

Date of Hearing: June 10, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Matt Haney, Chair

SB 722 (Wahab) – As Amended January 15, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 39-0

SUBJECT: Transit-oriented housing development: excluded parcels and sites

SUMMARY: Establishes the Mobile Home Park Protection Act (Act), which amends SB 79 (Wiener), Chapter 512, Statutes of 2025, to exempt parcels or sites that are subject to the Mobilehome Residency Law, Mobilehome Parks Act, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, and the Special Occupancy Parks Act from SB 79's provisions. This bill contains an urgency clause.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Creates, pursuant to SB 79, a streamlined, ministerial approvals process for housing development projects in urban transit counties meeting certain objective standards within a specified distance of transit-oriented development (TOD) stops as follows:
 - a) Makes housing development projects an allowable use on any site zoned for residential, mixed-use, or commercial development within one-half mile of a TOD stop in cities with a population of 35,000 or more, and within one-quarter mile of a TOD stop in cities with a population of less than 35,000; and
 - b) Establishes minimum land use standards, including requirements related to height, density, and floor area ratio, for TOD housing projects based on proximity to the TOD stop and the population of the jurisdiction. (Government Code (GOV) 65912.157)
- 2) Prohibits a TOD housing development project under SB 79 from being located on either of the following:
 - a) A site containing more than two units where the development would require the demolition of housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power that has been occupied by tenants within the past seven years; or
 - b) A site that was previously used for more than two units of housing that were demolished within seven years before the development proponent submits an application under this section and any of the units were subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power. (GOV 65912.157)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown.

COMMENTS:

Author's Statement: According to the author, "SB 79 is unintentionally putting at risk vital naturally occurring affordable housing at a time when the preservation of every housing unit is key to battling the ongoing housing crisis. Half of the ten largest mobile home parks in

California are in my district. Three of those are in Sunnyvale, including the largest mobile home park in the state with 900 spaces. All three will be vulnerable to SB 79 redevelopment without these amendments that Senator Wiener and I agreed to.

Thousands of people in just my district — women, seniors, veterans, and families — could lose their homes because of an oversight. That doesn't even include the mobile home parks across the state that are vulnerable because they are within a quarter or half mile of a train, light rail, or bus-rapid-transit stop. These are our constituents, neighbors, family, and friends. And the damage this mistake can cause, if not fixed, will irreparably harm these people and our communities. We have a duty to make sure the laws we pass lift people up, not push them out, and we must act with urgency to prevent the actual harm this oversight will create.”

Planning for Housing: Historically, housing planning and land use decisions in California have been delegated to local governments, which exercise primary authority over land use, zoning, permitting, and development approvals through their police power. While the state has long required each jurisdiction to adopt a housing element identifying how it will accommodate its share of regional housing need, these requirements historically lacked meaningful enforcement mechanisms. In addition, earlier iterations of Housing Element Law and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process required significantly less upzoning and did not compel jurisdictions to adopt zoning that could realistically accommodate assigned housing needs. As a result, jurisdictions could comply on paper while maintaining restrictive zoning and development standards that limited actual housing production. Local discretionary approval processes further allowed projects to be delayed, reduced in scale, or denied based on subjective criteria, contributing to significant constraints on housing supply, particularly in high-opportunity areas.

According to a 2024 analysis by the Othering & Belonging Institute at UC Berkeley, a staggering 95.8% of all residential land in California is zoned exclusively for single-family housing, severely constraining opportunities for infill development near transit. Even when lower-density unincorporated areas are excluded, over 82% of residentially zoned land in the state prohibits multifamily housing. The state has taken some strides to facilitate additional housing typologies in exclusionary zoning districts, namely through State Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Law and SB 9 (Atkins), Chapter 161, Statutes of 2021, effectively making single-family zoned parcels eligible to accommodate up to four dwelling units. However, much of California's residential land remains off-limits for denser development, regardless of how well-situated the land may be when it comes to access to jobs, transportation, and other opportunities.

SB 79: In recent years, the state has taken a series of actions to address local constraints on housing production by both expanding allowable residential density and shifting project approvals from discretionary review to more predictable, ministerial processes governed by objective standards. SB 79 was one of these most recent attempts to encourage additional residential density in climate-smart locations. SB 79 establishes a statewide framework to increase residential density near major transit stops by making qualifying housing development an allowable use on sites zoned for residential, mixed-use, or commercial development within specified distances of transit in urban transit counties. The bill sets minimum statewide standards for height, density, and residential floor area ratio based on a project's proximity to high-quality transit, and limits the ability of local governments to impose standards that would physically preclude achieving those thresholds. Projects must include at least five units and comply with specified affordability, labor, and antidisplacement requirements, including prohibitions on

demolishing rent-restricted housing and requirements to provide deed-restricted affordable units for developments containing more than 10 units.

SB 79 applies to cities with a population of at least 35,000 that have qualifying high-quality transit stops, and requires that, beginning July 1, 2026, housing development projects be an allowable use on qualifying sites within one-half mile of a TOD stop (or one-quarter mile in smaller jurisdictions). The bill establishes a series of implementation deadlines, including requiring the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to issue guidance by July 1, 2026 on how SB 79 capacity is counted toward a jurisdiction's housing element sites inventory, and requiring Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to prepare maps of TOD stops and zones to guide implementation. Local governments may adopt implementing ordinances or local TOD alternative plans, subject to HCD review, prior to July 1, 2026, to tailor development standards, so long as the plan maintains equivalent overall residential capacity. SB 79 also provides that, beginning January 1, 2027, denial of a qualifying project in a high-resource area is presumed to violate the HAA, subject to specified exceptions.

Within this framework, SB 79 provides local governments with the ability to craft local alternative plans and implement ordinances. This includes providing local governments with limited local flexibility to reduce development intensity on certain sites. A local TOD alternative plan may reduce the allowable density on an individual site by up to 50% below SB 79's baseline standards, and may further reduce or exempt sites designated as historic resources on a local register, provided that such exemptions do not cumulatively exceed 10% of the total eligible area within a TOD zone. In addition, SB 79 allows local governments, through an implementing ordinance, to fully exempt sites designated as historic resources on a local register as of January 1, 2025 from SB 79 until one year following the adoption of a seventh cycle housing element.

Exempted Sites: SB 79 does not apply to either of the following: (1) a site in which more than two units in the development would require the demolition of housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control that was occupied by tenants within the last seven years, and (2) a site that was previously used for more than 2 units of housing that was demolished within the last seven years and those units were subject to price or rent control. Land use bills that encourage streamlining and denser housing developments have frequently exempted sites that contain units that have been occupied by tenants, particularly low-income tenants. For example, AB 2011 (Wicks), Chapter 647, Statutes of 2022, created a ministerial, streamlined approval process for 100% affordable housing projects in commercial zones and for mixed-income housing projects along commercial corridors, as specified. AB 2011 exempted developments that would require the demolition of the following types of housing:

- 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.
- Housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power.
- Housing that has been occupied by tenants within the past 10 years, excluding any manager's units.

- The site was previously used for permanent housing that was occupied by tenants, excluding any manager's units, that was demolished within 10 years before the development proponent submits an application under this article.
- Parcels or sites if those parcels or sites are subject to the Mobilehome Residency Law, Mobilehome Parks Act, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, and the Special Occupancy Parks Act.

Mobilehome Parks and This Bill: Mobilehomes and manufactured homes provide a significant source of affordable housing and homeownership for many Californians, with more than 700,000 Californians living in approximately 4,700 mobilehome parks. Due to specific concerns about the potential impact of SB 79 on mobilehome parks in the author's district, this bill would exempt sites that are subject to the Mobilehome Residency Law, Mobilehome Parks Act, the Recreational Vehicle Park Occupancy Law, and the Special Occupancy Parks Act from SB 79. This bill contains an urgency clause and will become effective immediately should it be signed by the Governor. The language and intent of the bill represent an agreement between the author of this bill and the author of SB 79. That agreement was made at the end of the last legislative session, and the members agreed to pursue a legislative fix in the 2026 legislative session.

Arguments in Support: The Golden State Manufactured-home Owners League (GSMOL), the bill sponsor, writes in support: "When SB 79 passed the legislature in 2025, it left mobilehome residents vulnerable to displacement and exposed their homes to forfeiture by failing to extend the anti-demolition protections to mobilehome parks.

The omission is inconsistent with other land use bills such as AB 2011 (Wicks, 2022) that exempted application for mobilehomes. This lack of protection threatens existing affordable housing stock that SB 79 seeks to increase.

The remedy in SB 722 prohibits a SB 79 development from being located on a parcel of land or site governed by the laws related to mobilehomes, including the Mobilehome Residency Law and the Mobilehome Parks Act."

Arguments in Opposition: None on file for current bill version.

Related Legislation:

AB 2576 (Harabedian), of this legislative session, expands the historic sites exclusion in SB 79 to include contributing sites within a historic district and parcels individually listed as a historical resource in the State Historic Resources Inventory designated before January 1, 2025.

AB 2415 (Hoover), of this legislative session, revises SB 79 to add additional historic preservation protections for TOD zones in cities that meet certain characteristics.

SB 1361 (Durazo), of this legislative session, prohibits a local government with an existing or planned TOD stop from taking actions to interfere with a transit project's approval to avoid the application of SB 79 development standards.

SB 79 (Wiener), Chapter 512, Statutes of 2025, established a streamlined, ministerial approval process for TOD housing development projects.

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

Golden State Manufactured-home Owners League (Sponsor)
AIDS Healthcare Foundation
City of Carlsbad
League of California Cities

Opposition

None on file.

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