Housing Element Update

Marin County Board of Supervisors & Planning Commission

March 15, 2022
Meeting Agenda/Objectives

1. **Review Site Selection Process**
   a. RHNA, Candidate Sites, Four Scenarios, 2 Alternatives
   b. What we heard
2. **Present Recommended Site List**
3. **Provide Site Assessment Examples**
4. **Solicit Comments and Feedback**
What is a Housing Element?

- Updated every eight years
- Required to be reviewed by California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD)
- Adoption deadline: December 2022
- Housing Element for Marin County only covers the unincorporated areas
What is the RHNA?

- Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation for Unincorporated Marin County: 3,569 units

HCD determines RHNAs for each Council of Governments

RHNA for Bay Area region: 441,176 housing units

RHNA for all of Marin County: 14,210

For Unincorporated Marin County: 3,569 housing units

Marin County has 3.2% of the Bay Area RHNA total. And unincorporated Marin has 25% of Marin County RHNA total.
Housing Sites Selection Process
Site Selection Process

Candidate Housing Sites:
142 Sites

Guiding Principles: *Infill, Hazard, Equity, Countywide Distribution*

- Scenario 1 (Distribution): 88 Sites
- Scenario 2 (Equity): 85 Sites
- Scenario 3 (Infill): 88 Sites
- Scenario 4 (Hazards): 67 Sites

Comments From Public Engagement/Online Tools

- Alternative 1 (Distribution): 108 Sites
- Alternative 2 (Hazards & Infill): 100 Sites

Board of Supervisor and Planning Commission Comments

Recommended Sites: 82 Sites
Candidate Housing Sites

Candidate Housing Sites

- 1 - 10
- 11 - 50
- 51 - 150
- 151 - 250
- 251 - 1,800
Existing Housing Unit Distribution (2021)

29,818 Total Units

- District 1: 4,903 units (16%)
- District 2: 4,414 units (15%)
- District 3: 9,269 units (31%)
- District 4: 8,645 units (29%)
- District 5: 2,587 units (9%)
# Existing Zoning/General Plan

## Shortfall in Meeting RHNA for Lower and Moderate-Income Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADUs</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit Sites</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Overlay</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vacant Residential</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>748</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>2,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHNA</strong></td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>3,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over/Short</strong></td>
<td>-986</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>-810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1) Numbers are approximate.
Community Outreach and Public Comment
Ways We Collected Public Comment

Participants could ask questions and make comments at Road Shows

Provide general or site-specific comments via email or phone to County staff

Comment on County site map and Atlas

Select a scenario and make site specific comments on Balancing Act
## Comments Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Comments/Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadshow (10)</td>
<td>460 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>355 (as of 03/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>134 comments and suggestions (as of 02/28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing Act</td>
<td>2,925 page views 143 complete HE submissions (as of 2/28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Themes across Comment Methods

- Traffic congestion
- Fire risk/limited access for emergency services
- Threat of sea level rise/current flooding
- Impacts on natural resources
- Limited water supply
- Infrastructure limitations
Site Alternatives from March 1, 2022, Joint Workshop
Alternatives

Alternative 1: Countywide Distribution

- Distributed units by Supervisor Districts
- Targeted a range of 20% of total units within each District

Alternative 2: Environmental Hazards/Infill

- Remove sites affected by sea level rise, 100-year floodplain, and Very High Fire Severity Zones
- Prioritized infill sites
## What We Heard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Distribution</th>
<th>Countywide Plan Vision</th>
<th>Viable Affordable Housing Sites</th>
<th>Affirmatively Further Fair Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strive for site distribution throughout the County, taking into consideration the RHNA of cities and towns;</td>
<td>Consider the vision of the Countywide Plan (CWP) and its policies that focus on in-fill development and smart growth planning.</td>
<td>Ensure that housing sites designated for lower and moderate income are viable and likely to produce needed housing during the planning period; and</td>
<td>Incorporate means of affirmatively furthering fair housing in site selection to insure lower and moderate-income households have access to affordable housing, excellent schools, and healthy community amenities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting to the RHNA: Recommended Site List

For Discussion
## Recommended Site List: Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Site List</strong></td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units</strong></td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>4,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHNA</strong></td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>3,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining (Short/Over)</td>
<td>+705</td>
<td>+682</td>
<td>-599</td>
<td>+787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Net Loss Buffer</td>
<td>+41%</td>
<td>+133%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>+22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Housing Distribution (Existing + RHNA)

33,918 Total Units

- District 1: 6,428 units (19%)
- District 2: 4,858 units (14%)
- District 3: 9,980 units (29%)
- District 4: 9,527 units (28%)
- District 5: 3,125 units (9%)

2021 - #
RHNA - #
Recommended Site List: CWP Corridors

Countywide Plan Corridors | 4,100 Total Units

- City-Centered: 2,445 units (59.6%)
- Baylands: 899 units (21.9%)
- Coastal: 390 units (9.5%)
- Inland-Rural: 366 units (8.9%)
Housing Assessment
5 Examples

1. Strawberry Village Center
2. Sir Francis Drake Boulevard
3. Red/Green Barn
4. Buck Center Property
5. St. Vincent’s School for Boys
St. Vincent’s School for Boys
774.6 acres

High Fire Severity Zones

Highway 101

Pacheco Hill

40 acres

Miller Creek Rd

Flood Zone and Sea Level Rise
St. Vincent’s
Potential Development Type

Example: Keller Court Commons, Petaluma

Example: Annadel Apartments, Santa Rosa
Barn
510 Mesa Road
2.1 acres

1.2 acres
Pt. Reyes Station Red/Green Barn
Potential Development Type

Example: Walnut Place, Point Reyes Station
Kentfield Commercial
Potential Development Type

Example: Mixed Use with Ground Floor Commercial, Sonoma
Strawberry Village Center
Redwood Highway Frontage Road
14.7 acres
Strawberry Village Center
Potential Development Type

Example: Second & B Street Apartments with Ground Floor Retail, San Rafael

Marin County Community Development Agency | www.MarinCounty.org/HousingSafetyElements
Buck Center Vacant Property
Redwood Boulevard
233.8 acres
Buck Center Vacant Property
Potential Development Type

Example: Landsea Homes, Novato
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Provide direction on Recommended Sites List
- Housing Policy and Programs Workshop (3/29)
- Joint BOS/PC Session to confirm Housing sites and consider policies and programs (4/12)
- Joint BOS/PC Session to consider Safety policies and programs (4/19)
- Public Release of Housing & Safety Elements and EIR in Summer 2022
Questions and Comments