

From: [Maria Hernandez](#)
To: [Adam Blair](#)
Cc: [Neal Toft](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Comments for Planning Commission Meeting Oct 23 - Items 7A & 7B
Date: Monday, October 21, 2024 11:16:54 AM

From: Jenny Silva <jrskis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 10:57 AM
To: Web_CDD <CDD@sausalito.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments for Planning Commission Meeting Oct 23 - Items 7A & 7B

Dear Sausalito Planning Commission,

I am writing regarding items 7A and 7B

7A - There is great controversy in Sausalito over the Housing Element and the proposed amended Housing element.

I believe that the certified housing element erred in removing sites 67 and 68, the sites most likely to produce a substantial amount of housing, from the housing element.

Sausalito is now amending its housing element to make the only major proposed project to date unbuildable. It is clear that the community does not want the Bridgeway project as proposed. It's unclear if the City has made any attempts to meet with the property owner to come to a resolution that would provide the housing we so badly need in a manner that is more palatable. Instead, Sausalito is using the EIR process and amending its Housing Element to essentially kill this project. In this, Sausalito is proposing to move units from one unpopular site to another unpopular site. Many of the folks that oppose both the Bridgeway site and MLK site would like to see non-marine industrial sites in the Marinship considered, including sites 67 & 68. I would encourage the city to add these sites back into its amended housing element.

7B - The proposed ODDs, including the addition of historical standards and view ordinances to the ODDs.

In the past City Council meeting it was noted that HCD has already criticized Sausalito for its planned average unit size of 750 sq ft. If this standard still holds, I would advocate that Sausalito adjust it for a standard that is more reasonable and in line with the housing market. City Council members have stated that the 750 sq ft limit will make the housing "naturally affordable". However, this standard will be used on inclusionary building projects, in which the market rate units are subsidizing the affordable units. Financially, affordable housing doesn't generate sufficient revenue to subsidize more affordable housing. And even if the 750 sq ft was limited to 100% affordable units, it's still likely unworkable in Marin. I am unaware of any proposed developments in Marin, even 100% affordable developments, that have an average unit size of 750 sq ft.

As acknowledged, the current drafted historical standards do not meet the criteria of being objective. Further, they are greatly restrictive and again, will result in the ODDs not being used.

Lastly, there seems to be great agreement on the benefits of a View ordinance. I do not see it that way. The traditional way that someone ensures that their view is unobstructed is that they enter a voluntary, legal agreement with neighbors that compensates the neighbor for agreeing to not obstruct the view. In this way, residents who live lower on the hill or in flat land receive compensation for never accessing the view themselves and for limiting what they can do with their property.

The implementation of a highly restrictive view ordinance is an enormous transfer of property values from the residents in the lower portions of Sausalito, especially those without views of their own, to the wealthier hillside residents. It is profoundly unfair that someone living in the flats of Sausalito who wishes to add another bedroom for a growing family may be asked to give up their outside space in order that someone up the hill does not experience a 7% reduction in a theoretical view. If a small reduction in view is that valuable to the hillside dweller, they should compensate their neighbor in exchange. If the view ordinance is successfully implemented, hillside dwellers are receiving an enormous increase in property values, and they are not compensating their neighbors or the City of Sausalito for this gift. (This, of course, assumes that the view software is feasible, can truly provide objective standards that can be known ahead of time and can be done at the suggested price tag. As someone with a background in software product development, I have doubts on all these points).

Sincerely,

Jennifer Silva