



DRAFT
HOUSING ELEMENT TASK FORCE MINUTES
January 16, 2012
5:30 p.m.
City Council Conference Room
City Hall at 420 Litho Street

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – 5:34 p.m., all present except as noted

Chair Stan Bair (Planning Commission Rep)	Vice-Chair Joan Cox (Planning Commission Rep)
Mike Kelly (City Council Rep)	Vacant (City Council Rep)
Susan Cleveland-Knowles (City Resident)	Steve Flahive (City Resident)
Kim Stoddard (City Resident)*	Chris Visher (City Resident)
Ray Withy (City Resident)	

* absent

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA**

None.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – January 9, 2012

Member Kelly moved to approve the January 9, 2012 minutes. Member Cox seconded the motion. Motion passed 7-0.

4. **REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT**

Glossary:

HCD: California Department of Housing and Community Development

RHNA: Regional Housing Needs Allocation

ADU: Accessory Dwelling Unit

ABAG: Association of Bay Area Governments

FAR: Floor Area Ratio

CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act

APN: Assessors Parcel Number

BCDC: Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Consultant Bradley and Consultant Hong described the most recent changes made to the Housing Element document.

Questions and Comments from the Task Force included:

Emergency Shelters

- Member Flahive asked if there was another way to satisfy the requirements for emergency shelters, such as cooperation with other jurisdictions, or local churches. He also asked how the homeless number was counted.
- Consultant Bradley responded that cities had considered looking at emergency shelters together with other jurisdictions, however this required the partnering cities to actually develop an emergency shelter within the first two years of the adopted Housing Elements. Consultant Hong added that the Marin County Point in Time count made the homeless count and asked homeless persons "Where did you stay last night" to record the number of homeless persons in various jurisdictions.
- Consultant Bradley stated that it was possible to pick out a zoning district that would accommodate emergency shelters.
- Vice-Chair Cox asked if staff or consultants had talked to any jurisdictions. She stated that Mill Valley had 50 beds in a development for homeless persons and asked if Sausalito could collaborate with Mill Valley. Consultant Bradley stated that he would look into the issue.
- Community Development Director Graves stated that staff recognizes that the Public Institutional (PI) Zoning District was voted to be the appropriate Zoning

District at the last meeting, and staff and consultants still felt that the Marinship Industrial Zoning District was a more appropriate Zoning District for several reasons, and would be bringing this issue up at the Planning Commission and City Council Joint meeting.

Issues related to ADUs

- Vice-Chair Cox stated that she would like staff and consultants to put back the bullet point "Elimination of ADU permit application fee" in Chapters II and IV. Vice-Chair Cox and Member Cleveland-Knowles both stated that this was previously discussed and would like the City to consider this as part of the ADU program.

Program 5: Condo conversion regulations

- Member Flahive asked how many condos had been converted over the last few years, and whether this program was really necessary.
- Consultant Bradley responded that there had been a steady flow of numbers incoming over time. Staff estimated that in 2011 there were three dwelling units, two dwelling units in 2010, and seven dwelling units in 2009.

Program 10b: ADU Amnesty Program Advisory Body

- Member Flahive recalled that staff had recommended the Housing Element Task Force also be the task force to develop the ADU amnesty regulations and asked for an update. Associate Planner Schinsing responded that this was not yet decided by the City Council, the item has been moved to the next City Council meeting.

Program 12: Affordable Housing Development Assistance

- Member Flahive stated that he was surprised to read this and did not think affordable housing was Sausalito's business. He asked for clarifications on flexible development standards.
- Consultant Bradley stated that this program was highly recommended by the consultant team, to provide the City with mechanisms to facilitate affordable housing where the City chooses to do so. Often, affordable housing does not get built without city support, and the support does not have to be financial. For example, the mayor could write a letter of support. This program was recently modified to address concerns from the Task Force. While the overall Housing Element was to accept a framework so that housing could develop on its own, nearly every city has policies to support the non-profit provision of affordable housing.
- Consultant Bradley stated that development fees under affordable housing development assistance could include reductions of impact fees and permit fees. Taking Task Force direction, examples were struck out from flexible development standards to avoid suggesting that any one standard was guaranteed to be flexible. Density bonus is a requirement under State law, allowing for a range of 5% to 35% over the normal density allowed in a Zoning District, and only applies to projects with at least 5 projects under base zoning regulations. Financial assistance through a future affordable housing fund would provide the City with a mechanism to collect any fees and spend such fees in support of affordable housing projects and programs.
- Member Flahive stated that his intention as a Task Force member was not to help people build affordable housing, and asked how this intention changed from previous discussions.
- Consultant Bradley stated that as a policy, this program helps give the City "a seat at the table" for projects it wishes to be a part of. If an affordable housing developer or for-profit developer proposed a project, the City could have a voice to pursue its interests in support of affordable housing in a variety of ways. This program also shows HCD that this city has ability to be an active affordable housing partner, and has the tools to make affordable housing happen where appropriate.
- Community Development Director Graves mentioned that this program was already existing practice, as the City's Zoning Ordinance on senior housing overlay indicated that density bonuses and parking reductions were allowed for senior housing developments. Staff and consultants agreed to edit the description for Program 12 to reflect that it is existing practice.

Program 29: Housing for Marine Workers

- Member Flahive stated that he was concerned about the statement 'to help workers to live near work opportunities'. Vice-Chair Cox stated that she had requested this to be changed to reflect liveboards only.
- Consultant Bradley stated that marine workers could live on land or marinas.
- Member Cleveland-Knowles proposed to change the statement to state: "to help workers to locate in Sausalito, and showcase the skills of local marine workers." Member Kelly cautioned that if the description was too specific, it could call unnecessary attention. After discussion, the Task Force asked the for the description to be edited according to Member Cleveland-Knowles' proposal.

Policy 2.3: Adaptive Reuse

- Vice-Chair Cox stated that the language on adaptive reuse was misleading. Consultant Bradley suggested that it was useful to the City to have adaptive reuse on a policy level, and suggested that Policy 2.3 be reworded to focus on Program 8. Vice-Chair Cox stated that the language should be confined to the description for Program 8.
- Member Cleveland-Knowles proposed to change the statement to state: Support innovative strategies for the adaptive reuse of commercial ~~and other~~ structures to provide for a wide range of housing types and residential uses, for example the residential use of upper floors of commercial buildings.

Other General Questions and Discussions

- Member Flahive asked about the location of mixed use commercial districts. Staff and consultants showed the commercial districts on the Zoning map.
- Member Flahive asked for more explanation on Program 19 - Density Bonus and other Incentives for Affordable Housing.
- Consultant Bradley stated that this program cited standard state density bonus law to allow for a density bonus of over the normal density allowed in a Zoning District, ranges from 5% to 35% of the density, and this would apply to projects with at least 5 projects under base zoning. He confirmed that all Housing Elements have this as it is State mandate.
- The Task Force reviewed the Land Use program for Policy 1.6 in its Land Use Element context.
- The Task Force briefly discussed long-term affordability controls.
- The Task Force briefly discussed the sites strategy broken down by units.

Actions taken:

Member Flahive made a motion to eliminate Program 5. Vice-Chair Cox seconded. Chair Bair amended the motion to not re-open the discussion of Program 5 as a former motion had been made and the vote was to retain Program 5.

Ayes: Member Flahive, Member Withy, Vice-Chair Cox.

Noes: Member Visher, Member Cleveland-Knowles, Member Kelly, Chair Bair.

Motion failed 3-4.

Member Cleveland-Knowles made a motion to recommend the draft Housing Element to the City Council, with the changes proposed at the January 16, 2012 meeting, and remaining additions identified by staff and consultants. Member Withy seconded the motion.

Public Comments included:

Mary Arnold, Buchanan Drive, asked for clarification on the Public Institutional Zoning District and suggested to add a definition for it in the glossary. She also asked why there still was a large buffer. Consultant Bradley responded that the consultants had recommended a 10% overall buffer so that the City would not be held to developing all the units at their identified densities in the Housing Element. He explained that the two planning periods would each rely on specific strategies, as policies for ADUs and liveboards would need to be implemented in the second and current planning period before those units could be counted. Hence the first period heavily utilizes the vacant and underutilized sites strategy with a very small buffer. As the ADU and liveboards strategy has received some critique for not being aggressive enough, the much larger buffer in place is anticipated to help support the strategy.

David Kliman, 806 Butte Street, stated that he was really concerned about the rush to action, and the lack of knowledge of the Housing Element Task Force about the changes that were being proposed. He stated that the document was huge and that it was not possible to be able to read through the entire document in one weekend.

Additional Task Force comments included:

Member Flahive stated that he agreed with Mr. Kliman, and felt that there was too much information being considered. Vice-Chair Cox stated that she agreed with the sentiment, and that she was also concerned with the rush. She stated that she felt pressure to analyze and assimilate information contained in Element, and was worried that the Task Force would miss out certain things. She also reiterated her issues with Programs 5, 12, 13, and 17.

Chair Bair stated that he was sympathetic to the comment, however the project has been going on for two years. While the Task Force did not have to adhere to the schedule entirely, they were also not ahead of schedule. He stated that he felt the process has had a lot of transparency, and responses were made to inputs made by the public, largely in a measured and detailed way. He also stated that there was much information being circulated that was inaccurate.

Member Withy stated that he would comment on his time as a Task Force member since March 2011. He felt that this was rather a good document, and concurred with Chair Bair. From his vantage point, he felt that the process had been very transparent, and the Task Force had listened to very diverse concerns from residents. He stated that the Task Force had achieved a Housing Element that was balanced, and that recognized that there would be another Housing Element to write in a few years, and there was enough information in this Element to ensure that it would be certifiable. He felt that there was not much more the Task Force could do to improve it and felt that it should get to the City Council and the State. He thanked the staff and consultants for doing a fantastic job.

Member Cleveland-Knowles stated that she joined the Task Force at the same time as Member Withy. She stated that she learned a lot from the public, and appreciated the active, informed roles, and careful considerations that many people took in the process. She also stated her appreciation for the staff and consultants' time. She stated that she is comfortable with this document, as it is essentially the same document the Task Force received a few weeks ago. She stated that it was a difficult subject, and while the Task Force would not be able to please everyone, it had listened to concerns and she was pleased with the results. She concurred with Member Withy that the Task Force may not have more to add to the document.

Chair Bair stated that he had enjoyed working with the entire team on the Housing Element document. He stated that Vice-Chair Cox had read through the document very thoroughly, and thanked her for her participation.

Vice-Chair Cox stated that M-Group had done a good job identifying a site inventory while satisfying the rezoning concerns of Sausalito's residents. She stated that there were many programs in the Housing Element, and she was not sure if the Task Force had considered the ramifications of all the programs, and wished to enunciate this concern even though it was limited. She also stated that she appreciated the collaborative work done as a group.

Action taken by the Task Force:

The motion was previously made by Member Cleveland-Knowles to recommend the draft Housing Element document to the City Council, with the changes proposed tonight and remaining additions identified by the staff and consultants, seconded by Member Withy. Ayes: Member Withy, Member Visher, Member Cleveland-Knowles, Member Kelly, Chair Bair.

Noes: Member Flahive, Member Cox.

Motion passed 5-2.

5. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. TASK FORCE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

7. AGENDA TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING

The Task Force had no comments on the agenda topics for the next meeting.

8. ADJOURN – Next Meeting – none. Joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting would be held on January 23, 2012.

Chair Bair moved and Member Kelly seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 7-0 and the meeting was adjourned at 7.10 p.m.