

Al Adam  
Mayor

August 3, 2020

Honorable Scott Wiener  
Chair - Housing Committee  
California State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 2209  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: AB 2345 (GONZALES/CHIU) – PLANNING AND ZONING DENSITY BONUS  
OPPOSE**

Dear Chair Wiener:

On behalf of the City of Thousand Oaks, I respectfully oppose AB 2345. This bill would make amendments to Density Bonus Law (DBL) based on the formulas identical to the ones that City of San Diego adopted as part of their San Diego Affordable Homes Density Program. This bill would amend DBL by providing developers a maximum density of 50 percent if 24 to 33 percent of the units produced are restricted to low income units, 15 to 33 percent for very low-income units; and 44 percent for moderate income. This bill would also allow developers to receive up to five concessions and amend parking restrictions based on housing type.

DBL has been used as a tool to incentivize developers to build housing for all income levels. Current DBL allows for a maximum density bonus of 35%. AB 2345 creates a range for developers to qualify for 50% density bonus. While we appreciate 50% density bonus for low and very low-income categories, we do not believe they are necessary for moderate income units. A majority of permits issued by the City are for moderate and above moderate income. Since moderate income units provide greater financial yield, this bill would discourage development of low and very-income units as developers would receive the same 50% density bonus and more revenue.

Developers should only be rewarded with a 50% density bonus to construct units for the most vulnerable populations in very unique circumstances. In Ventura County, permits for low and very low-income developments are lagging. Very-low and low-income units help house senior adults, students, single parents, and service sector employees such waiters, retail and grocery workers. As the state wades through the COVID-19 pandemic, housing for the service sector or “essential employees” is even more critical especially for our community.

**AB 2345 – Oppose**  
**August 3, 2020**  
**Page 2**

Furthermore, developers already receive sufficient concessions. Expanding concessions to more than four is unnecessary and would impact City's ability to provide appropriate housing for City's most vulnerable population.

For these reasons, I oppose AB 2345.

Sincerely,



Albert C. Adam  
Mayor

c: Assemblymember Lorena Gonzales  
Assemblymember Jacqui Irwin  
Senator Henry Stern  
David Mullinax – Regional Public Affairs Manager, [dmullinax@cacities.org](mailto:dmullinax@cacities.org)  
League of California Cities, [cityletters@cacities.org](mailto:cityletters@cacities.org)  
Joe A. Gonsalves and Son

CMO:660-40/ml/H:Common/Lesigation/2020/AB/08 03 20 AB 2345 Planning and Zoning DB Oppose

