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

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – *5:30 p.m., all present except as noted*

Chair Stan Bair (Planning Commission Rep)
Mike Kelly (City Council Rep) (arrived 5.35 pm)
Susan Cleveland-Knowles (City Resident)*
Kim Stoddard (City Resident)
Ray Withy (City Resident)*
** absent*

Vice-Chair Joan Cox (Planning Commission Rep)
Vacant (City Council Rep)
Steve Flahive (City Resident)*
Chris Visher (City Resident)*

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA**
Chuck Donald, Spencer Ave, stated that due to a number of activities happening in the town, he hoped that there would be clearer public notification to avoid confusion.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – January 16, 2012
Chair Bair moved to approve the January 16, 2012 minutes. Vice-Chair Cox seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-0.

Member Kelly arrived at 5.35 pm.

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 stated that the Draft Housing Element was reviewed by HCD within 60 days of submittal. To summarize the comments in HCD's review letter, the Draft Housing Element was on the right track, with a few outstanding pieces of analysis and strategic decisions required for certification, in particular the required provision of higher density housing.

Consultant Bradley also stated that the consultants and City staff had sent factual and state mandated information to HCD on March 27, 2012, to facilitate the review, so that the HCD letter would focus on the items of higher strategic importance.

Consultant Hong focused the presentation to the Task Force on three specific topics:
1) HCD's recommended approach to addressing the RHNA for both housing units.
2) New modifications to the 2007-2014 planning period numbers to demonstrate meeting the RHNA.
3) Mixed Use Opportunity incentives to respond to HCD's requirement to "promote a variety of housing types, including housing for larger families, and additional identify acreage allowing higher density housing". Details on the MUO incentives were provided in a supplemental Information handout for reference.

Task Force Member Questions included:

- *Q: How long would the deed restrictions be for units built under the MUO incentives?*
  A: About 40 years. [Additional notes post-meeting: Deed restrictions are 55 years for typical tax credit projects, however the number could depend on funding sources, and the City Council may specify the number of years for both owner and rental units.]

- *Q: How many parcels were removed from the very low and low income levels and moved to moderate?*
  A: 9 parcels (or 12 units) were moved from very low/low income levels to moderate income levels in the R-2-2.5 Zoning District. 15 parcels (or 27 units) were moved in the R-3 Zoning District, and 8 parcels (or 18 units) total were moved in the Commercial Zoning Districts. This would add up to a total of 32 parcels, or 57 units, that were moved from very low/low to moderate income levels in the RHNA chart, as it was more difficult to demonstrate the affordability of development on small sites of a few units.

- *Q: Could there be less sites considered for the Mixed Use Opportunity incentives?*
  A: The consultants recommend that four sites is appropriate.

- *Q: Would the State Density Bonus law apply to these sites?*
  A: The State Density Bonus law provides a maximum of 35% increase in the density if certain affordability requirements are met. Consultants are currently proposing an affordability level higher than that of the State Density Bonus law to show credibility with the incentives.

- *Q: Neighbors may have feedback on parking issues.*
  A: These sites are ideal candidates for residents who wish to use transit. There may. be potential to provide sufficient on-site parking. Consultants recognize limited street parking on Second Street. Lowering parking standards is one type of concession that could be given for this development incentive.

Task Force Member Comments included:
Chair Bair stated that it seemed that Sausalito was close to the end of the Housing Element update process, and hoped that residents would see the merits of the Mixed Use Opportunity incentives proposal. He also observed that all four proposed sites were on a major transit corridor.

Member Kelly stated that he found the Mixed Use Opportunity incentives to be a workable solution, and hoped that most residents would agree.

Vice-Chair Cox stated that the Mixed Use Opportunity incentives should consider height restrictions, whether they would remain the same or not. She recommended requiring one parking space per unit to be developed. She also stated that she would like to see M-Group's recommendations for zoning, height, parking, and deed restrictions.

Vice-Chair Cox emphasized the importance of notifying the neighbors of the four proposed sites for Mixed Use Opportunity incentives. She also requested to notify neighbors if any other sites were to be picked for this purpose. She also requested that the new potential unit numbers that would be possible with these incentives to be stated in the notice. Lastly, she requested that City staff place a notification in the local paper regarding the proposed sites.

Vice-Chair Cox commended the consultants' revised strategy to use the site inventory from 1999 – 2006 in the 2007 – 2014 planning period again, which would result in more realistic numbers for strategies used in the second planning period.

Public Comments included:
Michael Rex stated that he had spoken to Lamar Turner of Public Advocates Group, and felt that the City should get them on board. He comment that the sites proposed for MUO incentives were good, but the City should not engage in 'spot zoning', and stated that there

should be incentives for all sites along the commercial corridor. He also stated that this proposal works against ground floor commercial viability as it takes away square footage from commercial fronts. He suggested that the City consider parcels that are unusually deep, such that commercial frontage may be maintained, with residential uses permitted at the rear of the respective parcels.

Mr. Rex also stated that the proposed 50% affordability exceeds the State Density Bonus requirements. He stated that the State Density Bonus is rarely feasible because there is usually not enough parking spaces. He stated that 50% affordability may only be possible with subsidies, and suggested that in-lieu fees be prioritized for these projects. He opined that increased heights would likely be needed to make these developments viable, but also acknowledged the potential view blockage.

As parking often drives development, Mr. Rex also suggested that the Task Force consider Mill Valley's example where a 25% reduction in parking was offered for transit-oriented development, if the site was within a quarter mile of a transit stop. He mentioned that car-sharing, bike-sharing, and shared uses of parking were useful considerations.

Chair Bair and Member Kelly left the meeting at 6.35 pm.

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 – May 7, 2012.
Vice-Chair Cox moved and Member Stoddard seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 2-0 and the meeting was adjourned at 6.38 p.m.