

**Los Altos City Council
Legislative Committee
September 6, 2022**

The Committee tracked 16 bills during the 2021-22 session. Of those, eight did not move forward and eight passed the Legislature. One bill amended late in the session that the Committee did not track is of interest; it moved forward and is included here for information (SB 6). It would be consistent with prior Council direction to support vetoes of AB 2011, AB 2097, SB 897, SB 932, especially if the League of California Cities seeks support for such veto letters.

PASSED LEGISLATURE

AB 2011 (Wicks) – *Allow housing and mixed-use in office, retail, or parking regardless of general plan or zoning* (Los Altos opposed)

AB 2097 (Friedman) – *Prohibit any requirement for parking on developments within one-half mile of major transit stop* (Los Altos opposed)

AB 2164 (Lee) – *Use business license tax to provide financial assistance to small businesses re: Disability access* (Los Altos supported)

AB 2221 (Quirk-Silva) – *Specifies additional staff requirements on processing ADU applications.* (Los Altos took no position)

AB 2625 (Ting) – *Exceptions to Subdivision Map Act for leasing or easement on land involving an electrical energy storage system.* (Los Altos took no position)

SB 897 (Wieckowski) – *Requires objective standards for ADUs/JADUs; prohibits limiting to less than 25 feet; reduces parking; further limits owner-occupancy requirement* (Los Altos opposed)

SB 922 (Wiener) – *Changes sunset for exempting certain bicycle and other transportation plans from CEQA.* (Los Altos supported)

SB 932 (Portantino) – *Changes requirements in Circulation Element of General Plan.* (Los Altos opposed)

Added for information: **SB 6 (Caballero)** – *Would allow construction of certain multi-family housing on a parcel that is zoned for office, retail, or parking.*
(A late gut-and-amend; Committee made no recommendation; Los Altos took no position)

FAILED TO ADVANCE OR WERE WITHDRAWN BY AUTHOR

AB 1944 (Lee) – *Amend Brown Act to allow hybrid meetings, change notice and requirements regarding legislative body officials participating remotely.*
(Los Altos supported)

AB 2053 (Lee) – *Would create a new California Housing Authority*
(Committee watched but made no recommendation; died early)

AB 2063 (Berman) *Would prohibit collection of certain impact fees on “density bonus” units*

(Committee watched but made no recommendation; died early)

AB 2181 (Berman) – *Change composition and selection of VTA board*

(Los Altos opposed)

AB 2762 (Bloom) *States intent of the Legislature to enact subsequent legislation to allow local agencies to build affordable housing on parking lots that serve public parks and recreational facilities*

(Committee watched but made no recommendation; died early)

SB 930 (Wiener) – *Originally a housing bill, amended by author to be alcohol control bill.*

(A late gut-and-amend; Committee made no recommendation; Los Altos took no position)

SB 1067 (Portantino) *Would prohibit a city with population greater than 200,000 from imposing any minimum automobile parking requirement on a housing development within ½ mile of public transit under certain conditions.*

(Committee watched for amendment that would cover Los Altos; made no recommendation)

SB 1292 (Stern) *Would require jurisdictions that constrain development within certain fire hazard zones to provide for replacement development double the number of units eliminated in the fire hazard zones.*

(Committee watched but made no recommendation; no application to Los Altos)

Possible action on ballot measures for November 2022

Councilmember Weinberg asked the committee to consider SCA 1 (Proposition 1) and Councilmember Lee Eng and others, in response to request from a community member, asked the committee to consider Proposition 31. City Attorney offered to provide guidance memo.

The Legislative Committee has, over the past three years, made recommendations to the Council to have letters of official council positions conveyed to the Legislature and/or Governor on matters before them. Previously, the Committee has not taken up, nor has it been directed to take up, any matters that will be appearing on State ballots.

Policy question for Council: Does the Council wish to expand the historical remit of the Legislative Committee to consider State ballot propositions?

Policy question for council: Does the Council wish to expand the historical remit of the Legislative Committee to consider State ballot propositions?