

1 ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE
MALLORY & NATSIS LLP
2 DAVID H. BLACKWELL (BAR NO. 153354)
JACOB E. ARONSON (BAR NO. 313353)
3 3 Embarcadero Center, 25th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4070
4 Phone: (415) 837-1515
Fax: (415) 837-1516
5 Email: dblackwell@allenmatkins.com
jaronson@allenmatkins.com
6 Attorneys for Petitioner
WILLOW PROJECT LLC
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
10

11 WILLOW PROJECT LLC,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 CITY OF MENLO PARK,

15 CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MENLO
PARK,

16 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
17 DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF MENLO
PARK,

18 DOES 1–20,

19 Respondents.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. _____

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDATE, WRIT OF PROHIBITION,
AND DAMAGES**

[Code Civ. Proc., §§ 1085, 1094.5, 1095,
1094.9, 1103; Gov. Code §§ 65589.5,
65912.100–65912.140, 65914.2, 65915]

**ATTENTION: THIS
MATTER IS ENTITLED
TO PRIORITY AND
SUBJECT TO THE
EXPEDITED HEARING
AND REVIEW
PROCEDURES
CONTAINED IN
SECTION 1094.9 OF THE
CODE OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE**

Petitioner Willow Project LLC (“Petitioner”) files this Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate, Writ of Prohibition, and Damages (“Petition”) and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. “California has a housing supply and affordability crisis of historic proportions. The consequences of failing to effectively and aggressively confront this crisis are hurting millions of Californians, robbing future generations of the chance to call California home, stifling economic opportunities for workers and businesses, worsening poverty and homelessness, and undermining the state’s environmental and climate objectives.” (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(a)(2)(A).) “The excessive cost of the state’s housing supply is partially caused by activities and policies of many local governments that limit the approval of housing.” (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(a)(1)(B).) “Many local governments do not give adequate attention to the economic, environmental, and social costs of decisions that result in disapproval of housing development projects, reduction in density of housing projects, and excessive standards for housing development projects.” (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(a)(1)(D).)

2. To address this statewide problem, the Legislature has enacted a number of housing reform laws within the Planning and Zoning Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65000–66499.58) that constrain the ability of local governments to block various kinds of qualifying housing projects.

3. This case involves Petitioner’s proposed Willow Park Project (“Project”), a mixed-use development that would add 665 residential units—including 100 units affordable to low-income households—in a mixed-use neighborhood of Respondent City of Menlo Park (“City”).

4. Due to the interplay between several state housing reform laws, the Project is considered a use by right and qualifies for streamlined, ministerial review—in other words, the City is not permitted to say no to the Project. Yet over the course of nearly three years, the City has repeatedly refused to comply with state housing reform laws with respect to the Project, drawing admonishments from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (“HCD”) and the California Attorney General.

5. The City’s refusal to comply with applicable state housing reform laws and approve the Project has forced Petitioner to file this lawsuit.

1 **PARTIES**

2 6. Petitioner is, and at all times relevant to this action was, a limited liability
3 company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware and authorized to
4 transact business in the State of California. Petitioner is, and at all times relevant to this action
5 was, the fee owner of the real property located at 80 Willow Road in the City (“Property”).
6 Petitioner is, and at all times relevant to this action was, the developer of the Project.

7 7. The City is, and at all times relevant to this action was, a municipal corporation
8 and general law city incorporated in the State of California.

9 8. Respondent City Council of the City of Menlo Park (“City Council”) is, and at all
10 times relevant to this action was, the legislative body of the City.

11 9. Respondent Community Development Department of the City of Menlo Park
12 (“Department”) is, and at all times relevant to this action was, a department within the City that is
13 responsible for administering the Planning and Zoning Law and the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

14 10. Petitioner does not know the identities of Does 1 through 20 and therefore sues
15 these respondents by these fictitious names. Petitioner is informed and believes, and on that basis
16 alleges, that Does 1 through 20 are in some manner responsible for the acts or omissions alleged
17 in this Petition. Petitioner will amend this Petition to identify each such person or entity as a
18 respondent if and when Petitioner ascertains the identity, interest, and capacity of any such person
19 or entity.

20 11. Petitioner is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the City,
21 the City Council, the Department, and Does 1 through 20 (collectively, “Respondents”) is, and at
22 all times relevant to this action was, an agent or employee of each and all of the other
23 Respondents, and its acts or omissions alleged in this Petition were within the scope of such
24 agency or employment.

25 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

26 12. The Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo
27 (“Court”) has original jurisdiction in this action pursuant to Article VI, Section 10 of the
28 California Constitution; Code of Civil Procedure sections 1085, 1094.5, 1094.9, and 1103;

1 Government Code sections 65589.5(k)(1)(A)(i), 65915(d)(3), and 65915(e)(1); and other
2 applicable laws.

3 13. Venue for this action is proper in this Court pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
4 sections 392(a)(1), 393(b), 394(a), and 395(a) because Respondents are public entities and public
5 officers, Respondents are situated in and reside in the County of San Mateo, the Property is
6 located in the County of San Mateo, Respondents' acts or omissions complained of occurred in
7 the County of San Mateo, and the causes of action alleged in this Petition arose in the County of
8 San Mateo.

9 **LEGAL BACKGROUND**

10 **Housing Element Law**

11 14. All cities and counties must include in their general plan a housing element
12 meeting the requirements of the Housing Element Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65580–65589.11). (Gov.
13 Code, § 65302(c).)

14 15. Local governments must review and revise their housing elements periodically, on
15 a “planning period” schedule as specified in the Housing Element Law. (Gov. Code, § 65588.)

16 **The Housing Accountability Act**

17 16. The Legislature enacted the Housing Accountability Act (Gov. Code, § 65589.5)
18 “to significantly increase the approval and construction of new housing for all economic segments
19 of California’s communities by meaningfully and effectively curbing the capability of local
20 governments to deny, reduce the density for, or render infeasible housing development projects
21 and emergency shelters.” (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(a)(2)(K).)

22 17. The Housing Accountability Act should “be interpreted and implemented in a
23 manner to afford the fullest possible weight to the interest of, and the approval and provision of,
24 housing.” (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(a)(2)(L).)

25 18. The Housing Accountability Act provides that if a housing development project
26 complies with applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and subdivision standards and criteria,
27 including design review standards, in effect at the time that the application was deemed complete,
28 the local agency can disapprove the project only if it finds that (a) the project would have a

1 “specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety” and (b) the only feasible method to
2 satisfactorily mitigate or avoid that adverse impact is disapproval or lowering the density of the
3 project. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(j)(1).)

4 19. The Housing Accountability Act also provides that if a housing development
5 project includes specified amounts of affordable housing, the local agency may disapprove the
6 project only in limited circumstances. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(d).) One such circumstance is if (a)
7 the local government had adopted a revised housing element that was in substantial compliance
8 with the Housing Element Law on the date the application for the project was deemed complete
9 and (b) the project is inconsistent with both the zoning ordinance and general plan land use
10 designation. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(d)(5).) Thus, if a local government has *not* adopted a revised
11 housing element that is in substantial compliance with the Housing Element Law on the date the
12 application was deemed complete, the local government *cannot* disapprove the project based on
13 its inconsistency with either the zoning ordinance or the general plan land use designation. This is
14 known as the “builder’s remedy.”

15 20. The Housing Accountability Act broadly defines what constitutes a local agency’s
16 disapproval of a housing development project, including when a local agency “[f]ails to cease a
17 course of conduct undertaken for an improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary
18 delay or needless increases in the cost of the proposed housing development project, that
19 effectively disapproves the proposed housing development without taking final administrative
20 action” or “[f]ails to make a determination of whether the project is exempt from the California
21 Environmental Quality Act [(‘CEQA’)] (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 21000–21189.91)] or commits
22 an abuse of discretion” if certain requirements are met. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(h)(6)(E), (J).)

23 21. Under a provision of the Housing Accountability Act added by Senate Bill (“SB”) 330 (2019), a housing development project “shall be subject only to the ordinances, policies, and
24 standards adopted and in effect” on the date that a “preliminary application” meeting specified
25 requirements was submitted to a local agency. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(o)(1).) “[O]rdinances,
26 policies, and standards’ include[] general plan, community plan, specific plan, zoning, design
27 review standards and criteria, subdivision standards and criteria, and any other rules, regulations,
28

1 requirements, and policies of a local agency, as defined in [Government Code] Section 66000,
2 including those relating to development impact fees, capacity or connection fees or charges,
3 permit or processing fees, and other exactions.” (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(o)(4).) Provisions of the
4 Housing Accountability Act based on the date an application is “deemed complete” apply to the
5 date a complete preliminary application was submitted. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(h)(5).)

6 22. Assembly Bill (“AB”) 1893 (2024) amended the Housing Accountability Act to,
7 among other things, provide that “[f]or a housing development project application that is deemed
8 complete before January 1, 2025, the development proponent for the project may choose to be
9 subject to the provisions of this section that were in place on the date the preliminary application
10 was submitted, or, if the project meets the definition of a builder’s remedy project, it may choose
11 to be subject to any or all of the provisions of this section applicable as of January 1, 2025.”
12 (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(f)(7)(A).)

13 23. The definition of a “housing development project” in the Housing Accountability
14 Act was amended by SB 838 (2025), effective January 1, 2026, to, *inter alia*, exclude hotels from
15 the definition.

16 24. If a court finds that a local agency has failed to comply with its order or judgment
17 compelling compliance with the Housing Accountability Act, the court must impose fines on the
18 local agency in a minimum amount of \$10,000 per housing unit in the housing development
19 project on the date the application was deemed complete. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(k)(1)(B).) If the
20 court finds that the local agency acted in bad faith when it violated the Housing Accountability
21 Act and failed to carry out the court’s order or judgment within the time period prescribed by the
22 court, the court must multiply this fine by a factor of five. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(l).) If the court
23 previously found that the local agency violated the Housing Accountability Act within the same
24 planning period, the court must multiply the fines by an additional factor for each previous
25 violation. (*Id.*)

26 **The Density Bonus Law**

27 25. The Density Bonus Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65915–65918) allows housing
28 development projects that include specified amounts of affordable housing to receive a specified

1 number of incentives or concessions and unlimited waivers or reductions of development
2 standards. (Gov. Code, § 65915(d), (e).) The local agency must grant requested incentives or
3 concessions and waivers or reductions of development standards unless it makes specified
4 findings. (*Id.*)

5 **The Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act**

6 26. The Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act (Gov. Code, §§ 65912.100–
7 65912.140) was added by AB 2011 (2022) and has since been amended several times. This law
8 provides that housing development projects that meet specified requirements (including a
9 specified amount of affordable housing) “shall be a use by right” and “shall be subject to a
10 streamlined, ministerial review.” (Gov. Code, § 65912.120.) As a “use by right,” the project is not
11 subject to any discretionary local government approval, permit, or review process, and is not a
12 “project” subject to CEQA. (Gov. Code, § 65912.101(y).)

13 27. As presently amended, the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act provides
14 that when a local government reviews a housing development application for consistency with the
15 standards in that law, it must provide the applicant a written exhaustive list of any standards that
16 the project conflicts with, and an explanation for the reasons of such conflicts, within specified
17 timeframes. (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(2)(A).) If the local government does not provide this
18 required documentation, the project “shall be deemed to satisfy the objective planning standards.”
19 (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4).) In any subsequent review, “the local government shall not
20 request the development proponent to provide any new information that was not stated in the
21 initial list of items that were determined to be in conflict.” (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(2)(B).)
22 (Underlined provisions in this paragraph were added by AB 2243 (2024), effective January 1,
23 2025.)

24 28. If a housing development project application is submitted before December 31,
25 2024, the project is subject to the provisions of the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act
26 that were applicable on December 31, 2024, unless the development proponent chooses to be
27 subject to any of the provisions as applicable on January 1, 2025. (Gov. Code, § 65912.106.)
28

1 **AB 712**

2 29. AB 712 (2025), codified at Government Code section 65914.2, provides that if an
3 applicant for a housing development project is the prevailing party in an action brought against a
4 public agency to enforce the agency's compliance with a state housing reform law as applied to
5 the applicant's project, and specified conditions are satisfied, the court must impose a fine of *at*
6 *least* \$10,000 per housing unit. (Gov. Code, § 65914.2(b)(2)(A)(i).) An applicant is not required
7 to present a claim pursuant to the Government Claims Act in order to seek the fine referenced
8 herein. (Gov. Code, § 65914.2(b)(2)(B).) If a court has previously found that the local agency
9 violated the same housing reform law on which an applicant prevailed in its lawsuit, within the
10 same planning period, the court must impose a fine of at least \$50,000 per housing unit. (Gov.
11 Code, § 65914.2(b)(2)(A)(ii).)

12 30. AB 712 also prohibits public agencies from requiring housing development project
13 applicants to indemnify the public agency with respect to an action alleging that the public agency
14 violated the applicant's rights or deprived the applicant of the benefits or protections provided by
15 a housing reform law. (Gov. Code, § 65914.2(c).)

16 **SB 808**

17 31. SB 808 (2025), codified at Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.9, establishes
18 special procedures for expedited judicial review of a local agency's denial of entitlements for a
19 housing development project. These expedited procedures include the following: "The clerk of
20 the court shall set a hearing for review of the petition for writ of mandate no later than 45
21 calendar days from the date the petition is filed." (Code Civ. Proc., § 1094.9(d)(5).) "Following
22 the conclusion of the hearing, the court shall render its decision in an expeditious manner. In no
23 event shall the decision be rendered later than 30 calendar days after the matter is submitted or 75
24 calendar days after the date the petition is filed . . . whichever is earlier." (Code Civ. Proc., §
25 1094.9(d)(6).)

26 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

27 32. The Project would demolish an existing single-story commercial office building on
28 the Property and construct four new buildings, including 665 residential units (of which 15

1 percent, or 100 units, would be restricted as affordable to low-income households), office and
2 retail space, a hotel with 130 rooms, a preschool and playground, a swim and fitness club, and an
3 outdoor common area.

4 33. On or about December 7, 2023, Petitioner submitted to the Department a complete
5 preliminary application for the Project.

6 34. On December 22, 2023, the Department acknowledged that the Project's
7 preliminary application included all items required to be submitted pursuant to Government Code
8 section 65941.1(a). Therefore, the Project "shall be subject only to the ordinances, policies, and
9 standards adopted and in effect" as of December 7, 2023. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(o)(1).)

10 35. At the time Petitioner submitted a complete preliminary application for the Project
11 on December 7, 2023, the City had not adopted a revised housing element that was in substantial
12 compliance with the Housing Element Law. Therefore, the Project is subject to the builder's
13 remedy. HCD certified that the City's Housing Element was substantially compliant with state
14 law on or around March 20, 2024.

15 36. On May 24, 2024, Petitioner submitted to the Department a full development
16 application for the Project pursuant to Government Code section 65941.1(e)(1). Petitioner noted
17 in the application that the Project was subject to the builder's remedy under the Housing
18 Accountability Act and was a use by right and subject to streamlined, ministerial review under the
19 Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act.

20 37. On June 22, 2024, the Department sent Petitioner a letter asserting that the Project
21 did not meet certain site criteria and objective development standards in the Affordable Housing
22 and High Road Jobs Act and, therefore, was not subject to streamlined, ministerial review under
23 that law.

24 38. Also on June 22, 2024, the Department sent Petitioner a separate letter asserting
25 that the Project's development application was incomplete. The Department asserted that the
26 application was incomplete in part because Petitioner had not applied for a general plan
27 amendment or zoning amendment, despite the fact that the builder's remedy precluded such a
28 requirement.

1 39. On July 15, 2024, Petitioner submitted a request for technical assistance to HCD
2 regarding the Department's refusal to accept the Project's development application as complete
3 without submittal of a General Plan amendment and zoning amendment.

4 40. On September 12, 2024, Petitioner resubmitted the Project's development
5 application to address the items that the Department had identified as missing in its June 22,
6 2024, incompleteness letter.

7 41. On October 11, 2024, the Department sent Petitioner a letter again asserting that
8 the Project's development application was incomplete.

9 42. On October 16, 2024, Petitioner resubmitted the Project's development application
10 to address the items that the Department had identified as missing in its October 11, 2024,
11 incompleteness letter.

12 43. On November 14, 2024, the Department sent Petitioner a letter with its
13 determination that the Project's development application was complete.

14 44. On November 26, 2024, HCD sent a Letter of Technical Assistance to the City
15 explaining that because the Project was subject to the builder's remedy, the Housing
16 Accountability Act prohibited the City from requiring Petitioner to apply for an amendment to the
17 City's General Plan. The Letter of Technical Assistance further explained that even if a General
18 Plan amendment were permitted under the Housing Accountability Act, the Permit Streamlining
19 Act would also prohibit the City from using the absence of a General Plan amendment application
20 as a basis for determining that the Project's development application was incomplete because that
21 item was not explicitly required on the City's application submittal requirement checklist.

22 45. On December 20, 2024, the Department responded to HCD's Letter of Technical
23 Assistance, asserting that the issue was moot because the Department had already determined that
24 it would no longer require Petitioner to apply for General Plan or zoning amendment applications
25 as requirements for finding the Project's development application to be complete.

26 46. On January 13, 2025, the Department sent Petitioner a 46-page letter asserting that
27 the Project was inconsistent with various development standards. This letter asserted again that
28 the Project was inconsistent with the City's General Plan and zoning (despite the Project's being

1 subject to the builder's remedy under the Housing Accountability Act) and with development
2 standards that were adopted after the Project's complete preliminary application was submitted on
3 December 7, 2023 (despite the Project's being vested in the development standards in effect on
4 that date under the Housing Accountability Act).

5 47. Petitioner provided additional information regarding the Project's development
6 application on March 7, 2025, and March 19, 2025. Petitioner made minor revisions to the
7 Project's application to address the development standard inconsistencies that the Department had
8 previously identified. Petitioner also identified concessions and waivers under the Density Bonus
9 Law to the extent the Project remained inconsistent with any applicable development standards.
10 Petitioner reminded the Department that under the Housing Accountability Act, the City could
11 not enforce any purported inconsistencies with the City's General Plan and zoning because the
12 Project was subject to the builder's remedy, nor could the City enforce any purported
13 inconsistencies with development standards that were adopted after the Project's complete
14 preliminary application was submitted on December 7, 2023, because the Project was vested in
15 the development standards in effect on that date.

16 48. On May 6, 2025, the Department sent Petitioner a letter again asserting that the
17 Project was inconsistent with various development standards.

18 49. On October 10, 2025, Petitioner responded to the Department's June 22, 2024,
19 letter that had asserted the Project did not meet the requirements for streamlined, ministerial
20 review under the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act. Petitioner's response letter
21 addressed each of the Department's asserted grounds for ineligibility and explained why the
22 Project was a use by right and eligible for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable
23 Housing and High Road Jobs Act.

24 50. The Department responded to Petitioner on November 7, 2025, again asserting that
25 the Project was not eligible for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and
26 High Road Jobs Act. Nearly every basis of ineligibility that the Department asserted in this letter
27 was a new item that the Department had not previously identified in its June 22, 2024, letter.

28 51. Also on November 7, 2025, the Department sent Petitioner another letter asserting

1 that the Project was inconsistent with various development standards.

2 52. On November 19, 2025, Petitioner sent a letter to the Department responding to
3 the Department's November 7, 2025, letter regarding the Project's eligibility for streamlined,
4 ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act. Petitioner pointed out
5 that nearly every basis of ineligibility that the Department had asserted in its letter on November
6 7, 2025, was a new issue that it was prohibited from raising. Petitioner also provided additional
7 information from an environmental consultant to demonstrate that the Project met the site
8 development criteria related to wetlands and protected species habitat. Finally, Petitioner notified
9 the Department that its letter was a written notice pursuant to the Housing Accountability Act
10 (specifically, Government Code section 65589.5(h)(6)) that the City had effectively denied the
11 Project because the City's course of conduct had been undertaken for an improper purpose and
12 the City had failed to make a determination that the Project was exempt from CEQA and had
13 committed an abuse of discretion.

14 53. The Department responded to Petitioner on December 18, 2025, again asserting
15 that the Project did not meet the criteria for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable
16 Housing and High Road Jobs Act. The Department disputed that it was prohibited from
17 identifying new bases of ineligibility that it had not asserted in its June 22, 2024, letter.

18 54. On December 24, 2025, Petitioner responded to the Department, again explaining
19 why the Project qualified for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and
20 High Road Jobs Act.

21 55. On January 16, 2026, Petitioner sent to the Department a letter identifying all of
22 the concessions and waivers that it had previously requested under the Density Bonus Law.
23 Although not required by the law, Petitioner provided this letter in response to the City's request
24 for a "single, enumerated list" of all requested concessions and waivers. Petitioner's letter
25 reminded the Department that the purportedly inconsistent development standards did not apply
26 to the Project because the Project was subject to the builder's remedy. Petitioner's letter stated,
27 among other things, that (a) this list was complete to the best of Petitioner's knowledge based on
28 the correspondence to date, and (b) Petitioner reserved the right to seek additional concessions

1 and waivers under the Density Bonus Law if the City identified other purported inconsistencies
2 with development standards. Petitioner requested the Department to advise Petitioner if the
3 Department determined that Petitioner had omitted any items that the Department identified as a
4 required concession or waiver; thereafter, the Department did not inform Petitioner of any
5 omitted items. Petitioner's letter identified the following development standards for which it
6 sought a waiver (reserving its right to categorize the first two items as concessions if necessary):

- 7 a. Number and size of below market rate units (City's Below Market Rate
8 Housing Program Guidelines, § 5.1).
- 9 b. Below market rate unit distribution and appearance (City's Below Market
10 Rate Housing Program Guidelines, § 5.1).
- 11 c. Minimum lot depth (City Code, § 16.30.030(2)).
- 12 d. Minimum lot width (City Code, § 16.30.030(2)).
- 13 e. Minimum yard depth (City Code, § 16.30.030(3)).
- 14 f. Maximum lot coverage (City Code, § 16.30.030(4)).
- 15 g. Maximum structure height (City Code, § 16.30.030(5)).
- 16 h. Maximum floor area ratio (City Code, § 16.30.030(7)).

17 56. On January 22, 2026, the Department responded to Petitioner regarding the
18 Project's eligibility for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and High
19 Road Jobs Act. The Department continued to assert that the Project was ineligible for
20 streamlined, ministerial review, based entirely on new reasons that the Department had not
21 identified in its original June 22, 2024, letter.

22 57. On February 10, 2026, the Department responded to Petitioner's November 19,
23 2025, letter, disputing that the City was deemed to have disapproved the Project under the
24 Housing Accountability Act. The Department also asserted that the Project was no longer a
25 "housing development project" under the Housing Accountability Act because SB 838's recent
26 amendment to the statutory definition excluded projects with a hotel.

27 58. On February 12, 2026, the Department sent Petitioner a letter in which it continued
28 to assert that the Project was inconsistent with various development standards. The Department

1 also asserted that the Project did not qualify for the builder's remedy because the Project was no
2 longer a "housing development project" under the Housing Accountability Act as recently
3 amended by SB 838.

4 59. On February 12, 2026, Petitioner transmitted to the Department a letter from the
5 Project's architect, SCB, that disputed the Department's prior assertions that the Project was not a
6 "housing development project" under the current definition in the Housing Accountability Act
7 because Petitioner had elected to be subject to the prior definition, as Petitioner was entitled to do
8 under Government Code section 65589.5(f)(7)(A) because the Project's application was deemed
9 complete before January 1, 2025.

10 60. On April 6, 2026, Petitioner sent a letter to the Department explaining again why
11 the Project qualified for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and High
12 Road Jobs Act and why the Department had not identified (and could not identify) any lawful
13 reason why the Project was ineligible. Petitioner requested the Department "provide its final
14 comprehensive response" with regard to the Project's eligibility for streamlined, ministerial
15 review.

16 61. On April 13, 2026, the Department sent Petitioner a letter asserting that the Project
17 was inconsistent with various development standards, and again asserting that the Project was not
18 a "housing development project" under the current definition in the Housing Accountability Act
19 due to its inclusion of a hotel. The Department's letter did not address Petitioner's election (as
20 memorialized in Petitioner's February 12, 2026, letter to the Department) to be subject to the
21 prior definition of "housing development project" under Government Code section
22 65589.5(f)(7)(A).

23 62. On May 6, 2026, the Department sent Petitioner its most recent letter asserting that
24 the Project does not qualify for streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and
25 High Road Jobs Act based on 10 purported inconsistencies with eligibility criteria.

26 63. Based on the Department's May 6, 2026, letter, Petitioner is informed and
27 believes, and on that basis alleges, that the Department disputes that the Project satisfies the
28 following eligibility criteria under the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act:

1 a. The Project is on a site located within a zone where office, retail, or
2 parking is a principally permitted use (*see* Gov. Code, § 65912.121(a)) and, even if not,
3 the Project is deemed to comply with this standard because the City did not timely raise
4 this issue in its initial inconsistency determination letter (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4)).

5 b. The Project is a “housing development project” under the Housing
6 Accountability Act (*see* Gov. Code, § 65912.123(a)) and, even if not, the Project is
7 deemed to comply with this standard because the City did not timely raise this issue in its
8 initial inconsistency determination letter (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4)).

9 c. The Project is located on a site where at least 75 percent of the perimeter of
10 the site adjoins parcels that are developed with urban uses (*see* Gov. Code, §
11 65912.121(e)).

12 d. The Project is not located on a site that has wetlands or habitat for
13 protected species (*see* Gov. Code, §§ 65912.121(g), 65913.4(a)(6)(C), (J)).

14 e. The Project is deemed to comply with the requirement that the affordable
15 units have the same bedroom and bathroom count ratio as the market rate units (*see* Gov.
16 Code, § 65912.122(d)) because the City did not timely raise this issue in its initial
17 inconsistency determination letter. (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4).)

18 f. The Project is deemed to comply with the requirement that the affordable
19 units be equitably distributed within the Project (*see* Gov. Code, § 65912.122(d)) because
20 the City did not timely raise this issue in its initial inconsistency determination letter.
21 (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4).)

22 g. The Project is deemed to comply with residential density standards (*see*
23 Gov. Code, § 65912.123(b)) because it is a builder’s remedy project. (Gov. Code, §
24 65589.5(f)(6)(F)(i).)

25 h. The Project is entitled to a waiver from height limits (*see* Gov. Code, §
26 65912.123(c)) under the Density Bonus Law. (Gov. Code, §§ 65912.124(f)(2),
27 65915(e)(1).)

28 i. The Project is deemed to comply with the requirement that all parking must

1 be set back at least 25 feet from any property line that fronts a commercial corridor (*see*
2 Gov. Code, § 65912.123(d)(1)(B)) because the City did not timely raise this issue in its
3 initial inconsistency determination letter. (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4).)

4 j. The Project is deemed to comply with the requirement that the ground
5 floors of the Project’s buildings must abut within 10 feet of the street for at least 80
6 percent of the property lines that front a commercial corridor (*see* Gov. Code, §
7 65912.123(d)(1)(C)) because the City did not timely raise this issue in its initial
8 inconsistency determination letter. (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(4).)

9 64. On July 29, 2026, the Attorney General sent a letter to the City pursuant to AB 712
10 to notify the City that its treatment of the Project’s development application violated the Housing
11 Accountability Act and the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act, a copy of which is
12 attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** (“AB 712 Letter”). The AB 712 Letter determined, in part, that:

13 a. “The Office of the Attorney General remains concerned that the City has
14 not handled the application in accordance with the Affordable Housing and High Road
15 Jobs Act of 2022 (the ‘Act’). (Gov. Code, §§ 65912.100-65912.140.) As we discussed,
16 records show that the City untimely asserted additional grounds to support its initial
17 determination that the Project was ineligible for streamlined approval under the Act.
18 Because the City cannot change its rationale for finding the Project ineligible for
19 streamlined approval from its initial rationale, and because the City’s initial rationale is
20 incorrect, the City’s handling of the application for this Project would represent a
21 violation of the Act.”

22 b. “The City’s treatment of the Project also violates the Housing
23 Accountability Act (the ‘HAA’) in two respects. First, the City is failing to afford the
24 Project the protections to which it is entitled under the builder’s remedy. (§ 65589.5, subd.
25 (d)(5)-(6).) Second, the City is unlawfully requiring the Project applicant to pay for the
26 City’s legal counsel in connection with the City’s review of the Project, which goes
27 beyond the limited authority the HAA reserves to local agencies to impose fees on
28 development applicants. (See *id.*, subd. (f)(3).)”

1 c. Each of the City’s initial inconsistency findings under Government Code
2 section 65912.123 was without merit, and the City’s subsequent inconsistency findings
3 were either without merit or were prohibited new grounds not stated in the City’s initial
4 response.

5 d. Under the Housing Accountability Act and AB 712, the City cannot require
6 Petitioner to pay the City’s attorney fees related to the Project’s development application.

7 65. On August 3, 2026, Petitioner sent a letter to the City pursuant to AB 712 to notify
8 the City of its intent to commence this lawsuit to enforce the City’s compliance with state housing
9 reform laws. Petitioner also notified the City that its practice of requiring Petitioner to pay the
10 City’s legal fees in connection with the Project’s development application was unlawful, and that
11 the City was required to refund the approximately \$300,000 in legal fees that Petitioner had paid
12 to date. Because Petitioner provided this written notice to the City pursuant to AB 712, in the
13 event that Petitioner is the prevailing party in this action, the Court is *required* to impose a fine in
14 a *minimum* amount of \$10,000 per housing unit in the Project as of the date the application was
15 deemed complete—at least \$6,650,000. (*See* Gov. Code, § 65914.2(b)(2).)

16 66. On August 5, 2026, Petitioner sent a letter to the City pursuant to SB 808
17 (specifically, Code of Civil Procedure section 1094.9(d)(2)) to request the City prepare the record
18 of proceedings or administrative record regarding the Project.

19 67. On September 29, 2026, the City Council met in closed session to discuss potential
20 litigation related to the Project’s development application. At the conclusion of that closed
21 session, the City Council reported to the public that it disagreed with the Attorney General’s AB
22 712 Letter and intended to litigate the matter notwithstanding the threat of significant fines and
23 other financial consequences. The Mayor of the City stated that the “City Council is united in its
24 position that the Attorney General has incorrectly directed the City to approve the 80 Willow
25 Road project under the terms of [the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act],” that the City
26 Council “strongly opposes approval of the project under the terms in the [Attorney General’s]
27 letter,” and that the City would litigate the matter “even if there are financial consequences and
28 service impacts for the City that may be triggered by our effort to vindicate our rights and protect

1 the Menlo Park community.”

2 68. Respondents have failed, and continue to fail, to cease a course of conduct
3 undertaken for an improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless
4 increases in the cost of the Project, that effectively disapproves the Project without taking final
5 administrative action, and all the conditions in Government Code section 65589.5(h)(6)(E) are
6 met; this constitutes an ongoing violation of applicable housing reform laws.

7 69. Respondents have failed to make a determination of whether the Project is exempt
8 from CEQA and committed an abuse of discretion, as defined in Government Code section
9 65589.5.1(b), and all the conditions in Government Code section 65589.5.1(a) are satisfied; this
10 constitutes an ongoing violation of applicable housing reform laws.

11 70. The Department’s letter to Petitioner on May 6, 2026, constitutes a disapproval of
12 the Project under the Housing Accountability Act. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5(h)(6).) The City
13 Council’s statement regarding the Project following its meeting in closed session on September
14 29, 2026, also constitutes a disapproval of the Project under the Housing Accountability Act. (*Id.*)

15 71. Respondents have acted in bad faith when they violated the Housing
16 Accountability Act, the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act, the Density Bonus Law,
17 AB 712, and other applicable laws as alleged in this Petition.

18 72. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate legal remedy other than the relief
19 sought in this Petition.

20 73. Petitioner has exhausted all available administrative remedies to the extent
21 required by law. To the extent Petitioner has not exhausted any available administrative remedies,
22 it would have been futile to attempt to do so and any such remedies would have been inadequate.

23 74. Petitioner has satisfied all prerequisites to filing this Petition.

24 75. This action seeks enforcement of an important right affecting the public interest
25 and will confer a significant benefit on the general public or a large class of persons.

26 76. This action is subject to the procedures contained in SB 808 because this is an
27 action or proceeding to review Respondents’ denial of entitlements for a housing development
28 project and Petitioner has provided the notice described in Code of Civil Procedure section

1 1094.9(d)(4).

2 **STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS**

3 77. This action is timely under the Housing Accountability Act because this Petition is
4 filed and will be served on Respondents no later than 90 days (plus a 60-day extension under AB
5 712) from the later of (1) the effective date of a decision of Respondents imposing conditions on,
6 disapproving, or any other final action on the Project, or (2) the expiration of the time periods in
7 Government Code section 65589.5(h)([6])(B). (Gov. Code, §§ 65589.5(m)(1),
8 65914.2(b)(2)(A)(i)(III).)

9 78. This action is timely under SB 808 because this Petition is filed and will be served
10 on Respondents no later than 90 days (plus a 60-day extension under AB 712) from the later of
11 (1) the effective date of a decision of Respondents imposing conditions on, disapproving, or any
12 other final action on the Project, (2) the effective date of the denial of a permit for the Project, or
13 (3) any other action by which Respondents disapprove the Project. (Code Civ. Proc., §
14 1094.9(d)(4); Gov. Code, § 65914.2(b)(2)(A)(i)(III).)

15 79. This action is timely under AB 712 because this Petition is filed at least 60 days
16 after Petitioner provided notice to the City of its intent to commence this action following the
17 Attorney General's AB 712 Letter to the City advising it that its decision, action, or inaction
18 represents a violation of housing reform law in substantially the same manner as alleged in this
19 Petition. (Gov. Code, § 65914.2(b)(2)(A)(i).)

20 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **(Writ of Mandate and/or Writ of Prohibition: Violation of Housing Accountability Act,**
22 **Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act, and Density Bonus Law)**

23 80. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in each
24 of the paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

25 81. The Project is a housing development project under the Housing Accountability
26 Act.

27 82. The Project includes housing for very low, low-, or moderate-income households
28 under the Housing Accountability Act.

1 83. The Project is a builder's remedy project under the Housing Accountability Act.

2 84. The Project complies with all applicable, objective general plan, zoning, and
3 subdivision standards and criteria, including design review standards, in effect at the time that the
4 application was deemed complete.

5 85. The Project is entitled to incentives or concessions under the Density Bonus Law.
6 (Gov. Code, § 65915(d)(2).) Respondents have not made—and, based on the evidence in the
7 record of proceedings, cannot make—findings required to deny the Project's requested
8 concessions or incentives under the Density Bonus Law (specifically, Government Code section
9 65915(d)(1)).

10 86. Under the Density Bonus Law, the Project is entitled to an unlimited number of
11 waivers or reductions of development standards that will have the effect of physically precluding
12 the construction of a development meeting the criteria of Government Code section 65915(b) at
13 the densities or with the concessions or incentives permitted under the Density Bonus Law. (Gov.
14 Code, § 65915(e)(1).) Respondents have not made—and, based on the evidence in the record of
15 proceedings, cannot make—findings required to deny the Project's requested waivers or
16 reductions of development standards under the Density Bonus Law (specifically, Government
17 Code section 65915(e)(1)).

18 87. The Project is a use by right and is subject to streamlined, ministerial review under
19 the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act because with respect to each requirement in
20 Government Code sections 65912.121, 65912.122, and 65912.123, the Project either (1) satisfies
21 the requirement, (2) is deemed to comply with the requirement because it is a builder's remedy
22 project, (3) is entitled to a concession or waiver from the requirement under the Density Bonus
23 Law, and/or (4) is deemed to satisfy the requirement pursuant to Government Code section
24 65912.124(a)(4) because Respondents did not timely identify any inconsistency with the
25 requirement. Respondents must approve—but have not approved—the Project within 90 days
26 after the Project is determined to comply with all applicable requirements in the Affordable
27 Housing and High Road Jobs Act. (Gov. Code, § 65912.124(a)(3)(B).)

28 88. Respondents have not made—and, based on the evidence in the record of

proceedings, cannot make—findings required to disapprove the Project under the Housing Accountability Act (specifically, Government Code sections 65589.5(d) and 65589.5(j)(1)).

89. Respondents have clear, present, and mandatory duties to: (a) comply with the Housing Accountability Act, the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act, the Density Bonus Law, and other applicable laws; (b) grant all of the Project’s requested concessions and waivers under the Density Bonus Law; (c) deem the Project a use by right and subject to streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act; and (d) approve the Project under the Housing Accountability Act, the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act, the Density Bonus Law, and other applicable laws. Petitioner has a clear, present, and beneficial right to Respondents’ performance of these mandatory duties. Respondents have failed to perform these mandatory duties.

90. Respondents’ acts or omissions alleged in this Petition violate the Housing Accountability Act, the Affordable Housing and High Road Jobs Act, the Density Bonus Law, and other applicable laws.

91. Respondents’ acts or omissions alleged in this Petition were without or in excess of their jurisdiction.

92. Respondents’ acts or omissions alleged in this Petition constitute a prejudicial abuse of discretion in that they were arbitrary, capricious, without evidentiary support, and failed to conform to procedures required by law.

93. Respondents’ acts or omissions alleged in this Petition constitute a prejudicial abuse of discretion in that Respondents did not proceed in the manner required by law, Respondents’ actions are not supported by legally adequate findings, and any alleged findings are not supported by the evidence.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Writ of Mandate, Writ of Prohibition, and/or Damages: Violation of Housing Accountability Act and AB 712)

94. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in each of the paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

1 95. Respondents have a clear, present, and mandatory duty to comply with the
2 Housing Accountability Act and AB 712. Petitioner has a clear, present, and beneficial right to
3 Respondents' performance of this mandatory duty. Respondents have failed to perform this
4 mandatory duty.

5 96. Respondents have required Petitioner to reimburse the City's legal fees in
6 connection with the Project's development application.

7 97. To date, Petitioner has paid the City approximately \$302,938.00 to reimburse the
8 City for its legal fees in connection with the Project's development application.

9 98. Petitioner's August 3, 2026, letter requesting a refund of the City's legal fees that
10 Respondents required Petitioner to pay constituted a claim for money or damages under the
11 Government Claims Act (Gov. Code, §§ 900 *et seq.*). To the extent it did not, Petitioner submitted
12 an additional claim to the City under the Government Claims Act on October 1, 2026.

13 99. Respondents have not responded to Petitioner's August 3, 2026, request for a
14 refund or Petitioner's October 1, 2026, claim.

15 100. Respondents have not refunded to Petitioner the City's legal fees that Respondents
16 have required Petitioner to pay.

17 101. Petitioner is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Respondents
18 intend to continue to require Petitioner to reimburse the City's legal fees in connection with the
19 Project's development application.

20 102. Under the Housing Accountability Act, Respondents cannot require Petitioner to
21 reimburse the City's legal fees in connection with the Project's development application because
22 no objective standard requiring payment of such fees was in effect on the date that the Project's
23 complete preliminary application was submitted.

24 103. The Mitigation Fee Act (Gov. Code, §§ 66001 *et seq.*) does not permit the City to
25 assess fees for legal services incurred in reviewing project applications for consistency with state
26 housing laws.

27 104. AB 712 also prohibits Respondents from requiring Petitioner to reimburse the
28 City's legal fees in connection with the Project. The City Council's statement following its

1 meeting in closed session on September 29, 2026, makes clear that the City has required
2 Petitioner to reimburse the City for legal services that have been procured in anticipation of this
3 litigation, in which Petitioner alleges that Respondents have violated Petitioner's rights or
4 deprived Petitioner of the benefits or protections provided by a housing reform law. By requiring
5 Petitioner to reimburse these legal fees, Respondents have required Petitioner "to indemnify,
6 defend, or hold harmless [the City] in any manner with respect to [this] action," in violation of
7 AB 712. (Gov. Code, § 65914.2(c)(1).)

8 105. Petitioner is entitled to a refund of all money that it paid to the City to reimburse
9 the City's legal fees in connection with the Project's development application.

10 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

11 WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays for Judgment as follows:

12 1. A writ of mandate and/or writ of prohibition pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
13 sections 1085, 1094.5, and 1103; Government Code sections 65589.5(k)(1)(A)(ii), 65912.120,
14 65915(d)(3), and 65915(e)(1); and other applicable laws, ordering Respondents and their agents
15 and employees (a) to comply with the Housing Accountability Act, the Affordable Housing and
16 High Road Jobs Act, the Density Bonus Law, and other applicable laws; (b) to grant all of the
17 Project's requested concessions and waivers under the Density Bonus Law; (c) to deem the
18 Project a use by right and subject to streamlined, ministerial review under the Affordable Housing
19 and High Road Jobs Act; and (d) to approve the Project.

20 2. A writ of mandate and/or writ of prohibition pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure
21 sections 1085, 1094.5, and 1103; Government Code sections 65589.5(k)(1)(A)(ii) and 65914.2(c);
22 and other applicable laws, (a) prohibiting Respondents and their agents and employees from
23 requiring Petitioner to pay the City's legal fees in connection with the Project's development
24 application, and (b) ordering Respondents and their agents and employees to refund to Petitioner
25 all such legal fees that Petitioner has actually paid to the City.

26 3. Damages according to proof and prejudgment interest pursuant to Code of Civil
27 Procedure section 1095.

28 4. Fines pursuant to Government Code sections 65589.5(k)(1)(B), 65589.5(l),

1 65914.2(b)(2), and other provisions of law.

2 5. Costs of suit pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure sections 1021 and 1032;
3 Government Code sections 65589.5(k)(1)(A)(ii), 65914.2(b)(1), 65915(d)(3), and 65915(e)(1);
4 and other provisions of law.

5 6. Attorney fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5; Government
6 Code sections 800, 65589.5(k)(1)(A)(ii), 65914.2(b)(1), 65915(d)(3), and 65915(e)(1); and other
7 applicable law.

8 7. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

9
10 Dated: October 2, 2026

ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE
MALLORY & NATSIS LLP

11
12 By: 
13 DAVID H. BLACKWELL
14 JACOB E. ARONSON
15 Attorneys for Petitioner
16 WILLOW PROJECT LLC
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Disinfectant