



**SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM**

January 5, 2023

**TO:** Marin County Planning Commission

**SUBJECT:** Public comments received between 5:00 p.m. on December 30, 2022 and 10:00 a.m. on January 5, 2023 on the Housing & Safety Elements Update and associated Final Environmental Impact Report (Agenda Items 4 and 6), ahead of January 5, 2023 hearing

**COMMENTS ATTACHED:**

1. Email from Barbara Kalmanson dated December 30, 2022
2. Email from Frank Egger dated December 30, 2023
3. Email from Jennifer & Steve Tenaglia dated December 30, 2022
4. Email from Kris & Eric Brewer dated December 30, 2022
5. Email from Pam Keon dated December 30, 2022
6. Email from Patrick Daniels & Mary Cashman-Daniels dated December 30, 2022
7. Email from Peta Penson & Peter Banyts dated December 30, 2022
8. Email from Ruthanne Ranz Appell & Gary Appell dated December 30, 2022
9. Email from Stephen Nestel dated December 30, 2022
10. Email from Suellen Miller dated December 30, 2022
11. Email from Susan Letteer dated December 30, 2022
12. Email from Susan V. Simpkin dated December 30, 2022
13. Email from Jennifer Silva dated December 31, 2022
14. Email from Kathy Flores dated December 31, 2022
15. Email from Lee & Jim Budish dated December 31, 2022
16. Email from Randa S. Pratt dated December 31, 2022
17. Email from Victoria & Adam Wise dated December 31, 2022
18. Email from Caleigh Hall dated January 1, 2023
19. Email from Connie Ducey dated January 1, 2023
20. Email from Craig & Patti Litman dated January 1, 2023
21. Email from Fred Ross dated January 1, 2023
22. Email from Sara Brown dated January 1, 2023
23. Email from Darlene Apodaca dated January 2, 2023
24. Email from Erin Schneider dated January 2, 2023
25. Email from Gene Moore dated January 2, 2023
26. Email from Jack Krystal dated January 2, 2023
27. Email from Jeffrey Kraut & Diana Coughtry dated January 2, 2023

28. Email from Kathy Sanders dated January 2, 2023
29. Email from Mario Territo dated January 2, 2023
30. Email from Susan Pearlstine dated January 2, 2023
31. Email from Tom Peacock dated January 2, 2023
32. Email from Bruce Corcoran dated January 3, 2023 (1 of 2)
33. Email from Bruce Corcoran dated January 3, 2023 (2 of 2)
34. Email from Jamie Mackie dated January 3, 2023
35. Email from May and Wayne Lee dated January 3, 2023
36. Email from Rachel Burke dated January 3, 2023
37. Email from Sarah & Thornton Schaaf dated January 3, 2023
38. Email from Talley & Mike Henry dated January 3, 2023
39. Email from Anne Newman dated January 4, 2023
40. Email from Colleen Morrison dated January 4, 2023
41. Email from Elizabeth Briggson dated January 4, 2023
42. Email from Lucy Anderson dated January 4, 2023
43. Email from Tara McGann & Alex Friedman dated January 4, 2023

**From:** [Jones, Sarah](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP  
**Date:** Friday, December 30, 2022 6:23:40 PM

---

---

**From:** Barbara Kalmanson <barbara.kalmanson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 6:23 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>; Jones, Sarah <sbjones@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

Some people who received this message don't often get email from barbara.kalmanson@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I endorse Attorney Riley Hurd's December 28, 2022, letter.

I strongly urge you to preserve the legality of community plans to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,  
Barbara Kalmanson  
41 Tomahawk Dr. San Anselmo 94960

—

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 64 Unit Project at the end of San Francisco Blvd., unincorporated San Anselmo  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:37:24 PM

---

**From:** Frank Egger <[fegger@pacbell.net](mailto:fegger@pacbell.net)>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 5:01 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <[PlanningCommission@marincounty.org](mailto:PlanningCommission@marincounty.org)>  
**Cc:** BOS <[BOS@marincounty.org](mailto:BOS@marincounty.org)>  
**Subject:** 64 Unit Project at the end of San Francisco Blvd., unincorporated San Anselmo

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [fegger@pacbell.net](mailto:fegger@pacbell.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Marin County Planning Commissioners,

It has just been brought to my attention that you are either hearing an application for or including a 64 unit project at the end of San Francisco Blvd, in the proposed Countywide Plan Update.

My connection to and concern for San Anselmo dates back first to the 1940's when my family owned a large parcel on San Francisco Blvd and we camped and picnic'd there and then again in 1959, when as newly weds, Ronita and I moved to San Anselmo where we lived the first three years of our marriage.

I have not seen either the EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project.

I ask you to continue the item and properly notify the public and the Town Council of San anselmo.

Thank you, Frank Egger, 13 Meadow Way, Fairfax

**From:** [Jones, Sarah](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 8:00:41 AM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr - PC re CWPs - 12.28.22.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Jen Smith Tenaglia <[jentenaglia@icloud.com](mailto:jentenaglia@icloud.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 7:18 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <[PlanningCommission@marincounty.org](mailto:PlanningCommission@marincounty.org)>  
**Cc:** Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <[smoultonpeters@marincounty.org](mailto:smoultonpeters@marincounty.org)>; Jones, Sarah <[sbjones@marincounty.org](mailto:sbjones@marincounty.org)>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

You don't often get email from [jentenaglia@icloud.com](mailto:jentenaglia@icloud.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We are writing to let you know that we fully endorse Attorney Riley Hurd's December 28, 2022, letter that we have attached below.

We strongly urge you to preserve the legality of community plans to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,

Jennifer & Steve Tenaglia  
Strawberry Residents

**From:** [Jones, Sarah](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP  
**Date:** Friday, December 30, 2022 6:25:14 PM

---

---

**From:** Kris Brewer <krisbrewer317@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 5:46 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>; Jones, Sarah <sbjones@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

Some people who received this message don't often get email from krisbrewer317@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We endorse Attorney Riley Hurd's December 28, 2022, letter.

We strongly urge you to preserve the legality of community plans to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,  
Kris & Eric Brewer  
Strawberry Residents

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:38:16 PM

---

**From:** PAMELA KEON <keonvitale@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 5:36 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

You don't often get email from [keonvitale@aol.com](mailto:keonvitale@aol.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Marin County Planning Commission -

I have just learned today of the proposed edits to the Marin County Countywide Plan and the community plans adopted by individual communities in Marin County.

I live in Tamalpais Valley, and am aware that the Tamalpais Area Community Plan is the result of an inclusive and thoughtful process intended to support the conservation of our semi-rural community, and to ensure the harmonious integration of any new development. This plan was created with the understanding that with its adoption in 1992 it became a statement of policy for future land use and development decisions. It was also understood at the time of adoption that any future changes should not abrogate the fundamental objectives of the plan.

Most recently, I believe that the County Planning Commission agreed that any amendments to the Countywide Plan would support the preservation of community plans to the fullest extent possible.

It's my understanding however that the County Planning Commission is now considering proposed edits to the Countywide Plan that will potentially undermine the objectives of the Tamalpais Area Community Plan, including a statement that the "Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations."

Whenever possible, I would like to see respect and priority given to the community plans with every effort made to preserve the legality of these plans.

I've reviewed the December 28, 2022 letter to the Planning Commission from Riley Hurd. I share his concerns and endorse his proposed edit in lieu of those that have been otherwise proposed.

Thank you very much,

Pam Keon

[keonvitale@aol.com](mailto:keonvitale@aol.com)  
Tennessee Glen Way

Mill Valley CA 94941

Marin County District 3



**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:43:44 PM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr - PC re CWPs - 12.28.22.pdf](#)

---

**From:** Patrick Daniels <patrickguydaniels@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 8:10 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>; Jones, Sarah <sbjones@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [patrickguydaniels@gmail.com](mailto:patrickguydaniels@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commission,

We, Patrick Guy Daniels and Mary Cashman-Daniels endorse Attorney Riley Hurd's December 28, 2022 letter. (Attached)

We strongly urge you to preserve the legality of the community plans to the fullest extent.

Sincerely

Patrick and Mary Daniels  
118 Nelson Ave  
Mill Valley, California 94941

Planning Commission County of Marin  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room #275  
San Rafael, CA 94903

Re: CWP Amendments – Community Plans

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

At your last meeting regarding the CWP amendments associated with the Housing Element, a very clear consensus was reached that community plans should be preserved to the fullest extent possible. In response to this direction, the proposed edit to Policy 3.4- 3 has been modified to address situations where there is a conflict between community plans and the CWP regarding density or floor area.

However, the remaining proposed edits to Policies 1.4-3 and 1.5-3 continue to completely eviscerate Community Plans. Policy 1.4-3 is entitled **“How to Read the Countywide Plan”** and proposed to **now include the following language:** *“...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the*

*County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan...*" Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories and is proposed to now say: *"The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations."* These edits do not preserve community plans to the fullest extent possible.

Page 2 of 2

There are many major sites and large areas carefully planned for in a community plan, but with nothing more than a land use designation in the CWP. Implementing these edits would eliminate all of this careful planning, and is not necessary for housing preservation. Furthermore, these edits are horizontally inconsistent with the proposed edit to Policy 3.4-3, which says the community plans only supersede the CWP in regards to density or FAR.

Community plans have been developed via a comprehensive, thoughtful, transparent, and fair process with all stakeholders. While they could certainly use some updating, overriding them in one fell swoop is unnecessary. Many community plans serve as the entire planning document for large sites. Simply reverting to the CWP designation would be catastrophic.

The following simpler, singular, edit could achieve the goals of advancing housing while not single-handedly wiping out community plans:

"No provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with State housing law or that physically precludes the construction of a project at its permitted density."

We would ask that you please use the edit proposed above and not adopt the various other edits regarding CWPs. Thank you.

Very Truly Yours,

Riley F. Hurd III  
CC: SNA

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: URGENT!! Housing Element Update  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:40:08 PM

---

**From:** Peta Penson <pgpenson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 5:51 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** BOS <BOS@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** URGENT!! Housing Element Update

You don't often get email from [pgpenson@yahoo.com](mailto:pgpenson@yahoo.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**Subject:** Letter to PC re: Housing Element Update, Marin CWP Amendments and Community Plans

Dear Marin County Planning Commissioners,

At your last meeting regarding the Marin Countywide Plan Amendments associated with the Housing Element, a very clear consensus was reached that Community Plans should be preserved to the fullest extent possible. However, proposed edits to Policies 1.4-3 and 1.5-3 of the Marin Countywide Plan continue to completely eviscerate these vital Community Plans.

Policy 1.4-3 is entitled “How to Read the Countywide Plan” and proposed to now include the following language:

**“...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan...”**

Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories and is proposed to now say: **“The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations.”**

These proposed edits must be discarded. We don't appreciate your trying to slip this through during the holidays. Own it, folks, and take the heat as is your job.

We strongly urge you to change the proposed amendments so that the legality and authority of Community Plans are preserved to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,  
Peta Penson and Peter Banys MD  
268 Greene St.  
Mill Valley 94941`

---

**From:** Ruthanne Ranz Appell <[garyamv@comcast.net](mailto:garyamv@comcast.net)>

**Date:** December 30, 2022 at 9:25:57 PM PST

**To:** [planningcommission@marincounty.org](mailto:planningcommission@marincounty.org)

**Cc:** [BOS@marincounty.org](mailto:BOS@marincounty.org)

**Subject: Letter to PC re: Housing Element Update, Marin CWP Amendments and Community Plans**

Dear Marin County Planning Commissioners,

My name is Ruthanne and I have lived in Tam Valley since 1986. At your last meeting regarding the Marin Countywide Plan Amendments associated with the Housing Element, a very clear consensus was reached that Community Plans should be preserved to the fullest extent possible. However, proposed edits to Policies 1.4-3 and 1.5-3 of the Marin Countywide Plan continue to completely eviscerate these vital Community Plans.

Policy 1.4-3 is entitled “How to Read the Countywide Plan” and proposed to now include the following language:

**“...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan...”**

Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories and is proposed to now say: **“The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations.”**

These proposed edits must be discarded.

I (We) strongly urge you to change the proposed amendments so that the legality and authority of Community Plans are preserved to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,  
Ruthanne Ranz Appell and Gary Appell  
(607 Northern Avenue, Mill Valley, CA 94941)

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Strongly support Riley Hurds December 28th letter  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:40:45 PM

---

---

**From:** Stephen Nestel <stephennestel@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 6:13 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>; Sackett, Mary <MSackett@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Strongly support Riley Hurds December 28th letter

Dear Supervisors :

I can confidently say that no one moved to Marin County to be inside high density housing next to a transit stop. Instead, we choose to live next to open space in right sized, livable communities. The demands of Sacramento are unrealistic and unfunded. Please join communities across California that oppose the draconian plans that strip our communities of their soul. I strongly support Riley Hurd's December 28th letter.

Stephen Nestel  
Lucas Valley/Marinwood

**From:** [Suellen Miller](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Housing  
**Date:** Friday, December 30, 2022 8:36:52 PM

---

You don't often get email from [suellenmiller@gmail.com](mailto:suellenmiller@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Housing for Marin. I have lived for 47 years at 402 San Francisco Blvd, San Anselmo, Ca 94960, I agree that Marin County needs more low income housing. The situation is desperate. We have 17 units next door at 404 San Francisco, that are "below market" price. We understand that a builder had been making plans to upgrade the site for 30 units .of which some would be designated for low income housing. I think this is something most of the neighbors support.

However, this state mandated push to build many more homes everywhere in California, the housing element, would allow for 64 units to be built on the same property. We also understand that the developer does not want to make this low income housing. We feel as many do in California that the state needs MORE LOW INCOME HOUSING, not just more housing The numbers being mandated by the State are ridiculously high and ignore the guidelines necessary for safety and health of our citizens.

We need guidance from the County planning commission and supervisors on how to push back against these numbers which seem to me to be mandated to fatten the pockets of developers and do nothing for those who need affordable housing, while endangering public health. Living at a dead end street, which is against a hillside of dried grasses and trees in the summer, I can not imagine what fire evacuation would look like with an additional 64 units on San Francisco Blvd.

It seems the State has us/Marin/any County/ the people over a barrel with the high penalties for non compliance with these exaggerated, thoughtless numbers for numbers sake.

There are so many conditions that are violated by these mandates and the punishing fines for non-compliance. These natural and pre-existing conditions, like climate changes' effects on our streams and bodies of water, the drought, and on our increased risk of wildfires, lack of water for necessities, existing traffic problems, hilly and uneven terrain (unbuildable land), etc. must be taken into account, how can they not be?

Are there no legal remedies for the Counties to take back local control of our neighborhoods? No appeals processes? or does the lack of appeal processes violate our constitutional rights to safety?

Thank you

Dr. Suellen Miller, Professor  
Director, Safe Motherhood Programs  
Dept. Ob, Gyn,& Repro Sciences  
Bixby Ctr for Global Reproductive Health and Policy  
University of California, San Francisco  
[suellenmiller@gmail.com](mailto:suellenmiller@gmail.com)  
[suellen.miller@ucsf.edu](mailto:suellen.miller@ucsf.edu)  
LifeWrap NASG Ignitor  
[www.safemotherhood.ucsf.edu](http://www.safemotherhood.ucsf.edu)

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: I endorse this letter written by Riley F Hurd  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:42:27 PM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr - PC re CWPs - 12.28.22.pdf](#)

---

-----Original Message-----

From: suzi l <[sletteer@gmail.com](mailto:sletteer@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2022 6:23 PM  
To: PlanningCommission <[PlanningCommission@marincounty.org](mailto:PlanningCommission@marincounty.org)>  
Cc: Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <[smoultonpeters@marincounty.org](mailto:smoultonpeters@marincounty.org)>  
Subject: I endorse this letter written by Riley F Hurd

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [sletteer@gmail.com](mailto:sletteer@gmail.com). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

I agree entirely with this letter. Susan Letteer





Ragghianti|Freitas LLP

Attorneys at Law

1101 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 100  
San Rafael, CA 94901  
telephone 415.453.9433  
facsimile 415.453.8269  
www.rflawllp.com

Riley F. Hurd III  
rhurd@rflawllp.com

December 28, 2022

**Via E-Mail Only**

Planning Commission  
County of Marin  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room #275  
San Rafael, CA 94903

**Re: CWP Amendments - Community Plans**

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

At your last meeting regarding the CWP amendments associated with the Housing Element, a very clear consensus was reached that community plans should be preserved to the fullest extent possible. In response to this direction, the proposed edit to Policy 3.4-3 has been modified to address situations where there is a conflict between community plans and the CWP regarding density or floor area. **However, the remaining proposed edits to Policies 1.4-3 and 1.5-3 continue to completely eviscerate Community Plans.**

Policy 1.4-3 is entitled "How to Read the Countywide Plan" and proposed to now include the following language:

**"...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan..."**

Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories and is proposed to now say:

**"The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations."**

These edits do *not* preserve community plans to the fullest extent possible.



Ragghianti|Freitas LLP

Page 2 of 2

There are many major sites and large areas carefully planned for in a community plan, but with nothing more than a land use designation in the CWP. Implementing these edits would eliminate all of this careful planning, and is not necessary for housing preservation. Furthermore, these edits are horizontally inconsistent with the proposed edit to Policy 3.4-3, which says the community plans only supersede the CWP in regards to density or FAR.

Community plans have been developed via a comprehensive, thoughtful, transparent, , and fair process with all stakeholders. While they could certainly use some updating, overriding them in one fell swoop is unnecessary. Many community plans serve as the entire planning document for large sites. Simply reverting to the CWP designation would be catastrophic.

The following simpler, singular, edit could achieve the goals of advancing housing while not single handedly wiping out community plans:

**“No provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with State housing law or that physically precludes the construction of a project at its permitted density.”**

We would ask that you please use the edit proposed above and not adopt the various other edits regarding CWPs. Thank you.

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Riley F. Hurd III'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Riley F. Hurd III

CC: SNA

**From:** [Jones, Sarah](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 8:00:14 AM

---

---

**From:** Susan Simpkin <svsimpkin@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 7:47 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>; Jones, Sarah <sbjones@marincounty.org>; Masaya Juge <masayajuge@gmail.com>; Tenaya Juge <tasjuge@gmail.com>; Hannah Juge <hmsjuge@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [svsimpkin@gmail.com](mailto:svsimpkin@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We endorse Attorney Riley Hurd's December 28, 2022, letter.

The Planning Commission must revise their proposed amending language which annihilates the preservation and application of community-based plans that have been carefully developed through consensus and deliberation and, instead, please adopt the proposed language in Mr. Hurd's letter:

**"No provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with State housing law or that physically precludes the construction of a project at its permitted density."**

We strongly urge you to preserve the legality of community plans to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,

Susan V. Simpkin  
Masaya Juge  
Hannah Juge  
Tenaya Juge

44 Glen Drive  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

**From:** [Jenny Silva](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Additional comment on Item #6 for Jan 5 meeting  
**Date:** Saturday, December 31, 2022 3:31:21 PM

---

Dear Marin County,

I am writing to submit additional information on my comments for the Jan 5 meeting.

As stated in my previous comments, I do not believe that Marin has submitted sufficient analysis that sites that are currently occupied will redevelop. There is no individual site analysis, just references to generic criteria like "owner interest" and "low FAR".

I am submitting a link to the [red-lined draft](#) of the San Bruno Housing Element. As can be seen in this draft, the initial draft of the San Bruno Housing Element provided far more analysis and details on why each occupied site would redevelop. This more intense analysis was insufficient, and San Bruno was asked to do more. This sort of analysis is completely missing in the Marin Housing Element, and needs to be completed to be compliant with state housing law.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Silva  
Volunteer, Campaign for Fair Housing Elements

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Marin CWP Amendments and Community Plans  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:44:56 PM

---

**From:** Kathy Flores <k-flores@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 31, 2022 7:58 AM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** BOS <BOS@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Marin CWP Amendments and Community Plans

You don't often get email from [k-flores@comcast.net](mailto:k-flores@comcast.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Marin County Planning Commissioners,

At your last meeting regarding the Marin Countywide Plan Amendments associated with the Housing Element, a very clear consensus was reached that Community Plans should be preserved to the fullest extent possible. However, proposed edits to Policies 1.4-3 and 1.5-3 of the Marin Countywide Plan continue to completely eviscerate these vital Community Plans.

Policy 1.4-3 is entitled “How to Read the Countywide Plan” and proposed to now include the following language:

**“...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan...”**

Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories and is proposed to now say: **“The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations.”**

These proposed edits must be discarded!

I strongly urge you to change the proposed amendments so that the legality and authority of Community Plans are preserved to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,  
Kathy Flores  
14 Claus Circle  
Fairfax, CA

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Housing Element - Marin CWP Amendments and Community Plans  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 1:45:32 PM

---

**From:** Lee Budish <[budishlee@gmail.com](mailto:budishlee@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 31, 2022 12:45 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <[PlanningCommission@marincounty.org](mailto:PlanningCommission@marincounty.org)>  
**Cc:** BOS <[BOS@marincounty.org](mailto:BOS@marincounty.org)>  
**Subject:** Housing Element - Marin CWP Amendments and Community Plans

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [budishlee@gmail.com](mailto:budishlee@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Marin County Planning Commissioners,

At your last meeting regarding the Marin Countywide Plan Amendments associated with the Housing Element, a very clear consensus was reached that Community Plans should be preserved to the fullest extent possible. However, proposed edits to Policies 1.4-3 and 1.5-3 of the Marin Countywide Plan continue to completely eviscerate these vital Community Plans.

Policy 1.4-3 is entitled "How to Read the Countywide Plan" and proposed to now include the following language:

**"...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan..."**

Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories and is proposed to now say: **"The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations."**

These proposed edits must be discarded.

We have lived in Tam Valley for 33 years and recognize the importance of the Tam Area Community Plan.

It has guided our community during changing, challenging and greedy times which could have exploited our treasured environmental surroundings in a way which as to quote the plan itself:

"The primary land use goal for the Tamalpais Planning is the conservation of the semi-rural small town residential and commercial character and scale of the community, and its close relationship with the natural beauty of its setting. The purpose of this plan is to

retain and enhance these qualities."

Without the Tam Area Community Plan our community will suffer detrimental environmental consequences from which we will never come back from.

Please understand the core value of these of these plans to our communities and uphold them for future generations and imagine the nightmare of what our communities would have looked like without these plans.

We strongly urge you to change the proposed amendments so that the legality and authority of Community Plans are preserved to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,

Lee and Jim Budish

**From:** [Jones, Sarah](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Strawberry Plan  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 8:31:04 AM

---

---

**From:** RANDA PRATT <randapratt@me.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 31, 2022 12:53 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>  
**Cc:** Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>; Jones, Sarah <sbjones@marincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Strawberry Plan

You don't often get email from [randapratt@me.com](mailto:randapratt@me.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**To:** [planningcommission@marincounty.org](mailto:planningcommission@marincounty.org)  
**Cc:** [smoultonpeters@marincounty.org](mailto:smoultonpeters@marincounty.org); [sbjones@marincounty.org](mailto:sbjones@marincounty.org)  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Meeting January 5, 2023 re CWP

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I endorse Attorney Riley Hurd's December 28, 2022, letter.

I strongly urge you to preserve the legality of community plans to the fullest extent possible.

Sincerely,  
Randa S. Pratt  
Strawberry

---

---



**From:** [Victoria George](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#); [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Urge you to NOT approve 64 Units at 404 San Francisco Blvd, San Anselmo  
**Date:** Saturday, December 31, 2022 10:16:50 AM

---

You don't often get email from [victoria.george@compass.com](mailto:victoria.george@compass.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

To Katie Rice and the County Planning,

My family and I live at 248 San Francisco Blvd in San Anselmo, we bought our house in 2013 and have watched the neighborhood change over the years. I understand there is a large proposed development at the end of our street at **404 San Francisco Blvd** and the county is considering approving 64 Units where 17 now exist. This would significantly change the traffic patterns and feel of our neighborhood. We have already had terrible problems with motorists driving too fast on our roads and increasing the number of car trips is only going to make this worse. Over the last few years, our neighborhood went to great lengths to replace our stop signs with roundabouts in an effort to make it safer and to slow down cars. Our neighborhood is unique as our streets get a lot of use from our beloved Memorial park, Sorich recreation and hiking area (which is adjacent to the 404 development) as well as from Butterfield residents who use Indian Rock and San Francisco Blvd as a shortcut to avoid the traffic on Butterfield. Our streets will strain under the frequent car trips 64 units will inevitably create. I urge you to take this into consideration when you make your decision and be more measured about the number of units you approve as it will negatively impact the residents and children that already live here.

Respectfully,

Victoria & Adam Wise

--

**Victoria George**

Luxury Property Specialist

---

**Compass**

415 747 6948

[victoria.george@compass.com](mailto:victoria.george@compass.com)

License # 01997697

*I have not and will not verify or investigate the information supplied by third parties.*

**WIRE FRAUD WARNING:** *"If you receive an email / text providing wire instructions or requesting personal financial information that appears to come from me or any Compass representative, do not respond, send or wire any funds. Instead, call me immediately. Be advised such instructions may be fraudulent. To ensure authenticity contact the escrow/title company to verify the authenticity of the wire instructions. Do not call the number provided*

*with the wire instructions. There have been instances of wire fraud in connection with real estate transactions, observe this protocol to protect yourself. ”*



**From:** [Caleigh Hall](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Marin Countywide Plan Proposed Text Amendments  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 2:00:01 PM

---

You don't often get email from caleighlynnh@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Marin County's Community Plans are the result of extended and thoughtful processes and consideration. Their preservation has staunch support among our populace, and they should not be summarily discarded absent fair and suitable alternatives that address relevant concerns while also respecting the voices of your constituents.

Although the proceedings of your last meeting resulted in verbal agreements that Community Plans would not be broadly disregarded and abandoned, the following sweeping and contradictory language remains in the [Marin Countywide Plan Proposed Text Amendments](#) (Dec. 22, 2022) (Item 6, Exhibit B, on the [Agenda for the January 5, 2023 Planning Commission meeting](#)):

- Policy 1.4-3 ("How to Read the Countywide Plan") states:

**"[N]o provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan or state housing law."**

- Policy 1.5-3 ("Land Use Categories") states:

**"The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations."**

In his December 28 letter to the Planning Commission, Riley Hurd, an experienced land use attorney, suggested replacing the language above with the following alternative language, which would achieve Housing Element objectives without destroying the Community Plans:

- **"No provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with State housing law or that physically precludes the construction of a project at its permitted density."**

Rather than formalizing the language as currently drafted, I ask that you honor the consensus demonstrating broad support of our Community Plans and adopt Mr. Hurd's reasonable and goal-oriented alternative language.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Caleigh Hall  
11 Seminary Cove Drive  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

--

Caleigh Hall

**From:** [Connie Ducey](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed change in zoning for 404 San Francisco Blvd. San Anselmo  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 1:55:18 PM

---

You don't often get email from [conniekaytay@comcast.net](mailto:conniekaytay@comcast.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

Good afternoon –

I am writing to express my deep concern about expanding what is currently 17 units to 64 units on 4 parcels in unincorporated San Anselmo at 404 San Francisco Blvd.

My immediate concern is the access and additional traffic on San Francisco Blvd. that an additional 47 dwellings would add. There is basically ONE WAY in and ONE WAY out since SF Blvd. is a dead end street. There is a major open space hiking trailhead adjacent to the proposed new development (at Sorich Park.) There is a “magnet” beautiful public park with 3 baseball diamonds, a fabulous big playground, and a VFW post with a bar, both of which host many parties and events yearlong. These are all in what is known as Memorial Park which is off SF Blvd (at Veteran’s Way.) The park has recently been beautifully refurbished (making it even more desirable therefore more traffic.) San Anselmo’s corporation yard, which generates a lot of traffic usually in the form of trucks and equipment, is also adjacent to the proposed development. And, like every other community, online purchasing means constant, daily delivery trucks on every street in the neighborhood. The increase in traffic from this development would add hundreds more daily trips up and down SF Blvd. I visualize a constant stream of traffic into a neighborhood with ONE WAY IN AND ONE WAY OUT.

As concerning as the huge increase in traffic the proposed development would bring, there’s also the very real issue of fire danger. I will point out that side streets such as Sacramento Ave and Los Angeles Blvd. are also dead end streets. There are a couple side streets on which traffic can wrangle through often winding and narrow passage to get out to the main artery, Sir Francis Drake, but basically this neighborhood is locked in. We’re surrounded by hills which have often experienced fire in the 45 years I’ve lived here and again, the major artery to escape is SF Blvd.

Of course there are also concerns about water usage, environmental effects to the landscape and impacts of adding such dense dwelling to the already stressed wildlife, their passages and food sources.

I am aware of the pressure the planners and our county leadership face in trying to meet housing quotas we are required to meet. I do appreciate this leadership and trust the decisions will be made fairly, for the sake of our neighborhoods, our resources, and stewardship of our beautiful natural settings.

Bottom line from my perspective is 64 units at 404 San Francisco Blvd in unincorporated San Anselmo will absolutely overwhelm our roads and resources (think air quality from those vehicles and hundreds of extra daily trips back and forth.) Cut the proposed number of dwelling in half at least. Sixty four [64] new dwellings are just too many for this area.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Sincerely,

Connie Ducey  
45 year resident at  
141 Sacramento Ave., San Anselmo

**From:** [Craig Litman](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Strawberry Community Plan  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 9:41:06 AM

---

You don't often get email from craiglitman1@outlook.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners —

Despite verbal agreements that Community Plans would not be broadly swept aside, there remains broad and contradictory language in the ITEM 6, Exhibit B. ITEM 6 is the “Housing Element Countywide Plan Amendments/Rezoning.”

In this Exhibit B, you will find the following problematic language:

Policy 1.4-3 entitled “How to Read the Countywide Plan” includes the following language:

**“...no provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with the Countywide Plan.**

Policy 1.5-3 addresses land use categories now says:

**“The Countywide Plan land use designations supersede Community Plan designations.”**

Exhibit B can be accessed here: <https://www.marincounty.org/-/media/files/departments/cd/planning/cwp/housing-and-safety-elements/pc-hearing-010523/item-6-he/attachment-3.pdf?la=en>

It has been brought to my attention that land use attorney, Riley Hurd, recommended to you substitute language which could achieve Housing Element objectives without destroying Community Plans. Will you please consider and adopt his proposed language and remove the proposed broad language cited below?

**"No provision of a community plan may be applied by the County in a manner that conflicts with State housing law or that physically precludes the construction of a project at its permitted density."**

Thank you for your consideration and thoughtful work.

Craig & Patti Litman

**Concerned Seminary Neighbors**

**From:** [Pam Ross](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco Blvd.  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 3:21:17 PM

---

You don't often get email from fross898@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

I'm aware that all of the objections to this project have already been enumerated: the disruptions, the strain on existing infrastructure, the increased demand on a limited water supply in the midst of an unprecedented and historic drought; the list goes on and on. I'm also aware that the current residents can be accused of elitism and NIMBYism for any objections that they may have to this seemingly senseless state mandated new housing requirement. I nonetheless need to go on record as objecting to both this development, and the state mandate generally. I'm curious: by what process was this mandate created, and what pressures were brought to bear, and by whom? Shouldn't such a momentous decision that will irreparably alter the quality of our community, be subject to the input of those whose lives will be affected? The development of the West is the history of real estate speculation; when will we begin to balance the needs of the community and the environment against the greed of developers?

Sincerely,

Fred Ross



**From:** [Sara Brown](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** OPPOSE 404 San Francisco Blvd.  
**Date:** Sunday, January 1, 2023 9:51:31 PM

---

You don't often get email from sarabneto@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern,

I have been a resident of the Sorich Park neighborhood on Los Angeles Blvd. for 11 years. I am writing in direct opposition to the 64 proposed units at 404 San Francisco Blvd.

Over the last 11 years I have watched the planning committees allow real estate developers to buy small, inexpensive, modest homes in this neighborhood and triple them in size to triple their profit. This once quiet, lovely and affordable enclave on San Anselmo is rapidly turning into a community for the wealthiest Marin residents with no regard for keeping houses square footage suited for the lot size or for the low income buyer.

The traffic on SFD is impossible at this point at commute hours. The air quality this winter was in the red for weeks at a time due to the car exhaust and wood burning stoves. If there was a fire it would literally be impossible to evacuate on SFD. If there is a broken down car, it can shut down the road at commute times. How could we possibly add 64 units to 404 San Francisco Blvd???

At this point it is not possible to make a left turn onto San Francisco Blvd. in the morning or afternoon. We are at max capacity.

To tear down what is truly low income housing to build 40 fancy new units in this already over run neighborhood is insane. We are already on water restriction and have no clear evacuation access in case of a fire. To build in this neighborhood in this way may satisfy a short term goal, but in the long term it will be doing a HUGE disservice to our community.

We beg you to stop this proposal. It is a mistake.

Thank you,  
Sara Brown

**From:** [Darlene Apodaca](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Sorich park  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 2:12:39 PM

---

You don't often get email from andaling@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

The traffic on San Francisco Bl increase that would be created by going from 17 units to 64 is a nightmare!! Access to Sir Francis Drake is already congested by people coming over the hill from Sleepy Hollow to avoid access via Butterfield rd -especially during school year-no doubt housing is needed-but 64 is too many for the existing infrastructure more time studying the possibility of creating another exit over the hill to 101 might be considered before add to the congestion.

**From:** [Erin Schneider](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Housing development -end of SF Blvd  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 10:39:12 PM

---

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from [schneids11@gmail.com](mailto:schneids11@gmail.com). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Hello,

I'm writing about the housing unit that is proposed for the end of San Anselmo's San Francisco Blvd. As a resident of SF Blvd, I wonder the following:

- what the town has planned for alternative emergency escape routes, let alone the daily traffic in/out of the avenue onto SFD.
- what our neighbors who currently live there will have to do, since most of them can not afford a new home/ market rent.
- why other sites closer to highway 101 are not being favorably considered, as these seem easier to evacuate and more accessible.

I'd be in support of this project if it truly were a low-income housing unit for the majority of renters/ owners and if it were a manageable size, but the fact that it's neither has me worried about our safety and our goals as a community.

Thanks for considering this perspective as you create our future in San Anselmo.

Thanks,  
Erin

**From:** [Gene Moore](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#); [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco Blvd. comments  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 5:30:12 PM

---

You don't often get email from [genefm@comcast.net](mailto:genefm@comcast.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

## 404 San Francisco Blvd San Anselmo comments

I live down the street from the proposed 404 San Francisco Blvd (San Anselmo) proposed project and I am writing to voice my opinions on it.

I object to the concept of putting 64 units on this property. That would make the area and streets very congested and out of character with the surrounding residential area, and open space. My specific concerns are as follows:

Traffic would probably increase by at least 50%, or more, as would pollution of the air we breathe, greenhouse gas emissions, noise and wear on the street.

Parking will become a problem because people will opt to use parking up and down the street rather than deal with the inconvenience of stacked parking. Residents might even use the small Sorich Park lot next to the development, and make the park inaccessible to attendees. Also, a stacked parking structure would slow down evacuation during an emergency. Residents would probably rather park on the street for a safe and timely exit.

Public transportation on Sir Francis Drake Blvd. is more than the recommended half mile distance. Would seniors, or physically impaired people, be able or willing to walk that far to transportation?

I have concerns about wildfires and whether firefighting access will be sufficient.

Where is the water for this coming from? We already have a serious water shortage. The plan seems to call for a swimming pool, which seems outrageous in this time of drought.

Open space aesthetics and the visual character of surrounding park will be severely compromised.

Ground absorption of rainfall and water runoff will be severely impaired by so much coverage. I worry that storm drains might overflow, and that water flow down the street will increase dramatically.

I worry that Sorich Creek will be further damaged.

Current low income residents will lose housing. Where will they go during the years of development, given the lack of low income housing?

And given the density of this project, would the county allow me to put at proportionate 4.5 units on my lot?

Gene Moore

**From:** [jack krystal](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Comments and changes to proposed Marin County Code  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 2:44:43 PM

---

1. 22.14.060/8. b. Delete " ,,,subject to approval of U.S. Army core of Engineers and other trustee agencies."
2. 22.14.060/10. a. IV. Delete the proposed "Deed Restriction." It is overreaching! It is not equitable and in conflict with the Safety element requirements. Lenders and title companies will not accept it.

Best wishes and a Happy New Year,

Jack Krystal

**From:** [Jeffrey M. Kraut](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed development at 404 San Francisco Blvd.  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 4:23:32 PM

---

[You don't often get email from [jkraut@mcn.org](mailto:jkraut@mcn.org). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

To Marin Co Housing Element officials,  
We have listened to the zoom session re the proposed development at 404 San Francisco Blvd near San Anselmo.

The proposed 64 unit project falls very short of providing a significant amount of low income housing while eliciting great opposition to its scale from neighborhood residents. Any reduction of units is unlikely, as it appears that decision would be left to the developer who faces rising costs. Without certainty of the viability and cost of infrastructure to serve 64 units - such as water, sewer and road expansion (Sir Francis Drake) no decision should be made.

The project would negate much of what our local planning officials and supervisors have accomplished over the years and require rebuilds of infrastructure that our tax dollars have already funded. As such we would encourage the county to join other entities who are litigating these requirements and not allow the state to override decisions made in view of Marin's unique water shortage and pending solutions, traffic problems and fire safety.

Sincerely,  
Jeffrey Kraut  
Diane Coughtry

**From:** [kathy sanders](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco Blvd. San Anselmo  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 3:35:54 PM

---

You don't often get email from katsanders03@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing in regards to the housing element proposal at 404 San Francisco Boulevard in San Anselmo. Currently there are 17 units, and the new density density would be put at 64 units. This is an area that's very close to rural and parklands, and such a high density on such small acreage is ill advised and poor planning. There is also the issue that virtually all the new traffic would have to go through the Hub of San Anselmo, which has historically been rated at levels of D and F.

I realize the county is desperate to find space for this new mandate for housing, but zoning housing away from major arteries like 101 is a mistake. Drive anytime during daylight hours in the Ross Valley and San Rafael, and you will see how ill advised this zoning will be! To be told that we can't take issues like traffic into consideration is ludicrous, at least in the mind of any sane person, in my humble opinion!

Respectfully Submitted,  
Kathy Sanders, San Anselmo

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)



**From:** [mario t](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco Blvd  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 3:43:10 PM

---

[You don't often get email from [mariotj1@yahoo.com](mailto:mariotj1@yahoo.com). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

I live on San Francisco Road Blvd. Please do not approve a massive housing project at 404 San Francisco Blvd I feel that current traffic on my street is already over capacity with constant back ups getting on to Sir Francis Drake.  
Thank you, Mario Territo  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Susan Pearlstine](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** regarding the building project at 404 San Francisco Blvd  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 4:35:00 PM

---

You don't often get email from suepearlstine@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am a home owner on San Francisco Blvd and Durham Boulevard and I object to this new proposed development as the appropriate environmental reviews have not been made and the project is very large for the land and the community. This disregard for the existing neighborhood and resources is very wrong and seems that the housing department is just bowing to political power and push. I hope that this ends up in law suits for many years as I think it is a bad decision that is being rushed. This will have a huge impact both in the construction phase and in the future land use issues on this street and this area. I understand the rush to add more housing in Marin County but as usual the commitment to low income housing will be minimal and instead it will be more high end housing and single use homes adding more traffic and noise and abuse of the land resources. This plan is outrageous and I encourage everyone to vote it down and revise it to a more reasonable project that the area can command.

Very truly yours,  
Susan Pearlstine

**From:** [TOM PEACOCK](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco Blvd.  
**Date:** Monday, January 2, 2023 6:56:46 PM

---

You don't often get email from tompeacock6333@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Today appears to be a couple days late for public comment, however, the weather doesn't wait for bureaucracy or public comment.

Today, 1/2/23, It is apparent Sorich Creek has over flowed it's course just west of 300 Los Angeles Blvd. requiring substantial clearing to resume secure flow That, with just 17 units currently existing in the proposed project area. How the Los Angeles Blvd down stream neighborhood will do with 64 units with newly impervious roofs, walkways, roads and the assorted detritus of community is easily imagined but, in fact, really your responsibility. Poor planning is the precursor for disaster certainly not the solution to problems.

Tom Peacock  
43 Durham Rd.  
San Anselmo, Ca. 94960

Please use my new email address:  
tompeacock6333@comcast.net

**From:** [John Bruce Corcoran](#)  
**To:** [EnvPlanning](#); [Jones, Sarah](#); [Moulton-Peters, Stephanie](#)  
**Subject:** Fw: Marin County Housing and Safety Elements, Comments on DEIR  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 8:37:21 AM

---

Dear Rachel Reid,

It is not clear to me that you have received my original letter dated November 21, 2022, because I inadvertently misspelled the Environmental Planning email address.

Please include this letter in the record.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Bruce Corcoran

---

**From:** John Bruce Corcoran  
**Sent:** Monday, November 21, 2022 3:59 PM  
**To:** envplanning@maincounty.org <envplanning@maincounty.org>  
**Subject:** Marin County Housing and Safety Elements, Comments on DEIR

Dear Rachel Reid, Environmental Planning Manager,

I am submitting the following comments about the DEIR:

**Environmental Topic: Transportation**

A detailed VMT analysis of the Highway 101/SR 131 (Tiburon Boulevard) is lacking.

In a letter dated January 20, 2022, in response to the NOP, Caltrans' District 4 Branch Chief Mark Leong required of Environmental Planning a detailed analysis of VMT. That requirement has not been fulfilled for the Highway 101/SR131 interchange. This interchange lies completely within the boundaries of the unincorporated area of Strawberry-Alto. Therefore, "As the Lead Agency, the County of Marin is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the State Transportation Network (STN). The project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures."

The RHNA allocations for Belvedere (160), Tiburon (639), Mill Valley (865), and the pending NCLH project in Strawberry (E 350 new units) will add over 2,000 housing units to the area served by the Highway 101/SR131 interchange. Using the average of 10 trips per day per housing unit, this will add 20,000 trips per day. The cumulative impacts of these additional trips have not been analyzed.

**Environmental Topic: Population and Housing**

An analysis of the impacts of open borders and unfettered illegal immigration has been ignored. We cannot even house our own citizens. Homeless people, including our military veterans, are living in tents. Illegal immigrants compete directly with low-income US citizens for housing, jobs, education, and healthcare. We will never succeed in building enough affordable housing if unfettered illegal immigration continues.

Sincerely,

Bruce Corcoran

**From:** [PlanningCommission](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: PC Meeting January 5, 2023 re Housing Element  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 2:24:54 PM

---

**From:** John Bruce Corcoran <BruceCorcoran@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 30, 2022 4:59 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission <PlanningCommission@marincounty.org>; Moulton-Peters, Stephanie <smoultonpeters@marincounty.org>; Jones, Sarah <sbjones@marincounty.org>; envplanning@maincounty.org  
**Subject:** PC Meeting January 5, 2023 re Housing Element

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I challenge Staff's determination that "Regarding the impacts of open borders and illegal immigration, those comments do not pertain to the adequacy or content of the EIR; no further response is required." (126-2, p. 532) What could be more important to the adequacy or content of the EIR than the displacement of lower income US citizens by a flood of illegal immigrants?

The policy of open borders is inhumane to all parties. It is a deliberate, self-destructive policy that overwhelms the Housing Element. Predominantly lower income US citizens, who are the very people that Staff claims it wants to protect, will be forced to compete directly with illegal immigrants for housing, healthcare, education, and jobs.

The cruel irony is that US taxpayers are paying for the well-being of illegal immigrants, while ignoring the needs of unhoused US citizens, including some of our military veterans.

According to the Public Policy Institute of California, about 22% of California's nearly 11 million immigrants are in the United States illegally. That is an additional 2.42 million people that need housing that should be available to US citizens instead.

Last week Gov. Gavin Newsom warned that California would experience an unsustainable flow of illegal immigrants once President Joe Biden reverses Title 42.

Governor Newsome said, "We're already at capacity at nine of our sites (for housing illegal immigrants). We can't continue to fund all of these sites because of the budgetary pressures now being placed on this state and the offsetting issues that I have to address.... The reality is, unless we're doing what we're doing, people will end up on the streets."

The Governor continued, "California has invested roughly \$1 billion over the past three years to support the health and safety of migrants as well as the surrounding border communities, but we cannot continue to do this work alone."

Governor Newsom claimed the U.S. government is sending "more and more" migrants to California because the state is "taking care of folks."

"The more we do, the burden is placed disproportionate on us," he said.

The unexpected increase in population growth is a crisis that is impacting all of us. We cannot ignore it any longer. It is the under-reported issue of our times. It may be a new category, but it deserves to be part of the Housing Element.

Sincerely,

Bruce Corcoran

Strawberry

**From:** [JAMIE MACKIE](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** San Francisco Blvd housing development San Anselmo  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 3:04:29 AM

---

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from mackieisme@hotmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Hello,

I received an email about a housing development being planned at the end of San Francisco Blvd in San Anselmo. I would like to comment on the development. I live close to the first roundabout on San Francisco Blvd. My biggest concern about a development being placed at the end of the street is the traffic impact the neighborhood will experience. Those that live on San Francisco Blvd experience not only a significant amount of traffic on the road but even more concerning is the speed at which cars travel on the road. As the neighborhood has changed the street is now home to lots and lots of little children. The street was built much too wide and straight for a 25mph speed limit. The street almost welcomes motorists to speed. The curb on the roundabouts are much too low to limit speeding. Cars just drive over them with slowing. The speed bumps on the street are also insufficient to low traffic. The break between the speed bumps allows motorists to position their tires in the flat area and avoid slowing down. My second concern is the proximity of the housing development to the open space. The additional use of the open space as well as the increased housing density in close proximity would negatively affect the usability of the space as well as the wildlife which rely on the area.

At this time I can not support any additional development that would increase traffic on San Francisco Blvd unless the city or county take action to slow the speed of traffic.

Thank you,  
Jamie Mackie

Sent from my iPhone



**From:** [MAY CHOW](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 5:08:21 PM

---

[You don't often get email from [wmsb3737@aol.com](mailto:wmsb3737@aol.com). Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification> ]

Planning Commission,

I am a homeowner on Monterey Ave in San Anselmo. I am writing to encourage the Planning Commission to follow the best 'responsible growth for Marin' ideals that the commission is capable of and not let the State short circuit the guidelines in place for such responsible growth in Marin.

Please redevelop 404 San Francisco responsibly and work towards providing true middle and low cost housing.

Best regards,  
May and Wayne Lee

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Rachel Burke](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Potential Sorich housing development  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 7:54:54 AM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from imosoawesome@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good morning and happy New Year . I've never written one of these before and not sure how to go about it. But felt like this is important enough that I should voice my concerns on the potential 64 units being put in at Sorich. In place of the now 17 units that exist.

I am a resident in the neighborhood and with the flood that just hit where I live, it once again just shows what a powerful force nature is.

With that being said. My biggest concerns have always been that of our unpredictable weather and the dangers adding 64units would bring.

The biggest being fire

With Sorich park and the very flammable eucalyptus trees surrounding the area. I've always felt the potential for fire danger in our neighborhood as is.

Adding 64 units. Would bring at least 64 new vehicles if not up to 120 (with most households I know in Marin having two cars or more)

The congestion if/when there were a fire would literally leave us trapped as sitting ducks on San Francisco Blvd unable to evacuate on our one access in and out to Sir Francis Drake. I've heard of propositions of new developments in North Gate and other such areas that seem to make far more sense as far as housing being built in areas that are safer from fire danger. And near the freeway But putting the units here feels like a disaster waiting to happen.

I have other concerns such as drought and just general congestion But wouldn't have written for those. As I know Marin is having to fill a quota for housing. But the fire danger made me 'pick up my pen' for lack of a better term and write this.

I hope this reaches you, and thank you for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely,  
Rachel Burke

**From:** [Sarah Schaaf](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Urge you to NOT approve 64 Units at 404 San Francisco Blvd, San Anselmo  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 6:24:35 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sarahkschaaf@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To Katie Rice and the County Planning,

My family and I live at 58 Monterey Avenue in San Anselmo. We bought our home a year and a half ago and have been astounded by the welcoming and close community and how family friendly the neighborhood is safe the surrounding streets are for our children, aging community members and pets.

I understand there is a large proposed development at **404 San Francisco Blvd** and the county is considering approving 64 Units where 17 now exist. This would significantly change the traffic patterns and feel of our neighborhood in ways that could create unsafe conditions for the existing residents.

We have already had terrible problems with motorists driving too fast on our neighborhoods roads due to the popularity of our beloved Memorial Park, the Sorich recreation and hiking area (which is adjacent to the 404 development) as well as Butterfield residents who use Indian Rock and San Francisco Blvd as a shortcut to avoid the traffic on Butterfield and Sit Francis Drake.

Unfortunately, adding so many additional units and residents to our already popular and frequented area will increase the number of cars, drivers, and traffic congestion. Over the last few years our neighborhood has already gone to significant and expensive lengths to replace our stop signs with roundabouts in an effort to make it safer for our residents by slowing down cars.

Our streets will strain under the additional cars and frequent traffic that 47 additional units will inevitably change the safe road conditions for our children and. Sigh or hood residents. I urge you to take this into consideration when you make your decision and not approve the adding additional units tj 404 San Francisco as it will negatively impact the residents and children that live here already.

Respectfully,

Sarah and Thornton Schaaf

**From:** [Talley Henry](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#); [Mike Henry](#)  
**Subject:** Submission re Proposed Development Project at 404 San Francisco Blvd in San Anselmo  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 3, 2023 3:19:57 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from talleyhenry@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Marin County Planning Commission:

We are writing to ask that the Marin County Planning Commission do everything possible to disapprove the proposed project at 404 San Francisco Blvd and Sacramento Ave in San Anselmo based on the lack of responsible planning to date and the significant resulting impacts on our neighborhood.

Locating this number of additional units at the end of a dead-end street in this location will have unavoidable impacts relating to wastewater infrastructure, air, quality, water supply, traffic, transportation, and noise. It will also have a significant impact on the ability of the entire Sorich Park neighborhood to safely and efficiently evacuate in the event of a fire or earthquake.

There is only one way out and one into this neighborhood and adding 64 residential units at the end of the road will likely add well over 100 additional cars to this small area. The daily impact of this increase to traffic on a barely two-lane road out of the neighborhood is extremely detrimental. And worse yet, in the event of the need to evacuate, this would create a dangerous and potentially life-threatening situation.

The issues facing this specific development are the same ones aptly noted in the Planning Commission's own environmental impact report and appropriately raised by the commissioners at the December 12, 2022 meeting with staffers, which have not been properly studied and effectively addressed from a planning perspective. To move forward with development projects of this nature without proper planning due to pressure from the state is unnecessary, unacceptable, and shortsighted. We can and must do better.

It appears the proverbial cart is being put before the horse in this situation, and we submit that proper vetting of these issues has not occurred and thus necessitates disapproval of this development project by the Marin County Planning Commission at this juncture and ultimately by the Board of Supervisors. This is the time to do the right thing before a neighborhood is significantly impacted by irresponsible planning.

Sincerely,

Talley & Mike Henry  
Owners at 171 Sacramento Ave  
San Anselmo

**From:** [Anne Newman](#)  
**To:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Cc:** [housingelement](#)  
**Subject:** sorich park 404 San Fransisco blvd  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 4, 2023 2:17:52 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from annenewman2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good Afternoon,

I just read the notice and I did have a couple of thoughts

I'd like to see if the project could be designed so that access could occur from both San Francisco blvd as well as Los Angeles ave (this would require to have through traffic flow through the parking lot access of Memorial Park. I am thinking this would alleviate congestion on one street-

The impact on street wear and tear during the building process will be terrible and the developer should be assessed so that we can resurface streets post construction ( typically low income housing unit dwellers need to commute to work.)

I'd also like to float the crazy idea that any resident who opts out to own a vehicle get a further rent reduction so that they can offset having to utilize public/private transportation cost, delivery charges etc.

I look forward to seeing the renditions.

--

*Thanks so much,*

*Anne Newman*  
*415.419.4294*

**From:** [Colleen Morrison Mackie](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#); [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding: Development at 404 San Francisco Blvd, San Anselmo  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 4, 2023 10:44:53 AM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [colleen.c.morrison@gmail.com](mailto:colleen.c.morrison@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Happy new year,

I would like to respectfully ask for the disapproval of the ability to expand to 64 units for proposed project at 404 San Francisco Blvd and Sacramento Ave in San Anselmo due to significant resulting impacts on our neighborhood.

My main concern is the traffic that this project will create for San Francisco Blvd. This road already has congestion and people driving well over the speed limit (despite roundabouts). I believe that the additional housing will exacerbate an existing problem. In addition, I would be concerned about emergency vehicles being able to get to the end of San Francisco in a timely manner and I am concerned about the ability to evacuate the area in case of emergency if we add additional people and vehicles to the end of the street. Finally, the traffic leaving San Francisco Blvd to pull onto Sir Francis Drake will cause even more back-up to those going to and from Fairfax/Sleepy Hollow.

My other concern is that this area borders an open space and having a dense housing area on the edge of this natural environment could have possible negative impacts. Has it been studied whether high density housing like this on the edge of open space has on the wildlife?

Thank you,

Colleen Morrison  
415-261-7111

**From:** [isabela@sonic.net](mailto:isabela@sonic.net)  
**To:** [housingelement](mailto:housingelement)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](mailto:Rice, Katie)  
**Subject:** 404 San Francisco Blvd. Proposal \*  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 4, 2023 3:39:19 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [isabela@sonic.net](mailto:isabela@sonic.net). [Learn why this is important](#)

[housingelement@marincounty.org](mailto:housingelement@marincounty.org) Re: 64 unit development proposal at 404 San Francisco Blvd

cc: [krice@marincounty.org](mailto:krice@marincounty.org) San Anselmo , CA 94960

ATTN: Marin County Planning Commission

: Planning Staff

: Katie Rice

First and foremost:

This plan to up-zone the 2.2 acres at 404 San Francisco Blvd to 64 units - is:

Environmentally careless and irresponsible, and - You have all the facts.

The 17 structures which have housed locals for decades is housing to 17 units of ALREADY LOW INCOME inhabitants & their families. To displace this community of individuals and their families - who many have raised their children from babies to adults-with grandparents, in this quiet community at the end of San Francisco Blvd. is absurd, unfair, and atrocious.

This proposed development would be removal and displacement of already Low income and fixed income families who are established people who have built their lives and connections to jobs and community here.

What is the common sense to this proposal ?

TRAFFIC: 64 units would most likely bring at least 128 more vehicles through this small community where many streets are already forced to use San Francisco Blvd to exit and access the many homes which merge down to SFB. Sir Francis Drake—has a high volume of traffic already- and driving from San Anselmo to Fairfax, cars cannot make a left turn onto Tamal- the cross street from SFBlvd. **\*\*Consider** adding the bicycles and electric bikes into this number .

Spagnolville- where I lived for 20 years, now living on Plumas Ave in SA.... was originally a dairy farm. A small piece of rural San Anselmo, with Open Space and a park where people come to hike, bring children and dogs. This “treasure” of Marin County, I thought was one of the areas which Marin County prides itself in.

There are also Water considerations and Environmental and Wildlife impact to think carefully about and review the facts.

\*Many reasons to review over ,and reconsider this proposal .\*

Thank you,



Sincerely,

Elizabeth Briggson

7 Plumas Ave.

San Anselmo, CA 94960

**From:** [Lucy Anderson](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** hard PAUSE on 404 San Francisco Blvd development  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 4, 2023 5:14:14 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from anderson\_415@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi - expressing CONCERN over proposed development at 404 San Francisco Blvd.  
Too big.

Thank you

**From:** [Tara McGann](#)  
**To:** [housingelement](#)  
**Cc:** [Rice, Katie](#)  
**Subject:** Disapprove the proposed project at 404 San Francisco Blvd  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 4, 2023 9:30:59 AM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [tara.k.mcgann@gmail.com](mailto:tara.k.mcgann@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

Marin County Planning Commission:

We are writing to ask that the Marin County Planning Commission do everything possible to disapprove the proposed project at 404 San Francisco Blvd and Sacramento Ave in San Anselmo based on the lack of responsible planning to date and the significant resulting impacts on our neighborhood.

Locating this number of additional units at the end of a dead-end street in this location will have unavoidable impacts relating to wastewater infrastructure, air, quality, water supply, traffic, transportation, and noise. It will also have a significant impact on the ability of the entire Sorich Park neighborhood to safely and efficiently evacuate in the event of a fire or earthquake.

There is only one way out and one into this neighborhood and adding 64 residential units at the end of the road will likely add well over 100 additional cars to this small area. The daily impact of this increase to traffic on a barely two-lane road out of the neighborhood is extremely detrimental. And worse yet, in the event of the need to evacuate, this would create a dangerous and potentially life-threatening situation.

The issues facing this specific development are the same ones aptly noted in the Planning Commission's own environmental impact report and appropriately raised by the commissioners at the December 12, 2022 meeting with staffers, which have not been properly studied and effectively addressed from a planning perspective. To move forward with development projects of this nature without proper planning due to pressure from the state is unnecessary, unacceptable, and shortsighted. We can and must do better.

It appears the proverbial cart is being put before the horse in this situation, and we submit that proper vetting of these issues has not occurred and thus necessitates disapproval of this development project by the Marin County Planning Commission at this juncture and ultimately by the Board of Supervisors. This is the time to do the right thing before a neighborhood is significantly impacted by irresponsible planning.

Sincerely,

Tara McGann & Alex Friedman  
Owners at 28 Oakland Ave  
San Anselmo

--

Tara McGann, PT, DPT, MFDc  
[tara.k.mcgann@gmail.com](mailto:tara.k.mcgann@gmail.com)  
(415) 694-9451