CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA
REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM

Report: Consideration of Interim Urgency Ordinance Regarding Senate Bill 9 Housing Development and Lot Split Projects and Senate Bill 478 Floor Area Ratio Standards

1. Introduction of Interim Urgency Ordinance of the Council of the City of Glendale, California, Establishing Interim Standards and Ministerial Processes for Reviewing and Approving Eligible SB 9 Projects and Setting Minimum SB 478 Floor Area Ratio Standards for Certain Multi-Family Housing Development Projects;
2. Fee Resolution Amending the Adopted 2021-22 Citywide Fee Schedule by Establishing Fees for SB 9 Projects.

COUNCIL ACTION

Item Type: Action Item

Approved for December 7, 2021 **calendar**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As reported by staff at the City Council's October 26, 2021 meeting, several important planning/zoning and housing laws will go into effect on January 1, 2022. Most significantly among these laws is Senate Bill (SB) 9, which will afford property owners in single-family zones the ability to obtain ministerial approval to split one lot into two lots and/or build two residential units on a lot. Although SB 9 contains qualifying criteria, the majority of single-family lots in the City of Glendale will be eligible to use SB 9. The law allows the City to enact an implementing ordinance containing objective zoning, subdivision, and design guidelines, with some explicit limitations such as a prohibition on precluding either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area and setback regulation limitations similar to those applicable to accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and junior accessory dwelling units (JADUs). The law also allows the City to deny a SB 9 project if the Building Official makes written findings that the project would have a specific adverse impact on health, safety or the physical environment for which there is not feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. Another separate law that also becomes effective on January 1, 2022, SB 478, prohibits the City from requiring a floor area ratio (FAR) of less than 1.0 for a housing development project consisting of 3 to 7 units and a FAR of less than 1.25 for housing development project consisting of 8 to 10 units.

Following the October 26 staff presentation regarding SB 9 and other new state laws, Council initiated the preparation of an Interim Urgency Ordinance, to be brought for

introduction and adoption in December of 2021 (with an effective date of January 1, 2022 concurrently with the effective date of the new laws), to enact objective zoning, subdivision and design standards and other regulations permitted to be regulated by the City related to SB 9 projects, as well as revised FAR standards required by SB 478. Staff has prepared an Interim Urgency Ordinance for introduction. Among other things, the Ordinance contains an 800 square foot limitation on each new residential dwelling unit built under SB 9; a definition of "unit" that includes accessory dwelling units (ADU) and junior accessory dwelling units (JADU) for both SB 9 lot splits and SB 9 "two-on-a-lot" developments; objective design, zoning and subdivision standards; a process for findings to be made by the Building Official of specific, adverse impacts; and an application process for SB 9 projects and applicable fees. The Ordinance will be in effect for 45 days but can be extended for an additional 10 months and 15 days following a noticed public hearing, and an additional year thereafter. Staff anticipates being able to bring a permanent ordinance to Council for adoption prior to January 1, 2023 after Planning Commission consideration and recommendation, once it gains experience implementing the Interim Urgency Ordinance and researches and determines additional regulations and best practices. A fee resolution is also included for Council's consideration, in order to set applicable application fees for SB 9 projects.

COUNCIL PRIORITIES

Safe and Healthy Community: Adoption of an interim urgency ordinance containing an application process, as well as objective zoning, subdivision and design standards for SB 9 projects will ensure the orderly development of housing in the City and contribute to the Council's goal of ensuring houses are safe, free from blight, and conform to the City's design and development standards.

Balanced, Quality Housing: The development of high quality housing is an important goal, especially with respect to providing housing opportunities to all segments of the population. An interim urgency ordinance setting forth objective zoning, subdivision and design standards for SB 9 projects will promote housing development consistent with the Council's goal of providing a balanced mix of housing opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council hear and review this report and introduce and subsequently adopt an Interim Urgency Ordinance to be effective January 1, 2022, related to interim objective zoning, subdivision and design standards and processes for ministerial review and approval of eligible SB 9 projects; and floor area ratio amendments necessitated by SB 478, as well as the accompanying fee resolution.

BACKGROUND

Senate Bill 9

SB 9, known as the California Housing Opportunity and More Efficiency (HOME) Act, has been dubbed by many commentators as the law that will "end single family zoning in California." SB 9 allows a property owner to build two units and/or subdivide an existing single-family-zoned parcel into two parcels. SB 9 adds sections 65852.21 and 66411.7

to the Government Code, and requires cities and counties to ministerially approve a housing development containing no more than two residential units (duplex) on a single parcel in single-family zones ("two-on-a-lot" projects). The bill also requires a city to ministerially approve an urban lot split, creating two independent lots that may be sold separately. A property owner able to meet SB 9's requirements could potentially combine the two provisions of SB 9 to split one existing lot into two and then build two residential units on each new lot, resulting in four residential units where only one was allowed before. To be eligible for an SB 9 project, a parcel must meet a specific list of qualifications, discussed below.

SB 9 "Two-On-A-Lot" Qualifying Projects

SB 9 would allow housing development projects containing no more than two dwelling units on a single-family zoned parcel to be permitted on a ministerial basis, upon satisfaction of qualifying criteria that include the following:

- The project site is in a city or urbanized portion of an unincorporated county (the City of Glendale is such a city);
- The project site is not:
    - Within a Coastal Zone;
    - Prime farmland, or farmland of statewide importance;
    - Wetlands;
    - Within a very high fire severity zone with exceptions (see explanation applicable to the City below);
    - A hazardous waste or hazardous list site;
    - Within a delineated earthquake fault zone with exceptions;
    - Within a 100-year flood zone;
    - Within a floodway;
    - Identified for conservation in an adopted natural community conservation plan;
    - Habitat for protected species; or
    - Lands under conservation easement;
- The project site cannot require demolition or alteration of any housing if:
    - Housing is restricted affordable housing;
    - Subject to rent control; or
    - Contains tenant occupied housing in the last three years;
- The project site cannot be withdrawn from the rental market (i.e., under the Ellis Act) within the past 15 years;
- The project does not propose demolition of more than 25 percent of the existing exterior walls unless either:
    - The local ordinance allows more demolition; or
    - The site has not been occupied by a tenant in the past three years;
- The project site is not within a historic district or property included on the California Historical Resources Inventory or within a site that is designated or listed as a city or county landmark or historic property or district pursuant to a city or county ordinance.

A local agency may enact objective zoning, subdivision and design review standards, provided such objective standards do not preclude the construction of either of the two units being at least 800 square feet in floor area. Similar to state ADU/JADU legislation, no setbacks are required for an existing structure or a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as an existing structure. In other circumstances, the local agency may require four-foot interior (side and rear) yard setbacks. Parking of no more than one space per dwelling unit (with no requirement that this be uncovered parking)[1] is allowed, except no parking required for projects:

- Within a half-mile walking distance of a high-quality transit corridor or a major transit stop; or
- Within one block of car share.

Moreover, a local agency is not required to permit an ADU/JADU on parcels that take advantage of both the "two-on-a-lot" and lot split provisions. This means that a local agency may limit a parcel with an *existing* ADU or JADU to using just one, *not both* provisions of SB 9 (i.e., a parcel with an existing ADU/JADU may split the lot but may not thereafter build two houses on each of the two new lots; a parcel with an existing ADU/JADU may not build any additional units on the lot since it already has two (and in some cases three) units on its lot (the primary dwelling unit and the ADU and/or JADU)). This also means that if a parcel without an existing ADU/JADU takes advantage of a lot split, it cannot thereafter build any ADU/JADU on the property because this would be considered a "two-on-a-lot" SB 9 project. If a parcel without an existing ADU/JADU builds a "two-on-a-lot" SB 9 project and later splits the lot into two lots, it similarly cannot build an ADU/JADU on either of the two new lots.

A local agency may deny a SB 9 housing development project if the building official makes written findings that the project would create a "specific adverse impact" upon public health and safety or the physical environment that there is no way to mitigate or avoid, a heightened standard to meet. A "specific adverse impact" means a "significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete."

Additional local agency-applicable regulations include:

- The rental of any unit created must be for a term longer than 30 days;
- The California Coastal Act still applies, except that no public hearing is required for Coastal Development Permits for housing developments pursuant to SB 9;
- A local agency may not reject housing solely on the basis that a project proposes adjacent or connected structures provided that the structures meet building code safety standards and are sufficient to allow separate conveyance.

---

[1] State law governing accessory dwelling units specifies that in instances where parking is required, a local agency may not require more than one space per accessory dwelling unit and that this requirement may be satisfied through "tandem parking on a driveway". (Gov't Code § 65852.2(a)(1)(D(x)(I))). State law governing SB 9 housing developments is silent as to whether a local agency may require applicable parking requirements to be satisfied through covered parking (i.e., through construction of a garage), but if a garage is required for a SB 9 housing development under Glendale's Ordinance no design review could be conducted on the garage.

If these criteria are satisfied, the city must approve the project ministerially (i.e., without discretionary review or hearings). Projects approved ministerially are not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and cannot be required to obtain any discretionary approvals such as design review.

SB 9 Lot Split Projects

In addition to permitting two units on a single family lot, the proposed legislation would allow qualifying lot splits to be approved ministerially pursuant to a parcel map, upon meeting a number of criteria, including many of the same criteria for the two units described above. Additional criteria include the following:

- Each parcel must be at least 40 percent of the original parcel's size;
- Each parcel must be at least 1,200 square feet in lot size unless the local agency permits smaller lot size per ordinance;
- There cannot be a sequential lot split on the same parcel, nor can there be a lot split if the owner of the parcel being subdivided (or someone working in concert with that owner) has subdivided an adjacent parcel pursuant to this lot split legislation;
- No right-of-way dedication or off-site improvement may be required;
- The parcel must be limited to residential use;
- An affidavit that the applicant intends to use one of the housing units as a principal residence for at least three years from the date of approval is required;
- The local agency shall not require a condition that requires correction of nonconforming zoning conditions;
- For each parcel created through this legislation, a local agency is not required to permit more than two dwelling units on a parcel.

A local agency may require, as conditions of approval:

- Easements for public services and facilities;
- Access to the public right-of-way;
- Objective subdivision standards.

Senate Bill 478

SB 478 prohibits the City from imposing a floor area ratio (FAR) of less than 1.0 for a housing development project (comprised solely of residential units, a mixed-use development with at least two-thirds of the square footage attributed to residential uses or transitional or supportive housing as defined in the Housing Accountability Act) consisting of three to seven units and a FAR of less than 1.25 for a housing development project consisting of 8 to 10 units. Additionally, the City may not deny a housing development project located on an existing legal parcel solely on the basis that the lot area does not meet the requirement for minimum lot size. To qualify, a project must consist of 3 to 10 units in a multifamily residential zone or mixed-use zone in an urbanized area and cannot be within a single-family zone or within a historic district. SB 478 also makes any private development CC&R void and unenforceable if it effectively prohibits or

unreasonably restricts an eligible FAR, as authorized under the new FAR standards as summarized above (and now found in Government Code Section 65913.11).

ANALYSIS

SB 9 requires ministerial approval, without condition, discretion or a hearing, of a housing development containing no more than two residential units on an individual parcel in single-family zones. It also requires local governments to ministerially approve an urban lot split, creating two independent lots that may be sold separately.

The intent of the law is two-fold: break down barriers to additional housing and to increase housing supply. The potential impact of SB 9 on cities has been analyzed by the University of California Berkeley Terner Center for Housing Innovation. According to this analysis (full article was attached as an exhibit to the October 26, 2021 Council report on SB 9), the new law has the potential, statewide, to "enable the creation of over 700,000 new homes that would otherwise not be market feasible." The Terner Center article notes that a lot depends on the local context: "[L]ocal market prices and development costs play a large role in determining where there is financial viability for the addition of new homes. Moreover, physical constraints, such as small lot sizes and other local regulations, can limit the number of new homes built as a result of SB 9". To that end, the article also contains an analysis of CA jurisdictions with greater than 5,000 single family parcels (attached to this report as Exhibit 3), and for Glendale, predicts that out of 23,000 single family parcels, there are only 12,400 "SB 9 eligible parcels"; only 700 parcels "where SB9 would increase the number of market-feasible units"; and only 100 parcels "where SB9 changes feasible outcome from no new units to 1+ new units." Moreover, the Glendale-specific analysis also claims there is potential for only 1,000 total market-feasible new units under SB9. Some published information from the Terner Center regarding the methodology used to generate these predictions is also included in Exhibit 3.

Although SB 9 requires the City to ministerially approve certain qualifying projects to build two units on a single family-zoned lot, it does allow a city to enact certain objective standards for "two-on-a-lot" projects. SB 9 allows a city to "impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards", as long as these standards do not conflict with other requirements in the legislation. SB 9 defines the terms "objective zoning standards," "objective subdivision standards," and "objective design review standards" as "standards that involve <u>no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official prior to submittal</u>. These standards may be embodied in alternative objective land use specifications adopted by a local agency, and may include, but are not limited to, housing overlay zones, specific plans, inclusionary zoning ordinances, and density bonus ordinances." Gov't Code § 65852.21(i)(2) (emphasis added). Examples of non-objective (subjective) standards are those that require general compatibility with the architectural style of the home or with the architectural style or pattern of the neighborhood.

A city's objective standards cannot "have the effect of physically precluding the construction of up to two units or . . . physically preclude either of the two units from being

at least 800 square feet in floor area." Gov't Code § 65852.21(b)(2)(A). Also, a city cannot require a setback for "existing structures or structures constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as an existing structure." Id. at § 65852.21(b)(2)(B)(i). In all other circumstances, a city may require a four-foot interior setback. Id. at § 65852.21(b)(2)(B)(ii). With respect to parking, a city may require one off-street space per unit, except in cases where the lot is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor, or a major transit stop (as defined in other laws), or in cases where there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel. Id. at § 65852.21(c)(1)(A-B).

On October 26, 2021, Council directed staff to prepare an Interim Urgency Ordinance regulating SB 9 projects with following general components, which are all included in the Ordinance:

- Limitation on the two new units to a maximum of 800 square feet;
- Counting an existing or proposed ADU/JADU as a "unit";
- Requiring payment of City's regular development impact fee for multi-family units;
- Requiring projects to adhere to objective design standards such as height/stories, setbacks (to the extent allowed to be regulated), roof form, location (e.g. outside front/street-side setback), and others, in order to produce the least impactful high quality design;
- Mandating and enforcing owner-occupancy requirements to the fullest extent permitted by law.

The Ordinance contains additional requirements for SB 9 lot splits, as follows:

- Requires lots to front a dedicated and improved public or private street;
- New lot lines shall be at right angles adjacent to the street frontage;
- A minimum lot width of 12 feet (consistent with existing driveway standards for a flag lot); and
- Prohibits lots with double frontage (except on corner lots).

Provisions related to shared driveways and parking include:

- Requirement for parking to share the driveway with the existing residence and prohibits adding an additional separate driveway (exception for when adjacent to an alley);
- Requirement that development of a SB 9 housing development on vacant land share a singular driveway.

The Ordinance applies the same parking standards to SB 9 housing developments as the current rules for ADUs. While required parking for SB 9 housing developments is not specifically mandated by the state to be uncovered, it is staff's recommendation to allow uncovered parking because enclosed/covered parking would add an additional building to the site, increasing lot coverage and reducing landscaping/open space that would likely exceed all existing zoning standard limits. Additionally, because the enclosed parking would be for the SB 9 housing development, design review is prohibited, making objective design standards more challenging.

Other miscellaneous provisions:

- Prohibits a parcel with a SB 9 unit from also having a guest house;
- Prohibits the location of new construction or any addition for a SB 9 unit between an existing or proposed residential dwelling and the street front or street side setback, and
- Requirement for a covenant for a SB 9 housing development for reciprocal use agreements to allow for cross-access, cross-drainage, utilities services and parking.

Objective design standards have been developed that govern height and massing, including roof forms and breaks in volume, as well as exterior materials for walls and roofs. For example, a height limit of 12 feet is established for flat roofs and 16 feet for pitched roofs. Standard details are also included for windows, entryways and doors, as well as associated covered porches and patios. Windows must be recessed and require a sill, entry doors must be on the street facing façade and covered porches are limited to 80 square feet. Particular attention has been given to standards to match the new SB 9 unit to the existing residential dwelling, when retained, in terms of roof form and exterior materials.

Also, as set forth above, the Ordinance states that ADUs/JADUs are not permitted on a parcel that applies for both a SB 9 housing development and SB 9 lot split. By way of example, a parcel with an existing ADU/JADU may split the lot but may not thereafter build two houses on each of the two new lots. Another example is if a parcel without an existing ADU/JADU takes advantage of a lot split, it cannot thereafter build any ADU/JADU on the property because this would be considered a “two-on-a-lot” SB 9 project. If a parcel without an existing ADU/JADU builds a “two-on-a-lot” SB 9 project and later splits the lot into two lots, it similarly cannot build an ADU/JADU on either of the two new lots.

The Ordinance also creates a detailed application and review process for SB 9 projects and sets appropriate fees. For both an SB 9 housing development (two-on-a-lot) and an SB 9 lot split, the Ordinance requires the property owner to execute and record a covenant and agreement. With respect to SB 9 housing developments, the fact that there is no prohibition in the state law with respect to owner-occupancy requirements for two-on-a-lot developments (in other words, the state law is silent on that point) is indicative that such a requirement is left open to local regulation.

Given the state law’s silence on the issue leading to the presumptive ability of Glendale to enact an owner-occupancy requirement for SB 9 housing developments, the Ordinance requires that a property owner applying for a SB 9 housing development covenant to reside in at least one of the residential dwelling units that constitute the non-lot split SB 9 housing development, or only rent or lease the property as a single rental property and not rent or lease the residential dwelling units separately from each other (similar to how ADUs were regulated prior to the state changing the law). The state law does not allow a similar owner-occupancy requirement for SB 9 lot splits, however, and limits a local agency to requiring a signed affidavit that the owner “intends to occupy one of the housing

units as their principal residence for a minimum of three years from the date of the approval of the urban lot split." Government Code Section 66411.7(g)(1). As such, the Ordinance requires such a sworn statement (for SB 9 lot split projects) to be incorporated into a covenant and agreement containing other promises by the property owner related to parking and the prohibition of short-term rentals, but specifies that the written statement under penalty of perjury of the property owner's intent to occupy does not run with the land and is only binding and enforceable upon the current property owner.

Another key component of the Ordinance is a procedure for the Building Official to make findings of denial of a SB 9 project. These findings must be based upon a preponderance of the evidence, leading the Building Official to conclude that the SB 9 project would have a specific, adverse impact (a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete) upon public health and safety or the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. The process in the Ordinance requires the Building Official to review each SB 9 project application for such specific adverse impacts, and, if found, the Building Official must draft written findings and make a recommendation of denial of the SB 9 project. Upon review of the Building Official's findings and recommendation of denial, the Director of Community Development must issue a written decision to deny the project, and must publish the written decision with the Building Officials' findings on the City's website, which denial is appealable to the Planning Commission, then to the City Council, pursuant to the procedures set forth in Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 30.62. In addition to existing written public health or safety standards, policies or conditions, the Ordinance contains additional standards for potential historic resources (those not listed/designated and those not surveyed as eligible, and thus not part of the State Historic Resources Inventory) that allows the Building Official to deny a SB 9 project if there exists substantial evidence that the project will have a substantial adverse effect on a potential resource the City determines to be a historic resource.

The Ordinance does not contain additional standards related to high fire areas with substandard streets. Construction of a SB 9 housing development in the existing high and very high fire hazard severity zones in the City would not prevent the Fire Department from servicing those areas and similarly to accessory dwelling units, a SB 9 housing development would not pose a substantial adverse impact on fire safety in these areas. Furthermore, new SB 9 housing developments would be required to follow the additional building construction code and standards related to construction in these fire hazard area and must follow the adopted fire mitigation standards of the Glendale Building and Safety Code.

The Ordinance does not contain a requirement to notify property owners within either a 300 or 500-foot radius from the proposed SB 9 project site of the application. Since state law requires the City's review of an SB 9 project to be ministerial and without a hearing, meaningful public comment is foreclosed. Nevertheless, if Council chooses, it may introduce the Ordinance with such a notification/notice requirement. Staff recommends that any notification provision require a property owner and/or applicant to pay for such

noticing to be completed, as with any other land use application. Moreover, the Ordinance does not contain an affordability requirement at this time. The City Attorney's Office has analyzed this possibility and determined that such a requirement would necessitate amendment of the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, after completion of additional analyses and studies that would have to be undertaken by an outside consultant. These studies are not feasible to undertake and complete in time for the Interim Urgency Ordinance. If Council wishes to pursue this option, it may direct staff to undertake these studies in 2022, or at a later date (staff recommends waiting until after any additional amendments to SB 9 are proposed and after it has studied other jurisdictions' best practices).

In addition to the above SB 9 standards, the Interim Urgency Ordinance also modifies floor area ratios for certain qualifying projects under SB 478.

A fee resolution, setting application and other fees for SB 9 projects is also included for Council's consideration. The fees are proposed as follows:

1. "SB 9 housing development review fee", $309.00;
2. "SB 9 housing development covenant and agreement fee", $364.00;
3. "SB 9 lot split parcel map application fee", $17,006.00;
4. "SB 9 lot split land development engineering and processing fee", $3,139.00; and
5. "SB 9 lot split covenant and agreement fee" $364.00.

These fees are based on existing fees for similar applications established in the FY 21-22 Fee Schedule. The City is currently undergoing a Comprehensive Fee Study that may set new fees for FY 22-23 as well as modify the cost of existing fees. As a result, these newly established fees may be modified in the coming fiscal year.

STAKEHOLDERS/OUTREACH

Not applicable.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fiscal impact associated with introduction and adoption of an interim urgency ordinance setting forth a process (including fees and application requirements) for review and approval of SB 9 projects will depend on the number of SB 9 project applications received, and is difficult to predict. Additional revenue in the form of application/permit fees and development impact fees could be realized from SB 9 housing development or lot split proposals.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Community Development Department staff determined that this interim ordinance implements the provisions of Government Code Sections 65852.21 and 66411.7 and pursuant to Government Code Sections 65852.21(j) and 66411.7(n), is therefore not a project under Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code. Moreover, staff determined that this interim ordinance implements the provisions of Government Code Section 65913.11 and is therefore: (1) exempt from further environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant

to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations ("CEQA Guidelines") Section 15305 (minor alterations to land use limitations), Class 5 Exemption, as the Ordinance will allow a slightly more generous floor area ratio than currently allowed in certain zones, but the Ordinance will not allow for or encourage any more density or development than is already anticipated under the City's existing General Plan and as regulated by existing zoning, or otherwise allow for or promote physical changes in the environment; (2) exempt from further environmental review under CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) because the Ordinance will allow a slightly more generous floor area ratio than currently allowed in certain zones, but the Ordinance will not allow for or encourage any more density or development than is already anticipated under the City's existing General Plan and as regulated by existing zoning, or otherwise allow for or promote physical changes in the environment, and therefore, it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the ordinance will have a significant effect on the environment; and (3) not intended to apply to specifically identified housing development projects and as such it is speculative to evaluate any such future project now. Moreover, the Ordinance is not intended to, nor does it, provide CEQA clearance for future development-related projects by mere establishment of a slightly more generous floor area ratio in certain zones; any such projects subject to the Ordinance will be subject to appropriate environmental review at such time as approvals for those housing projects are considered. Each of the foregoing provides a separate and independent basis for CEQA compliance and, when viewed collectively, provides an overall basis for CEQA compliance.

CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE

This item is exempt from campaign disclosure requirements.

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1: Introduce, and subsequently adopt, Interim Urgency Ordinance effective January 1, 2022 regarding processes and objective zoning, subdivision and design standards for SB 9 projects, as well as revised floor area ratio standards for certain SB 478 projects.

Alternative 2: Do not introduce an Interim Urgency Ordinance, but rather, wait to consider permanent amendments to Titles 16 and 30 of the Glendale Municipal Code related to SB 9 and SB 478 project standards. This option will leave the City without a process and without objective standards for several months, as a non-urgency zoning ordinance requires Planning Commission review and recommendation, a noticed public hearing prior to adoption, and goes into effect 30 days after adoption.

Alternative 3: Any other alternative not proposed by staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Prepared by:
Kristen Asp, AICP, Principal Planner
Yvette Neukian, Senior Assistant City Attorney

Approved by:
Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., City Manager

EXHIBITS / ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit 1: Text of SB 9 and Government Code Section 65913.4;
Exhibit 2: Text of SB 478;
Exhibit 3: Terner Center/Mapcraft SB 9 model results, CA jurisdictions with greater than 5,000 single family parcels (including methodology).