

Date of Hearing: April 22, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Matt Haney, Chair

AB 2741 (Muratsuchi) – As Amended March 19, 2026

SUBJECT: Housing element: inventory of land: substantial compliance

SUMMARY: Allows a local government to use a zoning classification, including an “affordable overlay zone” that allows for a “mix of uses” for owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use with specified minimum densities to satisfy the requirement to rezone sites for lower income households in their housing element if they have not met their Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) in the previous housing element cycle. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Allows a local government to use an affordable overlay zone that permits owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use with specified minimum densities to satisfy the requirement to rezone sites for lower income households in their housing element.
- 2) Requires a rezoning program that includes an overlay zone to include a written explanation of the housing and affordability incentives of the zoning classification.
- 3) Provides the following for a zoning classification:
 - a) It may allow for a mix of uses if it allows for 100% residential use; and
 - b) It is required that if an applicant seeks to develop a mixed-used project that includes both residential and nonresidential uses on a single site, at least 50% of the total floor area on the site must be dedicated to residential uses.
- 4) Defines “allow for a mix of uses” to mean that the zoning permits any of the following:
 - a) Residential use;
 - b) Nonresidential use; and
 - c) A mix of residential and nonresidential uses include without limitation, vertical and horizontal mixed use projects.
- 5) Provides that “total floor area” shall combine the floor area for existing uses that are proposed to remain with the floor area for new proposed uses. For the purposes of calculating the total floor area for the project, “site” shall be defined as the parcel or assemblage of parcels upon which the project is proposed.
- 6) Deletes the existing provision that finds that a housing element or amendment is out of substantial compliance if HCD’s determination that a housing element is in compliance has been superseded by a subsequent contrary findings by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) or by a court of competent jurisdiction.
- 7) Provides that if a court of finds that housing element is out of compliance, despite HCD’s findings of substantial compliance, the adopted housing element or amendment shall be considered in substantial compliance with this article until the earlier of the following:

- a) The date HCD finds the newly adopted housing element in compliance; or
- b) 270 days after a court order, writ or judgement is issued requiring a local agency to bring its housing element into compliance.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires all of the following for a rezone program necessary to accommodate a jurisdiction's lower income RHNA:
 - a) Requires sites to accommodate 100% of the need for housing for lower income households for which site capacity has not been identified in the inventory of sites on sites that shall be zoned to permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use by right for developments in which at least 20% of the units are affordable to lower income households during the planning period;
 - b) Requires sites in a rezone program to be zoned with minimum density and development standards that permit at least 16 units per site at a density of at least 16 units per acre in an incorporated city within a nonmetropolitan county and for a nonmetropolitan county that has a micropolitan and shall be at least 20 units per acre in suburban jurisdiction and metropolitan counties and have adequate infrastructure, as defined; and
 - c) Requires that at least 50% of the lower income housing need shall be accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted, except that a city or county may accommodate all of the lower income housing need on sites designated for mixed use if those sites allow 100% residential use and require that residential use occupy 50% of the total floor area of a mixed-use project. (Government Code (GOV) 65583.2).
- 2) Establishes that a local agency's housing element or housing element amendment is considered to be in "substantial compliance" with Housing Element Law if either of the following applies:
 - a) HCD has found the adopted housing element or amendment to be in substantial compliance, and that finding has not been superseded; or,
 - b) A court of competent jurisdiction has determined the housing element or amendment to be in substantial compliance, and that determination has not been overturned or superseded. (GOV 65585.03)
- 3) Provides, for purposes of the Housing Accountability Act (HAA), that a housing element or amendment is considered in substantial compliance only if it was in substantial compliance, based on a determination by HCD or a court, at the time a preliminary application was submitted, or, if no preliminary application was submitted, at the time a complete application was submitted. (GOV 65589.55)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill has been keyed non-fiscal by the Legislative Counsel.

COMMENTS:

Author’s Statement: According to the author, “California cities are working in good faith to comply with state housing law by submitting housing elements to the California Department of Housing and Community Development for certification. However, recent court decisions have created uncertainty around the use of residential overlay zoning—an essential tool for identifying housing sites in built-out communities. Without legislative clarity, previously certified housing elements across the state are vulnerable to legal challenge and potential exposure to immediate “builder’s remedy” projects. This bill provides clarity by affirming the lawful use of overlays and allowing jurisdictions that relied on state guidance the opportunity to correct their housing elements if a court finds them noncompliant. Cities should not be penalized for acting in good faith to follow California law and take meaningful steps to increase housing production.”

Adoption and Implementation of Housing Elements: All the state’s 540 cities and counties are required to appropriately plan for new housing through the housing element of each community’s General Plan, which outlines a long-term plan for meeting the community’s existing and projected housing needs. Cities and counties are required to update their housing elements every eight years in most of the high population parts of the state, and five years in areas with smaller populations. Localities must adopt a legally valid housing element by their statutory deadline for adoption. Failure to do so can result in certain escalating penalties, including an accelerated deadline for completing rezoning, exposure to the “builder’s remedy,” public or private lawsuits, financial penalties, potential loss of permitting authority, or even court receivership.

Among other things, the housing element must demonstrate how the community plans to accommodate its share of its region’s RHNA, described above. To do so, each community establishes an inventory of sites designated for new housing that is sufficient to accommodate its fair share. Where a community does not already contain the existing capacity to accommodate its fair share of housing, it must undertake a rezoning program to accommodate the housing planned for in the housing element. Depending on whether the jurisdiction met its statutory deadline for housing element adoption, it will have either one year (if it failed to meet the deadline) or three years (if it met the deadline) from its adoption deadline to complete that rezoning program.

It is critical that local jurisdictions adopt legally compliant housing elements on time in order to meet statewide housing goals and create the environment locally for the successful construction of desperately needed housing at all income levels. Unless communities plan for production and preservation of affordable housing, new housing will be slow to build. Adequate zoning, removal of regulatory barriers, protection of existing stock and targeting of resources are essential to obtaining a sufficient permanent supply of housing affordable to all economic segments of the community. Although not requiring the community to develop the housing, Housing Element Law requires the community to plan for housing. Recognizing that local governments may lack adequate resources to house all those in need, the law nevertheless mandates that the community do all that it can and that it not engage in exclusionary and harmful practices.

Local governments have a statutory deadline to submit a housing element based on region. Ninety days before the deadline to adopt a housing element, localities must submit a draft to HCD. HCD is required to review the draft element within 90 days of receipt and provide written findings as to whether the draft amendment substantially complies with Housing Element Law. If HCD finds that the draft element does not substantially comply with the law, the local agency

may either make changes to the draft element to substantially comply with the law or adopt the element and make findings as to why it complies with the law despite the findings of the department. Following adoption of a housing element, a local agency submits it to HCD. When a local government adopts its housing element without making the changes HCD provides, the process is called “self-certification.” Despite the fact that the process allows a local agency to adopt a housing element without making the changes required by HCD to be in substantial compliance, a local agency is not considered compliant until receiving ultimate approval from HCD. In 2024, AB 1886 (Alvarez), Chapter 267, further clarified that a housing element is in compliance when both a local agency has adopted a housing element and HCD had found the element in compliance.

New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach: As part of the Housing Element, local governments must prepare a site inventory that includes specific actions that will be taken to zone sites to accommodate all the RHNA for lower income households. When the site inventory does not identify enough sites to accommodate each income level of the RHNA a local government must include a rezoning program to address this shortfall. A rezoning program to address unmet needs for lower income housing shall “permit owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use by right for developments in which at least 20% of the units are affordable to lower income households during the planning period.” The sites must be zoned with “minimum density and development standards” of “at least 20 units per acre” in suburban jurisdictions. Further, at least 50% of the lower income housing is required to be “accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted.”

There is an exception to this rule for certain mixed-use sites, which allows a local government to “accommodate all of the lower income housing need on sites designated for mixed use if those sites allow 100% residential use and require that residential use occupy 50% of the total floor area of a mixed-use project.”

In the 6th RHNA cycle, HCD approved over 100 housing elements that relied on the use “overlay zones” that permitted residential uses, even where the underlying zoning did not require residential use at the density required for a rezoning program under Housing Element Law. For example, a site with 100% commercial base zoning and a residential overlay, where a commercial project could be approved without any residential component.

In a recent court case, *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach*, the court invalidated the City of Redondo Beach’s housing element because an “overlay zones cannot be used to satisfy the minimum density and residential use requirements...where the base zoning expressly permits development that does not include housing.” The court found that an overlay zone does not meet the standard required for rezoning programs intended to accommodate lower income housing.

As a result of this case, more 100 of cities’ housing elements may be found to be out of compliance with Housing Element Law and are vulnerable to legal challenge. The state has put in place significant consequences for local jurisdictions if a housing element is out of compliance. The most significant of these consequences, the Builder’s Remedy, makes housing an eligible use on sites that are not zoned residential with certain restrictions.

The cities that utilized overlay zones had HCD-approve housing elements and followed HCD’s guidance on how to complete their local housing elements in compliance with Housing Element

Law, but were found out of compliance by the court. HCD allowed overlay zones to be used to accommodate local governments' obligations to rezone sites to meet their sixth cycle RHNA.

To get back in compliance with Housing Element Law and avoid penalties, local governments must rezone sites where they used overlay zones and the underlying zones does not permit residential use at the densities required for a compliant rezoning program. According to some local governments, this could take over a year to complete, likely requiring the use of outside consultants, depending on the local approval process for the housing element, after which HCD must review the local housing element and determine compliance.

This outcome may raise significant policy concerns for local governments and the state's broader housing planning framework. Updating a housing element is a costly and resource-intensive process, often requiring extensive staff time, consultant support, environmental review, and multiple rounds of public engagement and state review. Jurisdictions that relied on overlay zoning approaches or certain mixed-use zoning strategies, all of which were reviewed and approved by HCD during the 6th cycle, may now be required to undertake substantial rezoning efforts on an accelerated timeline to avoid litigation that might bring them out of compliance with Housing Element Law. This creates potential fiscal and administrative strain, particularly for smaller jurisdictions, and may divert limited local capacity away from actual housing production toward corrective planning efforts.

Conversely, some stakeholders view the decision as a necessary corrective to prior practice, arguing that the use of overlay zones and certain mixed-use designations allowed jurisdictions to identify "paper sites" that did not realistically accommodate lower income housing. From this perspective, requiring underlying zoning to permit residential use at appropriate densities ensures that housing elements more accurately reflect true development capacity. These stakeholders may also support the increased exposure to the Builder's Remedy, viewing it as an enforcement mechanism that incentivizes compliance and facilitates housing production in jurisdictions that have historically underperformed.

This Bill: This bill allows for the use of "affordable housing overlay zone" to meet the rezone requirements under Housing Element Law. The zoning classification would be required to permit but not zone for either a zoning mix of uses if it allows 100% residential use and requires that, if an applicant seeks to develop a mixed-use project that includes both residential and nonresidential uses on a single site, or at least 50% of the total floor area on the site shall be dedicated to residential uses. This change would bring those housing elements that are out of compliance into compliance without having to amend their housing element. The bill does not have an urgency, so this change would not take effect until January 1, 2027 if the bill is signed by the Governor.

This change would apply more broadly than to just the 6th Cycle of RHNA, which would lead to sites that don't have a realistic chance of being developed into housing because there are exiting uses and the underlying zoning is not residential to be included in a jurisdiction's sites inventory. The committee may wish to consider limiting the amendments to this section to the 6th RHNA cycle. In the 7th and all future housing element cycles local governments would have to identify sites for rezone and rezone them for the appropriate densities. By applying this provision to the 6th cycle, it protects those cities that relied on HCDs guidance, and allows them to avoid penalties like the Builders Remedy. It does not require the sites that were included in a housing element using overaly zones to do additional rezoning in this cycle in order for a jurisdiction to

maintain compliance with Housing Element Law. This could result in fewer sites that can accommodate the 6th cycle RHNA, because some of the sites in an overlay zone had existing businesses on them and would not be developed for housing during this planning cycle.

Several organizations representing local governments and city planners maintain that allowing for the use of zoning overlays in the housing element rezoning process beyond the 6th cycle may be necessary. The American Planning Association, Rural County Representatives of California, CSAC, League of Cities and Urban Counties of California, write, “Zoning overlays remain an important affordable housing tool for local governments and have been a state-endorsed method for cities and counties to create thousands of additional housing units at all income levels. These overlays help support walkable, infill development near transit, jobs, and services, while promoting higher-density affordable housing. Eliminating or unduly restricting these tools would make it significantly more difficult for local governments to achieve the Legislature’s priorities including transit-oriented development and balanced economic and residential growth....Additionally, we firmly believe that overlay zones should remain a tool local agencies can use to comply with RHNA obligations and balance the need for economic development and residential growth. We remain open to ongoing dialogue and conversations on these issues and strongly encourage the legislature to act with urgency, as more local governments may face lawsuits soon.”

This bill also creates a safe harbor of 270 days for local governments that have an HCD-approved housing element that a court finds out of compliance. The housing element would be in compliance until the date HCD finds the newly adopted housing element in compliance or 270 days after the judgment. This provision does not apply solely to the *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach*, but to any ruling in which HCD has approved a housing element that is found out of compliance by a court. This change would have broader consequences than just the immediate issue facing Redondo Beach and other cities and could lead to an outcome in which the court makes a ruling that the HCD and the Legislature do not align. It would also require that a city be sued in order for the safe harbor to apply, which would not help cities who have not been sued to deal with the current challenge of being out of compliance due to the *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach* ruling.

Arguments in Support: The City of Redondo Beach writes in support, “AB 2741 addresses two areas that have created uncertainty for local governments. First, the bill confirms that cities may satisfy required rezoning programs by applying a zoning classification, such as an affordable housing overlay zone, that permits owner-occupied and rental multifamily housing at required minimum densities and development standards. This clarification is particularly important for built-out communities like ours, where infill opportunities are limited and flexible zoning tools are essential to meeting Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) requirements. The flexibility of a housing overlay zone makes it more appealing and affordable to a property owner or developer to build housing on a portion of a property without fully eliminating existing uses that may be necessary for fiscal feasibility. The bill also provides clearer guidance on how HCD determines whether a housing element remains in substantial compliance with state law. Establishing more predictable standards helps cities address identified deficiencies while continuing to process housing applications, and it provides greater certainty for both local governments and housing developers. Finally, the bill alleviates the many cities that have used affordable housing overlay zones in their certified housing elements from having to modify and resubmit their housing element mid-term to protect from developer lawsuits whose intent is to

use Builder's Remedy if their lawsuit prevails. This would create fiscal and staff workload impacts to cities and HCD.”

Arguments in Opposition:

California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation, Public Interest Law Project, Public Advocates, and Western Center on Law and Poverty write in opposition:

“We agree that the court in New Commune correctly interpreted the law. Housing Element Law requires that if a jurisdiction does not have sufficient sites to meet its RHNA obligations, the housing element must include a rezone program that commits the jurisdiction to rezoning sufficient sites early in the housing element planning period. Government Code Section 65583.2(h)(2) establishes minimum density and other requirements for these sites... Sites that are subject to a zoning overlay that allows residential use but where the underlying zoning is industrial, commercial, or some other use and that can develop with no housing at all do not meet the minimum residential density standard of 16 or 20 units per acre... In addition to failing to meet the minimum density requirement, the court in New Commune found that Redondo Beach also did not meet the other requirements that it accommodate at least half of its lower-income RHNA allocation on sites zoned exclusively residential and that if more than half of its lower-income RHNA allocation was met through mixed-use sites that must allow uses other than residential, those sites must allow 100% residential uses and for projects with mixed uses, that residential uses must occupy half of the total floor area.

In addition to Redondo Beach, over 100 other jurisdictions similarly relied on HCD’s guidance related to rezone program sites requirements in adopting their 6th cycle housing elements. We sympathize to the position these jurisdictions are in and believe that they should have time to remedy the zoning deficiencies before facing any consequences, but we also believe that long-standing law related to sites requirements must remain intact. The strong zoning requirements in Housing Element Law are crucial to ensuring that communities have sufficient sites to support affordable housing development. An interpretive error affecting the current planning period is not a reason to weaken Housing Element Law for all future planning periods, no matter how many jurisdictions have been impacted, and doing so would also be unfair to the hundreds of other jurisdictions that did the hard work of rezoning sites that do meet legal requirements.

As such, we ask that you strike Sections 1 and 2 of the bill, which would weaken existing sites requirements, from the bill and focus on Section 3. Though we think the language of Section 3 needs refinement, we agree with the general approach of providing more time to remedy zoning deficiencies to ensure that every community has adequate sites to support affordable housing development. We are happy to work with your office and with local government partners and other stakeholders to refine that language as the bill moves forward.”

California YIMBY also writes in opposition:

“AB 2741 would grant jurisdictions whose housing elements are found out of compliance by a court a 270 day period during which key enforcement consequences are effectively suspended. This change would fatally undermine third party litigation as a mechanism for correcting inadequate housing elements, removing an essential tool for enforcing state housing law. Additionally, this bill would apply to a broad variety of cases beyond the Redondo Beach case,

including those in which a city is sued for failure to faithfully implement the commitments in their housing element. The Legislature should not create a precedent to shield cities that have failed to meet their obligations under state housing law from consequences.

AB 2741 would also allow cities to include unrealistic sites with little prospect of housing development in the inventory of sites to meet their housing needs. One reason that the housing element process failed for decades to meet California’s housing needs was the practice by some cities of using unrealistic or flat out undevelopable sites to “accommodate” their housing needs. The Legislature took action against this “paper zoning” in 2017 with AB 1397 (Low, 2017), which strengthened the standards sites must meet to be included in a city’s inventory

Those stronger standards were at the heart of the court ruling in *New Commune v. City of Redondo Beach* that this bill seeks to undo. In the aftermath of that ruling, we have seen property owners asking cities to withdraw their sites from the city’s sites because they do not wish to commit to possible residential development. This represents the court ruling, and law, working as the Legislature intended: sites where the owner is not interested in pursuing new housing are screened out, and the city has to instead identify sites where housing is a realistic prospect.

California YIMBY is open to reforming sites inventory standards in ways that give cities more flexibility, including the option to use overlays that allow for either residential or nonresidential use. However, AB 2741 lacks essential guardrails such as likelihood of development accounting to ensure that overlays are implemented in a responsible manner that furthers the state’s housing goals.”

Policy Considerations: The Committee may wish to consider limiting this bill to solely to allowing local governments that relied about HCD guidance and have compliant housing elements to use overlay zones to maintain compliance for the 6th RHNA cycle. This limitation would mean that in the 7th RHNA cycle the court ruling in *New Commune* would apply, and local governments would be required to zone sites as part of a rezone program at the appropriate levels to accommodate the low income RHNA and could not use overlay zones.

Committee Amendments: The Committee may wish to consider the following amendments:

SECTION 1.

Section 65583.2 of the Government Code, as amended by Section 6.5 of Chapter 282 of the Statutes of 2024, is amended to read:

65583.2.

...

(3) (A) For the purposes of this subdivision, “shall be zoned” includes applying a zoning classification, including, but not limited to, an ~~affordable housing overlay zone~~ **mixed-use zone, combining district, or similar zone** that permits owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use with the minimum density and development standards described in paragraphs (1) and (2). A program that includes application of a zoning classification permitted pursuant to this paragraph shall include a written explanation of the housing and affordability incentives of the zoning classification.

(B) The zoning classification permitted pursuant to this subdivision may allow a mix of uses **if either of the following apply:**

(i) at least 50 percent of the lower income housing need is accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted.

(ii) all of the lower income housing need is accommodated on sites that allow a mix of uses if those sites allow ~~it allows~~ 100 percent residential use and requires that, if an applicant seeks to develop a mixed-use project that includes both residential and nonresidential uses on a single site, at least 50 percent of the total floor area **of the mixed-use project** shall be dedicated to residential uses.

...

(m) This section shall remain in effect only until December 31, 2028, and as of that date is repealed.

(4) Changes made to this subdivision by the act adding this paragraph apply only to the sixth housing element revision cycle and are retroactive to January 1, 2019. SEC. 2.

Section 65583.2 of the Government Code, as amended by Section 7.5 of Chapter 282 of the Statutes of 2024, is amended to read:

SEC. 2.

Section 65583.2 of the Government Code, as amended by Section 7.5 of Chapter 282 of the Statutes of 2024, is amended to read:

...

(3) (A) For the purposes of this subdivision, “shall be zoned” includes applying a zoning classification, including, but not limited to, ~~an affordable housing overlay zone~~ **mixed-use zone, combining district, or similar zone** that permits owner-occupied and rental multifamily residential use with the minimum density and development standards described in paragraphs (1) and (2). A program that includes application of a zoning classification permitted pursuant to this paragraph shall include a written explanation of the housing and affordability incentives of the zoning classification.

(B) The zoning classification permitted pursuant to this subdivision may allow a mix of uses **if either of the following apply:**

(i) At least 50 percent of the lower income housing need is accommodated on sites designated for residential use and for which nonresidential uses or mixed uses are not permitted.

(i) All of the lower income housing need is accommodated on sites that allow a mix of uses if those sites allow ~~it allows~~ 100 percent residential use and requires that, if an applicant seeks to develop a mixed-use project that includes both residential and nonresidential uses on a single site, at least 50 percent of the total floor area **of the mixed-use project** shall be dedicated to residential uses.

...

(m) This section shall remain in effect only until December 31, 2028, and as of that date is repealed.

(4) Changes made to this subdivision by the act adding this paragraph apply only to the sixth housing element revision cycle and are retroactive to January 1, 2019. SEC. 2. Section 65583.2 of the Government Code, as amended by Section 7.5 of Chapter 282 of the Statutes of 2024, is amended to read:

~~SEC. 3.~~

~~Section 65585.03 of the Government Code is amended to read:~~

~~65585.03.~~

~~(a) A housing element or amendment shall be considered to be in substantial compliance with this article when the local agency adopts the housing element or amendment for the current planning period in accordance with Section 65585 and either of the following apply:~~

~~(a) (1) The department finds that the adopted housing element or amendment is in substantial compliance with this article and the department's compliance findings have not been superseded by subsequent contrary findings by the department or by a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction. article.~~

~~(b) (2) A court of competent jurisdiction determines that the adopted housing element or amendment substantially complies with this article and the court's decision has not been overturned or superseded by a subsequent court decision or by statute. article.~~

~~(b) If a court of competent jurisdiction finds that, despite the department's findings of substantial compliance, the adopted housing element or amendment is not in substantial compliance with this article, the adopted housing element or amendment shall be considered in substantial compliance with this article until the earlier of the following:~~

~~(1) The date the department finds that a newly adopted housing element or amendment is in substantial compliance with this article.~~

~~(2) Two hundred seventy days after a court order, writ, or judgment is issued in accordance with Section 65754 requiring the local agency to bring its housing element into compliance.~~

~~SEC. 4.~~

~~Section 65589.55 of the Government Code is amended to read:~~

~~65589.55.~~

~~(a) For purposes of a local agency's approval, conditional approval, or disapproval of a housing development project pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, a housing element or amendment shall be considered in substantial compliance with this article only if the element or amendment was in substantial compliance, as determined by the department or a court of competent jurisdiction, when a preliminary application, including all of the information required~~

by subdivision (a) of Section 65941.1, was submitted or, if a preliminary application was not submitted, when a complete application pursuant to Section 65943 was submitted.

~~(b) This section does not constitute a change in, but is declaratory of, existing law. If a court of competent jurisdiction determines that, despite the department's findings of substantial compliance, the adopted housing element or amendment is not in substantial compliance with this article, the adopted housing element or amendment shall be considered in substantial compliance with this article until the earlier of the following:~~

~~(1) The date the department determines that a newly adopted housing element or amendment is in substantial compliance with this article.~~

~~(2) Two hundred seventy days after a court order, writ, or judgment, is issued in accordance with Section 65754 requiring the local agency to bring its housing element into compliance.~~

~~(c) For purposes of this section, a "determination by a court of competent jurisdiction" shall refer only to a determination of substantial compliance.~~

Double-Referred: This bill was also referred to the Assembly Committee on Local Government where it will be heard should it pass out of this Committee.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

City of Redondo Beach

Support If Amended

American Planning Association California Chapter

California State Association of Counties

League of California Cities

Rural County Representatives of California

Urban Counties of California

Opposition

California YIMBY

South Pasadena Residents for Responsible Growth

Oppose Unless Amended

California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation.

Public Advocates

Public Interest Law Project

Western Center on Law & Poverty

Analysis Prepared by: Lisa Engel / H. & C.D. / (916) 319-2085