



TOWN OF LOS GATOS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION
(408) 354-6872 Fax (408) 354-7593

CIVIC CENTER
110 E. MAIN STREET
LOS GATOS, CA 95030

June 5, 2026

Brian Heaton
Section Chief, Land Use Policy
Housing Accountability Unit
Department of Housing and Community Development
651 Bannon Street, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95811
Via email

RE: Los Gatos Senate Bill (SB) 9 Ordinance-Technical Assistance Letter

Dear Mr. Heaton,

Thank you for your Technical Assistance Letter dated May 5, 2026. The Town is committed to enforcing current state law regarding Senate Bill 9 (SB 9), which aids in the streamlining of housing production for the Town. The Town acknowledges that its existing SB 9 ordinance is not consistent with current state law and is taking action to remedy the situation. While we work to update our ordinance, when discrepancies exist between the existing ordinance and state law, the Town defers to state law and does not enforce conflicting local regulations.

An updated SB 9 ordinance has been drafted that the Town believes aligns with current state law and is responsive to the findings outlined in the Technical Assistance Letter dated May 5, 2026. The Planning Commission is scheduled to consider the updated ordinance on August 26, 2026. Following its review, the Commission will provide a recommendation to the Town Council, which will take action at a subsequent meeting.

Below are HCD's 17 findings provided in the Technical Assistance Letter regarding the Town's SB 9 ordinance followed by the Town's response.

1. Section 29.10.610 – *Definition of Two-Unit Development* – The Municipal Code defines a two unit housing development as "... either the construction of no more than two (2) new primary dwelling units, one (1) new primary dwelling unit and retention of one (1) existing primary dwelling unit, or retention of two (2) existing legal non-conforming primary dwelling units where one (1) or both units are subject to a proposed addition or alteration." However, this applies SB 9 law only in the case that two units are created and/or retained.

SB 9 states, “[a] proposed housing development *containing no more than* two residential units within a single-family residential zone shall be considered ministerially, if the proposed housing development meets all of the following requirements...” [emphasis added]. Therefore, SB 9 is applicable in a scenario where construction results in the construction of either one or two primary dwelling units on a lot. Both the first and the second primary dwelling unit constructed on a lot are eligible for SB 9. An applicant can choose to utilize SB 9 to construct a single primary structure on a lot even if there are no existing units on the site. The Municipal Code must be modified to clarify that both first and second primary dwelling units are eligible for SB 9 processes and applicable development standards.

TOWN RESPONSE: In practice, the Town currently allows both first and second primary dwelling units to be processed ministerially through SB 9. The draft ordinance is consistent with HCD’s finding.

2. Section 29.10.620 (3) – *Historic Property* – The municipal code contains outdated historic exclusion language under Section 29.10.620(3). Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1061 of 2025, the historic exclusions under SB 9 were amended as detailed in Government Code Sections 65852.21(a)(5) and 66411.7(a)(3)(E). The municipal code must be amended to reflect SB 9’s current historic exclusion language.

TOWN RESPONSE: The Town’s draft ordinance includes exclusions for historic properties consistent with CA Government Code Sections 65852.21(a)(5) and 66411.7(a)(3)(E).

3. Section 29.10.630 (1)(a) – *Height in Setbacks* – The Municipal Code states, “[b]uildings located within the required side or rear setbacks of the applicable zoning district, and those located in the Hillside Residential (HR) zones, shall not exceed sixteen (16) feet in height.” However, Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3) states, “[a] local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards that do not apply uniformly to development within the underlying zone.” There is no generally applicable height limitation imposed on other structures within rear and side setbacks, and section 29.40.275 sets height maximums in the Hillside Residential at 30 feet. The limit of 16 feet for SB 9 units is more restrictive than the underlying zoning and is therefore inconsistent with state SB 9 law. The Town must amend the municipal code to remove this height limitation.

TOWN RESPONSE: In practice, the Town currently defers to the height limitation of the underlying zone. The draft ordinance does not include height limitations specific to SB 9 projects.

4. Section 29.10.630(1)(f)(2) – *Grading* – The Municipal Code states “Grading activity associated with a two-unit housing development shall not exceed fifty (50) cubic yards, cut plus fill...”. However, this is a restriction that is exclusive to SB 9 development, and which does not appear in the underlying zoning. Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3) prohibits “objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective

design standards that do not apply uniformly to development within the underlying zone.” The Town must remove this limitation.

TOWN RESPONSE: The draft ordinance removes the grading language included in Section 29.10.630 (1)(f)(2).

5. Section 29.10.630 (3) and (4) – *Maximum Size* – The Municipal Code states, “[t]he maximum size of the first new residential unit shall not exceed one thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet.” It later states, “[w]hen a two-unit housing development is proposed and the existing structures are at or below the maximum allowed floor area, a ten (10) percent increase in the floor area ratio standards for residential structures is allowed, excluding garages, and this increase in floor area cannot be combined with a separate increase for an accessory dwelling unit allowed by Town Code Section 29.10.320. The additional floor area allowed by this subsection shall not exceed one thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet.” In both cases, the Town is restricting SB 9-unit size below the allowances provided to conventional single-family residential development in the underlying zoning. Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3) prohibits “objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards that do not apply uniformly to development within the underlying zone.” Therefore, the Town must remove these SB 9-specific size maximums.

TOWN RESPONSE: The 1,200-square foot limitation for the first unit is no longer enforced. The draft ordinance does not include this limitation.

6. Table 1-2 – *Setback Requirements* – The Municipal Code appears to omit reference to rear yard setbacks. Per Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (c)(3)(B) states that, “a local agency may require a setback of up to four feet from the side and rear lot lines.” While the Town is not required to apply setback requirements, please note that new construction SB 9 units may not be subject to rear setbacks larger than four feet.

TOWN RESPONSE: In practice, the Town requires a four-foot rear setback for new units under SB 9. The draft ordinance clarifies the four-foot rear setback requirement in Table 1-2.

7. Table 1-2 – *Street Side Yard Setback* – The Municipal Code requires “street side” setbacks “per the applicable zoning district” for corner lots. However, state SB 9 law does not refer to “street side” setbacks, and Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (c)(3)(B) requires side and rear setbacks of no more than four feet. The Town must remove requirements for underlying setbacks that exceed four feet for street-facing sides of corner lots.

TOWN RESPONSE: The Town enforces a setback of four feet from rear, side, and street side property lines, consistent with state law. The draft ordinance clarifies the required street-side setback.

8. Section 29.10.630 (e) – *Second Story Setback* – The Municipal Code states, “[t]he interior side and rear elevations of the second story of a two-story primary dwelling unit shall have a minimum setback of nine (9) feet.” However, this second story setback does not appear in the underlying zoning. Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3) prohibits the application of development standards that do not appear in the underlying zoning to units subject to state SB 9 law. The Town must amend the Municipal Code to remove this second story setback requirement.

TOWN RESPONSE: The design review standards included in Section 29.10.630 (2), including the *second-story setback* requirement, are no longer enforced by the Town. The SB 9 specific design review standards are not included in the draft ordinance.

9. Section 29.10.630 (g) – *Plate Height* – The Municipal Code states “[t]he plate height of each story shall be limited to a maximum of ten (10) feet as measured from finished floor, and when above the first floor the plate height shall be limited to a maximum of eight (8) feet...” However, this height restriction does not appear in the underlying zoning. Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3) prohibits the application of development standards that do not appear in the underlying zoning to units subject to state SB 9 law. The Town must amend the Municipal Code to remove more restrictive height requirements.

TOWN RESPONSE: The design review standards included in Section 29.10.630 (2), including the *plate height* limitation, are no longer enforced by the Town. The SB 9 specific design review standards are not included in the draft ordinance.

10. Section 29.10.630 (h) and (i) – *Development Standards* – The Municipal Code requires clerestory windows and prohibits vinyl siding and plywood as external materials. Neither of these requirements appear to apply to conventional residential development in the underlying zoning, which is inconsistent with Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3). The Town must remove these requirements.

TOWN RESPONSE: The design review standards included in Section 29.10.630 (2), including the *windows* and *prohibited materials* standards, are no longer enforced by the Town. The SB 9 specific design review standards are not included in the draft ordinance.

11. Section 29.10.630 (3)(a) and (3)(b) – *Duplex Unit Cap* – The Municipal Code allows “[a] maximum of four (4) units, with a maximum of two (2) primary dwelling units, on lots that have not undergone an urban lot split... In addition to the two (2) residential units allowed under this section, consistent with Chapter 29, Article 1, Division 7, Accessory Dwelling Units,” of the Municipal Code, one (1) accessory dwelling unit and one (1) junior accessory dwelling unit shall be allowed on lots that have not undergone an urban lot split.”

Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (f) states, “[n]otwithstanding Article 2 (commencing with Section 66314) or Article 3 (commencing with Section 66333) of Chapter 13, a local agency shall not be required to permit an accessory dwelling unit or a junior accessory dwelling unit on parcels that use both the authority contained within this section

and the authority contained in Section 66411.7.” Thus, in instances where a property has only utilized SB 9 duplex law (Government Code 65852.21), the number of ADUs or JADUs allowed is to be consistent with what is allowed by State ADU Law. The Town must amend the code to reflect this allowance. In some instances, the creation of more than two ADUs may be possible.

TOWN RESPONSE: For a property that has only utilized SB 9 duplex law, the Town currently allows for two primary dwelling units and the maximum number of ADUs and a JADU pursuant to CA Gov. Code Sections 66310 through 66342. Section 29.10.630 (3)(b) permits ADUs and a JADU on a property that has not undergone an urban lot split consistent with Chapter 29, Article 1, Division 7, "Accessory Dwelling Units," of the Town Code. The draft SB 9 ordinance is consistent with state law.

The Town recognizes that its existing ADU ordinance is not consistent with current state law. A draft ADU ordinance has been prepared and shared with HCD that the Town believes to be consistent with state law. The Town’s draft ADU ordinance will be considered by the Planning Commission on June 10, 2026. Following its review, the Commission will provide a recommendation to the Town Council, which will take action at a subsequent meeting.

12. Section 29.10.630 (3)(c) – *Building Code* – The Municipal Code states, “[T]he International Building Code ("Building Code"), and the California Fire Code and International Fire Code (together, "Fire Code"), as adopted by Chapter 6 of the Town Code, respectively, apply to all two-unit housing developments.” However, this would apply current building/fire codes to all SB 9 units, including existing dwellings on a site. For example, if an existing site contains one primary dwelling and a second, detached primary dwelling is proposed pursuant to SB 9, this Town code provision could result in the application of building/fire code requirements for the existing dwelling (such as building sprinkler systems) above and beyond what the building/fire codes would typically require for an existing detached unit. Per Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3), “A local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards that do not apply uniformly to development within the underlying zone.” The Town must remove this language or clarify that existing structures are not subject to additional building/fire code requirements above and beyond what the building and fire codes would ordinarily require of residential development in single-family zones.

TOWN RESPONSE: The draft ordinance clarifies that the requirements included in Section 29.10.630 (3)(c) do not apply to existing structures.

13. Section 29.10.630 (e) – The Municipal Code states, “[t]he two-unit housing development shall not require either demolition of more than twenty-five (25) percent of the exterior walls”. However, SB 450 removed language requiring a demolition cap of 25 percent from State SB 9 Law in 2021; therefore, the Town must remove this language.

TOWN RESPONSE: The Town does not currently enforce this limitation. The draft ordinance does not include this limitation.

14. Section 29.10.630 (4) – *Exceptions* – The Municipal Code exempts zoning standards that would preclude a two-unit development but omits a necessary reference to split lots. Government Code section 66411.7, subdivision (c)(2) states, “[A] local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards that would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of two units on either of the resulting parcels or that would result in a unit size of less than 800 square feet.” The Town must add language to include split lots in this exception clause.

TOWN RESPONSE: The draft ordinance includes language exempting urban lot splits from applicable zoning standards that would have the effect of precluding the construction of two units on either of the resulting parcels.

15. Section 29.10.640 (3) and 29.10.660 (3) – *Neighbor Notification* – The Municipal Code states, “[i]n addition to the standard application materials, the applicant will be required to submit one (1) set of stamped, addressed envelopes to neighboring residents and property owners” in the case of either a two-unit development or a lot split. However, this does not appear to apply to conventional residential development in the underlying zoning, which would conflict with Government Code section 65852.21, subdivision (b)(3).

Furthermore, this requirement is not related to “the design or to improvements of a parcel”, which are the only standards that may be applied to split lots. The Town must remove these sections.

TOWN RESPONSE: The Town no longer requires neighbor notification for SB 9 projects. This notification requirement is not included in the draft ordinance.

16. Section 29.10.640(5) and 29.10.660(6) – *Denial* – The Municipal Code refers to “the physical environment” in the sections describing denial conditions. However, SB 450 removed references to “the physical environment” from Government Code section 66411.7, subdivision (d) and section 65852.21, subdivision (d), which now refer to an “...adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.” The Town must remove the reference.

TOWN RESPONSE: The draft ordinance does not include “the physical environment” in Sections 29.10.640 (5) or 29.10.660 (6).

17. Section 29.10.640 (I) – *Utility Providers* – The Municipal Code states, “[t]he requirements of the parcel's utility providers shall be satisfied prior to recordation of a parcel map.” However, SB 9 states, “Notwithstanding Section 66411.1, a local agency shall not impose regulations that require dedications of rights-of-way or the construction of offsite improvements for the parcels being created as a condition of issuing a parcel map for an urban lot split pursuant to this section.” Neither the Town nor utility provider may require offsite improvements to approve or record an urban lot split and the Town must modify the

zoning code to clarify this.

TOWN RESPONSE: The draft ordinance clarifies that neither the Town nor utility provider may require offsite improvements to approve or record an urban lot split.

If you have any questions, I can be contacted by phone at (408) 354-6823 or by email at smullin@osgatosca.gov.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean Mullin".

Sean Mullin, AICP
Planning Manager

Attachments: HCD TA Letter dated May 5, 2026

This Page Intentionally Left Blank