RESTORING LOCAL CONTROL

A constructive conversation for Orland • **Statewide goals, local voices**

This is not a debate about whether housing or services matter — **they do**. The question is simpler and fairer: how should statewide goals be put into practice here in Orland, and who should have a meaningful voice in how a project fits our streets, neighborhoods, and infrastructure?

WHAT WE'RE ASKING

A meaningful voice

Input from the people who live here, who know our streets and neighborhoods best.

Neighborhood fit

Scale, compatibility, and accountability for projects that shape our town.

A better balance

Not opting out of state law — restoring balance between state goals and local input.

A DECADE OF SHIFTING AUTHORITY

Over the last decade, the state has steadily expanded the kinds of housing project that can be approved at the staff level — without the public hearing where a council or commission weighs local fit. A quick timeline:

2015	AB 1 limited certain local landscape rules during drought emergencies.
2016–21	ADU reforms, SB 35 and SB 9 created streamlined or ministerial housing pathways.
2022–24	AB 2011 and SB 423 expanded qualifying approval pathways, including housing on commercial land.
2025–26	AB 130 and SB 131 modified aspects of CEQA and housing review.

The good news: local authority has not disappeared. Building codes, fire and life-safety rules, and lawfully adopted local design standards still apply. Our goal is simply to keep a meaningful local voice within what the law allows.

WHY LOCAL CONTEXT MATTERS

Orland is not Los Angeles, San Francisco, or Silicon Valley.

Rural Orland has its own development patterns, infrastructure, service capacity, and economic needs. A one-size-fits-all policy can overlook the local knowledge that makes good planning work. Legitimate local considerations include:

Appearance & fit
Neighborhood appearance and compatibility.

Infrastructure
Circulation, site suitability, and service capacity.

Opportunity
Commercial opportunity and long-term tax base.

Accountability
Lawful public review, conditions, and accountability.

FOUR ORLAND EXAMPLES

These are four different local questions — illustrations of how these pressures show up here — not four proven cases of state preemption. Each benefits from meaningful local review:

Woodward Family Apartments
Building scale, sightlines, and neighborhood compatibility.

Youth & Family Wellness Center
Site selection, jurisdiction, and commercial land-use tradeoffs.

Tranquility Place
Operations, site suitability, and business-district compatibility.

Lakewest Parkside
Rezoning decisions and future approval pathways.

A CONSTRUCTIVE NEXT STEP

1	Refer the issue to the Planning Commission.
2	Review the California Cities for Local Control model resolution.
3	Examine relevant state laws and Orland-specific examples.
4	Develop a proposed resolution for future joint consideration.

DISCUSSION AND REFERRAL ONLY — NO RESOLUTION ADOPTION TONIGHT