amended. 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 existing 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, Richard Shaw Council District 5, Zip Code 90064 (Add Neighborhood or Council District / zip code)