DRAFT
HOUSING ELEMENT TASK FORCE MINUTES
December 19, 2011
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)
Mike Kelly (City Council Rep)
Susan Cleveland-Knowles (City Resident)
Kim Stoddard (City Resident)
Ray Withy (City Resident)
Vice-Chair Joan Cox (Planning Commission Rep)
Vacant (City Council Rep)
Steve Flahive (City Resident)*
Chris Visher (City Resident)
** absent*

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA
None.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – December 5, 2011
Member Kelly made a motion, Vice-Chair Cox seconded, motion passed 7-0.

4. GOALS, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS

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

a. Summary of Workshop 3 Community Input
Consultant Bradley stated that M-Group made a number of adjustments to the language and intent of Implementing Programs based on the feedback heard at the Third Community Workshop. For example, a broader program for parking reduction for housing projects was originally proposed, but this was deemed problematic by the community, and the newer language limits the proposed parking reduction to senior housing projects and to situations where no life or safety threats are created.

There were no public comments for Item 4a.

b. Draft Chapter II: Goals, Policies and Implementing Programs
Consultant Bradley stated that the consultants classified the implementing programs as:

- federally /state mandated,
- highly recommended,
- recommended, and
- optional.

These recommendations are based on the goal of getting the Element to a 'certified level'. He asked the Task Force to give consideration to 'optional' programs. He stated that this was a realistic package and was vetted against Sausalito's constraints, and would take more comments from the Task Force and the public to ensure that this is a package that the community supports.

General comments from the Task Force on the package included:

- To facilitate the use of the document, the goals should be numbered on Page 1, and each goal beginning on Page 9 should be numbered.
- To facilitate the use of the document, the Implementing Programs should be numbered to correspond to the Goals and Policies.

General comments from the public on the package included:

- Walt Freedman, 20 Marin Ave, asked how the City would be able to manage the numerous programs proposed. He also asked what the "loss of community design" meant, as stated on a comment letter by Michael Rex on the Community meeting. Consultant Bradley stated that he had spoken to Mr. Rex at the Community meeting, and it refers to a State mandate that if a site is rezoned as part of the Housing Element, the following development must be "by right", (e.g., a use permit cannot be requested).
- John Flavin, Prospect Ave, stated that as part of affordable housing, the accounting burden, accountability, and other issues create a significant burden on the developer.

(* These members of the community also made other comments on specific programs. These are noted below.)

Comments on specific programs from the Task Force and the public are noted in the table below:

Implementing Program discussed with any clarifications from Consultants	**Discussion Points stated by Task Force, Consultants and City Staff**	**Public Comments**	**Proposed changes**
Goal 1.0: Housing and Neighborhood Assets			
5: Condominium Conversion Regulations (Existing Program – Expanded; Recommended) Clarifications: • If the proposed development is five or more units, 15% would be made affordable. • Ensure smaller units to contribute proportionately toward affordable housing. • Proportional contributions apply; does not have to be one full unit. • Goal of program is to prevent negative effects on rental market. • Recommended but not highly recommended. • The repository for in-lieu fees is proposed in Program 13 (Trust Fund).	Task Force: • Is this program necessary given the buffer in the sites inventory analysis to meet the RHNA, which demonstrates an abundance of housing stock? • Imposing in-lieu fees on two – four units would impose a hardship on homeowners who wish to convert their units. • Need to consider current economic conditions. • If conversions cause developer/landowner to bump up prices of units, could price people out of the market. • The purpose of the Housing Element is to address housing needs for all economic sectors of community. • City should consider where it wants to encourage development activity and whether it wants to encourage conversion from rental to ownership units.	• CJ Spady, 29 Marin Ave, stated that the discussion was originally about "preserving affordable housing acquisition opportunity". She stated that Sausalito has expensive property, and asked the Task Force to consider leaving the existing regulations alone as it was unnecessary for this housing element. • Allison Kilmer, 10 Marin Ave, requested to remove the "two unit reference" from the language, as it would present a hardship for her family.	• Make the cut-off 3 units, not 2. • If the property has been owner-occupied for some period of time, it should be exempt from in-lieu fees. • Need to indicate that a nexus study will be done.

Goal 2.0: Housing Diversity			
8: Mixed Use Zoning in Commercial Districts (Existing Program – Expanded; Highly Recommended) Clarifications: • This is intended to create an image of what mixed use development would look like.	• Whether 3rd stories are feasible and how it relates to 32' height restriction.	• John Flavin, Prospect Ave, stated that three floors is fairly easy to accomplish within 32' height.	• Modify language to state "Requirements for residential housing on ~~second and third~~ *additional stor(ies) up to the City's restriction of 32' height*, with commercial uses at ground level;
9. Non-Traditional Housing Types (Existing Program – Expanded; Optional)	• "Flexible zoning regulations" is misleading, the key is about retaining the City's ability to review such projects. • This language is meant to refer to City's ability to provide a Planned Development, as co-housing does not fit in current zoning regulations and this language would create that possibility.		• Rephrase "flexible zoning regulations" in Objectives to clarify intent.
10a. Adoption of Zoning Regulations to Encourage New ADUs (New Program; Required) Clarifications: • An ADU is an accessory use to the main residence on a parcel. • The ADU advisory body is proposed to be the Housing Element Task Force.	• Correction on reduced FAR and Lot Coverage thresholds. • Quantified objectives relating to ADUs may not be a good idea as future assessment would be based on the stated numbers. • Cautionary approach towards potential parking reductions near transit. • This is not a rezoning, but a tool is needed within the zoning ordinance to define how big an ADU should be in Sausalito. • Ministerial approval for ADUs is state law.	• Walt Freedman, 20 Marin Ave, and Chuck Donald, 254 Spencer Ave, expressed concerned about parking reductions.	• Correct sentence to state: "Flexible development standards including *exemption of ADUs from percentage of required* floor area and/or building coverage *limits*." • Rework quantified objectives.

10b. ADU Registration and Amnesty Program (New Program; Required)	• Quantified objectives relating to ADUs may not be a good idea as future assessment would be based on the stated numbers. • Concern about language stating that the City will identify additional sites if there is a shortfall in ADUs. This is intended to show HCD that the City is serious about following through.		• State that City will identify "additional strategies" and not "additional sites". • Refer to these additional strategies in general and not per strategy.
11. Liveaboards and Houseboats (Existing; Required)		• Gerry Fait, 100 Locust St, clarified that the liveaboard community was not counted as part of the *2000* Census.	
Goal 3.0: Housing Affordability			
12. Affordable Housing Development Assistance (New Program; Highly Recommended) Clarifications: • This program helps City to shape and facilitate proposed affordable projects. It is built on past case history.	• This type of activity is not frequent, but if an opportunity arises to assist an affordable housing developer, incentives could be provided. • Appears to impose additional layers of bureaucracy. However, a balanced approach is needed to get the Housing Element certified. • Higher density and high density development are not the same.	• Allison Kilmer, 10 Marin Ave, stated concerns that Programs 12, 13, 17 do not seem to serve the people of Sausalito, and do not seem like a balanced approach between developers and homeowners. • Adrianna Dinihanian, 254 Woodward, felt that Programs 12 & 13 would join the City and developer against the wishes of residents. This document appears to be for the average town in California but not for Sausalito. We should explain to the State that there is no space to develop these extra units.	

13. Local Affordable Housing Trust Fund (New Program; Highly Recommended) Clarifications • This program helps City to shape and facilitate proposed affordable projects. It is built on past case history.	• This puts the City on par with other cities in the Bay Area. • Appears to impose additional layers of bureaucracy. However, a balanced approach is needed to get the Housing Element certified and demonstrate that Sausalito is serious about providing affordable housing. • Housing funds are done by almost all communities in the Bay Area. • A study can be done to ensure the City knows where the fees would come from, their intended use, and that they are not punitive.	See Program 12.	
15. Homebuyer Assistance (Existing Program – Promote)		• Chuck Donald, 254 Spencer Ave, asked if home ownership and rental assistance referred to financial assistance, and where the funding would come from.	
17. Inclusionary Housing Regulations (New Program; Recommended) Clarifications: • Added based on community feedback	• Appears to impose additional layers of bureaucracy.		
Goal 4.0: Reduce Governmental Constraints *(note "Removing" has been changed to "Reduce")*			
20. Zoning to Promote Live/Work (New Program; Optional)	• Has not worked in other cities, became more "live" than "work" (e.g., San Francisco). • Difficult to enforce. • Task Force not opposed to commercial on ground floor and upper floor residential.	• John Flavin, Prospect Ave, stated that he has not seen this approach work -- "live/work" became "live" only.	• Hard to enforce. • More information needed for support.
23. CEQA Exemptions for Infill Projects (New Program – Existing Practice; Optional)		• John Flavin, Prospect Ave, stated that he is does not want to see a negative declaration. He did not think there should be a policy for exemptions.	
Goal 5.0: Equal Housing Opportunities and Special Needs			

No specific comments were made regarding programs under this section.			
**** Goal 6.0: Environmental Sustainability***			
33. Climate Action Plan (Program in Progress; State Mandate)	• Cautious approach toward mandatory language regarding what the Climate Action Plan would require the City's residents and business to do, as studies have not yet been done.		• Modify third paragraph to state "encourage and require, to the extent required by State mandate, the City…".
34. Contributions towards Employee Housing (New Program, Optional)	• Clarifications made that this is not the same program as live/work.		
Goal 7.0: Community Involvement			
36. Housing Element Monitoring / Annual Report	• Extraneous language		• Remove reference to report on progress of ADU amnesty program as it is included in the annual report.
37. Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Housing Needs Process (Existing Program – Expanded; Recommended)	• City staff is also monitoring county meetings on sustainability at a distance, but no issues there are predicted to affect the RHNA.		

* At 7.25 pm, after the discussion of programs under Goals 1 through 5, the Task Force took a brief recess. Chair Bair, Member Cleveland-Knowles, and Consultant Bradley left the meeting due to other engagements.

At 7.26 pm, the meeting resumed under the direction of Vice-Chair Cox. The Task Force consented to complete Item 7 first, before returning to Goals 6.0 and 7.0, and then completed Items 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10.

5. ANALYSIS OF THE 1995 HOUSING ELEMENT

The Task Force confirmed receipt of the Consultants' memo.

Vice-Chair Cox volunteered to help complete this task; she had comments and annotations to the draft that was circulated some time ago and would work with staff on those specific mark-ups.

6. JANUARY 2012 MEETING DATES

In addition to the January 9, 2012, meeting, the Task Force scheduled a meeting on January 16, 2012. The Planning Commission / City Council Joint Meeting is to be held on either January 24 or January 31, 2012.

The Task Force requested to receive the entire draft of the Housing Element on January 5, 2012 for more time to digest the material.

7. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

- Oral Update on Woodward Avenue ROW
Associate Planning Schinsing stated that City staff had looked for a company to do the research on the site. The first attempt fell through, and a second researcher has proposed to charge $10,000. The consultants (M-Group) have confirmed since there is a sufficient buffer for the site inventory, removing the Woodward site would not significantly impact the site inventory and hence staff requested the Task Force to consider discontinuing the research and remove the Woodward site from the sites inventory.

Member Kelly made a motion to not continue the research, and remove the Woodward site from the site inventory. Vice-Chair Cox seconded, motion passed 5-0.

- Correspondence Received
None.

Associate Planner Schinsing thanked the Task Force for the hard work put in and wished them Happy New Year.

8. TASK FORCE MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS
None.

9. AGENDA TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING
Vice-Chair Cox asked to remove the Woodward site from the January 9, 2012 agenda as the site has been removed from consideration altogether.

10. ADJOURN – Next Meeting – January 9, 2012
Member Kelly moved and Vice-Chair Cox seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed 5-0 and the meeting was adjourned at 7.52 p.m.

I:\CDD\Boards & Committees\HETF\Minutes\Draft\12-19-11 HETF Minutes draft -las edits.doc