

Community Workshop on the Housing Element

May 10, 2014

Summary of Large Group Debrief

| What are your top three takeaways? | What did you discover about placing the homes? |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was insufficient information provided to make measured or thoughtful decisions. • One-line sentences were provided about each site, but the information was not clear. For example, at site #8 the map is not clear at all and the info states that it is zoned for 5 units, but it is unclear whether it will be rezoned. • It is unclear if the number of sites on the materials will remain the same if sites are included in the Housing Element. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimously agreed (one group member at table). |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We felt the exercise puts the cart before the horse. • We don't agree with the 185 units. • We don't have enough information on the sites, such as impacts on traffic, schools, water, etc. • Why were some of these sites picked? • Some sites have constraints. • The housing video made it seem like everyone has a right to live in Marin even if they can't afford it, but we don't agree with this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a hard-working group earnestly trying to do the exercise but found there was too little information. • We really respected and listened to each other carefully, and agreed on most things. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that we don't know enough about the sites. An example is Marinwood – there is something planned there, but there are toxic issues at that site. We don't know enough to make judgment about sites. • Let's separate "density" from "affordable"; high density is incentivized for developers. Let's incentivize opportunities to build affordable housing instead. • We received great useful information about housing and relevant legislation from staff today. • We haven't yet had an opportunity to just become more informed about the Housing Element, legislation, and housing issues in general, we need more opportunities for this. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent process. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was frustration among our group because we all felt that it is not our place to comment on sites that are not in our own community. • Each respective community should be involved in choosing sites in their | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a civil discussion and listened to one another. |

| What are your top three takeaways? | What did you discover about placing the homes? |
|---|---|
| <p>area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transparency is an issue because we were informed that there were no sites in my area (unincorporated Novato). • More discussion needs to take place because everyone has interest in learning more about housing related issues such as development along freeways and related air quality impacts that need to be addressed. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel that most of the locations we looked at were unable to handle low income housing because of limited access to transportation. • One group member felt that having input from the community is extremely valuable and acknowledges that this is a difficult job, but questioned whether this exercise is intended for the County to simply be able to say they've reached out to community and done their due diligence. • Housing numbers were handed out by ABAG, but the community should have local control over this. • We didn't like the housing video, and questioned the PowerPoint which listed many stats but did not provide sources for those figures to validate them. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We listened to each other, but one member left early in the workshop. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a very interesting discussion. • There are hidden costs to Marin taxpayers when people with special needs move out of Marin to other counties, in which case Marin has to pay costs for those moving to other counties, and these costs in turn impact our local tax bill. • We should be given alternatives rather than being presented with one plan, so that we can decide which is the best alternative based on all factors. • Before we get to point of approving sites, we should know what alternatives there are and what the relative cost to community is. • We believe that each community knows its own area best, and that a premium should be placed on local control rather than decisions made by those who live outside the area. • Therefore we could not place housing numbers on sites we're unfamiliar with. • We don't have all the information that County planners do to make informed decisions. • We are not presented with various potential impacts on different communities, such as sea level rise, schools, traffic, and social services, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We learned a lot, and hope everyone else did today. |

| What are your top three takeaways? | What did you discover about placing the homes? |
|---|---|
| <p>which all come at a social price.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need those facts to make a decision. • We currently have a 20% inclusionary requirement for new housing development, which shows we are already doing something about housing. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agreed on many things, one was that citizen participation is valuable if some identification is done to insure Marin residents [vs non-residents]. • We are not competent to comment on most of these areas and didn't comment on those which we have no knowledge of. • The ones we commented on had site specific constraints and should be removed from list. • A third party consultant ensures impartiality, but we didn't have that today. • A consultant is also meant to ensure that all individuals are heard, represented, and noticed about all meetings and draft proposals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had an exhausting but exhilarating conversation. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agreed on one issue: to preserve agricultural areas, ridgelines, and wetlands. • We reached no complete agreement but shared strongly held positions on the following: Tam Valley/Almonte sites are unsuitable for housing; sites adjacent to the freeway create air quality impacts for residents; we tend to exaggerate the negative impacts of lower income housing (such as traffic, water consumption and impact on local infrastructure). • There should be a focus on other options, such as 2nd units | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our process was better than expected given the diversity of opinion around the table. • We got stuck in disputes around facts that no one had documentation for. • It was a useful discussion. • Decided as a group that we didn't want to be confined by the exercise, and shared a reluctance to plan housing in areas where we don't live. • The sites the planners have presented are not the most suitable for housing. • Other alternatives to be considered are second units, and sites not close to the freeway because of air quality issues. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are not going to become San Francisco if preventable. • This process is set to confuse and deceive participants. • The housing allocations are developers' smoke screen to build high density profitable housing. • The information presented is inefficient and inaccurate. • Building high density housing in our community is inappropriate, we should instead be looking earnestly at 2nd units and smaller developments built by local property owners who can personally manage the sites. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We had a very passionate conversation with a high level of agreement. • The group isn't deceived and we became more empowered. • We came up with viable creative alternative solutions that should be considered. |