



September 14, 2026

The Honorable Gavin Newsom
Governor of California
1021 O Street, Suite 9000
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: Senate Bill 1272 (Menjivar) Local ordinances: administrative fines or penalties
City of Irvine – Request for Veto**

Dear Governor Newsom,

On behalf of the City of Irvine, I respectfully request your veto of Senate Bill (SB) 1272 (Menjivar), which would impose a mandatory statewide minimum correction period before a local agency may assess administrative fines for certain code violations.

The City shares the author's concern for homeowners who discover, after purchase, that a prior owner left an undisclosed defect behind. Cities routinely work with such owners, and existing law already requires us to provide a reasonable period to correct these violations before any fine may issue. What SB 1272 does is replace that locally calibrated judgment with a fixed statutory floor of six months, extended to a mandatory 12 months upon a showing of good faith effort. That framework does not distinguish between a minor permit issue and a violation that materially affects a neighborhood, and it removes the City's ability to respond proportionately to the circumstances actually in front of us.

The practical consequence falls on neighbors. A structural or zoning violation that persists for a year is not a private matter; it affects adjacent property owners, neighborhood character, and in many cases the City's ability to resolve complaints from residents who have no involvement in the underlying dispute. Code Enforcement staff will be required to explain to those residents that the City is prohibited by State law from acting, regardless of the conditions on the ground. The bill's exclusions for immediate health and safety dangers, substandard housing, and fire hazards are appropriate, but they do not capture the full range of violations that meaningfully degrade a neighborhood over a 12-month period.

The bill also leaves critical terms undefined. It does not specify what constitutes a good faith effort sufficient to trigger the mandatory second six-month extension, nor what evidence adequately establishes that a violation went undisclosed at the time of sale. These determinations will fall to local staff without statutory guidance, producing inconsistent application across jurisdictions and exposing cities to appeals and litigation over standards the Legislature declined to define. The prohibition on recovering any administrative fee associated with an extension request means cities will absorb those costs directly, at a time when general

fund resources for code enforcement are already constrained.

Finally, the City is concerned by the bill's declaration that this subject is a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair, extending its requirements to charter cities. Code Enforcement timelines have long been understood as a core local function, calibrated by each community to its own housing stock, staffing capacity, and enforcement priorities. Preempting charter city authority in this area sets a precedent that reaches well beyond the narrow homeowner circumstance the bill is intended to address.

For the reasons above, the City of Irvine respectfully requests your veto of SB 1272.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Larry Agran". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Larry" and last name "Agran" clearly distinguishable.

Larry Agran
Mayor
City of Irvine

cc: Irvine City Council
Sean Joyce, City Manager