

Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Mary Strobel

ITEM 8 ATTACHMENT B

**[Exempt From Filing Fee  
Government Code § 6103]**

1 ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP  
SUNNY K. SOLTANI, State Bar No. 209774  
2 *ssoltani@awattotnrays.com*  
PAM K. LEE, State Bar No. 246369  
3 *plee@awattorneys.com*  
18881 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 1700  
4 Irvine, California 92612  
Telephone: (949) 223-1170  
5 Facsimile: (949) 223-1180

6 Attorneys for Petitioners  
7 Michael W. Webb (133414)  
Office of the City Attorney  
8 City of Redondo Beach  
415 Diamond Street  
9 Redondo Beach, CA 90277  
(310) 318-0655  
10 *michael.webb@redondo.org*

11 Attorney for Petitioner City of Redondo Beach

12 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL DISTRICT**  
14

15 CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, a California  
charter city; CITY OF CARSON, a California  
16 charter city; CITY OF TORRANCE, a  
California charter city; CITY OF WHITTIER,  
17 a California charter city

18 Petitioners/Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 ROB BONTA, in his official capacity as  
California Attorney-General, STATE OF  
21 CALIFORNIA; and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive,  
22

23 Respondents/Defendants.

Case No. 22STCP01143

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

(Civ. Proc. Code, §§ 526, 1060, 1085)

24  
25 This Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory  
26 Relief (“Petition”) is brought by Petitioners/Plaintiffs City of Redondo Beach, City of Carson, City  
27 of Torrance, and City of Whittier and directed to Respondents/Defendants Rob Bonta, in his official  
28 capacity as California Attorney-General, and the State of California.



1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. Petitioners/Plaintiffs City of Redondo Beach, City of Carson, City of Torrance, and  
3 City of Whittier bring this action to uphold the California Constitution and prevent the State of  
4 California from usurping a charter city’s land use authority, which is a uniquely municipal affair.  
5 As the California Supreme Court has opined: “*Charter cities are specifically authorized by our*  
6 *state Constitution to govern themselves, free of state legislative intrusion, as to those matters*  
7 *deemed municipal affairs.*” (*State Building & Construction Trades Council of California, AFL-*  
8 *CIO v. City of Vista* (2012) 54 Cal.4th 547, 555 (“*City of Vista*”).) As to municipal affairs, “charter  
9 cities are ‘supreme and beyond the reach of legislative enactment.’” (*California Fed. Savings &*  
10 *Loan Ass’n v. City of Los Angeles* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1, 12 (“*Cal Fed Savings*”).)

11 2. It is undisputed that planning and zoning laws are matters of municipal affairs. The  
12 constitutional right of municipalities to zone single-family residential districts and the sanctioning  
13 principle upon which that right is founded has been well settled law for almost 100 years. (*Miller*  
14 *v. Bd. of Public Works of City of Los Angeles* (1925) 195 Cal. 477, 486.)<sup>1</sup> Likewise, the right of  
15 housing development approvals has historically been a municipal affair.

16 3. Thus, any legislative enactment to curtail a matter of municipal affair must be a  
17 subject of statewide concern, and such enactment must be “‘reasonably related to...resolution’ of  
18 that concern” and “‘narrowly tailored’ to avoid unnecessary interference in local governance.” (*City*  
19 *of Vista, supra*, 54 Cal.4th at 556.)

20 4. In enacting Senate Bill 9 (“SB 9”) in 2021, the State of California eviscerated a city’s  
21 local control over land use decisions and a community-tailored zoning process. SB 9 provides a  
22

23 <sup>1</sup> The California Supreme Court went even further to add: “The establishment of single family  
24 residence districts offers inducements not only to the wealthy but to those of moderate means to  
25 own their own homes. ... With ownership of one's home comes recognition of the individual's  
26 responsibility for his share in the safeguarding of the welfare of the community and increased  
27 pride in personal achievement which must come from personal participation in projects looking  
28 toward community betterment. [¶] It is needless to further analyze and enumerate all of the factors  
which make a single family home more desirable for the promotion and perpetuation of family life  
than an apartment, hotel, or flat. It will suffice to say that there is a sentiment practically universal,  
that this is so.” (*Id.* at 493.)





1 ministerial approval process, without any discretionary review or hearings, for property owners to  
2 subdivide a residential parcel into two lots and to build up to two primary homes on each resulting  
3 lot. With the combination of SB 9 and/or previously adopted accessory dwelling unit (“ADU”)  
4 laws, one single-family parcel may now have up to four homes, notwithstanding any city’s general  
5 plan or local zoning laws prohibiting otherwise. In essence, SB 9 eliminates local authority to create  
6 single-family zoning districts and approve housing developments, a right that has existed for  
7 practically a century.

8           5. Through SB 9 the State has impinged upon local control in a manner that is not  
9 reasonably related to its stated State interest. SB 9 cites ensuring access to affordable housing as a  
10 matter of statewide concern that justifies its applicability to charter cities, but the bill does not  
11 require the newly created homes or the lots to have any affordability covenants or to be restricted to  
12 moderate- or lower-income households. Thus, in very urbanized areas where housing demand and  
13 prices are high, SB 9 housing developments could be sold or leased at market rate prices, which  
14 would do nothing to address housing affordability, and could exacerbate unaffordability by taking  
15 away potential affordable housing locations.

16           6. SB 9 also intended to allow the average single-family homeowner to split their lot  
17 and create duplexes and ADUs. Instead, developers and institutional investors with deep pockets  
18 are more likely to take advantage of SB 9. The new bill will raise land and home values, particularly  
19 in already very urbanized areas, making it harder for first-time homebuyers to get their foothold on  
20 the American Dream and further alienating lower-income households. Additionally, some advocacy  
21 groups claim that developers are likely to target communities of color, in areas where land is  
22 relatively cheaper, and demolish houses to build high-cost rentals that would limit the ability of  
23 minorities to build wealth, exacerbating inequalities and promoting gentrification.

24           7. In addition, the State has impinged upon local control in a manner that is *not*  
25 *narrowly tailored* to avoid unnecessary interference in local governance. With the addition of up  
26 to four times as many homes in an existing neighborhood under SB 9, the threat of adverse impacts  
27 is imminent. Although SB 9 allows a city to deny a project that would have specific and significant  
28 adverse impacts, such impacts are limited only to objective public health or safety concerns.



1 However, there are many environmental and community concerns that are not considered “objective  
2 public health or safety concerns” under SB 9. For example, local ordinances – such as those that  
3 preserve trees or views or create bike paths or open space – address important climate change,  
4 greenhouse gases, and community concerns but do not rise to the level of objective public health or  
5 safety concerns as contemplated under SB 9.

6 8. Even if an adverse impact is considered an “objective public health or safety  
7 concern,” one housing project built under SB 9 may not have a significant enough impact on an  
8 individual basis, such that it could be denied in accordance with the bill. Nonetheless, the  
9 cumulative impacts of several housing projects within a single neighborhood on public health or  
10 safety could still be significant. Specifically, the addition of up to four times as many families in  
11 existing neighborhoods will undoubtedly impact schools with increased class sizes, exacerbate  
12 traffic congestion, and create parking deficiencies. There will also be increased need for water and  
13 sewer capacity, use of utilities, maintenance and replacement of physical infrastructure, and demand  
14 for emergency access and response. Petitioners cannot address these cumulative impacts under SB 9  
15 on an individual basis for each housing project.

16 9. Petitioners recognize that housing, including housing affordability, are serious issues  
17 that must be addressed at both the State and local levels. In fact, Petitioners have been proactive in  
18 finding ways to provide more housing and affordable housing for residents. For example, the Cities  
19 of Redondo Beach and Torrance sponsor a Section 8 Housing Program and an Emergency Housing  
20 Vouchers Program, and the City of Redondo Beach is in process to adopt an inclusionary housing  
21 ordinance for affordable housing that mandates affordable housing be constructed for projects over  
22 10 units. The City of Whittier too has an existing inclusionary housing ordinance for affordable  
23 housing for housing projects over 7 units. Also, the City of Carson is in the process of adopting a  
24 below market rate housing ordinance with an inclusionary housing component to increase affordable  
25 housing stock within its community. Over the past two decades, the City of Carson, through the  
26 Carson Housing Authority, assisted in the development of almost 1,000 affordable housing units,  
27 and over 900 housing units are currently under construction or approved within the community.

28





1 mile. Over 75% of the City’s population is comprised of minorities. The community is impacted  
2 by freight, port, rail, and automobile traffic congestion, as well as poor air quality and pollution due  
3 to oil and gas production and refinery uses.

4 15. With respect to affordable housing, Carson is in the process of adopting a below  
5 market rate housing ordinance with an inclusionary housing component to increase affordable  
6 housing stock within its community. Carson, through the Carson Housing Authority, has developed  
7 or assisted in the development of almost 1,000 affordable housing units in its community over the  
8 past two decades.

9 16. Petitioner/Plaintiff City of Torrance (“Torrance”) is a charter city, duly organized  
10 under the Constitution and the laws of the State of California. The City of Torrance has a population  
11 density of 7,160 residents per square mile. Traffic and congestion on major thoroughfares and traffic  
12 safety are one of the biggest concerns of many residents, which is exacerbated by the high influx of  
13 daily workers and visitors into the City.

14 17. With respect to affordable housing, Torrance also sponsors a Section 8 Housing  
15 Program and an Emergency Housing Vouchers Program. Torrance has 659 affordable rental  
16 housing units in its community and is planning for an additional 2,467 affordable housing units in  
17 the next eight years.

18 18. Petitioner/Plaintiff City of Whittier (“Whittier”) is a charter city, duly organized  
19 under the Constitution and the laws of the State of California. Whittier has a population density of  
20 5,667 people per square mile. Approximately 75% of the City’s population is comprised of  
21 minorities.

22 19. With respect to affordable housing, Whittier has implemented the Affordable Home  
23 Ownership Program and the Housing Rehabilitation Program, as well as being a participant in the  
24 federal HOME Program to assist low and very low income families secure affordable housing. The  
25 City further established a Housing Rights Center to support tenants and landlords regarding their  
26 rights and responsibilities on rental housing.

27 20. Redondo Beach, Carson, Torrance, and Whittier are collectively referred to herein  
28 as “Petitioners.”



1 and with respect to municipal affairs shall supersede all laws inconsistent therewith.”

2 **SB 9**

3 28. SB 9 was signed into law by Governor Gavin Newsom, filed with the Secretary of  
4 State on September 16, 2021, and became effective on January 1, 2022. Attached as Exhibit A is a  
5 true and correct copy of SB 9, as chaptered and enrolled.

6 29. SB 9 added Government Code Sections 65852.21 and 66411.7 and amended  
7 Government Code Section 66452.6.

8 **SB 9: Development of Two Residences on One Lot**

9 30. Government Code Section 65852.21, subdivision (a) provides that “no more than  
10 two residential units within a single-family residential zone shall be considered ministerially,  
11 without discretionary review or a hearing,” if the housing project meets certain requirements.

12 31. Government Code Section 65852.21, subdivision (b) provides that only objective  
13 zoning, subdivision, and design review standards may be imposed upon any housing unit created  
14 under SB 9, and such standards cannot preclude the creation of two units that are at least 800 square  
15 feet each.

16 32. Government Code Section 65852.21, subdivision (c) allows a local agency to require  
17 up to one off-street parking space per unit, but no parking shall be imposed if the parcel is located  
18 within one-half mile walking distance of a high-quality transit corridor or a major transit stop, or if  
19 there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel.

20 33. Government Code Section 65852.21, subdivision (d) allows a local agency to deny  
21 a housing project under SB 9 only if it would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined in  
22 Government Code Section 65589.5 subdivision (d) paragraph (2), upon public health and safety, or  
23 the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid  
24 the specific, adverse impact. Government Code Section 65589.5 subdivision (d) paragraph (2)  
25 defines “specific, adverse impact” as “a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact,  
26 based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as  
27 they existed on the date the application was deemed complete.”

28







1           34. Government Code Section 65852.21, subdivision (k) further provides that a local  
2 agency shall not be required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications  
3 under the California Coastal Act of 1976 for housing developments under SB 9.

4           35. Government Code Section 65852.21, subdivision (e), prohibits short-term rentals of  
5 30 days or less, but there are no other occupancy restrictions under Section 65852.21.

6 **SB 9: Lot Splits**

7           36. Government Code Section 66411.7, subdivision (a) requires a local agency to  
8 ministerially approve, without discretionary review or a hearing, the splitting of one single-family  
9 residential parcel into two lots, provided that each lot is located in an urbanized area (as designated  
10 by the US Census Bureau), no smaller than 40% of the original parcel, and at least 1,200 square  
11 feet, among other requirements.

12           37. Government Code Section 66411.7, subdivision (c) provides that only objective  
13 zoning, subdivision, and design review standards may be imposed upon any lot split, and such  
14 standards cannot preclude the creation of two units that are at least 800 square feet each.

15           38. Government Code Section 66411.7, subdivision (d) allows a local agency to deny a  
16 proposed lot split under SB 9 only if it would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined in  
17 Government Code Section 65589.5 subdivision (d) paragraph (2), upon public health and safety, or  
18 the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid  
19 the specific, adverse impact.

20           39. Government Code Section 666411.7, subdivision (o) further provides that a local  
21 agency shall not be required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications  
22 under the California Coastal Act of 1976 for lot splits under SB 9.

23           40. Government Code Section 666411.7, subdivision (g) requires the owner to sign an  
24 affidavit of their intent to principally occupy one of the lots for at least three years after the lot split  
25 is approved, and subdivision (h) prohibits short-term rentals of 30 days or less. There are no other  
26 occupancy restrictions under Government Code Section 66411.7.

27 **SB 9: Matter of Statewide Concern**

28           41. In enacting SB 9, the State Legislature specifically found and declared that “ensuring



1 access to *affordable housing* is a matter of statewide concern and not a municipal affair as that term  
2 is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution.” (Emphasis added.) Accordingly,  
3 SB 9 applies to both general law and charter cities.

4 42. However, nowhere in the statutory text of SB 9 is there a requirement that any  
5 housing or lot split created under SB 9 be available at an affordable housing cost, as defined in State  
6 law, or restricted to moderate-income or lower-income households, as defined in State law, thereby  
7 allowing the housing units and the lots to be sold or leased at market rates.

8 **SB 9: Procedural History**

9 43. Prior to the introduction of SB 9 to the State Senate on December 7, 2020, the bill  
10 existed in virtually identical form in the prior year’s (2019/2020) legislative session as Senate Bill  
11 (SB) 1120. Petitioners Redondo Beach and Torrance provided comment letters on SB 1120. The  
12 thrust of their concern was that SB 1120 unconstitutionally preempted a charter city’s regulation of  
13 zoning and housing regulations that address adverse impacts of an overly dense and crowded  
14 community and improperly planned housing and infrastructure. Attached as Exhibit B is a true and  
15 correct copy of the City of Redondo Beach comment letter dated June 7, 2020 to the State Senate  
16 and Assembly Members. Attached as Exhibit C is a true and correct copy of the City of Torrance  
17 comment letter dated June 18, 2020 to the Senator Toni G. Atkins.

18 44. Petitioners are informed and believe that SB 1120 failed to be adopted because it was  
19 not submitted for final voting prior to a legislative floor deadline.

20 45. After SB 9 was introduced to the State Legislature on December 7, 2020, Petitioners  
21 provided comment letters on SB 9 for similar reasons. Attached as Exhibit D-1 is a true and correct  
22 copy of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments comment letter dated June 18, 2021 to the  
23 Honorable David Chiu, Chair of the Assembly Committee on Housing and Community  
24 Development. Attached as Exhibit D-2 is a true and correct copy of the City of Whittier comment  
25 letter dated June 8, 2021 to the Honorable Cecilia Aguilar-Curry, Chair of the Assembly Committee  
26 on Local Government.

27 46. Throughout the legislative process prior to SB 9’s passage, Petitioners and others  
28 commented on SB 9’s removal of local land use and zoning control from cities and its replacement

1 with a one-size-fits-all approach throughout the State, notwithstanding each community’s varying  
2 needs and unique natural and physical environment. Attached as Exhibit E is a true and correct  
3 copy of SB 9 Unfinished Business Analysis of the Senate Rules Committee dated August 28, 2021.

4 47. SB 9 contains no severability clause.

5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Petition for Writ of Mandate – Code of Civil Procedure § 1085)**

7 48. Petitioners hereby re-allege paragraphs 1 through 47, inclusive, and incorporate them  
8 herein by reference as if fully set forth below.

9 49. As set forth in this Petition, SB 9 violates the California Constitution. Therefore,  
10 Petitioners seek a peremptory writ of mandate under Code of Civil Procedure section 1085,  
11 compelling Respondent to cease enforcement of SB 9.

12 50. Respondents have a clear, present, and ministerial duty to administer the laws of the  
13 State of California, such as the Government Code provisions adopted or amended under SB 9,  
14 without violating the provisions of the California Constitution. Respondent’s adoption and  
15 enactment of SB 9 is clearly unconstitutional for the reasons set forth below.

16 51. Cities throughout California have already established residential land use and zoning  
17 regulations with respect to the densities, types, locations, and standards for housing developments,  
18 and such regulations have been found to be municipal affairs, as guaranteed under Article XI,  
19 Section 5 of the California Constitution. However, the enactment of SB 9 to allow for multiple  
20 homes on property that has been zoned by a city for only one single-family home and to permit the  
21 splitting of a single-family residentially zoned parcel into two lots, all subject to ministerial review  
22 and approval, usurps a charter city’s authority over its own municipal affairs.

23 52. SB 9 specifically cited to and found that “ensuring access to affordable housing” –  
24 rather than just any housing – is a matter of statewide concern and not a municipal affair. However,  
25 SB 9 is not reasonably related to this stated goal.

26 53. First, nowhere in the text of SB 9 is there a provision to improve or increase the  
27 State’s or a city’s affordable housing stock. SB 9 contains no restriction or limitation of any new  
28 housing or lot split created under SB 9 to be available at an affordable housing cost, as that is defined





1 in State law, or to be sold or leased to moderate- or lower-income households, as those terms are  
2 defined in State law. Any and all new housing and lot splits under SB 9 can be sold or leased at  
3 market rates. Considering the already high cost of land and housing units, as well as the high costs  
4 of labor and materials, within urban areas of the State, it is unlikely that most of the new housing  
5 created under SB 9 will be financially affordable to moderate- or lower-income households. Rather,  
6 SB 9 will exacerbate unaffordability by taking away potential affordable housing locations. In some  
7 dense urban areas where Petitioners are located, residential parcels valued at \$1.5 million may result  
8 in a lot split with new housing units valued at \$1.0 to \$1.2 million each. With a surplus of high  
9 market rate units and not enough affordable homes, SB 9 does nothing to alleviate the housing  
10 affordability issue and may, in fact, further alienate lower income households and threaten those  
11 looking to achieve the American Dream.

12 54. The State knows how to write a law that will meaningfully and truly impact the lack  
13 of affordable housing. SB 9 is not such a law. The only mention of affordability, other than in its  
14 purported justification for applying it to charter cities, is that the developments and lot splits  
15 authorized by SB 9 not require demolition or alteration of housing that was already otherwise  
16 restricted as affordable. Not creating more harm does not come close to meeting the standard of  
17 being reasonably related to the stated goal of increasing access to affordable housing. In comparison,  
18 AB 83 and AB 140, for example, establishing Project Homekey Part 1 and 2 are replete with  
19 restrictions that will actually create affordable housing. Although those laws also provide  
20 exemptions from city planning and zoning laws, the Plaintiffs did not challenge them as being  
21 unconstitutional. In fact, Redondo Beach recently partnered with the County of Los Angeles and a  
22 developer of low income housing to obtain \$7.3 million to acquire and rehabilitate a former hotel  
23 in Redondo Beach, providing permanent supportive housing to chronically homeless households  
24 even though the location is not zoned for residential under the Redondo Beach Municipal Code.  
25 This is because those laws have sufficient restrictions to ensure the housing will actually be  
26 affordable and not market rate. SB 9 has no such restrictions and therefore is not reasonably related  
27 to the specified state interest due to its failure to address the purported concern of lack of affordable  
28 housing.



1           55. Even if SB 9 were reasonably related to its stated goal it would still be  
2 unconstitutional because it is not narrowly tailored to avoid unnecessary interference in local  
3 governance, for several reasons. First, SB 9 does not allow a city to adequately address public health  
4 or safety concerns of the cumulative impacts of multiple SB 9 housing projects in a neighborhood  
5 or community. Although SB 9 allows a city to deny a housing project based on objective public  
6 health or safety concerns, the public health or safety impact must be significant. Although a single  
7 SB 9 housing project may not have a significant public health or safety impact, the *cumulative*  
8 *impacts of several projects within a single neighborhood* on public health or safety could be  
9 significant.

10           56. For example, SB 9 allows local ordinances to require up to one space of off-street  
11 parking per unit, but prohibits the application of a parking requirement when a housing project is  
12 within one-half mile walking distance of a high-quality transit corridor or major transit stop or within  
13 one block of a car share vehicle. Since SB 9 allows up to four houses on one parcel (with a lot split),  
14 a single SB 9 housing project could create parking demand for at least four to eight vehicles while  
15 supplying none, resulting in adverse parking and traffic issues, and hampering fire or emergency  
16 access where needed, particularly in neighborhoods where streets are narrow.

17           57. Likewise, one SB 9 housing project would not likely affect an existing water line or  
18 sewer capacity, but a 15% increase in housing projects could overwhelm the water or sewer system  
19 built to the capacity of an existing, non-growing neighborhood. None of these concerns could be  
20 addressed under SB 9 because the impact of one housing project would not meet the definition of a  
21 “significant impact” on an individual basis, and SB 9 does not allow a city to address the cumulative  
22 impacts of such housing projects.

23           58. Charter cities such as Petitioners have enacted ordinances to address their localities’  
24 specific concerns regarding traffic, parking, community character, and infrastructure, many of  
25 which were designed decades ago for a suburban density. Moreover, land use decisions oftentimes  
26 are required to take into account school capacity, financial sustainability, park and open space, air  
27 pollution, physical infrastructure and utility needs, and access to emergency services. None of these  
28 can be considered under SB 9 in denying a project unless they are significant enough on an



1 individual project basis. Therefore, SB 9 is overbroad and not narrowly tailored due to its intrusion  
2 in the city’s authority to regulate for the public health, safety, and welfare of its community.

3 59. Second, SB 9 disrupts a city’s housing element and the State’s housing laws  
4 (Government Code Section 65580 *et seq.*) by eliminating single-family zoning, which make up two-  
5 thirds of all residences in California. By allowing multiple houses on one lot without having to re-  
6 zone such lots from single-family to multi-family uses, a city’s zoning districts and thereby its  
7 housing element will become outdated and inaccurate by failing to adequately account for certain  
8 population increases, housing supply and demand, infrastructure needs, parks, emergency services,  
9 and other related service levels. As a result, cities will not be able to accurately plan for future  
10 housing, as contemplated and required under the Government Code. This is contrary to the purposes  
11 of SB 9 and significantly reduces the ability for cities to adopt complete and accurate housing  
12 elements in the future.

13 60. Moreover, uneven development of housing density will put further strain on a city’s  
14 infrastructure, public utilities, and local services without adequate planning and control to address  
15 the resulting impacts. Increasing by right the densities, population, and housing units by up to four  
16 times within existing neighborhoods, without allowing a city to review the potential adverse impacts  
17 of such developments on traffic, noise, greenhouse gases, water and sewer systems, and other  
18 concerns within its community on a cumulative level, is unsustainable and potentially disastrous.  
19 As a result, SB 9 is overbroad and not narrowly tailored to avoid unnecessary interference in local  
20 governance over its housing elements and local planning and zoning laws.

21 61. Third, SB 9 excludes certain areas subject to the California Coastal Act, which may  
22 leave large swaths of coastal cities such as Petitioners exempt from SB 9, while other portions of  
23 the same cities are not exempt, thereby disproportionately gentrifying parts of a community and not  
24 affirmatively furthering fair housing. Petitioners and other cities are already working to create more  
25 opportunities for affordable and fair housing, but certain exemptions under SB 9 hinder these goals.

26 62. Fourth, SB 9 removes any public engagement and review of land use decisions that  
27 affect neighboring homeowners by requiring a ministerial approval process. Particularly when a  
28 housing project is subject to the California Coastal Act where public hearings would normally be



1 required, ministerial review of a housing development jeopardizes the ability for the applicant,  
2 residents, other local agencies, and stakeholders to voice legitimate public health, safety, and other  
3 community concerns that may be resolved through the city's local authority over land use and zoning  
4 decisions.

5 63. SB 9 is non-democratic in that it prohibits any due process for the affected housing  
6 applicant or neighbors and closes off any public accountability of public officials for their actions  
7 in approving SB 9 housing projects. Again, SB 9 is overbroad and not narrowly tailored to avoid  
8 unnecessary interference in local governance and accountability in land use and zoning decisions  
9 and housing development approvals.

10 64. Petitioners are beneficially interested in Respondent's duties to uphold the California  
11 Constitution and not to enforce any law, statute, or regulation that is in violation thereof. The  
12 enactment of SB 9 constitutes an abuse of discretion and is unconstitutional.

13 65. Petitioners have no adequate remedy at law to redress the constitutional and statutory  
14 violations described herein other than through a petition for writ of mandate.

15 66. Therefore, Petitioners request and pray that a writ of mandate be issued by this Court  
16 overturning or invalidating SB 9, due to its unconstitutional violations as set forth herein.

17 67. It is important to note that overturning or invalidating SB 9 will not eliminate the  
18 ability of the State to address the lack of housing and housing affordability issues. The State will  
19 continue to have a plethora of recently enacted housing legislation to tackle the housing crisis,  
20 including SB 330, SB 35, AB 447, AB 634, and AB 787, as well a slew of existing tools localities  
21 can use to create housing and improve housing affordability.

22 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **(Declaratory/Injunctive Relief – Code of Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 1060)**

24 68. Petitioners hereby re-allege paragraphs 1 through 67, inclusive, and incorporate them  
25 herein by reference as if fully set forth below.

26 69. Petitioners and Respondent are each interested in the legal validity of SB 9, and there  
27 is an actual and present controversy between the parties. Petitioners seek to determine that the  
28 enactment of SB 9 and the various provisions of the Government Code contained therein,



1 unconstitutionally violate a charter city’s authority over matters concerning municipal affairs and is  
2 neither reasonably related to resolution of the specified statewide interest of access to affordable  
3 housing nor narrowly tailored to avoid unnecessary interference in local governance. Respondent  
4 is obliged by statute to implement and enforce SB 9.

5 70. A judicial declaration is appropriate and necessary at this time under the  
6 circumstances to resolve the Parties’ controversy and determine the constitutionality of SB 9,  
7 whether Petitioners and other charter cities are required to comply with SB 9, and whether  
8 Respondent can properly enforce the bill.

9 71. Petitioners are presently and continuously injured by Respondent’s enactment of SB  
10 9, insofar as they violate Petitioner’s rights under the California Constitution. Petitioners have no  
11 plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law, and damages are indeterminate or unascertainable, and  
12 in any event, would not fully redress any harm suffered by Petitioners. Accordingly, the Court must  
13 enjoin Respondent from enforcing the provisions of SB 9.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray for judgment as follows:

- 16 1. For a peremptory writ of mandate invalidating SB 9 and directing Respondent to  
17 cease implementation and enforcement of SB 9, and all provisions that violate the State Constitution  
18 and statutory law;
- 19 2. For a declaration that SB 9 is unconstitutional, and that Respondent be enjoined from  
20 implementing or enforcing SB 9;
- 21 3. For Petitioners’ costs of suit;
- 22 4. For an award of attorneys’ fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5  
23 or other applicable law; and
- 24 5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

25 ///  
26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///



1 DATED: March 29, 2022

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



By: \_\_\_\_\_  
SUNNY K. SOLTANI  
Attorneys for Petitioners CITY OF REDONDO  
BEACH, CITY OF CARSON, CITY OF  
TORRANCE, and CITY OF WHITTIER

VERIFIED PURSUANT TO CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE § 446

ALESHIRE &  
WYNDER<sup>LLP</sup>  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW



# EXHIBIT A

## Senate Bill No. 9

### CHAPTER 162

An act to amend Section 66452.6 of, and to add Sections 65852.21 and 66411.7 to, the Government Code, relating to land use.

[Approved by Governor September 16, 2021. Filed with  
Secretary of State September 16, 2021.]

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 9, Atkins. Housing development: approvals.

The Planning and Zoning Law provides for the creation of accessory dwelling units by local ordinance, or, if a local agency has not adopted an ordinance, by ministerial approval, in accordance with specified standards and conditions.

This bill, among other things, would require a proposed housing development containing no more than 2 residential units within a single-family residential zone to be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or hearing, if the proposed housing development meets certain requirements, including, but not limited to, that the proposed housing development would not require demolition or alteration of housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income, that the proposed housing development does not allow for the demolition of more than 25% of the existing exterior structural walls, except as provided, and that the development is not located within a historic district, is not included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, or is not within a site that is legally designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district.

The bill would set forth what a local agency can and cannot require in approving the construction of 2 residential units, including, but not limited to, authorizing a local agency to impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards, as defined, unless those standards would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of up to 2 units or physically precluding either of the 2 units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area, prohibiting the imposition of setback requirements under certain circumstances, and setting maximum setback requirements under all other circumstances.

The Subdivision Map Act vests the authority to regulate and control the design and improvement of subdivisions in the legislative body of a local agency and sets forth procedures governing the local agency's processing, approval, conditional approval or disapproval, and filing of tentative, final, and parcel maps, and the modification of those maps. Under the Subdivision Map Act, an approved or conditionally approved tentative map expires 24



months after its approval or conditional approval or after any additional period of time as prescribed by local ordinance, not to exceed an additional 12 months, except as provided.

This bill, among other things, would require a local agency to ministerially approve a parcel map for an urban lot split that meets certain requirements, including, but not limited to, that the urban lot split would not require the demolition or alteration of housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income, that the parcel is located within a single-family residential zone, and that the parcel is not located within a historic district, is not included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, or is not within a site that is legally designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district.

The bill would set forth what a local agency can and cannot require in approving an urban lot split, including, but not limited to, authorizing a local agency to impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards, as defined, unless those standards would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of 2 units, as defined, on either of the resulting parcels or physically precluding either of the 2 units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area, prohibiting the imposition of setback requirements under certain circumstances, and setting maximum setback requirements under all other circumstances. The bill would require an applicant to sign an affidavit stating that they intend to occupy one of the housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of 3 years from the date of the approval of the urban lot split, unless the applicant is a community land trust or a qualified nonprofit corporation, as specified. The bill would prohibit a local agency from imposing any additional owner occupancy standards on applicants. By requiring applicants to sign affidavits, thereby expanding the crime of perjury, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would also extend the limit on the additional period that may be provided by ordinance, as described above, from 12 months to 24 months and would make other conforming or nonsubstantive changes.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA does not apply to the approval of ministerial projects.

This bill, by establishing the ministerial review processes described above, would thereby exempt the approval of projects subject to those processes from CEQA.

The California Coastal Act of 1976 provides for the planning and regulation of development, under a coastal development permit process, within the coastal zone, as defined, that shall be based on various coastal resources planning and management policies set forth in the act.



This bill would exempt a local agency from being required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications for housing developments and urban lot splits pursuant to the above provisions.

By increasing the duties of local agencies with respect to land use regulations, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would include findings that changes proposed by this bill address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair and, therefore, apply to all cities, including charter cities.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for specified reasons.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

SECTION 1. Section 65852.21 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65852.21. (a) A proposed housing development containing no more than two residential units within a single-family residential zone shall be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or a hearing, if the proposed housing development meets all of the following requirements:

(1) The parcel subject to the proposed housing development is located within a city, the boundaries of which include some portion of either an urbanized area or urban cluster, as designated by the United States Census Bureau, or, for unincorporated areas, a legal parcel wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urban cluster, as designated by the United States Census Bureau.

(2) The parcel satisfies the requirements specified in subparagraphs (B) to (K), inclusive, of paragraph (6) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4.

(3) Notwithstanding any provision of this section or any local law, the proposed housing development would not require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:

(A) Housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income.

(B) Housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power.

(C) Housing that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.

(4) The parcel subject to the proposed housing development is not a parcel on which an owner of residential real property has exercised the owner's rights under Chapter 12.75 (commencing with Section 7060) of Division 7 of Title 1 to withdraw accommodations from rent or lease within 15 years before the date that the development proponent submits an application.



(5) The proposed housing development does not allow the demolition of more than 25 percent of the existing exterior structural walls, unless the housing development meets at least one of the following conditions:

(A) If a local ordinance so allows.

(B) The site has not been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.

(6) The development is not located within a historic district or property included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, as defined in Section 5020.1 of the Public Resources Code, or within a site that is designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district pursuant to a city or county ordinance.

(b) (1) Notwithstanding any local law and except as provided in paragraph (2), a local agency may impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards that do not conflict with this section.

(2) (A) The local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards that would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of up to two units or that would physically preclude either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area.

(B) (i) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), no setback shall be required for an existing structure or a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as an existing structure.

(ii) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), in all other circumstances not described in clause (i), a local agency may require a setback of up to four feet from the side and rear lot lines.

(c) In addition to any conditions established in accordance with subdivision (b), a local agency may require any of the following conditions when considering an application for two residential units as provided for in this section:

(1) Off-street parking of up to one space per unit, except that a local agency shall not impose parking requirements in either of the following instances:

(A) The parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code, or a major transit stop, as defined in Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code.

(B) There is a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel.

(2) For residential units connected to an onsite wastewater treatment system, a percolation test completed within the last 5 years, or, if the percolation test has been recertified, within the last 10 years.

(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a local agency may deny a proposed housing development project if the building official makes a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment and for which there is



no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.

(e) A local agency shall require that a rental of any unit created pursuant to this section be for a term longer than 30 days.

(f) Notwithstanding Section 65852.2 or 65852.22, a local agency shall not be required to permit an accessory dwelling unit or a junior accessory dwelling unit on parcels that use both the authority contained within this section and the authority contained in Section 66411.7.

(g) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b), an application shall not be rejected solely because it proposes adjacent or connected structures provided that the structures meet building code safety standards and are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.

(h) Local agencies shall include units constructed pursuant to this section in the annual housing element report as required by subparagraph (I) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 65400.

(i) For purposes of this section, all of the following apply:

(1) A housing development contains two residential units if the development proposes no more than two new units or if it proposes to add one new unit to one existing unit.

(2) The terms “objective zoning standards,” “objective subdivision standards,” and “objective design review standards” mean standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official prior to submittal. These standards may be embodied in alternative objective land use specifications adopted by a local agency, and may include, but are not limited to, housing overlay zones, specific plans, inclusionary zoning ordinances, and density bonus ordinances.

(3) “Local agency” means a city, county, or city and county, whether general law or chartered.

(j) A local agency may adopt an ordinance to implement the provisions of this section. An ordinance adopted to implement this section shall not be considered a project under Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.

(k) Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or in any way alter or lessen the effect or application of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code), except that the local agency shall not be required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications for a housing development pursuant to this section.

SEC. 2. Section 66411.7 is added to the Government Code, to read:

66411.7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this division and any local law, a local agency shall ministerially approve, as set forth in this section, a parcel map for an urban lot split only if the local agency determines that the parcel map for the urban lot split meets all the following requirements:



(1) The parcel map subdivides an existing parcel to create no more than two new parcels of approximately equal lot area provided that one parcel shall not be smaller than 40 percent of the lot area of the original parcel proposed for subdivision.

(2) (A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), both newly created parcels are no smaller than 1,200 square feet.

(B) A local agency may by ordinance adopt a smaller minimum lot size subject to ministerial approval under this subdivision.

(3) The parcel being subdivided meets all the following requirements:

(A) The parcel is located within a single-family residential zone.

(B) The parcel subject to the proposed urban lot split is located within a city, the boundaries of which include some portion of either an urbanized area or urban cluster, as designated by the United States Census Bureau, or, for unincorporated areas, a legal parcel wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urban cluster, as designated by the United States Census Bureau.

(C) The parcel satisfies the requirements specified in subparagraphs (B) to (K), inclusive, of paragraph (6) of subdivision (a) of Section 65913.4.

(D) The proposed urban lot split would not require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:

(i) Housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income.

(ii) Housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power.

(iii) A parcel or parcels on which an owner of residential real property has exercised the owner's rights under Chapter 12.75 (commencing with Section 7060) of Division 7 of Title 1 to withdraw accommodations from rent or lease within 15 years before the date that the development proponent submits an application.

(iv) Housing that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.

(E) The parcel is not located within a historic district or property included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, as defined in Section 5020.1 of the Public Resources Code, or within a site that is designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district pursuant to a city or county ordinance.

(F) The parcel has not been established through prior exercise of an urban lot split as provided for in this section.

(G) Neither the owner of the parcel being subdivided nor any person acting in concert with the owner has previously subdivided an adjacent parcel using an urban lot split as provided for in this section.

(b) An application for a parcel map for an urban lot split shall be approved in accordance with the following requirements:

(1) A local agency shall approve or deny an application for a parcel map for an urban lot split ministerially without discretionary review.

(2) A local agency shall approve an urban lot split only if it conforms to all applicable objective requirements of the Subdivision Map Act (Division





2 (commencing with Section 66410)), except as otherwise expressly provided in this section.

(3) Notwithstanding Section 66411.1, a local agency shall not impose regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way or the construction of offsite improvements for the parcels being created as a condition of issuing a parcel map for an urban lot split pursuant to this section.

(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), notwithstanding any local law, a local agency may impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards applicable to a parcel created by an urban lot split that do not conflict with this section.

(2) A local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards that would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of two units on either of the resulting parcels or that would result in a unit size of less than 800 square feet.

(3) (A) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), no setback shall be required for an existing structure or a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as an existing structure.

(B) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), in all other circumstances not described in subparagraph (A), a local agency may require a setback of up to four feet from the side and rear lot lines.

(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a local agency may deny an urban lot split if the building official makes a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.

(e) In addition to any conditions established in accordance with this section, a local agency may require any of the following conditions when considering an application for a parcel map for an urban lot split:

(1) Easements required for the provision of public services and facilities.

(2) A requirement that the parcels have access to, provide access to, or adjoin the public right-of-way.

(3) Off-street parking of up to one space per unit, except that a local agency shall not impose parking requirements in either of the following instances:

(A) The parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code, or a major transit stop as defined in Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code.

(B) There is a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel.

(f) A local agency shall require that the uses allowed on a lot created by this section be limited to residential uses.

(g) (1) A local agency shall require an applicant for an urban lot split to sign an affidavit stating that the applicant intends to occupy one of the



housing units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the approval of the urban lot split.

(2) This subdivision shall not apply to an applicant that is a “community land trust,” as defined in clause (ii) of subparagraph (C) of paragraph (11) of subdivision (a) of Section 402.1 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, or is a “qualified nonprofit corporation” as described in Section 214.15 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(3) A local agency shall not impose additional owner occupancy standards, other than provided for in this subdivision, on an urban lot split pursuant to this section.

(h) A local agency shall require that a rental of any unit created pursuant to this section be for a term longer than 30 days.

(i) A local agency shall not require, as a condition for ministerial approval of a parcel map application for the creation of an urban lot split, the correction of nonconforming zoning conditions.

(j) (1) Notwithstanding any provision of Section 65852.2, 65852.21, 65852.22, 65915, or this section, a local agency shall not be required to permit more than two units on a parcel created through the exercise of the authority contained within this section.

(2) For the purposes of this section, “unit” means any dwelling unit, including, but not limited to, a unit or units created pursuant to Section 65852.21, a primary dwelling, an accessory dwelling unit as defined in Section 65852.2, or a junior accessory dwelling unit as defined in Section 65852.22.

(k) Notwithstanding paragraph (3) of subdivision (c), an application shall not be rejected solely because it proposes adjacent or connected structures provided that the structures meet building code safety standards and are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.

(l) Local agencies shall include the number of applications for parcel maps for urban lot splits pursuant to this section in the annual housing element report as required by subparagraph (I) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 65400.

(m) For purposes of this section, both of the following shall apply:

(1) “Objective zoning standards,” “objective subdivision standards,” and “objective design review standards” mean standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official prior to submittal. These standards may be embodied in alternative objective land use specifications adopted by a local agency, and may include, but are not limited to, housing overlay zones, specific plans, inclusionary zoning ordinances, and density bonus ordinances.

(2) “Local agency” means a city, county, or city and county, whether general law or chartered.

(n) A local agency may adopt an ordinance to implement the provisions of this section. An ordinance adopted to implement this section shall not be



considered a project under Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code.

(o) Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or in any way alter or lessen the effect or application of the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code), except that the local agency shall not be required to hold public hearings for coastal development permit applications for urban lot splits pursuant to this section.

SEC. 3. Section 66452.6 of the Government Code is amended to read:

66452.6. (a) (1) An approved or conditionally approved tentative map shall expire 24 months after its approval or conditional approval, or after any additional period of time as may be prescribed by local ordinance, not to exceed an additional 24 months. However, if the subdivider is required to expend two hundred thirty-six thousand seven hundred ninety dollars (\$236,790) or more to construct, improve, or finance the construction or improvement of public improvements outside the property boundaries of the tentative map, excluding improvements of public rights-of-way that abut the boundary of the property to be subdivided and that are reasonably related to the development of that property, each filing of a final map authorized by Section 66456.1 shall extend the expiration of the approved or conditionally approved tentative map by 48 months from the date of its expiration, as provided in this section, or the date of the previously filed final map, whichever is later. The extensions shall not extend the tentative map more than 10 years from its approval or conditional approval. However, a tentative map on property subject to a development agreement authorized by Article 2.5 (commencing with Section 65864) of Chapter 4 of Division 1 may be extended for the period of time provided for in the agreement, but not beyond the duration of the agreement. The number of phased final maps that may be filed shall be determined by the advisory agency at the time of the approval or conditional approval of the tentative map.

(2) Commencing January 1, 2012, and each calendar year thereafter, the amount of two hundred thirty-six thousand seven hundred ninety dollars (\$236,790) shall be annually increased by operation of law according to the adjustment for inflation set forth in the statewide cost index for class B construction, as determined by the State Allocation Board at its January meeting. The effective date of each annual adjustment shall be March 1. The adjusted amount shall apply to tentative and vesting tentative maps whose applications were received after the effective date of the adjustment.

(3) "Public improvements," as used in this subdivision, include traffic controls, streets, roads, highways, freeways, bridges, overcrossings, street interchanges, flood control or storm drain facilities, sewer facilities, water facilities, and lighting facilities.

(b) (1) The period of time specified in subdivision (a), including any extension thereof granted pursuant to subdivision (e), shall not include any period of time during which a development moratorium, imposed after approval of the tentative map, is in existence. However, the length of the moratorium shall not exceed five years.



(2) The length of time specified in paragraph (1) shall be extended for up to three years, but in no event beyond January 1, 1992, during the pendency of any lawsuit in which the subdivider asserts, and the local agency that approved or conditionally approved the tentative map denies, the existence or application of a development moratorium to the tentative map.

(3) Once a development moratorium is terminated, the map shall be valid for the same period of time as was left to run on the map at the time that the moratorium was imposed. However, if the remaining time is less than 120 days, the map shall be valid for 120 days following the termination of the moratorium.

(c) The period of time specified in subdivision (a), including any extension thereof granted pursuant to subdivision (e), shall not include the period of time during which a lawsuit involving the approval or conditional approval of the tentative map is or was pending in a court of competent jurisdiction, if the stay of the time period is approved by the local agency pursuant to this section. After service of the initial petition or complaint in the lawsuit upon the local agency, the subdivider may apply to the local agency for a stay pursuant to the local agency's adopted procedures. Within 40 days after receiving the application, the local agency shall either stay the time period for up to five years or deny the requested stay. The local agency may, by ordinance, establish procedures for reviewing the requests, including, but not limited to, notice and hearing requirements, appeal procedures, and other administrative requirements.

(d) The expiration of the approved or conditionally approved tentative map shall terminate all proceedings and no final map or parcel map of all or any portion of the real property included within the tentative map shall be filed with the legislative body without first processing a new tentative map. Once a timely filing is made, subsequent actions of the local agency, including, but not limited to, processing, approving, and recording, may lawfully occur after the date of expiration of the tentative map. Delivery to the county surveyor or city engineer shall be deemed a timely filing for purposes of this section.

(e) Upon application of the subdivider filed before the expiration of the approved or conditionally approved tentative map, the time at which the map expires pursuant to subdivision (a) may be extended by the legislative body or by an advisory agency authorized to approve or conditionally approve tentative maps for a period or periods not exceeding a total of six years. The period of extension specified in this subdivision shall be in addition to the period of time provided by subdivision (a). Before the expiration of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map, upon an application by the subdivider to extend that map, the map shall automatically be extended for 60 days or until the application for the extension is approved, conditionally approved, or denied, whichever occurs first. If the advisory agency denies a subdivider's application for an extension, the subdivider may appeal to the legislative body within 15 days after the advisory agency has denied the extension.



(f) For purposes of this section, a development moratorium includes a water or sewer moratorium, or a water and sewer moratorium, as well as other actions of public agencies that regulate land use, development, or the provision of services to the land, including the public agency with the authority to approve or conditionally approve the tentative map, which thereafter prevents, prohibits, or delays the approval of a final or parcel map. A development moratorium shall also be deemed to exist for purposes of this section for any period of time during which a condition imposed by the city or county could not be satisfied because of either of the following:

(1) The condition was one that, by its nature, necessitated action by the city or county, and the city or county either did not take the necessary action or by its own action or inaction was prevented or delayed in taking the necessary action before expiration of the tentative map.

(2) The condition necessitates acquisition of real property or any interest in real property from a public agency, other than the city or county that approved or conditionally approved the tentative map, and that other public agency fails or refuses to convey the property interest necessary to satisfy the condition. However, nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to require any public agency to convey any interest in real property owned by it. A development moratorium specified in this paragraph shall be deemed to have been imposed either on the date of approval or conditional approval of the tentative map, if evidence was included in the public record that the public agency that owns or controls the real property or any interest therein may refuse to convey that property or interest, or on the date that the public agency that owns or controls the real property or any interest therein receives an offer by the subdivider to purchase that property or interest for fair market value, whichever is later. A development moratorium specified in this paragraph shall extend the tentative map up to the maximum period as set forth in subdivision (b), but not later than January 1, 1992, so long as the public agency that owns or controls the real property or any interest therein fails or refuses to convey the necessary property interest, regardless of the reason for the failure or refusal, except that the development moratorium shall be deemed to terminate 60 days after the public agency has officially made, and communicated to the subdivider, a written offer or commitment binding on the agency to convey the necessary property interest for a fair market value, paid in a reasonable time and manner.

SEC. 4. The Legislature finds and declares that ensuring access to affordable housing is a matter of statewide concern and not a municipal affair as that term is used in Section 5 of Article XI of the California Constitution. Therefore, Sections 1 and 2 of this act adding Sections 65852.21 and 66411.7 to the Government Code and Section 3 of this act amending Section 66452.6 of the Government Code apply to all cities, including charter cities.

SEC. 5. No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because a local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the program or level of service mandated by this act or



because costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.

O



# EXHIBIT B



**Bill Brand**  
Mayor

415 Diamond Street, P.O. BOX 270  
Redondo Beach, California 90277-0270  
www.redondorg

tel 310 372-1171  
ext. 2260  
fax 310 374-2039

July 7, 2020

**RE: CITY OF REDONDO BEACH OPPOSES HOUSING BILLS THAT PREEMPT LOCAL REGULATORY CONTROLS**

Dear State Senate and Assembly Members:

There are several bills that have been introduced in the Senate and Assembly this year related to housing and affordable housing. Although the City of Redondo Beach understands the intent to address the shortage of housing and affordable housing in the State of California, there are concerns with the potential consequences of many of these bills. The list of applicable bills is as follows:

- SB 902 Planning and zoning: housing development: density
- SB 995 Environmental quality: Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011: housing projects
- SB 1085 Density Bonus Law: qualifications for incentives or concessions: student housing for lower income students: moderate-income persons and families: local government constraints
- SB 1120 Subdivisions: tentative maps
- SB 1299 Housing development: incentives: rezoning of idle retail sites
- AB 725 General Plans: housing element: moderate-income and above moderate-income housing: suburban and metropolitan jurisdictions
- AB 1279 Planning and zoning: housing development: high-opportunity areas
- AB 2345 Planning and zoning: density bonuses: annual report: affordable housing
- AB 3040 Local planning: regional housing needs assessment
- AB 3107 Planning and zoning: general plan: housing development

Local Controls and Planning

Existing State law leaves zoning decisions exclusively to local governments-this is a major part of the home rule doctrine. Several of the housing bills proposed in the Senate and Assembly preempt local regulation for housing.

Our City is currently updating its General Plan to address many local housing related concerns. Since spring 2017, a 27-member citizens General Plan Advisory Committee has conducted 21 meetings, with 6 more scheduled, many where the focus has been on housing in Redondo Beach. The intent is to ensure that a broad range of housing





types and densities are available. However, under numerous proposed housing bills this year, these robust planning efforts specific to our City would not be taken into consideration.

Redondo Beach provides for a broad range of housing types and densities. The City has also taken action to zone for higher densities around high quality transit nodes and to some extent along transit corridors. The City's certified Housing Element identifies specific sites in strategic locations and includes specific programs for ensuring housing goals as required are achieved. Every area identified in the Housing Element has distinct challenges that require different approaches.

Redondo Beach is a perfect example of a medium size coastal city striving to meet and address the housing needs of Southern California. We have every level and type of housing; singles, 1 bedroom, 2 bedrooms, 3 bedrooms, multi-family housing, single-family housing, accessory dwelling units, and multi-million-dollar coastal homes. Fifty percent of the housing units in the community is rental. We also have a Housing Authority with over 500 vouchers issued for Section 8 housing. We have numerous senior living complexes in all areas of town.

Like many communities in California, Redondo Beach is largely 'built-out' with worsening traffic, impacted schools, and water shortages. However, Redondo Beach's population continues to grow, along with average household size and the number of households. We have been averaging an additional 60 units per year for the last 15 years.

Redondo Beach's population density is 11,000 residents per square mile. Our city is one of the most densely populated areas in California. Demographia.com rated Redondo Beach as 43rd in population density for U.S. Cities over 50,000 people after the 2000 census. With this population density, the City as a result has 11 Level of Service 'F' intersections and similar parking challenges. Nonetheless, the City of Redondo Beach is producing a wide variety of housing after carefully considering the suitability and impacts of each housing project.

Many of the outlying cities in the LA area such as ours have a severe housing/jobs imbalance where over 90% of the residents leave their town in the morning to go to work (recognizing that during the LA County Safer at Home Order addressing the public health emergency related to COVID-19 and the curfews implemented recently this has been temporarily suspended but will return once orders are lifted). This creates huge impacts to our transportation sectors in one direction in the morning, to only reverse that impact during the evening commute. What these areas need is more job creating business centers to reverse some of that flow, not more housing that will only worsen the problem.



Yet, again, many of the proposed housing and affordable housing bills would exempt projects from local controls to appropriately plan, regulate, and provide infrastructure for housing in our community based on the community's needs and circumstances.

### One Size Does Not Fit All

Despite the city's contemporary land-use planning policies and zoning designations, the proposed legislation would replace our strategically planned, locally appropriate areas of housing intensification with a blanket policy. This one size fits all approach to local land use regulation would have significant adverse impacts on our established community and its character, many bills having significant implications regarding traffic, parking, and other infrastructure that was designed decades ago for a suburban density.

Land use decisions by communities and local officials are complex and take into account many different issues such as school capacity, financial sustainability, available park space, traffic, air pollution, water needs, sewer capacity, parking, affordability, street maintenance, commercial needs, industrial needs, access to emergency services, etc.

A one size fits all approach dictated from the State will be a disaster for many communities by exacerbating impacts that will also have consequences with State-wide interest. Water needs will increase and student/teacher ratios will deteriorate just to name two. Legislation that creates even bigger problems with State-wide interests will demand more rules and regulations to fix the problems they create.

State legislation should not interfere with complex decisions best handled at the local level. Local land-use decisions should be left to local communities who must manage and maintain the towns they create. To address this concern, on July 7, 2020 the Redondo Beach City Council received a report and authorized this response to the housing bills listed above that propose significant detrimental impacts on local control.

In conclusion, although it is important to make housing development a priority in today's climate, housing development regulations and approvals should be left to the local agencies that are best equipped to evaluate the impacts of projects, and can require mitigations to protect the health and safety of the residents they serve. We oppose home rule preemption.

Sincerely,



William Brand

CC: Senator Benjamin Allen, 26<sup>th</sup> State Senate District  
Assembly Member Al Muratsuchi, 66<sup>th</sup> Assembly District  
Michael J. Arnold, Michael J. Arnold & Associates  
City Council Members, City of Redondo Beach



# EXHIBIT C



---

**T O R R A N C E**

---

**PATRICK J. FUREY**  
MAYOR

June 18, 2020

Senator Toni G Atkins  
Senator President Pro Tempore  
Capitol Office  
State Capitol, Room 20S  
Sacramento, CA 95814

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

**HEIDI ANN ASHCRAFT**  
**GEORGE CHEN**  
**TIM GOODRICH**  
**MIKE GRIFFITHS**  
**SHARON KALANI**  
**AURELIO MATTUCCI**

**RE: SB 1120 (Atkins) Subdivisions: tentative maps**  
**Notice of Opposition**

Dear Senator Atkins,

The City of Torrance is **opposed** to SB 1120, which would require a proposed housing development containing two (2) residential units to be considered ministerially and would be without discretionary review or hearing in zones where allowable uses are limited to single-family, residential development, if the proposed housing development meets certain requirements.


SB 1120 lets cities apply local ADU laws, to double its envisioned four units to eight luxury units per single-family lot, further spurring speculation and destabilizing homeownership in California. At the same time, the bill requires just one parking space per home in most communities.

Specifically, the City of Torrance opposes the following provisions in SB 1120:

- Requires a housing development containing two units to be considered ministerially in single family zones if the development meets certain conditions.
- Requires a city or county to ministerially approve or deny a parcel map for an urban lot split that meets specified requirements, in addition to the requirements for eligible parcels that apply to both duplexes and urban lot splits.
- Prohibits a local agency from imposing regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way or the construction of reasonable offsite and onsite improvements for parcels created through an urban lot split.
- Prohibits the development of ADUs on parcels that use both the urban lot split and duplex provisions of the bill, and it applies the limitations on parking requirements from ADU law to both duplexes and urban lot splits under the bill.

For these reasons, the City of Torrance **Strongly Opposes** SB 1120.

Sincerely,

  
Patrick J. Furey  
Mayor, City of Torrance

cc. Senator Ben Allen & Assemblyman Al Muratsuchi  
Jeff Kiernan, League Regional Public Affairs Manager (via email)  
Meg Desmond, League of California Cities, [cityletters@cacities.org](mailto:cityletters@cacities.org)

---

3031 Torrance Boulevard • Torrance, California 90503 • 310/618-2801 • FAX 310/618-5841

(800) 666-1917

LEGISLATIVE INTENT SERVICE



# EXHIBIT D-1



**SOUTH BAY CITIES**  
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

2355 Crenshaw Blvd., #125  
Torrance, CA 90501  
(310) 371-7222  
[sbccog@southbaycities.org](mailto:sbccog@southbaycities.org)  
[www.southbaycities.org](http://www.southbaycities.org)

June 18, 2021

The Honorable David Chiu  
Chair, Assembly Committee on Housing and Community Development  
1020 N Street, Room 156  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 9 (Atkins) Increased Density in Single-Family Zones – Notice of Opposition**

Dear Assemblymember Chiu,

On behalf of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG), I am writing to express our continued opposition to SB 9, which would require a local government to ministerially approve a housing development containing two residential units in single-family residential zones. Additionally, this measure would require local governments to ministerially approve urban lot splits.

The SBCCOG agrees that housing affordability and homelessness continue to be among the most critical issues facing California cities. Affordably priced homes are out of reach for many people and housing is not being built fast enough to meet the current or projected needs of people living in the state. Cities lay the groundwork for housing production by planning and zoning new projects in their communities based on extensive public input and engagement, state housing laws, and the needs of the building industry.

While the desire to pursue a housing production proposal is appreciated, unfortunately, SB 9 as currently drafted would not spur much needed housing construction in a manner that supports local control, decision-making, and community input. State driven ministerial or by-right housing approval processes fail to recognize the extensive public engagement associated with developing and adopting zoning ordinances and housing elements that are certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

The SBCCOG is committed to being part of the solution to the housing shortfall across all income levels and will continue to work collaboratively with the Legislature and League of California Cities to spur much needed housing construction while maintaining local control and helping the State towards more sustainable development. The SBCCOG has previously shared with you our December 2018 and February 2019 White Papers on housing to achieve zero emission housing in suburban cities. Those papers are available on our website here: <https://www.southbaycities.org/news/response-sb-50-resolving-housing-carbon-dilemma-state-policy-role-local-government>

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ACTION

Carson El Segundo Gardena Hawthorne Hermosa Beach Inglewood Lawndale Lomita  
Manhattan Beach Palos Verdes Estates Rancho Palos Verdes Redondo Beach Rolling Hills  
Rolling Hills Estates Torrance Los Angeles District #15 Los Angeles County



For these reasons, the SBCCOG continues to oppose SB 9. Should you have any questions, please contact SBCCOG Executive Director, Jacki Bacharach, at (310) 371-7222.

Sincerely,



Olivia Valentine, SBCCOG Chair  
Mayor Pro Tem, City of Hawthorne

- cc. South Bay Senators: Bradford, Kamlager  
South Bay Assembly Members: Burke, Muratsuchi, Gipson, O'Donnell  
Jeff Kiernan, Regional Affairs Manager, League of CA Cities, LA Division (via email)  
League of California Cities (Via email: [cityletters@cacities.org](mailto:cityletters@cacities.org))  
Bill Higgins, Executive Director, CALCOG



# EXHIBIT D-2





# City of Whittier

13230 Penn Street, Whittier, California 90602-1772  
(562) 567-9999 www.cityofwhittier.org

Joe Vinatieri  
Mayor

Cathy Warner  
Mayor Pro Tem

Jessica Martinez  
Council Member

Fernando Dutra  
Council Member

Henry Bouchot  
Council Member

Brian Saeki  
City Manager

June 8, 2021

The Honorable Cecilia Aguiar-Curry  
Chair, Assembly Committee on Local Government  
State Capitol, Room 5155  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 9 (Atkins) Increased Density in Single-Family Zones  
Oppose (As amended 04/27/2021)**

Dear Assembly Member Aguiar-Curry:

The City of Whittier writes to express our opposition to SB 9 (Atkins). SB 9 would require cities and counties to ministerially approve, without condition or discretion, a housing development containing two residential units on an individual parcel in single-family zones. Additionally, this measure would require local governments to ministerially approve an urban lot split, thus creating two independent lots that may be sold separately and contain a total of four dwelling units.

Housing affordability and homelessness are among the most critical issues facing California cities. Affordably priced homes are out of reach for many people and housing is not being built fast enough to meet the current or projected needs of people living in the state. Cities lay the groundwork for housing production by planning and zoning new projects in their communities based on extensive public input and engagement, state housing laws, and the needs of the building industry.

While the City of Whittier appreciates President pro Tempore Atkins' desire to pursue a housing production proposal, unfortunately, SB 9 as currently drafted will not spur much needed housing construction in a manner that supports local flexibility, decision making, and community input. State-driven ministerial or by-right housing approval processes fail to recognize the extensive public engagement associated with developing and adopting zoning ordinances and housing elements that are certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

The City of Whittier understands that the housing supply and affordability are among the most poignant issues facing California cities. The COVID-19 pandemic has only intensified and highlighted this urgent issue. As

LEGISLATIVE INTENT SERVICE (800) 666-1917



Page Two


The Honorable Cecilia Aguiar-Curry  
June 8, 2021

such, the City of Whittier is in the midst of updating the Housing Plan Element to identify sites for additional housing. SB 9 (Atkins) would disregard this process and mandate more housing in existing single-family zones due to its top-down, one-size fits all approach. SB 9 (Atkins) does not acknowledge that each city is unique and the local agency is better equipped to understand the individual needs of the community.

California cities are committed to being part of the solution to the housing shortfall across all income levels and will continue to work collaboratively with you, the author, and other stakeholders on legislative proposals that will actually spur much needed housing construction.

For these reasons, the City of Whittier opposes SB 9 (Atkins).

Sincerely,



Joe Vinatieri  
Mayor

cc. The Honorable Senate President pro Tempore Toni Atkins  
Senator Bob Archuleta, District 32  
Assembly Member Lisa Calderon, 57<sup>th</sup> District  
Whittier City Council  
Kristine Guerrero, League of California Cities



# EXHIBIT E

---

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

---

Bill No: SB 9  
Author: Atkins (D), Caballero (D), Rubio (D) and Wiener (D), et al.  
Amended: 8/16/21  
Vote: 21

---

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE: 7-2, 4/15/21  
AYES: Wiener, Caballero, Cortese, McGuire, Skinner, Umberg, Wieckowski  
NOES: Bates, Ochoa Bogh

SENATE GOVERNANCE & FIN. COMMITTEE: 5-0, 4/22/21  
AYES: McGuire, Nielsen, Durazo, Hertzberg, Wiener

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/20/21  
AYES: Portantino, Bradford, Kamlager, Laird, Wieckowski  
NOES: Bates, Jones

SENATE FLOOR: 28-6, 5/26/21  
AYES: Archuleta, Atkins, Becker, Bradford, Caballero, Cortese, Dahle, Dodd,  
Durazo, Eggman, Gonzalez, Grove, Hertzberg, Hueso, Hurtado, Laird, Leyva,  
McGuire, Min, Nielsen, Pan, Portantino, Roth, Rubio, Skinner, Umberg,  
Wieckowski, Wiener  
NOES: Bates, Borgeas, Jones, Melendez, Ochoa Bogh, Wilk  
NO VOTE RECORDED: Allen, Glazer, Kamlager, Limón, Newman, Stern

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 45-19, 8/26/21 - See last page for vote

---

**SUBJECT:** Housing development: approvals

**SOURCE:** Author

---

**DIGEST:** This bill requires ministerial approval of a housing development of no more than two units in a single-family zone (duplex), the subdivision of a parcel zoned for residential use into two parcels (lot split), or both.

*Assembly Amendments* provide that a local agency may deny a housing project otherwise authorized by this bill if the building official makes a written finding based upon the preponderance of the evidence that the housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact upon health and safety or the physical environment and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact; provides that a local agency shall require an applicant for an urban lot split to sign an affidavit stating that they intent to occupy one of the housing units as their principle residence for a minimum of three years, unless the applicant is a community land trust or a qualified nonprofit corporation; and removes the sunset.

**ANALYSIS:**

Existing law:

- 1) Governs, pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act, how local officials regulate the division of real property into smaller parcels for sale, lease, or financing.
- 2) Authorizes local governments to impose a wide variety of conditions on subdivision maps.
- 3) Requires a local jurisdiction to give public notice of a hearing whenever a person applies for a zoning variance, special use permit, conditional use permit, zoning ordinance amendment, or general or specific plan amendment.
- 4) Requires the board of zoning adjustment or zoning administrator to hear and decide applications for conditional uses or other permits when the zoning ordinance provides therefor and establishes criteria for determining those matters, and applications for variances from the terms of the zoning ordinance.
- 5) Establishes the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which generally requires state and local government agencies to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, and to reduce those impacts to the extent feasible. CEQA applies when a development project requires discretionary approval from a local government. (See “Comments” below for more information.)
- 6) Requires ministerial approval by a local agency for a building permit to create an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) provided the ADU was contained within an existing single-family home and met other specified requirements. Requires a local agency to ministerially approve an ADU or junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU), or both, as specified, within a proposed or existing structure or



within the same footprint of the existing structure, provided certain requirements are met.

- 7) Requires each city and county to submit an annual progress report (APR) to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Office of Planning and Research that provides specified data related to housing development.

This bill:

- 1) Requires a city or county to ministerially approve either or both of the following, as specified:
  - a) A housing development of no more than two units (duplex) in a single-family zone.
  - b) The subdivision of a parcel zoned for residential use, into two approximately equal parcels (lot split), as specified.
- 2) Requires that a development or parcel to be subdivided must be located within an urbanized area or urban cluster and prohibits it from being located on any of the following:
  - a) Prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance;
  - b) Wetlands;
  - c) Land within the very high fire hazard severity zone, unless the development complies with state mitigation requirements;
  - d) A hazardous waste site;
  - e) An earthquake fault zone;
  - f) Land within the 100-year floodplain or a floodway;
  - g) Land identified for conservation under a natural community conservation plan, or lands under conservation easement;
  - h) Habitat for protected species; or
  - i) A site located within a historic or landmark district, or a site that has a historic property or landmark under state or local law, as specified.
- 3) Prohibits demolition or alteration of an existing unit of rent-restricted housing, housing that has been the subject of an Ellis Act eviction within the past 15 years, or that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.
- 4) Prohibits demolition of more than 25% of the exterior walls of an existing structure unless the local ordinance allows greater demolition or if the site has not been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.



- 5) Authorizes a city or county to impose objective zoning, subdivision, and design review standards that do not conflict with this bill, except:
  - a) A city or county shall not impose objective standards that would physically preclude the construction of up to two units or that would physically preclude either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area. A city or county may, however, require a setback of up to four feet from the side and rear lot lines.
  - b) A city or county shall not require a setback for an existing structure or a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as the existing structure.
- 6) Prohibits a city or county from requiring more than one parking space per unit for either a proposed duplex or a proposed lot split. Prohibits a city or county from imposing any parking requirements if the parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor or a major transit stop, or if there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel.
- 7) Authorizes a city or county to require a percolation test completed within the last five years or, if the test has been recertified, within the last 10 years, as part of the application for a permit to create a duplex connected to an onsite wastewater treatment system.
- 8) Authorizes a local agency to deny a housing project otherwise authorized by this bill if the building official makes a written finding based upon the preponderance of the evidence that the housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact upon health and safety or the physical environment and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact
- 9) Requires a city or county to prohibit rentals of less than 30 days.
- 10) Prohibits a city or county from rejecting an application solely because it proposes adjacent or connected structures, provided the structures meet building code safety standards and are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.
- 11) Provides that a city or county shall not be required to permit an ADU or JADU in addition to units approved under this bill.
- 12) Requires a city or county to include the number of units constructed and the number of applications for lot splits under this bill, in its APR.

- 13) Requires a city or county to ministerially approve a parcel map for a lot split only if the local agency determines that the parcel map for the urban lot split meets the following requirements, in addition to the requirements for eligible parcels that apply to both duplexes and lot splits:
  - a) The parcel map subdivides an existing parcel to create no more than two new parcels of approximately equal size, provided that one parcel shall not be smaller than 40% of the lot area of the original parcel.
  - b) Both newly created parcels are at least 1,200 square feet, unless the city or county adopts a small minimum lot size by ordinance.
  - c) The parcel does not contain rent-restricted housing, housing where an owner has exercised their rights under the Ellis Act within the past 15 years, or has been occupied by tenants in the past three years.
  - d) The parcel has not been established through prior exercise of an urban lot split.
  - e) Neither the owner of the parcel, or any person acting in concert with the owner, has previously subdivided an adjacent parcel using an urban lot split.
- 14) Requires a city or county to approve a lot split if it conforms to all applicable objective requirements of the Subdivision Map Act not except as otherwise expressly provided in this bill. Prohibits a city or county from imposing regulations that require dedicated rights-of-way or the construction of offsite improvements for the parcels being created, as a condition of approval.
- 15) Authorizes a city or county to impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards that do not conflict with this bill. A city or county may, however, require easements or that the parcel have access to, provide access to, or adjoin the public right-of-way.
- 16) Provides that a local government shall not be required to permit more than two units on a parcel.
- 17) Prohibits a city or county from requiring, as a condition for ministerial approval of a lot split, the correction of nonconforming zoning conditions.
- 18) Requires a local government to require an applicant for an urban lot split to sign an affidavit stating that the applicant intends to occupy one of the housing units as their principle residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the approval of lot split, unless the applicant is a community land trust, as defined, or a qualified nonprofit corporation, as defined.





- 19) Provides that no additional owner occupancy standards may be imposed other than those contained within 18) above, and that requirement expires after five years.
- 20) Allows a city or county to adopt an ordinance to implement the urban lot split requirements and duplex provisions, and provides that those ordinances are not a project under CEQA.
- 21) Allows a city or county to extend the life of subdivision maps by one year, up to a total of four years.
- 22) Provides that nothing in this bill shall be construed to supersede the California Coastal Act of 1976, except that a local government shall not be required to hold public hearings for a coastal development permit applications under this bill.

## **Background**

Cities and counties enact zoning ordinances to implement their general plans. Zoning determines the type of housing that can be built. In addition, before building new housing, housing developers must obtain one or more permits from local planning departments and must also obtain approval from local planning commissions, city councils, or county board of supervisors. Some housing projects can be permitted by city or county planning staff ministerially, or without further approval from elected officials. Projects reviewed ministerially require only an administrative review designed to ensure they are consistent with existing general plan and zoning rules, as well as meeting standards for building quality, health, and safety. Most large housing projects are not allowed ministerial review; instead, these projects are vetted through both public hearings and administrative review. Most housing projects that require discretionary review and approval are subject to review under CEQA, while projects permitted ministerially generally are not.

## **Comments**

- 1) *Modest density can result in large-scale housing production.* This bill could lead to up to four homes on lots where currently only one exists. It would do so by allowing existing single-family homes to be converted into duplexes; it would also allow single-family parcels to be subdivided into two lots, while allowing for a new two-unit building to be constructed on the newly formed lot. According to the University of California, Berkeley Turner Center for Housing Innovation, this bill has the potential to allow for the development of nearly 6 million new housing units. Assuming only five percent of the parcels impacted



by this bill created new two-unit structures, this bill would result in nearly 600,000 new homes.

- 2) *Historic preservation versus housing production.* As part of their general police powers, local governments have the authority to designate historic districts, which set specific regulations and conditions to protect property and areas of historical and aesthetic significance. While well-intentioned, academics and others have pointed out that there are negative impacts of historic districts on housing supply and racial equity. For example, in 2017, the Sightline Institute noted that, in relation to Seattle’s historic preservation efforts, “rules for historic preservation can sabotage housing affordability just like any other cost, red tape, permitting delay, or capacity limits imposed on homebuilding.” It made recommendations such as educating historic preservation board members on how the historic review process and resulting preservation mandates can impede homebuilding and harm affordability; raising the bar for justifying landmark designations in order to counteract local anti-development sentiment; and even prohibiting historic preservation restrictions from limiting new construction to less than the height or capacity that zoning allows.

Sites within a historic district are categorically exempt from the provisions of this bill. While the committee understands the desire to protect the integrity of historic districts from an aesthetic perspective, it is unclear that allowing small multi-unit construction in historic districts — which would be subject to objective historic design standards — would undermine the integrity of the historic districts. In addition, exempting historic districts from bills designed to increase multi-unit housing supply could lead to fair housing challenges. This committee is aware of several California cities — including neighborhoods in Eastern San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Jose — that have not excluded historic districts when performing rezonings.

This bill also contains a very broad definition of what kinds of historic districts are automatically exempt from this bill. The historic district exemption, similar to exemptions included in other pending bills in the Senate, does not require a historic district to be on a federal or state historic registry. Instead, a city can designate a zone as historic without the typical rigorous historic designation process required for a historic district to be placed on a federal or state registry. Certain NIMBY groups are already discussing use of this broad exemption as a tool to exempt communities from state housing laws. If a historic district exemption is needed, a more focused and rigorous exemption — for example,



similar to what the Governance and Finance Committee placed in SB 50 (Wiener, 2019) — should be considered.

- 3) *Senate's 2021 Housing Production Package*. This bill has been included in the Senate's 2021 Housing Production Package and is virtually identical to SB 1120 (Atkins, 2020). For key differences, see the Senate Housing Committee analysis.

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: Yes

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee:

- 1) HCD estimates costs of \$89,000 (General Fund) annually for 0.5 Personnel Years of staff time to provide technical assistance and outreach education to local agencies and affordable housing developers.
- 2) Unknown state-mandated local costs to establish streamlined project review processes for proposed duplex housing developments and tentative maps for urban lot splits, and to conduct expedited design reviews of these proposals. These costs are not state-reimbursable because local agencies have general authority to charge and adjust planning and permitting fees to cover their administrative expenses associated with new planning mandates.

**SUPPORT:** (Verified 8/27/21)

AARP

Abundant Housing LA

ADU Task Force East Bay

All Home

American Planning Association, California Chapter  
Bay Area Council

Bridge Housing Corporation

Cal Asian Chamber of Commerce

California Apartment Association

California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce

California Association of Realtors

California Building Industry Association

California Chamber of Commerce

California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

California YIMBY

Casita Coalition

Central Valley Urban Institute



Chan Zuckerberg Initiative  
Circulate San Diego  
Cities of Alameda, Oakland, San Diego  
Council Member Jon Wizard, City of Seaside  
Council Member Zach Hilton, City of Gilroy  
Council of Infill Builders  
County of Monterey  
East Bay for Everyone  
Eden Housing  
Facebook, INC.  
Fathers and Families of San Joaquin  
Fieldstead and Company, INC.  
Generation Housing  
Greenbelt Alliance  
Habitat for Humanity California  
Hello Housing  
Hollywood Chamber of Commerce  
Housing Action Coalition  
Inland Empire Regional Chamber of Commerce  
Innercity Struggle  
League of Women Voters of California  
LISC San Diego  
Livable Sunnyvale  
Local Government Commission  
Long Beach YIMBY  
Los Angeles Business Council  
Los Feliz Neighborhood Council  
Mayor Darrell Steinberg, City of Sacramento  
Midpen Housing  
Midpen Housing Corporation  
Modular Building Institute  
Mountain View YIMBY  
National Association of Hispanic Real Estate Professionals  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California  
North Bay Leadership Council  
Northern Neighbors  
Orange County Business Council  
Palo Alto Forward  
Peninsula for Everyone



People for Housing - Orange County  
Pierre Charles General Construction  
Plus Home Housing Solutions  
San Diego Housing Commission  
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce  
San Fernando Valley YIMBY  
San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Research Association  
San Francisco YIMBY  
Sand Hill Property Company  
Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee  
Santa Cruz YIMBY  
Schneider Electric  
Share Sonoma County  
Silicon Valley @ Home  
Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
South Bay YIMBY  
South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth  
Streets for People Bay Area  
TechEquity Collaborative  
Tent Makers  
Turner Center for Housing Innovation at the University of California, Berkeley  
The Greater Oxnard Organization of Democrats  
The Two Hundred  
TMG Partners  
United Way of Greater Los Angeles  
Urban Environmentalists  
YIMBY Action  
YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County  
Zillow Group  
94 Individuals

**OPPOSITION:** (Verified 8/27/21)

Adams Hill Neighborhood Association  
Aids Healthcare Foundation  
Alameda Citizens Task Force  
Albany Neighbors United  
Berkeley Associated Neighbors Against Non-affordable Housing  
Brentwood Homeowners Association  
Burton Valley Neighborhoods Group  
California Alliance of Local Electeds

California Cities for Local Control  
California Contract Cities Association  
Catalysts  
Cities Association of Santa Clara County  
Citizens Preserving Venice  
Cities of Arcata, Azusa, Bellflower, Belmont, Beverly Hills, Brea, Brentwood, Burbank, Calabasas, Camarillo, Carpinteria, Carson, Cerritos, Chino, Chino Hills, Clayton, Clearlake, Clovis, Colton, Corona, Costa Mesa, Cupertino, Cypress, Del Mar, Diamond Bar, Dorris, Downey, Dublin, Eastvale, El Segundo, Escalon, Fillmore, Fortuna, Foster City, Fountain Valley, Garden Grove, Glendora, Grand Terrace, Half Moon Bay, Hesperia, Hidden Hills, Huntington Beach, Indian Wells, Inglewood, Irvine, Irwindale, Kerman, King, La Canada Flintridge, La Habra, La Habra Heights, La Mirada, La Palma, La Quinta, La Verne, Lafayette, Laguna Beach, Laguna Niguel, Lakeport, Lakewood, Lancaster, Lawndale, Lomita, Los Alamitos, Los Altos, Malibu, Martinez, Maywood, Menifee, Merced, Mission Viejo, Montclair, Monterey, Moorpark, Murrieta, Newman, Newport Beach, Norwalk, Novato, Oakdale, Ontario, Orinda, Pacifica, Palm Desert, Palo Alto, Palos Verdes Estates, Paramount, Pasadena, Pinole, Pismo Beach, Placentia, Pleasanton, Poway, Rancho Cucamonga, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rancho Santa Margarita, Redding, Redondo Beach, Ripon, Rocklin, Rohnert Park, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Rosemead, San Buenaventura, San Carlos, San Clemente, San Dimas, San Fernando, San Gabriel, San Jacinto, San Marcos, San Marino, Santa Clara, Santa Clarita, Santa Monica, Santa Paula, Saratoga, Signal Hill, Simi Valley, South Gate, South Pasadena, Stanton, Sunnyvale, Temecula, Thousand Oaks, Torrance, Tracy, Upland, Vacaville, Ventura, Visalia, Vista, West Covina, Westlake Village, Whittier, Yorba Linda, Yuba City  
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods  
Coalition to Save Ocean Beach  
College Street Neighborhood Group  
College Terrace Residents Association  
Committee to Save the Hollywoodland Specific Plan  
Community Associations Institute - California Legislative Action Committee  
Comstock Hills Homeowners Association  
Culver City Neighbors United  
D4ward  
Durand Ridge United  
Encinitas Neighbors Coalition  
Friends of Sutro Park  
Grayburn Avenue Block Club



Hidden Hill Community Association  
Hills 2000 Friends of The Hills  
Hollywood Knolls Community Club  
Hollywoodland Homeowners Association  
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association  
Kensington Property Owners Association  
LA Brea Hancock Homeowners Association  
Lafayette Homeowners Council  
Lakewood Village Neighborhood Association  
Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments  
Latino Alliance for Community Engagement  
League of California Cities  
League of California Cities Central Valley Division  
Linda Vista-Annandale Association  
Livable California  
Livable Pasadena  
Los Altos Residents  
Los Angeles County Division, League of California Cities  
Los Feliz Improvement Association  
Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers  
Menlo Park United Neighbors  
Miracle Mile Residential Association  
Miraloma Park Improvement Club  
Mission Street Neighbors  
Montecito Association  
Mountain View United Neighbors  
Neighborhood Council Sustainability Alliance Trees Committee  
North of Montana Association  
Northeast Neighbors of Santa Monica  
Pacific Palisades Community Council  
Planning Association for The Richmond  
Riviera Homeowners Association  
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments  
Save Lafayette  
Seaside Neighborhood Association  
Shadow Hills Property Owners Association  
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association  
South Bay Cities Council of Governments  
South Bay Residents for Responsible Development  
South Shores Community Association



Southwood Homeowners Association  
Sunnyvale United Neighbors  
Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee  
Sustainable Tamalmonite  
Tahoe Donner Association  
Temecula Valley Neighborhood Coalition  
Towns of Apple Valley, Colma, Fairfax, Los Altos Hills, Mammoth Lakes, Ross,  
Truckee, Woodside  
Tri-Valley Cities of Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon, and Town of  
Danville  
United Neighbors of Assembly District 24  
United Neighbors of Senate District 13  
Ventura Council of Governments  
Verdugo Woodlands West Homeowners Association  
West Pasadena Residents' Association  
West Torrance Homeowners Association  
West Wood Highlands Neighborhood Association  
Westside Regional Alliance of Councils  
Westwood Hills Property Owners Association  
Westwood Homeowners Association  
Wilshire Montana Neighborhood Coalition  
Windsor Square Association  
290 Individuals

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:** According to the author, “Senate Bill 9 promotes small-scale neighborhood residential development by streamlining the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an existing lot. SB 9 strikes an appropriate balance between respecting local control and creating an environment and opportunity for neighborhood scale development that benefits the broader community. To that end, the bill includes numerous safeguards to ensure that it responsibly creates duplexes and strategically increases housing opportunities for homeowners, renters, and families alike. At a time when many Californians are experiencing economic insecurity caused by the pandemic, this bill will provide more options for families to maintain and build intergenerational wealth – a currency we know is crucial to combatting inequity and creating social mobility. SB 9 provides flexibility for multigenerational housing by allowing homeowners to build a modest unit on their property so that their aging parent or adult child can have an affordable place to live. Building off the successes of ADU law, SB 9 offers solutions that work in partnership with a number bills included in the Senate’s Housing Package, ‘Building Opportunities For All’ aimed at combating the State’s housing crisis.”





**ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION:** According to the League of California Cities, “SB 9 as currently drafted will not spur much needed housing construction in a manner that supports local flexibility, decision making, and community input. State-driven ministerial or by-right housing approval processes fail to recognize the extensive public engagement associated with developing and adopting zoning ordinances and housing elements that are certified by [HCD].”

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 45-19, 8/26/21

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Arambula, Berman, Calderon, Carrillo, Cervantes, Chiu, Cooley, Cooper, Megan Dahle, Flora, Fong, Gallagher, Cristina Garcia, Eduardo Garcia, Gipson, Lorena Gonzalez, Gray, Grayson, Holden, Jones-Sawyer, Kalra, Lackey, Lee, Low, Mathis, Mayes, Medina, Mullin, Quirk, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Reyes, Robert Rivas, Rodriguez, Salas, Stone, Ting, Valladares, Villapudua, Ward, Akilah Weber, Wicks, Wood, Rendon

NOES: Bauer-Kahan, Bigelow, Bloom, Boerner Horvath, Daly, Davies, Frazier, Friedman, Gabriel, Irwin, Levine, Muratsuchi, Nazarian, O'Donnell, Petrie-Norris, Seyarto, Smith, Voepel, Waldron

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bennett, Bryan, Burke, Chau, Chen, Choi, Cunningham, Kiley, Maienschein, McCarty, Nguyen, Patterson, Luz Rivas, Blanca Rubio, Santiago

Prepared by: Alison Hughes / HOUSING / (916) 651-4124  
8/28/21 11:32:51

\*\*\*\* END \*\*\*\*

