

Lilly Schinsing

From: Ray Withy [ray@twgadvisors.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 11:24 AM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: RE: reminder: comments on draft HE due today

Hi Lilly:

Here are a few comments on the draft Housing Element:

Chapter II - the following adds to and clarifies my comments of Monday evening re the wording of the goals - working from the unmarked version.

Page 1; The 7 goals summarized on this page should be replaced with the goals as worded on the subsequent pages above each of the listed policies, i.e. use goal 1 from page 2, Goal 2 from page 3 etc

Page 3: I suggest we reword Goal 2.0 to read:

"Encourage Diversity in Housing
Goal 2.0: Provide opportunities"

Page 4: I suggest rewording Goal 3.0 to read:

"Enhancing Housing Affordability
Goal 3.0: Expand and protect opportunities for households of all income levels to find housing"

Page 7: I suggest rewording Goal 6.0 to read:

"Implementing Environmental Sustainability
Goal 6.0: Promote environmental sustainability....."

I also endorse making the linkage between Policies and Implementing Programs. I realise that at times this is a many to many mapping. I suggest that we note each of the Implementing programs under each policy listing on pages 2-8. Also, I suggest that at the beginning of each of the programs (from pages 9 onwards) we note upfront which of the policies drive each program.

I also suggest that we add to each program description the Program Summary (or Goal) from the table at the end

Chapter IV: I have a few minor comments:

on page 14 first bullet point in b and on page 15 bottom of page, 2nd bullet point - here you need to correct the language to be consistent with Ch II re the ADUs i.e change to ".....including exemption of ADUs from floor area and/or building coverage limits....."

also, in this chapter cross check references to program numbers e.g. footnote 3 on page 10 is incorrect. Your program #s will also change because some are being eliminated.

Hope this helps
Cheers
Ray

Lilly Schinsing

From: Flahive, Steve [steve.flahive@credit-suisse.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 2:35 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: RE: reminder: comments on draft HE due today

I have a couple of comments. It seems that we are rushing this last part that need to be reviewed by the task force and the city council, can we get two extra weeks, one for the task force and one for the council? Its a lot to review in one week.

I do not like the condo provisions, given how many condo conversions we have in Sausalito, can we take this out and revisit it on the next one?

Steven Flahive

Director

CREDIT SUISSE

Private Banking USA

650 California Street

San Francisco, CA 94108

415.249.2089

fax: 415.395.1312

email: steve.flahive@credit-suisse.com

=====
The Private Banking USA business in Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC is a regulated broker dealer. It is not a chartered bank, trust company or depository institution. It is not authorized to accept deposits or provide corporate trust services and it is not licensed or regulated by any state or federal banking authority.

As provided for in Treasury regulations, advice (if any) relating to federal taxes that is contained in this communication (including attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (1) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (2) Promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any plan or arrangement addressed herein.
=====

From: Lilly Schinsing [<mailto:LSchinsing@ci.sausalito.ca.us>]

Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 10:05 AM

Cc: Jeremy Graves

Subject: reminder: comments on draft HE due today

Importance: High

Task Force,

Just a reminder to send your revisions to the draft Housing Element over to me today, by 5pm. I'll forward all comments I received by 5pm to M-Group for incorporation.

Sincerely,

Lilly Schinsing

Associate Planner

Planning Division | Community Development Department

City of Sausalito | 420 Litho St. Sausalito CA 94965

phone: 415.289.4134 | fax: 415.339.2256

lschinsing@ci.sausalito.ca.us

From: Gerry Fait [gerryfait@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 12:59 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing; Debbie Pagliaro
Subject: Comment on 1/9/12 Housing Element

Dear Lily:

Last night the Task Force voted to change the area designated for homeless shelters from Marinship to Public Industrial (PI) areas without a lot of public notice and without public discussion prior to the vote.

According to the California Housing Element Manual (see below), that you thoughtfully sent out to the e-mail distribution list, the PI sights would need to be identified by specific parcel and should not require unusually high development costs. In addition, the PI sights can not be located where NIMBY action will add to delays and costs.

Please identify the sites that are being considered, and propose steps that the city will take to minimize neighborhood objection. Where you have information regarding prohibitive costs of development (I am thinking in particular of the old Firehouse.), please let me know if you can provide it to me.

Thanks,
Gerry Fait

What is an "Available" Site?

The Court of Appeal has indicated (in the context of sites for homeless shelters and transitional housing) that an adequate and "available" site:

is one available for immediate development, which is located within reasonable access to public agencies and transportation services; will not require unusually high site development costs; has available public services and facilities; is consistent with the General Plan designation and site zoning so as to permit development of, conversion to or use of, a shelter or transitional housing without undue regulatory approval; and is consistent with applicable parking requirements, fire regulations and design standards.

Hoffmaster v. City of San Diego (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1112-13.

The sites must also be identified *specifically*. Although one appellate court case had indicated that the identification need not indicate specific sites (*Buena Vista Garden Apartments Assn., supra.*), the more recent *Hoffmaster* decision from the same appellate district found otherwise, and the Legislature ended the debate in 2004 when it adopted AB 2348 clarifying that sites identified in the inventory must be identified by specific parcel. §65583.2(b). This only makes sense because, as the *Hoffmaster* court explained: California Housing Element Manual, 2nd Edition [January 2009]—Chapter III 56

[F]or identification to be meaningful, it must necessarily be specific. It must set for sites which will be available to be developed, without restrictive zoning burdens which combined with the NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) factor... become insurmountable or produce protracted delays and deterrent cost increases.... Finally, through its action program, City bears the responsibility to ensure the regulatory process actually encourages the development of emergency shelters and transitional housing.

From: Gerry Fait [gerryfait@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 6:18 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing; Debbie Pagliaro
Subject: 2nd comment on 1/9/2012 Housing Element

Dear Lily:

I am pleased that the Housing Element recognizes liveaboards as housing and recognizes marine workers as a special needs group. I recognize that many of my comments were incorporated. I appreciate everyone's hard work.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON THE 1/9/2012 HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

Suggested Additions:

- 1) Give our Element some soul. State right away that we are a waterfront community. Add a paragraph before the introduction that describes Sausalito and sets the tone by describing our town's unique characteristics and needs. I like what Redwood City did in its Element. (See www.redwoodcity.org/phed/planning/.../02_Housing_FINAL.pdf)
- 2) page B-14 Geographical Constraints. Add that the Bay that is located on one side of town.
- 3) page IV-10 Liveaboard Affordability. Add that liveaboards tend to own the boats that they live on. The purchase cost is not calculated into the rent.
- 4) page F- 1 Appendix F - Glossary. Add the definition of "marina" and add "BCDC" with a summary of its mission for the Bay on which we live.
- 5) Somewhere, maybe in Chapter 2 #11 on page II-6, state whether we are or are not a Coastal Zone Community and add this term to the definitions.
- 7) Somewhere, maybe D. Opportunities for Energy Conservation, page IV-21, I would like the City to recognize that there is a reduced environmental footprint for people living in small places such as boats. (I believe that I have made this suggestion to the HEC subcommittee that I served on before it was demolished without notification to me.)
- 8) page B-1, Housing Constraints. Add BCDC to list of government agencies that have government restraints. BCDC affects parking on the Bay and therefore restricts development. It restricts the number of liveaboards.
- 9) Somewhere, the Richardson Bay Agency should be acknowledged and defined. Minimally, this agency administers the pump out program for liveaboards. Liveaboards are housing. Sausalito is on the water and the regulation of that water should be emphasized in the Housing Element because there are houses and apartments on the water and there may be more to come. I believe that the RBA coordinates with the Coast Guard in any water related emergencies that involve land as well. Your contact would be Bill Price at the RBA.

Suggested Changes:

- 1) page E-15. D. List of Meeting Dates for the Housing Update Process. - change Task Force to Housing Element Committee until Resolution 5221, dated 3/8/2011 took effect.

Comments of Task Force Member Withy's Comments:

- 1) On Using Most Recent Census Data: Agree but explain the sources of the data in a paragraph. Acknowledge the credit/housing crises and what it did to the statistics. I like the way Redwood City did it. Very clear. (See link above - go to introduction.)
- 2) Language That Didn't Match in Goals and Policies in the Plan, Section II: Agree. Since I am easily confused, this made me very confused. This confusion made it difficult for me to formulate meaningful comments at the meeting. Sorry.

Also, I expected to see objectives for each policy and spent a long time looking for them. For instance, it says we support efforts to preserve historic structure. The objective of this is not there. However, there appears to be an objective for the

policy of neighborhood services - to reduce reliance on gasoline. So, what about historic structures? Sausalito chose not to state the value of historic structures to the community and so I think why?

The lack of more stated objectives adds to my sense that the Element is soulless. Anyway, as the lady who commented last night said, "This is just my opinion." I am generally please with the Element but I hope you will consider my comments. I made considerable effort to send them to you in a timely fashion.

Thank you.

Gerry Fait

Lilly Schinsing

From: Gerry Fait [gerryfait@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2012 1:14 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Cc: Debbie Pagliaro
Subject: 3rd comment of 1/9/2012 Housing Element Update

Hi Lily:

I feel that homeless shelter (if ever built) should be placed in the Marinship. When I rented an art studio in the Marinship, I met many people who hovered between the anchorage, homes and homelessness. People down on their luck gravitate to the Marinship area because many of these people have had a connection to water or obtained marine related work at one time. The Marinship is near Galilee Harbor and the folks there, individually and as a community, frequently befriend and assist people who are in need. My neighbors and I have, on occasion, helped feed and given rides to people who were in need of social services. We live near Galilee. Because I know many people in need by name, I feel compassion for them and would like to see them remain in area where there is a community that cares about them and has a history of helping.

I know that many people are opposed to any type of housing precedent in the Marinship. I believe that an argument could be made that dormitories are not considered housing.

Yours,

Gerry Fait