

Date of Hearing: June 22, 2021

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

David Chiu, Chair

SB 9 (Atkins) – As Amended April 27, 2021

SENATE VOTE: 28-6

SUBJECT: Housing development: approvals

SUMMARY: Requires ministerial approval of housing developments with two units and subdivision maps that meet certain conditions. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Enables the development of two-unit housing developments as follows:
 - a) Requires local agencies to ministerially approve a proposed housing development project containing two residential units on parcels zoned for single-family residential development if all of the following conditions are met:
 - i) The parcel where the housing development will take place is located either:
 - (1) Within a city that includes some portion of an urbanized area or urban cluster as designated by the United States Census Bureau within its boundaries; or
 - (2) In an unincorporated area and the parcel is wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urbanized cluster as designated by the United States Census Bureau.
 - ii) The parcel where the housing development will take place is not located on or within:
 - (1) Environmentally unsafe or sensitive areas, as specified in Government Code Section 65913.4(a)(6)(B)-(K), such as a coastal zone, wetlands, a high or very high fire severity zone unless the site has adopted fire hazard mitigation measures required by existing building standards, a hazardous waste site, an earthquake fault zone, a flood plain or floodway, lands identified for conservation in an adopted natural community conservation plan, and lands under conservation easement;
 - (2) A state or local historical district or property, as defined;
 - (3) A parcel where the owner of residential property has withdrawn accommodations for rent or lease within the last 15 years.
 - iii) The housing development will not require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:
 - (1) Housing that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income;
 - (2) Housing that is subject to rent or price control; or

- (3) Housing occupied by tenants within the last three years.
 - iv) The housing development will not require the demolition of more than 25 percent of the exterior walls of an existing structure, unless such demolition is allowed by ordinance, or the development has not been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.
 - b) Prohibits local agencies from imposing objective design, subdivision, and zoning standards that would:
 - i) Physically preclude the development from including up to two units of at least 800 square feet each;
 - ii) Require setbacks for an existing structure, or for a structure built in the same location and to the same dimensions of an existing structure, if the required setbacks would physically preclude the development from including up to two units; or
 - iii) Require setbacks of more than four feet from the side and rear lot lines, if those setbacks would preclude the development from including up to two units.
 - c) Allows local agencies to require a development eligible for ministerial approval under the bill to provide one off-street parking space per unit, unless:
 - i) The parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, as specified; or
 - ii) A car share vehicle is located within one block of the parcel.
 - d) Allows cities and counties to require residential units connected to an onsite wastewater treatment system that are eligible for ministerial approval under the bill to have a percolation test completed within the last five years or recertified within the last ten years.
 - e) Provides that an application for a housing development must not be rejected solely because it includes adjacent or connected structures, provided that those structures meet existing building code and safety standards that are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.
 - f) Requires a local agency to require that a rental of any unit created pursuant to this bill be for a term longer than 30 days.
- 2) Enables the subdivision of parcels for an “urban lot split” as follows:
- a) Requires local agencies to ministerially approve a parcel map for an urban lot split if the parcel map:
 - i) Subdivides a parcel that is zoned for single-family residential use;
 - ii) Subdivides a parcel that is located:

- (1) Within a city that includes some portion of an urbanized area or urban cluster as designated by the United States Census Bureau within its boundaries; or
 - (2) In an unincorporated area and the parcel is wholly within the boundaries of an urbanized area or urbanized cluster as designated by the United States Census Bureau.
- iii) Subdivides a parcel that is not located on or within:
- (1) Environmentally unsafe or sensitive areas, as specified in Government Code Section 65913.4(a)(6)(B)-(K), such as a coastal zone, wetlands, a high or very high fire severity zone unless the site has adopted fire hazard mitigation measures required by existing building standards, a hazardous waste site, an earthquake fault zone, a flood plain or floodway, lands identified for conservation in an adopted natural community conservation plan, and lands under conservation easement; or
 - (2) A state, or local historical district or property, as defined.
- iv) Creates two new parcels, where neither of the new parcels are:
- (1) Less than 40 percent of the size of the original parcel; and
 - (2) Smaller than 1,200 square feet, unless a smaller minimum lot size is allowed by an ordinance adopted by a local agency.
- v) Would not require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing:
- (1) Housing that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income;
 - (2) Housing that is subject to rent or price control;
 - (3) A parcel where the owner of residential property has withdrawn accommodations for rent or lease within the last 15 years; or
 - (4) Housing occupied by tenants within the last three years.
- vi) Would not subdivide either of the following types of parcels:
- (1) A parcel previously established through an urban lot split; or
 - (2) A parcel where the owner or a person acting in concert with the owner previously subdivided an adjacent parcel through an urban lot split.
- b) Requires local agencies to approve urban lot splits that conform to the objective requirements of the Subdivision Map Act in accordance with the following:
- i) Ministerially and without discretionary review; and,

- ii) Without the imposition of regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way, or the construction of offsite improvements as a condition of approval.
- c) Allows local agencies to impose objective design and subdivision standards to parcels created by an urban lot split provided that the standards do not conflict with the standards established in the bill and the standards do not:
 - i) Physically preclude the construction of two units on either of the resulting parcels;
 - ii) Result in a unit size of less than 800 square feet;
 - iii) Require setbacks for an existing structure, or structure built in the same location and to the same dimensions of an existing structure if the required setbacks would physically preclude the development from including up to two units; or
 - iv) Require setbacks of more than four feet from the side and rear lot lines, if those setbacks would preclude the development from including up to two units.
- d) Provides that local agencies may impose or require any of the following conditions on an urban lot split:
 - i) Easements required for the provisions of public services and facilities;
 - ii) Requirements that parcels have access to or adjoin the public right-of-way; and
 - iii) Off street parking of up to one space per unit, unless the parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of public transit, as specified, or a car share vehicle is located within one block of the parcel.
- e) Requires local agencies to:
 - i) Limit parcels created through urban lot splits to residential uses;
 - ii) Restrict the rental term of any unit created through an urban lot split to a term of more than 30 days.
- f) Prohibits a local agency from
 - i) Requiring the correction of nonconforming zoning conditions as a condition of approval of an urban lot split; or
 - ii) Rejecting the urban lot split solely because it includes adjacent or connected structures, provided that those structures meet existing building codes and safety standards that are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.
- g) Authorizes a local agency to, until 2027, impose only the following owner occupancy requirements on an applicant for an urban lot split:
 - i) The applicant must intend to occupy one of the units created under the provisions of this bill for one year after the approval of an urban lot split; or

- ii) The applicant must be a qualified nonprofit corporation, as defined.
- 3) Provides measures that affect both the two-unit and lot-split provisions, as follows:
- a) Allows local agencies to adopt an ordinance to implement the provisions of this bill allowing for ministerial approval of two-unit housing developments and urban lot splits, and specifies that the action to adopt the ordinance is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
 - b) Specifies that a local agency is not required to permit accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs) on lots that have utilized the provisions of this bill to both subdivide the lot and construct two units on the subdivided parcel.
 - c) Requires local agencies to include information on the number of applicants for urban lot splits and the number of units constructed under the provisions of this bill in the annual housing element report submitted to the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
- 4) Allows local agencies to extend the life of subdivision maps by an additional 12 months, from the existing 12 months to 24 months.
- 5) Provides that the provisions of the bill address a matter of statewide concern rather than a municipal affair and therefore its provisions are applicable to all cities, including charter cities.
- 6) Provides that 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, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Allows cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws” (California Constitution, Article XI, Section 7).
- 2) Establishes Planning and Zoning Law, which requires every city and county to adopt a general plan that sets out planned uses for all of the area covered by the plan, and requires the general plan to include seven mandatory elements, including a land use element, and requires major land use decisions by cities and counties, such as development permitting and subdivisions of land, to be consistent with their adopted general plans (Government Code Section 65000 through 66301).
- 3) 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 (Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22).

- 4) Provides, pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Sections 66410 - 66499.38), the following related to the subdivision of land:
- a) Requires a city or county to require a tentative and a final map for all subdivisions of land creating five or more parcels, except for subdivisions which meet specified conditions;
 - b) Requires a city or county to require a parcel map for subdivisions meeting specified conditions;
 - c) Limits the improvements a city or county may require for a subdivision of land that is less than five parcels; and,
 - d) Requires a legislative body of a city or county to deny approval of a tentative map or a parcel map if it makes any of the following findings:
 - i) That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans;
 - ii) That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans;
 - iii) That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development;
 - iv) That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development;
 - v) That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause environmental damage, injure wildlife, or are likely to cause serious public health problems; or,
 - vi) That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with certain easements providing access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.
- 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 (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq).

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Author's Statement: According to the author, "Senate Bill 9 provides options for homeowners by streamlining the process for a homeowner to create a duplex or subdivide an existing lot. Building off the successes of ADU law, SB 9 strikes an appropriate balance between respecting local control and creating an environment and opportunity for neighborhood housing 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. 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. SB 9 is part of the Senate’s Housing Package, ‘Building Opportunities For All’ that establishes opportunities to make real progressive and positive changes in our communities to strengthen the fabric of our neighborhoods with equity, inclusivity, and affordability.”

California Housing Crisis: California is in the midst of a housing crisis. Only 27 percent of households can afford to purchase the median priced single-family home – 50 percent less than the national average. Over half of renters, and 80 percent of low-income renters, are rent-burdened, meaning they pay over 30 percent of their income towards rent. At last count, there were over 160,000 homeless Californians. The burden of this crisis is disproportionately born by communities of color, as Black and Latinx households are one-third less likely to own a home as White households, and 20 percent more likely to be rent-burdened.¹

A major cause of our housing crisis is the mismatch between the supply and demand for housing. According to the Roadmap Home 2030 (Housing CA and California Housing Partnership Corporation, 2021), to address this mismatch, California needs approximately 2.6 million units of housing, including 1.2 million units affordable to lower income households. And according to HCD, the state needs 180,000 units of housing built a year to keep up with demand. By contrast, production in the past decade has been under 100,000 units per year, further exacerbating the housing crisis.

Local Restrictions on Housing Development and their Implications: Planning for and approving new housing is mainly a local responsibility. The California Constitution allows cities and counties to “make and enforce within its limits, all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.” It is from this fundamental power (commonly called the police power) that cities and counties derive their authority to regulate behavior to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of the public – including land use authority. Cities and counties enforce this land use authority through zoning regulations that restrict and shape development, such as maximum densities of housing units, maximum heights, minimum numbers of required parking spaces, required setbacks, and maximum lot coverage ratios. These ordinances can also include conditions on development to address aesthetics, community impacts, or other particular site-specific considerations.

While local governments do not build housing, the restrictions they place on new housing production contribute to a lack of housing in the state. Historically, the provision of housing was highly correlated to market demand. However, that shifted with the rise of local zoning, which came to prominence just over 100 years ago. Zoning laws that limit housing to single-family homes on larger lots are the most prominent form of zoning in California.² The result of this zoning is that it locks in allowable density, independent of demand for new housing, even as the demand for new housing in California exceeds millions of units (as discussed above). This excessive demand drives up home prices and values. This increase in home values benefits existing homeowners, who are disproportionately White; in 2019 California homeownership

¹ HCD, 2018, *California’s Housing Future: Challenges and Opportunities Final Statewide Housing Assessment 2025*: https://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/plans-reports/docs/sha_final_combined.pdf

² UC Berkeley Turner Center, 2018, *Land Use in California* survey of cities and counties: <https://californialanduse.org/>

rates were 68 percent for White households, 49 percent for Latinx households, and 41 percent for Black households.³ The increased cost of housing disproportionately hurts communities of color, who are less likely to have assets to purchase a home or afford the rent, as White households have a median wealth of \$188,200, whereas for Latinx households it is \$36,100 and for Black households that figure is \$24,100.⁴

Second Units as a Solution: In California, most of the land developable for housing has already been developed. The remaining developable areas are typically far from job centers, in high-risk wildfire areas, and/or land that is environmentally sensitive or important for agriculture. Therefore, addressing the housing crisis in an environmentally responsible way will require an increase in density in already developed areas.

Increasing density can occur in multiple ways. In recent decades, this has often meant high-density housing near major transit stops. However, such housing is both expensive to build, and limited in geographic scope. Recently, there has been a national trend to allow for more “gentle density,” e.g., duplexes, four-plexes, townhomes, and other moderately dense developments that were common before the imposition of zoning. This includes adopted measures in Oregon, Minneapolis, and Berkeley, as well as measures under consideration in Sacramento, South San Francisco, and Connecticut.

In recent years, the Legislature has taken a more active role in facilitating such gentle density. In 2016 SB 1069 (Wieckowski) and AB 2299 (Bloom) permitted accessory dwelling units (ADUs) by right on all residentially-zoned parcels in the State. By permitting an ADU as a second unit on all single-family lots, these laws effectively doubled their allowed density.

Before 2016, approximately 1,000 ADUs were permitted statewide annually; in the past two years, that number has exceeded 10,000 (Per HCD’s Annual Progress Report Dashboard). This number is expected to grow quickly as the ADU construction and financing industry matures, given that market demand makes it economically feasible build approximately 1.8 million ADUs in California.⁵

This bill proposes to build on and complement the success of the state’s ADU program by allowing by right the development of two units on single-family lots. Unlike existing ADU law, newly constructed units permitted by this bill would not be limited to a single story and 1,200 square feet. This bill would not apply those size constraints. This bill contains other guardrails to help ensure that new housing projects that result in two units on a lot are built in a manner that is in keeping with neighborhood character, as well as in environmentally-appropriate locations. Such guardrails include that the new homes must comply with all of the following:

- A city or county’s objective standards, such as building height, setbacks, and lot coverage, as long as these constraints do not unduly preclude the development of two units of at least 800 square feet;

³ US Census data

⁴ Bhutta et al, 2020, *Disparities in Wealth by Race and Ethnicity in the 2019 Survey of Consumer Finances*, US Federal Reserve: <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/disparities-in-wealth-by-race-and-ethnicity-in-the-2019-survey-of-consumer-finances-20200928.htm>

⁵ Monkkonen et al, 2020, *One to Four: The Market Potential of Fourplexes in California’s Single-Family Neighborhoods*, UCLA Working Paper Series: <https://www.lewis.ucla.edu/research/market-potential-fourplexes/>

- Geographic parameters that require them to be built in or proximal to already urbanized areas;
- Environmental parameters than preclude development in environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, fault zones, and areas protected by conservation easements, as well as proof that the site can handle onsite wastewater;
- Cultural parameters, such that these units may not be built in state or locally-designated historic districts; and
- Equity standards, by ensuring that the new homes do not require the demolition of housing designated for lower income renter households.

By increasing development capacity, this bill will increase land values. A concern being raised about this bill is that the increased land value will facilitate speculative purchases of land by corporations, including institutional investors. Such concerns were also raised before and after the passage of the legislation that allowed ADUs. However, thus far this concern does not appear to have been borne out: while corporations own 17 percent of California’s housing stock, only eight percent of ADUs have been built on their property.⁶ One reason that corporations are not building as many secondary units is that construction is not part of their business model, which is instead predicated on rising rents providing a greater return than other investment alternatives.

While this bill would enable a second unit on existing property, the demolition of the existing home is subject to the provisions of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Skinner, Chapter 654, Statutes of 2019), as proposed to be clarified by SB 8 (Skinner, 2021). These provisions require that any unit that has housed a lower income households within the past five years cannot be demolished without being replaced by a unit affordable to lower income households, and that any lower or moderate-income occupants displaced by the demolition receive relocation benefits and be offered right of first refusal at affordable rents or costs in the new unit.

“Urban Lot Splits” and the Subdivision Map Act: The Subdivision Map Act establishes a statewide regulatory framework for subdividing land. For subdivisions of single parcels (“lot splits”), the Act requires a city or county in which the land is situated to approve a parcel map. Approval of parcel maps is discretionary, and cities and counties can require certain improvements as part of the parcel map.

This bill amends the Subdivision Map Act to require local agencies to ministerially approve subdivision maps for lot splits that qualify as an “urban lot split.” To qualify, an urban lot split must meet the same geographic, environmental, cultural, and equity requirements and standards as listed above for two-unit development. In addition, a proposed urban lot split is limited to subdivisions that:

- Divide a parcel that is zoned for single family residential use;
- Create two new parcels where neither of the new parcels is less than 40 percent of the size of the original parcel;
- Create parcels no smaller than 1,200 square feet, unless a smaller size is specifically allowed by local ordinance; and

⁶ Chapple et al, 2020, *Reaching California’s ADU Potential: Progress to Date and Progress to Date and the Need for ADU Finance*, UC Berkeley’s Temer Center and Center for Community Innovation: <https://temercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/ADU-Brief-2020.pdf>

- Do not divide a parcel that was previously created by an urban lot split, or is adjoined to a parcel previously created by an urban lot split by the same property owner.

The urban lot split provision of this bill has the potential to facilitate a substantial amount of housing beyond what is permitted by existing ADU law. This is because the split lot can be developed with for sale housing in addition to rental housing, and does not rely on the capital of the existing homeowner to develop the new home. Additionally, in conjunction with the two-unit provision, the lot split could result in a total of four units on the lot. This bill provides that the lot split provisions, in combination with the two-unit provisions, may only result in a maximum of four units on the lots – including ADUs.

The sale of a split lot will enable homeowners to realize the value of their property without requiring them to leave it. This is particularly important for lower and moderate income homeowners, as these homeowners often lack the assets to construct a second unit on the property.

Arguments in Support: Supporters of the bill argue that it has the potential to facilitate a substantial amount of new housing at a small-scale, neighborhood level, and that this new housing will help address the housing crisis by lowering rents and home prices. According to the Homebuilding Alliance, a coalition of organizations committed to supporting legislation that will increase housing production in California, “California’s continued housing shortage is a major source of stress on the state’s economic recovery and fiscal health, as well as its social welfare, medical and public safety systems. The severe mismatch between demand and available housing supply disproportionately impacts the state’s lowest-income families and puts them at greater risk for housing instability and homelessness, while lowering their chances for upward mobility. SB 9 strikes an appropriate balance between respecting local control and creating the environment and opportunity for small-scale neighborhood development that benefits the broader community.”

Arguments in Opposition: Opponents of the bill argue that it would override the traditional ability of localities to control the development process. According to the League of California Cities, “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 [HCD].” Other opponents argue that SB 9 will increase land value while simultaneously promoting gentrification because it will increase profitability for speculators. According to Livable California, “SB 9 will promote gentrification in stable neighborhoods, especially neighborhoods of color, the naturally occurring targets for speculators. Speculators will seek these area’s cheaper parcels in seeking higher profits, turning stable Black and Latino neighborhoods into targets for speculators/investors to buy up and turn homes into high-cost rentals without garages or yards.”

Related Legislation:

SB 1120 (Atkins, et al.), 2020: Substantially similar to SB 9, in that SB 1120 would have required ministerial approval of housing developments with two units (duplexes) and subdivision maps that meet certain conditions, and would have increased the length of time that cities and counties can extend the validity of existing subdivision maps. This bill died pending concurrence in the Senate.

SB 8 (Skinner), 2021: Clarifies that the anti-demolition protections of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019 (Skinner, Chapter 654, Statutes of 2019) would apply to the construction of single-family homes, thereby requiring that any demolished home with a lower income resident be replaced, and that the current residents get relocation benefits and a right of first refusal to the new unit at an affordable rent or cost. This bill is pending in this committee.

SB 50 (Wiener), 2020: Would have required a neighborhood multifamily project containing up to four dwelling units to be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process. Also would have required a local government to grant an equitable communities incentive, which reduces specified local zoning standards in “jobs-rich” and “transit rich areas,” as defined, when a development proponent meets specified requirements, if the local government has not adopted a local flexibility plan approved and certified by HCD, by January 1, 2023. This bill failed passage on the Senate floor.

SB 1069 (Wieckowski), Chapter 720, Statutes of 2016: This bill made several changes to reduce the barriers to the development of ADUs and expanded capacity for their development, including changes to parking, fees, fire requirements, and process.

AB 2299 (Bloom), Chapter 735, Statutes of 2016: This bill requires a local government to ministerially approve ADUs if the unit complies with certain parking requirements, the maximum allowable size of an attached ADU, and setback requirements.

Double referred: This bill was also referred to the Assembly Committee on Local Government where it passed on June 9, 2021 on a vote of 5 ayes, 1 no, and 2 not voting.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Bridge Housing Corporation
Cal Asian Chamber of Commerce
California Apartment Association
California Community Economic Development Association (CCEDA)
California YIMBY
City Council Member, City of Gilroy
City of Alameda
Clear Advocacy
County of Monterey
Eden Housing
Facebook
Facebook, INC.
Fathers and Families of San Joaquin
Inland Empire Regional Chamber of Commerce
Inner City Struggle
League of Women Voters of California
LISC San Diego
Local Government Commission
Long Beach Yimby

Mountain View Yimby
Orange County Business Council
Palo Alto Forward
San Fernando Valley YIMBY
Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee
Santa Cruz YIMBY
South Bay YIMBY
The Central Valley Urban Institute
YIMBY Democrats of San Diego County

Support If Amended

California Association of Realtors
California Community Land Trust Network
California State Association of Counties
Rural County Representatives of California
Urban Counties of California I
California Community Land Trust Network

Opposition

AIDS Healthcare Foundation
Alameda Citizens Task Force
Albany Neighbors United
California Cities for Local Control
Catalysts
Century Glen HOA
Cities Association of Santa Clara County
Citizens About Responsible Planning Long Beach CA
City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
City of Arcata
City of Atascadero
City of Bellflower
City of Beverly Hills
City of Burbank
City of Camarillo
City of Carson
City of Cerritos
City of Chino
City of Chino Hills
City of Crescent City
City of Cypress
City of Downey
City of El Segundo
City of Glendora
City of Hidden Hills
City of Huntington Beach
City of Irwindale
City of LA Canada Flintridge

City of Lafayette
City of Laguna Niguel
City of Lake Forest
City of Lomita
City of Menifee
City of Mission Viejo
City of Modesto
City of Norwalk
City of Oakley
City of Ontario
City of Palm Desert
City of Palos Verdes Estates
City of Pasadena
City of Pismo Beach
City of Placentia
City of Pleasanton
City of Rancho Palos Verdes
City of Redondo Beach
City of Rolling Hills
City of Rolling Hills Estates
City of Signal Hill
City of South Gate
City of Sunnyvale
City of Thousand Oaks
City of Torrance
City of Yorba Linda
Coalition for Economic Survival
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Comstock Hills Homeowners Association
Eastside Voice Long Beach CA
Grayburn Avenue Block Club
Indivisible 43
Indivisible Ca-43
Indivisible California Green Team
Indivisible Marin
Indivisible Normal Heights
Indivisible Ross Valley
Indivisible San Jose
Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments
Latino Alliance for Community Engagement
League of California Cities
Los Angeles Urban League
Magnolia Ave Residents Association
Mangan Park Neighborhood Association
Marin County Council of Mayors and Councilmembers
Miracle Mile Residential Association
Mission Street Neighbors
Montecito Association
Neighbors for a Better San Diego

New Livable California Db a Livable California
Old Agoura Homeowners
Progressive Democrats of America
Progressive Democrats of Santa Monica Mountains
Riviera Homeowners Association
Rooted in Resistance
S.B. Residents for Responsible Development
Save Lafayette
Seaside Neighborhood Association
Sherman Oaks Homeowners Association
SoCal 350
South Shores Community Association
Sunnyvale United Neighbors
Sustainable TamAlmonte
Temecula Valley Neighborhood Coalition
The City of Lakewood
The Valley Village Homeowners Association
Town of Woodside
Tri-valley Cities of Dublin, Livermore, Pleasanton, San Ramon, and Town of Danville
Truckee; Town of
United Neighbors
Ventura Council of Governments
Verdugo Woodlands West Homeowners Association
West Pasadena Residents' Association
Westwood Hills Property Owners Association
Westwood South of Santa Monica Blvd. Homeowners Association

Oppose Unless Amended

Build Affordable Faster CA
Carlsbad; City of
City of Bradbury
City of Brea
City of Del Mar
City of Half Moon Bay
City of Indian Wells;
City of Laguna Beach
City of Lakewood
City of Los Altos
City of Rancho Cucamonga
City of San Marcos
City of Santa Paula
City of Simi Valley
City of Stanton
City of Whittier
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Town of Apple Valley