

Your Community Impact Statement has been successfully submitted to City Council and Committees.

If you have questions and/or concerns, please contact the Department of Neighborhood Empowerment at NCsupport@lacity.org.

This is an automated response, please do not reply to this email.

Contact Information

Neighborhood Council: Rampart Village

Name: Rachael Rose Luckey

Phone Number: (323) 799-8772

Email: rachaelroseluckeyrvnc@gmail.com

The Board approved this CIS by a vote of: Yea(8) Nay(0) Abstain(0) Ineligible(1) Recusal(0)

Date of NC Board Action: 07/21/2020

Type of NC Board Action: For

Impact Information

Date: 07/23/2020

Update to a Previous Input: No

Directed To: City Council and Committees

Council File Number: 20-0002-S101

Agenda Date: 07/21/2020

Item Number: VII.I

Summary: We urge City Council Members to vote in favor of this motion and to bring forward additional motions in opposition to the other 8 developer bills now being considered in the CA State Legislature. See RVNC Resolution below. Thank you.



Resolution Regarding 9 State Land Use Bills

July 21, 2020

Rachael Rose Luckey, President | Ronee Reece, Vice President
KeAndra Cylear-Dodds, Treasurer | Lara Morrison, Secretary
Nathaniel Singer, Student Youth Rep | Uver Santa Cruz, Tenants Rep
Quazi Huda, Community Interest Rep | Philip Armstrong, At Large Rep
Alex Frazier, Business Rep | David Hourin, Community Organization Rep



WHEREAS the Los Angeles City Charter mandated certified Neighborhood Council and Community Council system of the City of Los Angeles represents grass roots democracy within our city; and

WHEREAS a portion of bills going through the State Legislature have a direct impact on RVNC stakeholders and thereby fall under the jurisdictional purview of the RVNC; and

WHEREAS the recently introduced slate of 9 legislative bills to the California State Legislature, as written and in general, constitutes top down pen stroke planning measures completely or in part removing land use and planning authority within large portions of the City of Los Angeles thereby elimination of this authority clearly abolishes local input by the city and its stakeholders into land use planning, and therefore constitutes an attack upon local independence and democracy, upon our neighborhoods, and upon the LA City certified Neighborhood Councils and Community Councils; and

WHEREAS it is reported the City of Los Angeles has enough zoning capacity to house 7,100,000 people without having to upzone a single parcel;

“The last time the City of Los Angeles calculated its un-tapped zoning capacity, for the 2006 General Plan Framework, it determined that the full buildout population of Los Angeles would be 7.1 million people, based on existing zoning.”¹

Given the passage of a city Transportation Orientated Communities (TOC) ordinance, the existing zoning capacity could be as high as 9,000,000 people; and

WHEREAS it is estimated the current population growth rate is 0.32% annually², which means at the current rate, the city would not reach its maximum capacity (7.1 million/9 million) for decades; and

WHEREAS the need for open space has been proven with respect to the health and well-being of the citizens of the City of Los Angeles³; and

WHEREAS, per the housing advocate organization Livable CA⁴, the list of these 9 bills and their detrimental nature are as follows:

SB 1120 (by Scott Wiener and Toni Atkins): Crushes single-family zoning in California, a threat to 8 million homeowners at all income levels. State Sen. Scott Wiener has called yards and single-family homes “immoral.” SB 1120 allows 4 market-rate homes where a single home now stands (theoretically it allows 8 units, if cities have local “granny flat” laws). Requires NO affordable units. Clearly opens California to speculation frenzy.

SB 902 (by Scott Wiener): Allows a majority on any city council to overturn voter-approved ballot measures that protect open space, shorelines and other lands — killing a 108-year-old California voter right. AND allows any city council to rezone “any parcel” to 10-unit luxury apartments, overriding all other zoning including single-family, and inviting gentrification into older, diverse, multi-family areas. Requires NO affordable units. Clearly opens California to speculation frenzy.

SB 995 (by Wiener and Atkins): Slashes the number of affordable units developers must build to qualify for large “fast-track” apartment complexes that get around the environmental protection law, CEQA. Currently, a “fast-track” building can ignore CEQA only if a developer offers 49% of units as affordable. SB 995 slashes the 49% to just 15%, allowing huge buildings but SEVERELY CUTTING the legislature’s commitment to affordable housing.

1 <https://citywatchla.com/index.php/2016-01-01-13-17-00/los-angeles/16371-five-myths-accelerating-la-s-race-to-the-bottom>

2 <https://www.citywatchla.com/index.php/cw/los-angeles/14042-elusive-population-growth-in-the-city-angels>

3 <https://journalistsresource.org/studies/environment/cities/health-benefits-urban-green-space-research-roundup/>

4 <https://www.livablecalifornia.org/9-bad-bills-sb-1120-sb-902-sb-1085-sb-995-and-ab-725-ab-1279-ab-2345-ab-3040-ab-3107/>

SB 1085 (by Nancy Skinner): Currently, developers are rewarded a 35% increase in apartment building size — a “Density Bonus” — if 40% of the units in the building are affordable to moderate-income households. SB 1085 slashes to just 20% the required moderate-income units, allowing huge buildings but CUTTING IN HALF the legislature’s commitment to affordable housing.

AB 725 (by Buffy Wicks and Scott Wiener): A severe threat to more than 300 cities who have not attracted enough housing to hit state-ordered growth targets known as “RHNA.” AB 725 would bring density and upheaval to single-family, duplex, and multi-family areas, whose residents have never even heard of “RHNA.” “RHNA” was once a helpful growth-forecasting tool, but is now used (especially by Scott Wiener) as a state weapon to force excessive density on communities.

AB 1279 (by Richard Bloom): IF this radical bill became law, an obscure state committee would ONLY THEN identify neighborhoods as “Opportunity Zones” where 50-unit to 120-unit apartment buildings could be built, ignoring local zoning as long as affordable units are included. For developers who don’t want to provide affordable units, the bill lets them pay a woefully insufficient “in lieu” fee — then build profitable 10-unit luxury apartments. All without a single hearing.

AB 2345 (by Lorena Gonzalez and David Chiu): Allows developers to add 50% in “Density Bonus” size to a building if they agree to provide more affordable housing units than are now required under “Density Bonus.” To create huge buildings, developers would be allowed to ignore most well-planned city controls on height, open space such as courtyards, parking, design review, building setbacks, side yards, trees, sustainable materials and other local standards.

AB 3040 (by David Chiu): It’s a “Sophie’s Choice”: Cities can choose to comply with AB 3040 by sacrificing single-family homes older than 15 years — think South L.A., East L.A., and diverse older suburbs — to satisfy state growth dictates known as “RHNA.” OR cities can refuse to comply with AB 3040 and try to meet the growth dictates by relying on the state Density Bonus program. Stay with us here, folks: Unfortunately, the Density Bonus program is a FAIL, preventing cities from approving even close to the number of affordable units required by “RHNA.” 300 cities won’t make the “RHNA” deadlines. When cities fail, a divisive and punitive law by Scott Wiener, SB 35, will let developers ignore many local zoning rules to build as they wish.

AB 3107 (by Richard Bloom and Phil Ting): Wreaks height havoc by allowing tall apartments where cafés, shops or businesses now stand, even if adjacent to homes. The new apartments would contain 20% affordable units. Each city faces a different fate — the bill arbitrarily upzones to the tallest height now allowed in commercial or residential areas ½ mile away. In L.A. it means 9-story apartments citywide. It wipes out a citywide residential 30-foot height limit in Manhattan Beach to allow 99 feet. In the working-class Latino and Black suburb of Inglewood, the 75’ maximum for commercial towers could quickly spread to neighborhood shops.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the RVNC strongly urges the Los Angeles City Council to bring a motion forward and to vote with haste to OPPOSE this slate of 9 CA state legislative bills, add opposition to these bills to its legislative agenda, and to vigorously lobby CA state legislators to vote no on these bills.

PRESENTED BY: Rachael Rose Luckey

SECONDED BY: Uver Santa Cruz

YES: 8 NO: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0 INELIGIBLE: 1

ON THIS DATE: July 21,2020