Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
Buffy Wicks, Chair
SB 1272 (Menjivar) – As Amended June 23, 2026

Policy Committee: Local Government Vote: 10 - 0

Urgency: No State Mandated Local Program: Yes Reimbursable: No

SUMMARY:

This bill provides that the "reasonable period of time" for an owner of an owner-occupied residential property to correct or otherwise remedy a local ordinance structural or zoning violation that does not create an immediate danger to health or safety is no less than six months, if the current property owner is not responsible for the cause of the violation.

Specifically, this bill:

1) For any violation of a local ordinance pertaining to building, plumbing, electrical, or other similar structural or zoning issues that does not create an immediate danger to health or safety, specifies the reasonable period of time to correct or otherwise remedy the violation is no less than six months if all of the following conditions are met:

    a) The property is an owner-occupied residential property containing four units or less.

    b) The current property owner submits a sworn affidavit they are not responsible for any action that caused the violation and had no knowledge of the violation at the time they took title to the property.

    c) The current property owner provides evidence the violation was not disclosed in a transfer disclosure statement pursuant to existing law governing required disclosures upon the transfer of residential property, as specified.

2) Requires a local agency to extend the reasonable period of time described above by an additional six months if the current owner shows a good faith effort to correct or otherwise remedy the violation, allows the local agency to provide a further extension in its discretion.

3) Prohibits a local agency from imposing an administrative fee associated with a request for an extension pursuant to item 2, above.

4) Prohibits the above provisions from applying to an administrative fine or penalty imposed for a violation of the State Housing Law, any law, regulation, or local ordinance regarding cannabis or that ensures the habitability of rental housing, or specified laws, regulations, or implementing local ordinances relating to fire hazards.

FISCAL EFFECT:

No state costs. One-time and ongoing administrative and legal costs, as well as foregone penalty revenue, to impacted cities and counties of an unknown but potentially significant amount depending on the jurisdiction. Because it is optional for a local agency to make a violation of a local ordinance subject to an administrative fine or penalty, any associated costs or revenue losses are not reimbursable by the state.

COMMENTS:

1) **Purpose.** According to the author:

> Keeping costs predictable for homeowners to address the state's growing affordability challenges is a matter of statewide concern. Homeowners are currently being unfairly penalized for actions taken by the previous homeowner on their property that do not pose an immediate danger to anyone's health or safety. And on top of this, even when the homeowner wants to do the right thing and fix the violation, they face additional financial pressure from the administrative fees and penalties imposed by localities. [This bill] seeks to provide some relief to homeowners.

This bill is supported by the California Apartment Association.

2) **Background.** The California Constitution and existing law allow counties and cities to adopt and enforce ordinances that regulate local health, safety, peace, and welfare of their communities. As an alternative to the judicial process, existing law allows a local agency to impose an administrative fine or penalty for a local ordinance violation by adopting an ordinance specifying the administrative procedures governing the imposition, enforcement, collection, and administrative review of the fines or penalties.

Existing law requires a local agency to a grant a "reasonable period of time" for the person responsible for a continuing violation to remedy the violation before the local agency may impose fines or penalties when the violation pertains to building, plumbing, electrical, or other similar structural and zoning issues that do not create an immediate danger to health or safety. What signifies a "reasonable period of time" is left to the discretion of the local agency and varies by jurisdiction.

Existing law requires a property owner, when selling a single-family residential property, to disclose to the buyer conditions and issues with the property of which the seller is aware. Many of these disclosures are provided on the real estate transfer disclosure statement, including any known significant defects in the insulation, roof, foundation, plumbing, and electrical systems, among others. In addition, a buyer may conduct additional due diligence measures, such as hiring a home inspector, reviewing property records, and purchasing title insurance.

This bill provides that the "reasonable period of time" for a residential homeowner to remedy a structural or zoning violation is no less than six months, if the property owner did not cause the violation and provides evidence the condition was not disclosed when they took title to the property.

3) **Opposition.** The California Association of Code Enforcement Officers, the California State Association of Counties, the Rural County Representatives of California, and other local jurisdictions are opposed, asserting that delaying the imposition of penalties erodes the effectiveness of local enforcement, making it more cumbersome and costly while reducing a jurisdiction's ability to promptly address community concerns. They further assert the bill mis-assigns responsibility by conditioning its protections on the absence of a transfer disclosure statement, which "effectively places enforcement burdens on local agencies for a seller's failure to disclose and a buyer's failure to perform due diligence." They believe non-disclosure issues in real estate transactions are "properly addressed through real estate and consumer protection law — not by restricting the enforcement tools that protect public health and safety."

Analysis Prepared by: Jennifer Swenson / APPR. / (916) 319-2081