

August 2024 LAND USE REPORT

This document does not (but portions may) represent the adopted position(s) of any neighborhood council.

In this report:

1. Current City Activity (and possible motions)
 - A) Housing Element Draft Ordinances: Comment deadline 8/26.
 - i. Action Alert
 - ii. Misinformation fuels efforts to upzone R1 properties.
 - iii. More background info
 - B) Proposed Citywide Landscape and Site Design Ordinance. Comment deadline 8/14
 - C) CF24-0140-S1 City of Grants Pass Oregon v. Johnson / Motion
 - D) CF24-0602 Synthetic Grass/ Artificial Turf/PFAS / Forever Chemicals / Motion
 - E) CF 23-0914 Oversize Vehicle Parking Restrictions / Motion
 - F) CF 21-0329-S5 Uniform Tracking System/City-Directed Encampment Engagements, etc. / Motion
 - G) HR 8340 Housing Unhoused Disabled Veteran's Act / Motion
 - H) CF 24-0867 Neighborhood Council bylaws / Youth Participation / (Term Limits)
 - I) Comprehensive Plastics Reduction PEIR
2. For your information
 - J) CF 24-0438 Weed and Brush Abatement (Adopted by Council 7/30/24)
 - K) CF 15-0719-S26 Mobility Plan 2035/Street Improvement Measures/ HIN, etc.
 - L) CF 14-1378-S1 Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone / OnSite and Off-Site/ Sales & Distrib, etc.
 - M) CPC-2024-150-GPA-CA Downtown Community Plan – at CPC 8/8/24
 - N) CPC-2016-3182-CA-AMDT3: Processes and Procedures Ordinance at CPC 7/25
 - O) Comprehensive Plastics Reduction PEIR
 - P) STAP Transit Shelter program update
 - Q) LA City Charter Reform Commission teach-in
3. State Law
 - R) SB 7 Would remove a city's ability to challenge the State's assigned RHNA goal
 - S) AB2712 Preferential Parking and Transit Oriented Development projects
 - T) State appeals SB 9 ruling challenging SB9's application to charter cities.
4. Metro-related
 - U) K-Line Northern Extension Public Hearings re: route selection
5. Events of Interest
 - V) Urban Forestry for Changing Times – Thursday, 9/5. Reg closes 8/31
6. Articles of Interest

1. **CURRENT CITY ACTIVITY/ with possible NC CIS statements or HOA Motions** where applicable

- A) **Housing Element Draft Ordinances – Hearing held 7/25 (recording available). Comment deadline 8/26, 5 pm . Include:** Case file CPC-2023-7068-CA

The current June 2024 draft CHIP Ordinance rezones commercial corridors and creates new zones for hybrid industrial uses while protecting single-family neighborhoods, Historic Districts/HPOZs and Rent Stabilized Units from being rezoned. Adaptive reuse is also a strategy being pursued by the City for citywide application based upon the City's earlier experience and success with an adaptive re-use program in downtown LA. The decision to remove R1, HPOZs and RSO properties from blanket upzoning proposed earlier was based upon a broad-based community input process that took place over many months involving community leaders from across the City.

There is a campaign underway by developers and pro-housing advocates to reverse the Planning Dept.'s current recommendation made in the June revised CHIP ordinance draft to preserve R1 zoning and instead seeks to REZONE R1 properties citywide for multi-family housing. Much of the narrative built and used to urge the abolition of R1 zoning is based on misinformation explained in Part B below.

- i. **Action Alert: TAKE ACTION NOW and IMPLEMENT THE 5 RECOMMENDED STEPS TO EXPRESS YOUR SUPPORT (and/or your group's support) OF THE CURRENT CHIP ORDINANCE DRAFT WITH ITS PROTECTION FROM UPZONING OF R1 Properties, HPOZs and RSO (Rent Stabilized) properties.**
- 1) **Submit formal comment to the Planning Dept. by August 26, 5 pm.** Send to: housingelement@lacity.org with copies forwarded to additional decision-makers as noted in Number 2 below.
 - a) Reference the case numbers in the subject line of your comment:
CPC-2023-7068-CA / Citywide Housing Incentive Program Ordinance, and
CPC-2024-387-CA / Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinance
 - b) Include your name and zip code.
 - c) Personalize your message with a comment of your own so that it does not appear to be a form letter.
- 2) **Forward your email comment** to your Councilmember (councilmember.lastname@lacity.org) and the Mayor (karen.bass@lacity.org). (If your community has a local Mayor's representative, include a copy to that person.) Tell them to support the CURRENT JUNE draft of the Housing Element CHIP Ordinance with the stated protections for R1, HPOZ and RSO properties from upzoning.
- 3) A) **Complete the posted Planning Dept. survey** with its biased introductory text and questions with your answers to show that you oppose upzoning of R1 single-family properties:
<https://planning.lacity.gov/plans-policies/community-plan-update/housing-element-rezoning-program-news/how-will-citywide>

B) If so inclined, send an email message to: housingelement@lacity.org, Vince.bertoni@lacity.org (planning director), Matthew.glesne@lacity.org (senior planning-housing), with copies to Mayor Bass and your Councilmember noting that the survey is biased in its introductory text and the manner in which questions are posed, and therefore has no validity and should be discontinued, with current results tossed.

- 4) **Introduce a motion** at your Neighborhood/Community Council (and/or other organizations) to adopt support for the current Housing Element CHIP ordinance draft with its protections against upzoning R1, HPOZs and RSO properties. Communicate that position to the contacts in Items 1 and 2 above.
- 5) **Spread the word.** While groups like Abundant Housing have staffing and resources well beyond those of true grass roots community groups, and can issue action alerts and provide trainings and sample testimony to their supporters (and have done so), it is imperative that each person who seeks to preserve R1 neighborhoods in LA serves as the start of a contact pyramid that reaches out to friends, neighbors, and family members and urges them to TAKE ACTION and implement their own pyramid of contacts. Share with them the five steps above and supporting info.

ii. **EFFORTS TO UPZONE R1 PROPERTIES ARE BASED ON THE INTENTIONAL SPREAD OF MISLEADING INFORMATION --**

- 1) **There is no such thing as single-family zoning now.** State law permits ADUs, Junior ADUs and SB 9 lot splits that means that a lot currently zoned R1 could have a house, ADU and Jr. ADU for a total of 3 units. If the lot were to be split as permitted under SB 9, ½ the lot could have a duplex, ADU and Jr. ADU PLUS another duplex (and possible ADU and Jr. ADU on it for a total of from 6-8 units on what was previously an R1 lot!
- 2) **The narrative that over 70% of the City's land is zoned R1 is misleading.** (Controller Meija says that 75% of the City's land is zoned R1.) The high percentage of land said to be unavailable for multi-family housing fails to distinguish between land zoned R1 and land zoned for R1 uses that can be developed. The unqualified 70-75% figure is used to blame homeowners for the high cost of housing/housing affordability and even the homeless on the streets. This is just plain wrong. People are left with the impression that nearly ¾ of LA's land is restricted from development simply because of its zoning. HOWEVER....

Buried in the City's Housing Element, Chapter 4 (NOT Chapter 2), page 210 is the admission that 35% of the land zoned R1 is not suitable for additional development! The text:

"Much of the city's single-family zoning is in ecologically sensitive and hazardous areas of the city. In fact, approximately 35% of the parcels of the city's single-family zoning are in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) or areas with vulnerability to Sea Level Rise (SLR) exposure."

If one does the math, 35% of 70% comes out to 24.5% which leaves 45.5% of our developable land zoned as single-family zoning. Therefore, we must change the narrative and from now more accurately state that 54.5% of the developable land in Los Angeles is zoned for multi-family, commercial or manufacturing use and only 45.5% is R1 or more restrictive.

Planning Dept. text goes further to state that in Higher Resource Areas of the City, 76% of land is zoned for the development of single-family housing. NOWHERE does it indicate how much of that land is unsuitable to be developed for higher uses and /or is located in sensitive and/or high fire severity zones. If one were to go to the map linked from the Planning Dept. website to view Higher Resource areas (<https://belonging.berkeley.edu/2023-ctcac-hcd-opportunity-map>), one would see that virtually all of LA's hillside areas are designated as "Highest Resource" by the State based upon a map created by the "Othering and Belonging Institute" at UC Berkeley (a group with its own agenda and biases).

Again, with the 76% figure, a completely misleading piece of data, is given not only to rationalize the upzoning of R1 properties and their neighborhoods, but further-- to focus that development on the Higher Resource Areas. If one considers the fact that a very large percentage of that land (perhaps more than the 35% noted for the entire city) cannot be put to higher development uses, the pressure on the remaining flatlands in Higher Resource Areas will be tremendous should the City seek to place a specific number or percent of new housing units in Higher Resource Areas. (We have repeatedly asked the City to tell us how many housing units are to be created in our planning areas but have never been given such a number.)

- 3) **If future upzoning of any R1 land is needed to meet State housing goals after earlier strategies such as focusing development on commercial corridors have been employed, the decisions as to where those changes are best implemented should be done via the community planning process – not via a wholesale Citywide upzoning implemented via the Housing Element that then allows DEVELOPERS and SPECULATORS to become our city's and communities' planners – cherry picking lots to develop based upon their profit motive, not based upon those projects that would minimize negative impacts and can be efficiently served and serviced by the City and its failing infrastructure.**

Allowing developers to build an out-of-scale large multi—family buildings in the midst of homes can and will likely lead to the undermining and destruction of stable neighborhoods. One or two out-of-scale developments on a block or in a neighborhood can destabilize and area and result in many negative impacts. Further, there is no reason why it should or would result in affordable housing production.

Zoning is established to foster the orderly development of a municipality. Developers are neither equipped or interested to determine what is best for a city or neighborhood. Empowering them to do so is an abdication of the City's and the Planning Department's responsibility and duties.

Editorial comment: Should this change to permit upzoning of R1 land be adopted, the Planning Dept. will need to consider whether it is even appropriate to refer to itself as the Dept. of City Planning. Rather, a better name for a planning department that seeks to abdicate its zoning responsibilities to developers is the “Entitlement Department.”

iii. **MORE BACKGROUND INFO FYI:**

The recordings and slide presentations from the July 25 Planning Dept. hearing are now posted at:
https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/4c1c45b9-da7e-4933-bce1-eb739f407a67/English_CHIP_HESMD_RPO-%20Public_Hearing_Presentation.pdf

Daily News article on the July Planning Dept. hearing:
<https://www.dailynews.com/2024/07/26/housing-sides-clash-at-l-a-city-hall-hearing-on-density-renting-homeownership/>

The **Draft Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinance (CPC-2024-387-CA)** includes proposals to change the zoning in different areas of the City. Many community leaders participated in meetings convened by United Neighbors that sought to identify that locations best suited in the areas for new density. Most determined to focus new residential development on commercial corridors and also by supporting incentives to re-use office buildings and other commercial structures no longer needed for their original intended use. Subsequent meetings with City electeds reflected the mapping done by community leaders to meet the City’s housing goals without the earlier proposed blanket upzoning of R1/single family homes. That input was well received and the decision was made to revise any recommendation to blanket upzone R1 housing under the Housing Element’s provisions.

The June 2024 draft of the CHIP Ordinance reflects the decision to remove R1, HPOZ and RSO properties

Information on the draft ordinances can be found [here](#).

Feedback gathered at the hearing and during the public comment period will be used to inform future revisions to the draft ordinances.. .

To submit questions, comments, or to be placed on the interested parties list, contact City Planning staff at: Theadora Trindle, DCP, 200 N. Spring Street, Room 750, LA 90012, housingelement@lacity.org

Please include case number CPC-2023-7068-CA for the Citywide Housing Incentive Program Ordinance, CPC-2024-387-CA for the Housing Element Sites and Minimum Density Ordinance, and CPC-2024-388-CA for the Resident Protections Ordinance in any submitted correspondence.

About the Draft Citywide Housing Incentive Program Ordinance (CPC-2023-7068-CA)

The Citywide Housing Incentive Program (CHIP) Ordinance encompasses several key CHIP strategies including Opportunity Corridors, the Affordable Housing Overlay, and updates to the City’s existing housing development incentive programs. In particular, these strategies have been

B. Proposed Citywide Landscape and Site Design Ordinance: Hearing 7/31, Comment deadline 8/14.

To ensure that projects built citywide incorporate high quality, environmentally sensitive design features, and to help overcome some of the glaring social and environmental health inequities uncovered during the pandemic, the City Planning Department is proposing a new ordinance that will provide objective standards for landscape and site designs of new construction projects (five units or more). The Ordinance if adopted will amend the City’s current landscape rules to better respond to the link of public health outcomes with the built environment. Using a performance-based approach, the new ordinance creates a mandatory point-based system to link site design, climate resilience, livability, and strategies for environmental design.

Written comments will be accepted through Aug. 14, 5 pm via email to: planning.urbandesign@lacity.org

If you care about the survival of existing trees and the ability to plant NEW trees weighed against (or developed in concert with) the City’s goals to produce housing, you will want to comment on this proposed program.

Contact Joanne D’Antonio for comments/draft letter from CFAC (Community Forest Advisory Committee): trees@ncsa.la that contains comments that you may wish to incorporate in your own communication.

The City hosted an information session followed by a public hearing on July 31st to gather input on their proposed Landscape and Site Design Ordinance which seeks to establish objective design standards using a point system meant to incentivize “Pedestrian-First Design, 360 Degree Design and Climate-Adapted Landscape and Site Design.” Points are proposed to be assigned through a combination of Mandatory and Elective Standards. The Ordinance would apply to projects of 4 or more units and could have an impact on the character of our communities as density increases.

The link to a recording of that info session will be posted at: <https://planning.lacity.gov/preservation-design/landscape-and-site-design#current-drafts>

For more information, go to: <https://planning.lacity.gov/preservation-design/landscape-and-site-design#about>

Fact Sheet: <https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/e9b9dd57-658b-416b-bcc5-51c9bfcfc66/Fact%20Sheet%20Landscape%20and%20Site%20Design%20Ordinance%20-%20January%202024.pdf>

Draft point system: https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/2344466b-e20b-4192-869b-8f898b828f74/Landscape_and_Site_Design_Ordinance_Point_System.pdf

Draft ordinance: https://planning.lacity.gov/odocument/33faf488-323e-4b58-a1e2-e40ee0509987/Landscape_and_Site_Design_Ordinance.pdf

C. CF24-0140-s1: https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2024/24-0140-s1_misc_6-28-24.pdf

City of Grants Pass Oregon v. Johnson

6/28/24 Motion referred to Housing and Homelessness Committee

On June 28, 2024, the United States Supreme Court issued a decision regarding City of Grants Pass, Oregon v. Johnson, finding that cities may enforce rules pertaining to homeless encampments and the regulation of public spaces.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the City Council request the City Attorney to provide an analysis of the ruling's impact on the City's existing rules relative to sleeping, lying and storage of property in the public right of way and other public settings, including but not limited to Los Angeles Municipal Code Sections 41.18, 56.11 and 63.44, as well as its impact on vehicle dwelling; and

I FURTHER MOVE that the City Council request the City Attorney to provide a confidential analysis regarding the ruling's impact on any existing litigation against the City related to homelessness, including how this ruling impacts the LA Alliance Settlement; and

I FURTHER MOVE that the City Council instruct the the Chief Legislative Analyst, with the assistance of the City Administrative Officer, to report to Council on current laws in the 87 other cities within Los Angeles County that restrict sleeping in the public right-of-way that will impact the City of Los Angeles.

MOTION:

“ _____ NC/CC, strongly supports the motion in CF 24-0140-S1 (Park, Krekorian and other CMs), calling for the City Attorney to analyze the impact of the Supreme Court’s ruling in *City of Grants Pass, Oregon v. Johnson* – that anti-camping laws do not violate the 8th Amendment’s prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment – on the City’s ability to regulate encampments in public spaces in Los Angeles, and further calling for a report by the Chief Legislative Analyst on current laws restricting camping in the 87 other cities in Los Angeles County that will impact the City of Los Angeles.”

D. CF24-0602: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=24-0602>

Synthetic Grass/Artificial Turf / PFAS / Forever Chemicals

6/28/24 Amended Motion (https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2024/24-0602_rpt_ee_06-28-24.pdf) approved by the Council’s Energy and Environment Committee. Awaiting scheduling at full Council. Motion requests a report back from a number of City officers, bureaus and departments, LAUSD.

See opinion piece in LA Times from Palms NC member, Charles Miller: <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2024-08-05/artificial-turf-grass-lawn-plants-gardening-plastic-climate-recycling-environment-water>

MOTION: The Board of _____ supports the motion (CF 24-0602) to transition away from the future use of synthetic turf or artificial grass and incentivize drought-friendly landscaping.

Not only does artificial turf have PFAS and pollutes the ground soil beneath it, but it also suffocates surrounding trees, creates a barrier to the recharging of groundwater and has additional negative impacts on the environment, such as contributing to climate change (by outgassing methane and ethylene).

E. CF 23-0914: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=23-0914>

Oversize Vehicle Parking Restrictions / Citywide Program

7/26/24 Motion approved by Council Transportation Committee. Motion also referred to Housing and Homelessness Committee (not scheduled)

MOTION: The Board of the _____ Neighborhood Council supports CF 23-0914, which calls for recommendations for a Citywide program to designate streets where RVs/oversize vehicles may safely park with access to services, including housing navigation, portable restrooms, automotive repair and septic tank disposal, and which would also restrict RV parking in residential areas, commercial corridors and other sensitive areas.

Neighborhoods across the City, including locations in the WNC area, have been impacted by unregulated RV parking with lack of support services that has resulted in the illegal discharge of hazardous substances into storm drains (our ocean) and public rights-of-way, the loss of parking for non-RV dwellers, reduced line-of-site at intersections and driveways and other impacts.

We support this measure with the understanding and trust that the City will seek community / neighborhood council input on the citing of future safe parking sites in our area.

F) CF 21-0329-S5: Uniform Tracking System/City-Directed Encampment Engagements, Dedicated Services / Street Engagement Strategy / HMIS / Interim Housing

Background: Regarding LAMC Sec. 41.18 (ordinance regulating encampments in the PROW / public spaces in Los Angeles): https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-0329-S5_misc_6-04-24.pdf
<https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=21-0329-S5>

See the CLA report in a related council file, stating that “LAPD believes that LAMC Sec. 41.18 and its subsections have an overwhelmingly positive impact on public safety” (5/31/24 CLA report, p. 7: https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2021/21-0329-S4_rpt_CLA_5-31-24.pdf).

See Westside Current article about the Yaroslavsky motion: <https://www.westsidecurrent.com/> (“Yaroslavsky Seeks Changes to LA Homelessness Ordinance”) https://www.westsidecurrent.com/news/yaroslavsky-seeks-changes-to-la-homelessness-ordinance/article_3304f038-2403-11ef-891b-c3f5ef2c249d.html

See: <https://www.westsidecurrent.com/news/> (“Dual Perspectives on LAMC 41.18 – Yaroslavsky’s Case for Amendment vs. Constituent Impact from Enforcement”)

or: https://www.reddit.com/r/LosAngeles/comments/1dbxgh5/dual_perspectives_on_lamc_4118_yaroslavskys_case/

See also:

<https://www.circlingthenews.com/ordinance-41-18-misunderstood-by-some-councilmembers/>
<https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/the-john-kobyit-show/id1243130823?i=1000658705119>

MOTION:

____ NC/CC, a member of the _____ Alliance of Councils), opposes the motion in CF 21-0329-S5, which makes implementation of LAMC Sec. 41.18 unnecessarily and unreasonably complicated and needlessly involves county agencies in city policy. We agree with the protection of sensitive use sites and deem this Municipal Code section to be a necessary tool for combatting the proliferation of homelessness and protecting public health and safety citywide.* ____ NC/CC therefore strongly supports LAMC Sec. 41.18, which has been effectively implemented in Council District 11 and other areas of Los Angeles to protect public health and safety and preserve the use of our public spaces for all constituents. **According to the Chief Legislative Analyst, "LAPD believes that LAMC Sec. 41.18 and its subsections have an overwhelmingly positive impact on public safety" (5/31/24 CLA Report in related CF 21-0329-S4).*

G) HR 8340:

BACKGROUND: HR 8340 is a bi-partisan bill introduced by Rep Brad Sherman that is also supported by Rep Lieu and has passed so far in the House Financial Services committee. The measure, **the "Housing Unhoused Disabled Veterans Act"** seeks to remove barriers to housing unhoused vets by addressing the fact that veterans who receive higher levels of disability benefits are often disqualified from homeless housing because the disability payments are considered as income and those benefits exceed allowable income levels for the homeless housing. it's unclear whether or when it will move forward and it was stated that LA City's support would be welcome and helpful.

Press release: <https://sherman.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressman-sherman-introduces-housing-unhoused-disabled-veterans-act>

WRAC HOMELESS COMMITTEE MOTION RECOMMENDATION BEING MADE TO WRAC BOARD:
NCs may consider these measures whether or not the WRAC Board recommends passage by WRAC members. It will be considered by the WRAC Board in August.

NCs can also urge their Councilmember to introduce a Council Motion to support HR 8340's inclusion in the City's WDC legislative agenda.

MOTION: The _____ Neighborhood Council requests the City Council to adopt a motion in favor of HR 8340 in the City's 2023-2024 federal legislative priorities. 8340, the "Housing Unhoused Disabled Veterans Act," led by Congressman Brad Sherman (D-CA).would exclude veterans' disability income for the purposes of determining income eligibility under the Housing and Urban Development-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program.

General NC-related motions for future NC consideration

H) From Los Angeles Neighborhood Council Coalition

Council File 24-0867: Neighborhood Council Bylaws/ Youth Participation / Diversity Increase / Leadership Growth (The CF description does not include the second part of the motion which is to establish term limits for NC members) <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=24-0867>

7/30/24 - Referred to Neighborhoods and Community Enrichment Committee

Relative to Board of Neighborhood Commissioners, with the assistance of the Dept. of Neighborhood Empowerment, and relevant departments be requested to provide recommendations on potential methods and options to amend the Neighborhood Council Bylaws to ensure youth participation in Neighborhood Councils including the designation of a youth seat on each Neighborhood Council board to increase diversity and allow for leadership growth.

The Council file also suggests the establishment of term limits for NC Board members:

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners, with assistance of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment, the Youth Development Department and the City Clerk, be requested to provide recommendations on potential methods and options to amend the Neighborhood Council Bylaws (Bylaws) to ensure youth participation in Neighborhood Councils including the designation of a youth seat on each Neighborhood Council board to increase diversity and allow for leadership growth;

I FURTHER MOVE the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners, with assistance of the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment and the City Attorney, be requested to report to the Council on potential options to amend the Bylaws to include term limits for Neighborhood Council board members in order to facilitate greater member participation and leadership development.

Editorial comment: There has already been action taken to establish youth seats. Term limits for NC members have been viewed as a way to weaken community representation by attempting to erase institutional community history.

I. Want to reduce single-use plastic use in this city on a large scale? Weigh in on the Comprehensive Plastics Reduction PEIR

The [Comprehensive Plastics Reduction Program's](#) Final Environmental Impact Report has not been released yet, but we are anticipating that it will go to the full city council for a vote in September, so the opportunity for neighborhood councils to weigh in once it has been released will be very limited. You can learn more at nca.la/waste

FOR YOUR INFORMATION:

J. CF 24-0438: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=24-0438>

2024 Weed and Brush Abatement

Transportation and Public Works Committees' Report Adopted by Council 7/30/24

An ordinance for the 2024 season determining and declaring that weeds, rubbish, refuse, and dirt on certain streets, sidewalks, and parkways, and on, or in front of, certain private properties are a public nuisance, and declaring the intention of the City Council to order the abatement of these nuisances.

K. CF 15-0719-S26: <https://cityclerk.lacity.org/lacityclerkconnect/index.cfm?fa=ccfi.viewrecord&cfnumber=15-0719-S26>

Mobility Plan 2035/Street Improvement Measures / Healthy Streets LA Ballot Measure / Street Resurfacing / Slurry Seal Projects / High Injury Network / Dangerous Streets

Heard at City Council 7/30/24 Continued consideration of Transportation and Public Works Report relative to the Mobility Plan 2035 implementation and City Mobility Plan street improvement measures. One of the issues addressed has to do with whether certain grant funded street infrastructure projects must comply with measure HLA and how new projects must comply with HLA. The report notes that part of Measure HLA passed by voters states that resurfacing projects on MP2035 networks that do not include these minimally compliant elements will be subject to lawsuits by any resident of the City of Los Angeles. Additional elements needed to be met by HLA are noted.

L. CF 14-1378-S1: Urban Agriculture Incentive Zone/Truck Gardening / On-Site and Off-Site / Sales and Distribution Restrictions

Adopted by Council 7/31/24

Approves preparation of an ordinance to amend the LAMC Section 12.03 with language to allow for the cultivation of produce and use on-site and sale or distribution on or off-site with limitations to every other week, only on Saturday or Sunday and restricted to a maximum of four hours. (Not clear whether this applies only to CD 15 or can be applied citywide.)

M. CPC-2024-150-GPA-CA: https://planning.lacity.gov/plndoc/Staff_Reports/2024/08-08-2024/CPC_2024_150.pdf

Downtown Community Plan – At City Planning Commission on 8/8/24

A General Plan Amendment and Code Amendment for the purpose of updating zoning district names and correspondence on the Downtown Community Plan General Plan Land Use Map, Downtown Community Plan text, and Appendix A of the Framework Element.

N. CPC-2016-3182-CA-AMDT3: https://planning.lacity.gov/plndoc/Staff_Reports/2024/07-25-2024/CPC_2016_3182_.pdf

Processes and Procedures Maintenance Ordinance to address technical corrections and clarifications identified during implementation of the new processes and procedures.

Heard at City Planning Commission 7/25/24. The City Council must consider the ordinance before it can be adopted.

O. From the Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance: Want to reduce single-use plastic use in this city on a large scale? Weigh in on the Comprehensive Plastics Reduction PEIR

The [Comprehensive Plastics Reduction Program](#)'s Final Environmental Impact Report has not been released yet, but it is anticipated that it will go to the full city council for a vote in September, so the opportunity for neighborhood councils to weigh in once it has been released will be very limited. You can learn more at ncsa.la/waste

P. STAP Transit Shelter Program: StreetsLA is finally rolling out some of the new transit shelters permitted under their new “STAP” program which will see digital ad structures installed. The program is now entering year 3 and shelters are just now being installed.

Two reminders: If current “static” ad shelters are slated to be replaced with digital shelters, check your local community overlays to assure that the new structures are permitted. There are plans that have restrictions against ads, against signs that flash or change, etc. Special protections are afforded to areas adjacent to sensitive biological zones, or those within 500 feet of the center line of a designated Scenic Highway (per the Mobility Element of the General Plan). If you see issues, contact your Council District Office.

Each fall, the Council District offices receive a list of proposed shelter locations to be installed and it is at that time that communities can have a voice in reviewing the lists for their areas. However, the COUNCIL DISTRICT office must know that you wish to be included in that process because last year it does not appear that any CD office contacted their communities or NCs to seek input and no changes were made to the lists. (Could this have anything to do with the fact that the Council District offices receive discretionary funds from the profits generated by the program and thus would not wish to remove any revenue-generating shelters with digital signage from the program?)

Q. LA City Charter Reform Commission teach-in

[Fair Rep LA](#)’s teach-in for people interested in the City of Los Angeles’s soon-to-be-formed **charter reform commission is available on line**. Here are the links to the [recording](#) and [slides](#). Please share this with anyone interested in being on the commission.

STATE LAW:

SB 7 (Blakespear): <https://ctweb.capitoltrack.com/public/publishbillinfo.aspx?bi=9sXVajLZhTW28%2fy9NR43pn0fslzbQ1PLthNITuzKy155IYdLv0KpXA%2flx1hrSd6h>
8/12/24: Assembly third reading file

This is a GUT AND AMEND measure which means that a previous bill on another subject has been gutted and an entirely new bill has replaced it. This means that the new bill did not go through the full legislative process wherein the public could weigh in to provide testimony and participate in its drafting and early consideration.

The measure seeks to remove a municipality’s ability to challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goal assigned to it by the State.

Desk	Policy	Fiscal	Floor	Desk	Policy	Fiscal	Floor	Conf.
Conc.	Enrolled		Vetoed	Chaptered				
1st House		2nd House						

Summary: The Planning and Zoning Law requires, for the 4th and subsequent revisions of the housing element, the Department of Housing and Community Development (department) to determine the existing and projected need for housing for each region, as specified. That law requires the department, in consultation with the council of governments, to determine the existing and projected need of housing for each region in a specified manner. That law requires the department's determination to be based upon population projections produced by the Department of Finance, as specified. That law also requires the department to meet and consult with the council of governments regarding the assumptions and methodologies to be used to determine each region's housing need and requires the council of governments to provide data assumptions from the council of governments' projections, as specified. That law authorizes the department to accept or reject the information provided by the council of governments and, after consultation with each council of governments, to make determinations on the council of governments' data assumptions and the methodology the department will use to determine each region's housing need. That law requires the department to provide its determinations to each council of governments, as specified. That law, upon making that determination, authorizes the council of governments to object to the determination. **This bill, for regions in which the department is required to distribute the regional housing need, would prohibit a city or county from filing an objection to the regional housing need**

S. AB 2712: : <https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB2712/2023>

Preferential Parking and Transit Oriented Development projects

This intent of this clean-up measure to Laura Friedman's earlier bill that prohibits minimum parking requirements for projects within a half mile of transit, is to prohibit residents of buildings that were built with transit oriented development bonuses to obtain preferential parking permits in adjacent preferential parking districts. Allowing those residents to obtain preferential parking permits undermines the purpose of transit-oriented development in that it creates an incentive for those who have vehicles to occupy units whose purpose was said to be to provide units close to transit so that the residents had easy access to transit and would use it. Providing an easy way for transit-oriented development residents to have vehicles when their buildings do not provide any parking undermines the claimed intent as to why those projects were permitted to build larger than permitted zoning – often with vastly reduced parking or no parking at all as permitted by Friedman's original AB 2097 bill adopted by the State legislature.

Shepherded by Century Glen President Sheida Ashley, the bill, a special statute for the City of Los Angeles, passed through the Senate where it was amended twice and now returns to the Assembly where it was amended three times. Unfortunately, the amendments now allow for the issuance of permits to residents of low income housing units ("deed restricted units intended for specified households") such as LA's ED 1 project residents which can be very large projects, and struck the language that prohibited vendors from obtaining preferential parking permits. It would apply to residents or visitors of development projects granted TOD entitlements and prohibit those buildings from being included in the boundaries of the adjacent preferential parking district and would prohibit the city from issuing permits to residents or visitors of the TOC project. Amendments included exemption of projects with 20 or fewer units.

The bill now returns to the Assembly.

T. State Appeals SB9 ruling on challenge brought by Del Mar and four other LA County cities

<https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/2024/07/03/state-appeals-sb-9-ruling-on-challenge-brought-by-del-mar-and-four-other-cities/>

The article describes the plans of CA Attorney General Rob Bonta to appeal Superior Court Judge Curtis Kin’s ruling that SB 9 does not apply to the five charter cities that argued that the law does not apply to them because it violated the state constitution because it “is neither reasonably related to its stated concern of ensuring access to affordable housing nor narrowly tailored to avoid interference with local government.” The appeal process will determine whether Judge Kin’s ruling is applied to all of California’s charter cities.

NOTE: Many of the housing bills now in the legislature are being tracked by **Livable California**. You may find the bills they are tracking (and there are MANY housing-related bills) at: <https://ctweb.capitoltrack.com/public/publish.aspx?session=23&id=31551d27-b116-4a97-b839-f2ec34c5d243>

METRO-RELATED

U. K-Line Northern Extension: The K-Line Northern Extension would fill a north/south gap in the central LA area by connecting four existing rail lines and six of the highest bus ridership lines in the County. There are three different proposed routes (San Vicente-Fairfax, Fairfax, La Brea) and an optional alignment at the northern terminus that could create an optional Hollywood Bowl station. The proposal is to create an underground route from the Expos Line to West Adams, Mid-City, Miracle Mile, West Hollywood and Hollywood.

The DEIR was released on July 23rd and public comment on the analysis presented and on input related to a preferred alignment will be taken until September 5th. Go to: metro.net/KNE for more info.

PUBLIC HEARINGS TO BE HELD:

Saturday, August 10 IN PERSON, 10 am – noon. Dorsey High School, 3537 Farmdale, LA
Tuesday, August 13 IN PERSON, 6-8 pm. Pan Pacific Community Center, 7600 Beverly Blvd., LA
Thursday, August 15 Virtual Meeting, 12 noon-1:30 pm.
Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87336933668>
Meeting ID: 87336933668 / Call-in: 213.338.8477

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS / UPCOMING EVENTS OF POSSIBLE INTEREST

**Urban Forestry for Changing Times:
The Practice of Science
and the Science of Practice**

**Thursday, September 5, 2024
8am to 5pm**

Angeles National Forest Headquarters (Supervisor's Office)
701 N. Santa Anita Avenue, Arcadia, CA 91006

REGISTRATION REQUIRED!
tinyurl.com/UrbanForestrySymposium
Registration closes 8/31

Join a diverse group of regional researchers, practitioners,
and representatives from government and nonprofit
organizations for a day of stimulating panel discussions
and networking opportunities.

Topics will include: the state of urban forestry research; science delivery & communication; urban forest equity; urban forest planning and management; and more.

Symposium co-presented by

LA County Chief Sustainability Office
UAS
US Forest Service, Region 5, Urban and Community Forestry Program
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Agriculture and Natural Resources
UCLA Center for Innovation
USC University of Southern California
PUBLIC EXCHANGE

6. ARTICLES OF INTEREST

<https://belonging.berkeley.edu/single-family-zoning-greater-los-angeles#!>

This March 2, 2022 report falsely claims that 77% of LA's land is zoned exclusively for R1 housing and fails to acknowledge that much of that land is not available for development.

Re: Housing Element in LA and reporting on the July 25 Planning Dept. hearing:

<https://www.dailynews.com/2024/07/26/housing-sides-clash-at-l-a-city-hall-hearing-on-density-renting-homeownership/>

The following entries came from Neighbors United San Francisco and were not reviewed. Their "summer reading list" is being copied for your information:

Summer Reading

Recent articles reveal how state legislators, YIMBY lobbyist, and local leaders aim to deregulate land use, prioritizing the interests of political donors and real estate investors. Most San Franciscans are unaware of these impending zoning changes that will adversely and

Developers want a tower taller than Telegraph Hill — next to Telegraph Hill. It's not a good idea

"Welcome to the troublesome mosaic of state density bonuses, where developers who include affordable units in their proposed projects basically can waive the height limit. The goal is worthy — to clear the way for new housing — but the overlap of rules and regulations could undermine the juxtaposition of city and nature that makes this city memorable."

"The more insidious threat is what's playing out in locations like Sansome Street, where three proposals on three blocks would transform a unique historic district and mar the public's view of a hill that defines many people's mental image of San Francisco's allure."

READ FULL ARTICLE: <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/telegraph-hill-tower-housing-19485060.php>

Chronicle, John King, June 3, 2024

SF Planning's upzoning without affordability or protections threatens small businesses

"Local small businesses, including 126 legacy businesses, within the SF Planning Department's proposed upzoning map are at risk of demolition or displacement. Should the City continue rushing these plans through the approval process without accounting for their impact, profit-driven developers will be able to take advantage of the projected inflated land values created by this upzoning and drive out current tenants."

READ FULL PRESS RELEASE: <https://www.repsf.org/press-releases/sf-planning-upzoning-threatens-small-businesses-06-06-2024>

Race and Equality in All Planning, June 6, 2024

Has the Sleeping Giant Awakened?

Forget NIMBY vs. YIMBY. It's Speculators vs. Affordability

"Few San Franciscans are okay with handing over their city's future to real estate speculators. However, the changes these speculators are proposing to local laws and regulations are more likely to be supported if they are presented as "pro-housing" and those who oppose them as "anti-housing." This is central to their strategy to convince voters to back policies that will enrich them, but do nothing to address San Francisco's real housing crisis, the dearth of affordable housing."

READ FULL ARTICLE: <https://www.phoenixprojectnow.com/phoenix-review/blog/forget-nimby-vs-yimby-it-s-speculators-vs-affordability>

Phoenix Project, Lincoln Mitchell, June 13, 2024

Study finds US does not have housing shortage, but shortage of affordable housing

"Helping people afford the housing stock that is available would be more cost-effective than expanding new home construction in the hope that additional supply would bring prices down, the authors wrote. Several federal programs have proven successful in helping renters and moderate-income buyers afford housing that would otherwise be out of reach.

Our nation's affordability problems result more from low incomes confronting high housing prices rather than from housing shortages," McClure said. "This condition suggests that we cannot build our way to housing affordability. We need to address price levels and income levels to help low-income households afford the housing that already exists, rather than increasing the supply in the hope that prices will subside."

READ FULL ARTICLE: <https://phys.org/news/2024-06-housing-shortage.html>

Phys Org, June 17, 2024

Fearing tall buildings, westside homeowners look to Aaron Peskin

"A paradox is emerging in the mayor's race: Peskin, who's considered progressive on most issues, has been outspoken about prioritizing neighborhood preservation instead of building market-rate housing. That seems to be resonating with homeowners on the west side, who are typically some of the city's most moderate-conservative voters."

READ FULL ARTICLE: <https://sfstandard.com/2024/06/28/san-francisco-mayors-race/>

YIMBY Want to Raise Your Rent

"The YIMBY claim for abundant and affordable housing is really a play for giving residential developers a license to print even more money as soon as they get their occupancy permit by shifting the infrastructure costs onto existing residents while raising rents for everyone. Promises of housing abundance and lower housing prices are a honey trap, a pleasant sounding ruse that YIMBY know is a lie. There will be no abundance of housing so long as market rate housing production relies on the kindness of the capital markets while interest rates fluctuate. Market rate housing will never sell for less than the cost to construct, which is much higher than 30% of most people's incomes which is the gold standard for affordability."

READ FULL ARTICLE: <https://www.counterpunch.org/2024/07/01/yimby-want-to-raise-your-rent/>

CounterPunch - Marc Salomon, July 1, 2024

SF 'truly in a new era' as it must fast-track housing projects

"It forces The City to haphazardly make changes to zoning and planning that will be felt for the next 100 years," said Lori Brooke, the co-founder of Neighborhoods United SF, which has been organizing opposition against The City's ongoing upzoning process, a multi-year effort aimed at increasing density in The City's western and northern neighborhoods to make room for the extra housing mandated by the state.

For Brooke, the streamlining requirements could mean "game over for local democracy and the public process as to what gets built and where."

She also suggested that the housing targets were set unreasonably high, intentionally setting up The City to fail and all but guaranteeing that the streamlining would take effect, a charge that Wiener denies."

READ FULL ARTICLE: https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/housing/slow-sf-housing-development-triggers-state-streamlining/article_9f52a62a-380a-11ef-ab1b-4b25606865d2.html?link_id=18&can_id=f7045f46ee60e74064f51ca5c6e9a62f&source=email-rep-sf-housing-justice-newsletter-july-2024&email_referrer=email_2377363&email_subject=rep-sf-planning-to-the-people-newsletter-july-2024

Examiner - Keith Menconi, July 2, 2024