

TUCC May 21, 2026

Disclaimer This summary approximates what was said in the meeting and are not necessarily direct quotes.

- (Steve Osbourne Hayward) AB 2541? ADU amnesty. Is this a 5 year pause or a way to permit the ADU at a lower level?
 - (Betty Chan, Milpitas) Yes it is considered a pause in our jurisdiction.
- (Steve) New law says that ADU can never change the occupancy of a building, has anyone ran into this? [Gov Code 66314 \(d\)\(8\)](#)
 - (Gale Bate) new guidance from HCD on this topic. BSC has put out new guidance on ADUs as well.
 - (Brett Wickham, Contra Costa County) 11A only applies to 3 or more new units, in terms of accessibility.
 - (Betty Chan – Milpitas) the requirements for R-2 would likely apply with the addition of a 3rd unit.
- (Jom Sicat, unknown) For AHJ's allowing door between new attached ADU and primary dwelling, what are the required features?
- (Brett Wickham) Some people are not completely satisfied with the markups system (Accela) used in Contra Costa County. Does anyone have experience with Accela? What is your markup process?
 - (Jom Sicat) Menlo Park uses DigEplan with Accela to markup plans. Submittals have to be in a specific format to be compatible with that process. And most of the probs occur with Applicants not being able to format the submittals.
 - (Dennis Lau, San Ramon) Their jurisdiction uses Energov for comments and review plans on Bluebeam.
 - (Aneline Anzini) We use Trackit + project docs. Uploading plans on the applicant's side is very clunky.
 - (Jonathan Clark, architect) The switch to digital was a great change during Covid. Submitting in complete sets is highly preferred. Comments packaged in an excel-style report are not ideal, because every little item input is captured as a comment.
- (Jonathan Clark) – some jurisdictions are not familiar with or issuing permits for master plans for various projects.
 - (Phuong Devries, Cupertino) Master plans permits are issued in their jurisdiction, and inspection-only permits are issued for individual lots. However, the Planning department requires 2 permits issued for ADUs, including a planning permit for entitlement review.

- (Dennis Lau) San Ramon also does a master permit and issues the permits referencing the master permit.
- (Brett Wickham) For one master plan, how do different jurisdictions deal with code updates?
 - (Phuong Devries) our jurisdiction allows the project to stay under the code at the time of permit issuance as long as construction is being done (continuously) onsite
 - (Jonathan Clark) In prior experience, when crossing code cycles, jurisdictions sometimes allow grace periods, brokered deals, etc to stay under the original code at the time of issuance, or provide a minor code update. AB 130 may change these requirements based on the code being frozen for the next 2 code cycles. In the past, new codes have been more restrictive and cost more to build under, but with the new assembly bill, it may be easier to remain under the original code cycle.
 - (Gale Bate) It will be interesting to see how the mid-cycle code updates look [referencing AB130]. The adoption of the model code is one thing, but the mid-cycle is typically leftover items that were not included in the model code. The model code changes are not stopping.
 - (Betty Chan) In the next code cycle, is there going to be a separate code adopted for nonresidential projects?
 - (Keyvan Irannejad) Leave CRC aside and make any amendments under the CBC.
 - (Jonathan Clark) There are several residential projects under the CBC that would be affected.
 - (Keyvan) The intent [of AB130] is to apply only to single-family residential construction.
 - (Betty Chan) That's not what the bill says.
 - (Keyvan) The intent if you reach out to HCD/etc is to freeze the code only for single-family residential.
 - (Betty Chan) it would be very helpful if HCD could issue a statement to confirm that the assembly bill applies only to projects under the CRC. Developers may come in and try to use the older codes (2025 CBC) for larger residential projects.
 - (Nicole Widjaja) From BSC Bulletin 25-03: AB 130 impacts. *The scope of the moratorium on residential building standards enacted by AB 130 encompasses "residential units," which is currently not defined in*

statute and regulation. As such, the commission interprets this to mean all Residential Group R occupancies, as listed in Section 310 of the California Building Code (Part 2 of Title 24), as well as detached one- and two-family dwellings and townhouses, as listed in the California Residential Code (Part 2.5 of Title 24). Specifically, the residential Group R occupancies listed in Section 310 of the CBC would include Residential Groups R-1, R-2, R-2.1, R 2.2, R-3, R-3.1, and R-4.

- (Keyvan) How do we deal with parking for converted existing structures to live-work units?
 - (Jonathan Clark) I've only worked on new live-work units. There's very little benefit in conversion.
 - (Keyvan) The zoning for the area in question was converted from commercial to residential
 - (Betty Chan) In one specific project, the planning entitlement restricted use to only the business owner.
- (Phuong Devries) For aging-in-place, if they are converting to an ADU or creating an attached ADU, would aging-in-place apply?
 - (Betty Chan) The requirement is triggered only for detached ADUs, where a new dwelling is constructed.
 - (Phuong) so for a new attached ADU, or an addition, aging-in-place would not apply?
 - (Betty Chan) I would not consider it as a newly constructed dwelling (only detached buildings) and would not require aging-in-place requirements.
 - (Keyvan) If they're doing a substantial alteration in the main dwelling unit and attaching an ADU, we may ask. It's a gray area, and we have an internal policy to sometimes require aging-in-place for substantial alterations. If you do a new ADU, all the current code requirements would apply. That addition would have to meet all the requirements of the code. An ADU by itself is considered a new dwelling unit.
 - (Phuong) The code says newly constructed dwelling units, not newly constructed buildings. I agree with both of you but the discrepancy in language is the cause of the question.
- (Conrad Fromme) ground mount solar on the property of the sanitary district. There is doubt that the city has jurisdiction over the property based on Gov Code 53091(d). Any experience here?

- (Betty Chan) if a structure onsite is leased out to a private commercial entity, then you have jurisdiction. However, if the building or project is serving the facility itself, you may not have jurisdiction.
- (Keyvan) Does the sanitary facility come to you when they do tenant improvements or modifications on the property? If so, then you have jurisdiction. In regard to putting solar on the ground, they typically defer to Building .
- (Phuong Devries) Per CBC 105.2.2, *A permit shall not be required for the installation, alteration or repair of generation, transmission, distribution or metering or other related equipment that is under the ownership and control of public service agencies by established right.*
- (Betty Chan) if those structures are owned by that agency and are serving themselves, we do not have jurisdiction?
- (Keyvan) The first question you ask yourself is 'who is going to review their plan?' There is a lot of gray area here. If the building is occupiable space, and the solar serves the occupiable space, and there is no one else to review the plans, then the jurisdiction must impose permits and review the plan.
- (Betty Chan) If they hire a 3rd party to review, we are not overseeing that plan review, they would not need a permit from us?