



**STAFF REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION
 MARIN COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE HEARING #1**

Item No: 5
 Workshop Date: July 28, 2014
 Planner: Leelee Thomas, Principal Planner
 Alisa Stevenson, Planner

- RECOMMENDATION:**
1. **Conduct public hearing; and**
 2. **Provide feedback to staff on policies and programs and identify sites to include in the Draft Housing Element.**

Purpose

The purpose of this hearing is to inform the Planning Commission about the Countywide Plan's Housing Element update, including feedback received from the public outreach process, and proposed policies, programs and housing sites. The Commission should consider the proposed Housing Element policies, programs and sites, and provide feedback within the context of achieving the Countywide Plan's housing goals of supporting a mix of housing types, densities, prices and designs.

Housing Element Update Schedule

The July 28, 2014 hearing is the first of three scheduled Planning Commission hearings on the Housing Element update. The focus of the first hearing will be on the available land inventory (sites list) and draft policies and programs. At the second hearing on August 25, 2014, the Planning Commission will continue review of the draft Housing Element in its entirety and consider submitting it to the State for review. At the third hearing on November 17, 2014, the Planning Commission will consider recommendation of the environmental review document and the draft Housing Element to the Board of Supervisors. The full 2014 schedule for completing the Housing Element update is as follows:

Event	Date/Timeframe
Initiate work on Housing Element	February
Board of Supervisors approve Work Plan	March 18
Stakeholder Meetings (2)	February – March
Meetings with Design Review Boards / Community Service Districts (4)	February – March
Meetings with other community organizations (4)	February – May
Community Workshops (5)	April - May
Housing Survey (online)	March – June
Affordable housing experts meeting	June
Planning Commission Hearing #1	July 28
Planning Commission Hearing #2	August 25
State review of draft Housing Element	September – November
Planning Commission Hearing #3	November 17
Board of Supervisors Hearing	December – January 2015 (tentative)
Submit Housing Element to State for certification	January 31, 2015

Housing Element Background

The State of California requires each city and county to adopt a General Plan containing at least seven chapters or elements, including one that addresses housing needs. Because housing availability is a critical issue with Statewide implications, State law requires that housing elements be updated every eight years. According to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), "Local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory schemes that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development." State policy acknowledges that most critical housing decisions occur at the local level, however housing elements must be reviewed and certified by HCD. This is unique to housing elements, whereas other sections of the general plan do not have to be reviewed by a State agency. Failure to receive State certification makes local governments ineligible to receive important sources of grant funding, and may expose the County to potential litigation.

State law requires that the Housing Element contain the following information:

- A review of the goals, objectives and policies of the existing Housing Element.
- Current demographic, economic and housing information for the locality.
- A quantified housing needs assessment.
- Analysis of the constraints to providing housing for all income levels.
- A discussion of opportunities for energy conservation in new housing developments.
- An inventory of assisted units at risk of conversion to market rate.
- An inventory of residential land resources, including suitable sites for housing, homeless shelters and transitional housing.
- Proposed housing goals, policies and programs.
- Quantified objectives for housing over the next five-year period.
- A description of diligent efforts toward participation by all economic groups in the update process.

The existing Marin County Housing Element addresses the period from 2007 through 2014. It was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 24, 2013 and then certified by HCD as complying with State law as of December 31, 2013.

Housing Element Public Outreach

CDA staff conducted extensive community outreach in early 2014 for the Housing Element update. The community engagement process was initiated with two small stakeholder meetings in late February and early March, followed by four meetings with local design review boards and community service districts, and four additional meetings with other community organizations. In April and May 2014, five interactive community workshops were held to present the Housing Element update process and gather input on sites from the community. A Housing Survey was available online between March and June 2014 to gather public opinions on housing needs in the unincorporated County. See Attachment 1 for a detailed report of the community outreach process.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a State-mandated process to distribute planning responsibility for housing needs throughout the State of California. The RHNA is established by allocating a specific number of housing units to each region in the State. The Bay Area's regional housing need is first allocated by HCD, and the distribution for each local jurisdiction is then finalized by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) through a committee comprised of local representatives from the affected communities. Unincorporated Marin County has been allocated 185 units for the 5th RHNA cycle of 2015-2023. This is a significant decrease from the previous planning period; the total has been reduced from the 773 units allocated for 2007-2014. This reduction is based on regional planning policies aimed at focusing growth in major urban employment centers in the Bay

Area that have access to fixed transit. Refer to Table 1 for a distribution of the RHNA for unincorporated Marin by income level. Attachment 2 provides further background on the RHNA methodology.

Table 1: Income Distribution of RHNA units (2015 - 2023) for unincorporated Marin County

Lower Income Categories			Subtotal Lower Income	Moderate Income	Above Moderate Income	Total
Extremely low Income	Very Low Income	Low Income				
27	28	32	87	37	61	185

The County is required to demonstrate the feasibility of developing the required lower income units by having a sufficient amount of land zoned at the default density of 30 units/acre to accommodate the RHNA. Feasibility is also demonstrated through the implementation of Housing Element goals, policies and programs intended to facilitate housing development at all income levels. Local governments are not required to construct the housing units allocated by the RHNA process, but rather to demonstrate that there is adequate opportunity for the units to be developed based on zoning and general plan regulations.

Housing Needs

A survey of Census data and local resources indicate that the total housing need in the unincorporated County is much greater than the 185 minimum RHNA requirement. Many residents of unincorporated Marin are living in unsustainable living situations, including those who are overpaying and those living in overcrowded conditions. According to housing standards established by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), households should pay no more than 30% of their income toward rent and utilities to have a sustainable living situation. According to Census data, more than 2,900 residents of the unincorporated County are lower income and currently paying more than 50% of their income toward rent. Census data also reflects that there are nearly 300 people in overcrowded living situations in the unincorporated area alone, and an estimated 1,600 disabled individuals who lack accessible affordable housing.

In addition to those paying more than they can afford for housing, the 2013 Point-in-Time Homeless Count documented that there are more than 900 people throughout Marin who are homeless, and more than 4,300 people who are at-risk of becoming homeless, many of whom are families with children.

Housing Element Land Inventory (2015-2023)

Housing Element statutes require the County to provide a land inventory of sites suitable for housing development that can accommodate Marin County’s short-term housing development objectives at all income levels, as determined by the RHNA for the period of January 2015 to January 2023.

To meet the required need for the unincorporated County, staff recommends focusing on 15 sites from the 2007-2014 Housing Element. This approach to meeting the County’s RHNA was included in the work program for the Housing Element update approved by the Board of Supervisors in March 2014. Because the RHNA requirement for 2015-2023 is significantly less than the previous cycle, not all of the 2007-2014 housing sites are needed to meet the current RHNA. With a RHNA of 185 units, there is flexibility to select sites from within this list. The Housing Element site inventory will only be identifying opportunities for housing development that already exist according to the Countywide Plan and zoning. Regardless of whether housing sites are included in the next Housing Element, they have potential to be developed subject to the County’s land use authority.

Housing Element law allows a portion of local jurisdiction's RHNA to be satisfied through second units projected to be built during the RHNA cycle. Based on past development patterns, the County projects that 5 new second units will be permitted on an annual basis from 2015 until 2023 (40 units total during the RHNA cycle). Based on the County's surveys of second unit affordability levels, 6% of the projected second units will be affordable to very low income households, 50% will be affordable to low income households, and 22% will be affordable to both moderate and above moderate income households respectively.

The unincorporated County's RHNA of 185 homes includes 61 market rate homes, 37 moderate income homes and 87 lower income homes. Staff recommends the site selection and unit distribution detailed in Table 2 to satisfy this requirement. Three alternatives to the staff recommendation are also presented for consideration in Attachment 4.

To address the need for above moderate income homes, staff has relied on sites where development is currently being pursued, as indicated by development proposals, prior entitlements, court decisions or active applications. The first three sites listed in Table 2 have been identified to meet the above moderate income housing need. To accommodate the housing need for moderate income households, staff has relied on small infill sites which, based on location, size and design, are more likely to produce rental housing or condominiums which would be more affordable at the moderate income level.

To meet the lower income housing need, staff has evaluated sites utilizing a set of criteria based on the feedback from the Community Workshops held in April and May 2014, as well as criteria developed through the Housing Element Taskforce for the 2007-2014 cycle. Nine housing sites identified for lower income housing in the 2007-2014 Housing Element have been evaluated and compared using four categories of criteria: Livability, Economic Feasibility, Geographic Equity and Environmental Constraints. Each of these four categories were weighted equally. The highest possible score was 20, for which a site would have a score of 5 in each category. The nine sites evaluated to accommodate lower income housing need included:

- 100 Marinwood Avenue, San Rafael (Marinwood Village)
- 2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, Fairfax (Oak Manor)
- Woodland Avenue at Auburn Street, San Rafael (California Park)
- Seminary Drive, Mill Valley (Golden Gate Seminary)
- 441 Drake Avenue, Marin City (Marin City CDC)
- 204 Flamingo Road, Mill Valley (Old Chevron)
- 217 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley (Armstrong)
- St. Vincent's Drive, San Rafael (St. Vincent's & Silveira)
- 150 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley (Manzanita Mixed-use)

Livability Criteria

The livability criteria focus on access to amenities and services. Locating homes in areas with a high livability score would have less impact than if the homes were developed farther from transit and services. This includes fewer vehicle miles travelled, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and greater convenience for residents. In addition, sites which score high in livability are likely to be more eligible for State funding sources, which prioritize housing located near services and transit. Livability criteria include the following five components:

1. Is the site within a ½ mile of a grocery store or farmers market?
2. Are accessible parks, open space or recreational facilities within a ½ mile?
3. Are transit services within a ½ mile of the site?

4. Is the site located in a walkable/bike-able area?
5. Are there opportunities for employment within 5 miles of the site?

Economic Feasibility Criteria

The economic feasibility criteria emphasize the feasibility of development of lower income housing. There is significant need for lower income housing in Marin and there are many challenges to developing housing for lower income households. According to non-profit housing providers, the most important factor in determining feasibility as it relates to construction and on-going operational costs is the number of units that can be developed on a site. Economic feasibility criteria include the following three components:

1. To meet operational cost efficiencies, is there potential to develop at least 25 units on the site?
2. Is the property likely to develop, as demonstrated by either the property owner pursuing development or the property being up for sale?
3. Is the zoning in place to meet State requirements for lower income housing?

Geographic Equity Criteria

The geographic equity criteria prioritize diversification of the housing stock. These criteria also respond to public input from the recent Housing Element community workshops, where it was frequently expressed that residents support providing housing at a mix of income levels, and that all of the County's lower income housing should not be concentrated in any one specific neighborhood. This also supports County goals of diversifying housing stock as articulated in Countywide Plan policy CD-2.1: *Provide a mix of housing*; and Program 16 of the County's Implementation Plan of the Analysis to Impediments to Fair Housing Choice: *Encourage and facilitate the development of more subsidized and affordable housing for families with children outside areas of minority concentration*. Geographic equity criteria included the following two components:

1. Is the site within 1 mile of other Housing Element sites?
2. Is the site located within a mile of existing affordable homes?

The locations of the three lower income sites listed in Table 2 meet or exceed the above criteria while achieving consistency with the focused growth strategy of the Countywide Plan.

Environmental Constraints Criteria

The environmental constraints criteria consider whether there are known environmental constraints on the site. These criteria were highlighted in public discussions as an important issue to consider during the Housing Element Community Workshops. The data comes from the Marin County Housing Element Supplement Environmental Impact Report and the Housing Element Task Force. Environmental constraints criteria included the following five components:

1. Is the average slope less than 15%?
2. Are there documented streams and/or wetlands on the site?
3. Are there known hazards on the site, such as flooding or contamination?
4. Are there sensitive species or habitats documented on the site?
5. Would the air quality contribute to documented significant health risks?

Sites Recommendation

The housing sites from the 2007-2014 Housing Element have been certified by the State, have been widely circulated and discussed by the public within the last year, and reviewed for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). With a minimum RHNA requirement of 185 units, there is flexibility to select sites from within this previously certified list. In other words, all of the sites listed in the recently certified Housing Element are not necessary to meet the minimum requirement for the current Housing Element. Staff recommends the site selection and unit distribution detailed in Table 2, which utilized the site evaluation criteria to assess and compare sites considering a variety of priorities and objectives, as well as input from public workshops. The evaluation criteria were used to evaluate the lower income housing sites. The evaluation compared these sites in the four criteria categories discussed above and rated them against each other.

The unincorporated area of the County has few remaining options for developable parcels, especially for multifamily housing. Most sites are small and have significant constraints. Based on the limited availability of developable sites, creating an inventory of housing sites for RHNA purposes that most people would agree meet all of the criteria described above is unachievable. However, within this context, the proposed sites score well on balance in livability, are more economically feasible, provide a housing balance geographically, and have fewer environmental constraints. The staff recommendation in Table 2 includes the three lower income housing sites that rated highest compared to the others, as well as sites to meet the housing needs for above moderate and moderate income households.

Table 2: Housing Element Sites 2015-2023: Staff Recommendation

Sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	Lower Income Units (subtotal)	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units
Paradise Drive, Tiburon <i>(Easton Point)</i>			43
12 Tamarin Lane, Novato <i>(Tamarin Lane)</i>			3
1970 Indian Valley Road, Novato <i>(Indian Valley)</i>			5
150 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley <i>(Manzanita Mixed-use)</i>		3	
217 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley <i>(Armstrong)</i>		10	
2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, Fairfax <i>(Oak Manor)</i>		10	
204 Flamingo Road, Mill Valley <i>(Old Chevron)</i>		10	
Seminary Drive, Mill Valley <i>(Golden Gate Seminary)</i>	40		
100 Marinwood Ave, San Rafael <i>(Marinwood Village)</i>	72		10
Woodland at Auburn, San Rafael <i>(California Park)</i>	40		
Second units*	21	10	9
TOTAL units allocated	173	43	70
<i>RHNA minimum requirement for 2015-2023</i>	87	37	61
<i>Units allocated above RHNA requirement</i>	86	6	9

Staff's recommendation includes additional lower income units above the County's required RHNA. This is because local jurisdictions are required by State law to ensure that the housing element land inventory can accommodate its RHNA through the end of the planning period (Government Code Section 65863). If the inventory only identifies enough units to meet the RHNA and one of the sites is developed with fewer units than the number in the inventory, then it creates a gap or deficit. Alternatively, the purchase of a site to preserve it from development completely would also create a deficit. State law requires the housing element inventory to make up for that lost unit potential if one or both of the above scenarios should occur before the housing element cycle expires. To make up for such a deficit, the County would need to repeat the process of identifying new sites to add to the inventory, followed by the entire review and certification process necessary to amend the housing element prior to the normal update deadline. By identifying more units than the required RHNA, the County would have the flexibility to accommodate such potential changes in the future without the need to amend the housing element later in the planning cycle.

Site Alternatives

Staff has also provided three additional site selection alternatives for consideration, which are included in Attachment 4. Alternative 1 carries forward all of the sites from the 2007-2014 Inventory, except the site located at 650 North San Pedro Rd because it was purchased in March 2014 to preserve it from future development. Alternative 2 would meet the RHNA for unincorporated Marin and provide increased flexibility beyond the staff recommendation by allocating the maximum possible units to the highest scoring sites with low income housing potential. Alternative 3 would meet the RHNA for unincorporated Marin assuming a reduced default density of 20 dwelling units per acre, and would be contingent upon adoption of proposed State legislation (Assembly Bill 1537) or State approval of a feasibility analysis for the 2015-2023 Housing Element.

Pending Legislation

A critical aspect of housing element legislation requires counties and cities to include an analysis of sites identified for housing. The sites must demonstrate density standards that can accommodate the housing need for all income levels, including for lower-income households. The sites must also demonstrate a feasibility to develop during the planning period. This latter criterion can be difficult to satisfy in the unincorporated County.

In 2003, the State established specific "default densities" for cities and counties to provide a proxy for affordability and for determining development feasibility for lower income housing. The default density for the unincorporated County is currently 30 units per acre. The County was assigned this density because it is located within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) with a combined population of more than 2 million that also includes San Francisco and San Mateo counties and has a jurisdictional population of over 50,000 (the population of the unincorporated county is currently 67,427).

During the recent Housing Element update for the 2007-2014 cycle, the County's metropolitan classification generated significant public discussion centered on the concern that the prescribed default density may lead to future housing developments that are out of character with a suburban community like Marin and lower density development patterns that are typical of many single-family residential neighborhoods in the unincorporated County. In response to these concerns, and consistent with the County's support, Assembly Member Mark Levine introduced Assembly Bill 1537 to allow Marin County and its cities with a population over 50,000 to have their default density classifications changed from metropolitan to suburban. This is intended to help Marin maintain its character while accommodating a diverse workforce and population. If signed into law, this bill would reduce the default density for the 2015-2023 housing element from 30 units per acre to 20 for these jurisdictions.

The legislation is currently pending review and if passed by the State Legislature and signed by the Governor, would go into effect January 1, 2015. If the Bill continues to move forward, Alternative 3 would provide an option for housing site selection at the lower 20 units per acre density for the 2015-2023 Housing Element (see Attachment 4). This bill is expected to be acted on by the State Legislature in August 2014.

Feasibility Analysis

To meet the statutory requirement of providing housing sites and establishing feasibility for housing for lower income households, local governments may either use the default density described above or provide an analysis demonstrating how lower densities can accommodate and facilitate the RHNA for lower income households. The analysis would include factors such as market demand, financial feasibility, and history of development projects that provide housing for lower income households.

If AB 1537 is not signed into law, the County could pursue a feasibility analysis to seek approval for a density below the current 30 unit per acre default density. It is noted, however, that conditions in the unincorporated county have not changed significantly since the County submitted an analysis in 2009. Based on data from the County Assessor's records, housing costs in the unincorporated County remain higher than many Marin towns and cities, there is a limited number of multi-unit rentals, comparable developments are limited, and most zoning is low density.

Policies and Programs

The Housing Element contains a series of programmatic activities that are proposed to support Countywide Plan policy objectives as well as statutory requirements. Housing Element goals are organized into three categories: land use principles, supporting a mix of housing, and institutional capacity. Since the 2007-2014 Housing Element was recently certified in December 2013, staff proposes to carry forward the existing policies and many of the programs.

Since 2007 when the previous Housing Element cycle began, several programs have been implemented by adoption in the Development Code or other action. Portions of other programs have also been completed, eliminated, moved or clarified. Attachment 5 provides an evaluation of programs contained in the 2007-2014 Housing Element and notes the implementation status of each program.

Nine new proposed programs have been added to the draft Housing Element for 2015-2023. Three of these were originally included in the 2009 draft but later deleted from the final Housing Element and deferred for consideration in the 2015-2023 planning cycle due to feasibility within the Agency's work plan. The new programs are discussed below. Attachment 6 is a comprehensive list of all programs, with ~~strike through~~ and underline showing changes proposed to the 2007-2014 Housing Element programs.

Programs Deferred from the 2007-2014 Housing Element, Proposed for the 2015-2023 Housing Element:

Evaluate Multi-family Land Use Designations. Conduct a comprehensive analysis of multi-family land use to evaluate whether multi-family zoning is appropriately located. Possible outcomes of this analysis could include:

- a. Adjust zoning maps as appropriate and redistribute multi-family zoning to locations suitable for multi-family development.
- b. Avoid designating or rezoning multi-family residential land for other uses or to lower densities without rezoning equivalent land for higher density multi-family development.

- c. Identify sites for multi-family, mixed-use, affordable workforce, and special needs housing, when undertaking community planning and zoning processes.

[adapted from Countywide Plan Program CD-2.e, p. 3-21]

Discussion: The scarcity and locations of multifamily zoning in the unincorporated areas cause significant barriers to the feasibility of lower income housing development. Most existing multi-family parcels are already developed. A cursory review found that there are approximately 2,500 parcels in the unincorporated County with multi-family land use designations that allow a range of low to moderate residential densities. Of these, 290 parcels are vacant, and approximately 190 are zoned for duplexes (MF2, 1 to 4 units per acre). The remaining 100 parcels are designated between MF3 (2 to 10 units per acre) and MF4.5 (11 to 45 units per acre). Most of these parcels are zoned at the lowest end of the density range. Only 16 vacant MF parcels allow density up to 20 units per acre. Only 5 vacant MF parcels allow up to 30 units per acre, which is the current required default density for Housing Element sites in the unincorporated County. One vacant parcel allows 40 units per acre.

Additionally, the location of multifamily zoning is often on sites with sloped topography, sensitive habitat or species, and other development constraints. These conditions translate to high development costs, limited access to public transit and services, and limited potential to meet the housing needs of Marin's lower income residents and workforce. A comprehensive evaluation of multifamily zoning is necessary to study the possibility of relocating these zones to areas that may be better suited for their intended purpose.

Require Multifamily Residential Development in Multifamily Zones. Require multifamily development in multifamily zones, including R2, RMP, and RMPC. Prohibit the development of single-family dwellings in multi-family zones unless the Director finds that multifamily development is infeasible or impractical based on physical site constraints, environmental constraints or in the case of the loss of an existing home due to emergency or natural disaster.

Discussion: This program encourages efficient use of limited land resources and facilitates the potential for moderate and lower income housing. Staff anticipates this program will primarily affect development in R2 (duplex) districts. Currently, single-family dwellings are a permitted use in R2, and allowed with a Master Plan in RMP and RMPC districts. The Development Code land use tables would be amended to reflect that single-family dwellings would not be allowed in R2, RMP and RMPC districts unless special findings are made. Provisions to allow existing homes to be rebuilt if they were lost due to natural disaster would be included. Existing detached single-family homes could also be remodeled and expanded subject to meeting development standards. In addition, the analysis would address fee issues such as Road Impact, School, Fire and Water that would be required and may significantly increase the cost of development.

Study Residential Density Equivalents. Evaluate options for calculating density through adjusted density equivalents based on bedrooms count or square footage rather than total number of units. Such an amendment to the Development Code would encourage development of smaller units, which corresponds to the demographic trend of increasing numbers of small households.

- a. Conduct an analysis to determine the feasibility of a density equivalent program. Identify appropriate density equivalent strategies for implementation and determine the fiscal impacts.
- b. Analyze how such a program might interact with inclusionary requirements, parking standards, and density bonuses.

- c. If it is determined feasible and appropriate, consider amending the Development Code to calculate density through density equivalents.

Discussion: Through the Marin Housing Workbook, research was conducted on sample practices utilized in other jurisdictions identified as applicable to housing conditions in Marin. One such sample practice in Santa Barbara suggested an alternate way of calculating residential densities. In that jurisdiction, studio units have a density equivalent of 0.50 units; one bedroom units a density equivalent of 0.66 units; two bedroom units a density equivalent of 1.00 unit; and three or more bedroom units a density equivalent of 1.50 units. Staff would study how unit size could drive density calculations rather than unit counts. The impacts of changes to the current method of density calculation would be analyzed, such as zoning considerations, density bonuses per state law, calculation for additions, equity issues of smaller versus larger units and inclusionary implications.

New Programs

Expand the Scope of Project Review. Consider requiring a socioeconomic analysis (SEA) for larger developments of more than 10 units to assess the costs and benefits of the proposed project and its potential impact on the local economy.

Discussion: The purpose of the SEA would be to help policy-makers and the public better understand the potential social and economic costs and benefits related to implementation of specific development. Socio-economic analysis seeks to quantify to the extent possible the social, economic and human health costs and benefits of different potential development scenarios to support rational, transparent and consistent decisions regarding land use.

Build Support for Affordable Housing. Address community opposition to homes for moderate and lower income families through education and outreach. Consider:

- Providing more information in planning documents about standards for affordable housing
- Using visual simulations
- Conducting interactive public workshops
- Coordinating housing providers and supporters
- Co-sponsoring an event for affordable housing week such as a tour of existing affordable homes

Discussion: At a recent workshop held with housing providers and funders, one of the most predominant barriers identified was the lack of community support for providing homes for moderate and lower income families. To effectively encourage and facilitate housing for seniors, disabled individuals, local workforce and lower income families, it was suggested that the County work proactively with local communities to help build support through education and outreach.

Increase Tenants Protections. Explore providing rental protections. Consider an ordinance to address rental protection such as:

- Noticing of rental increases
- Relocation costs
- Just cause eviction
- Rent stabilization
- Rent control

Discussion: Rents have increased dramatically over the past two years, leaving many renters feeling vulnerable and at risk. Renters' rights advocates have requested that the County explore adding rental protections which could alleviate drastic rental increases and reduce displacement. The County would explore best practices and could hold a community forum to discuss rental protections and explore the feasibility of adding protections as outlined above.

Establish a Housing Equity Commission. Consider adding a Housing Equity Commission whose role would be to advise on how to respond to the broad range of housing needs in Marin County by supporting a mix of housing types, densities, prices and designs. The Commission would study best practices, and take action to develop support for housing for low and moderate income households in Marin.

Discussion: The Housing Equity Commission would: advise the Board of Supervisors with respect to the County's housing needs; make recommendations on housing policy and specific goals to meet the County's Housing needs; annually review the housing plans and budgets of County programs to ensure conformance with County housing policy; and work with diverse agencies involved with housing (such as Health and Human Services, Marin County Community Development Agency, and Marin Housing Authority) to insure coordination and the best use of limited resources. The Commission could also encourage public and private partnerships in promoting housing preservation and production.

Conduct Site Assessments on Housing Element Sites. The County will consider conducting a detailed biological site assessment of sites in the Housing Element used to accommodate the County's lower income RHNA to confirm the extent of, and to document site constraints. The site assessment would identify potential constraints including topography, the presence of agricultural resources and sensitive biological resources, including but not limited to wetlands, streams, special status species and sensitive habitats. The assessment would recommend buffers, mitigation measures or required setbacks, development timing, and other information, analysis, or modifications appropriate to protect the resource.

Discussion: Opportunity sites to accommodate the County's lower income RHNA are limited and development of lower income housing faces numerous barriers. This program is intended to provide additional information which could be used to identify any existing constraints on a site. The analysis could be used to reduce up front predevelopment costs and determine development feasibility for lower income housing.

Evaluate the Housing Overlay Designation. Analyze the Housing Overlay Designation (HOD) policy in the Countywide Plan for its effectiveness in encouraging the construction of housing for lower income workforce and special needs populations. Amend the Countywide Plan if it is determined that changes are necessary to make the program more effective.

- a. Amend Countywide Plan Policy CD-2.3 to remove the requirement that HOD sites shall not comply with the mixed-use criteria.

Discussion: The Housing Overlay Designation (HOD) policy was adopted as part of the Countywide Plan update in 2007 to encourage construction of housing for local workforce and special needs populations; however, in the past seven years there has been no construction on the HOD sites. Staff recommends an analysis be conducted to identify revisions to the HOD policy that could make it more effective. Examples of areas to analyze include the criteria used to evaluate potential HOD sites.

Under current policies, sites which are designated as both HOD and mixed-use are required to develop under the provisions of the HOD policy and not comply with the mixed-use policies which may require

housing to be included in new development. For example, on lots larger than 2 acres in size, the mixed-use policies require at least 50% of the new floor area shall be developed for new housing and on lots 2 acres and less in size; at least 25% of the new floor area shall be developed for new housing. Subprogram “a” above would apply this standard to HOD projects.

2007-2014 Housing Element Program Implementation

State density bonus law specifies that density bonus units shall be allowed over both the zoning and the General Plan land use designation. Where there is a discrepancy, the general plan density shall prevail. During the review of the 2007-2014 Housing Element, HCD staff questioned whether Countywide Plan (CWP) and Development Code policies related to State Density Bonus Law and housing opportunity sites are consistent with Government Code § 65915-65918. The following Housing Element program was added to the 2007-2014 Housing Element to address this concern and is scheduled for implementation with the adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element.

Program 1.q Clarify applicability of State Density Bonus. Evaluate policies in the Countywide Plan and Development Code for housing opportunity sites to ensure consistency with Government Code § 65915-65918. Amend the Countywide Plan and Development Code as appropriate.

Discussion: Countywide Plan Policy CD-2.3, Program CD-2.d and Figure 3-3 regarding the Housing Overlay Designation (HOD) state that housing units allowed through the HOD are inclusive of any applicable density bonus units. The HOD designation permits a specific number of units on the HOD sites identified in the Countywide Plan, and provides that development shall be at least 30 dwelling units an acre and is *inclusive of any density bonus units*. Specific sites could allow more units than the number of units recommended in the Countywide Plan if a density bonus is applied. However, once the cap of 658 units is reached the HOD would no longer be applicable. Three HOD sites are included in the site inventory of the 2007-2014 Housing Element: 100 Marinwood Ave, 2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, and Woodland Ave at Auburn St.

Recommendation: Amend the language in Countywide Plan Figure 3-3 to reflect that the 658 total potential units are inclusive of any applicable density bonus units. See proposed change to Figure 3-3 on the following page.

Figure 3-3 HOD Unit Allocations by Traffic Impact Areas

Traffic Impact Areas as Determined by Screenlines and HOD Site Criteria (See Map 3-2c)	HOD Unit Potential for Traffic Impact Areas (Including Density Bonus Units)	Suggested Qualifying Sites Within Traffic Impact Areas
Screenline 7:	Up to 110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Marinwood Shopping Center (50 to 100 units) ◆ Idylberry School (up to 10 units) ◆ Other qualifying sites
Screenline 8:	Up to 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Gallinas Elementary School ◆ Other qualifying sites
Screenline 23:	Up to 88	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ College of Marin (up to 25 units – limited to student or workforce employees of the College) ◆ Marin General Hospital (up to 50 total units if associated with reconstruction or reuse, of which up to 25 units must be designated senior housing and up to 25 units designated for affordable, workforce employees, or special needs housing) ◆ Toussin (up to 13 units) ◆ Other qualifying sites
Screenline 22:	Up to 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Oak Manor ◆ Other qualifying sites
Screenline 13:	Up to 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ California Park (San Rafael) ◆ Other qualifying sites
Screenline 17:	Up to 100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Strawberry Shopping Center ◆ Other qualifying sites
Screenline 19:	Up to 50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Fireside Motel
Screenline 21:	Up to 150	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Marin City Shopping Center ◆ Other qualifying sites
	Up to 583	Units on named HOD sites
	Total: Up to 658	Total Potential HOD Units including Density Bonus Units

CD-2.d Implement the Housing Overlay Designation Program. The reviewing authority may allocate HOD units to suggested qualifying sites or other qualifying sites within Traffic Impact Areas shown on Map 3-2c up to a total of 658 units, including any applicable density bonus units. Housing Overlay units within identified Traffic Screenlines may be allocated to suggested HOD sites listed in Figure 3-3 if the HOD project meets the following standards:

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing, consider public comment, and continue the hearing to August 25, 2014, on which date the Commission should recommend submittal of the Draft Housing Element for 2015-2023 to the State Department of Housing and Community Development for review.

Attachments:

1. Report on Community Outreach
2. Regional Housing Needs Allocation
3. Site Evaluation Criteria
4. Site Alternatives
5. Evaluation of 2007-2014 Housing Element Programs
6. Draft Housing Element Programs
7. Administrative Record (comments received)

The staff report and attachments are available online at: www.marincounty.org/HousingElement and www.marincounty.org/PlanningCommission.

A copy of the staff report is also available for public review at the Community Development Agency, Planning Division, from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm, Monday-Thursday (closed Fridays).

Attachment 1:
Housing Element Community Engagement
Summary Report
July 2014

Executive Summary

Five community workshops were held during evenings and weekends in different parts of the County to provide an update on the Housing Element and to discuss locations for future housing growth in the unincorporated area of Marin. The format of the workshops was intended to provide a hands-on method for the community to be actively involved in the process of selecting sites for the next Housing Element. It allowed community members the opportunity to share meaningful input about the specific sites being considered.

A major focus of the community workshops was to provide a venue for community members to share different perspectives on housing. From this perspective the workshops were extremely successful. Overwhelmingly, participants agreed that their small group discussions facilitated by a volunteer were engaging, constructive and civil. Many groups found that they could have respectful conversations even when there was a range of diverse opinions.

However, as discussed in more detail below, many participants felt that they did not have enough information about the specific sites and potential impacts to make an informed recommendation, and some distrusted the process.

Background

The State of California requires each county, city and town to adopt a General Plan containing at least seven chapters, or elements, including one on housing. Because housing availability is a critical issue with statewide implications, the law requires that housing elements be regularly updated. State policy acknowledges that most critical housing decisions occur at the local level. However, State law calls for housing elements, unlike other sections of the general plan, to be reviewed and certified by the State. Failure to receive State certification makes local governments ineligible to receive important sources of grant funding, and may expose the County to potential litigation. More information on the housing element update is available at www.marincounty.org/housingelement.

State law requires that the Housing Element contain the following information:

- A quantified housing needs assessment, including current demographic, economic and housing information for the locality.
- Analysis of the constraints to providing housing for all income levels.
- Proposed housing goals, policies and programs.
- An inventory of residential land including suitable sites for housing, homeless shelters and transitional housing.
- A description of diligent efforts towards participation by all economic groups in the update process.

Housing issues affect the entire community, including residents, employers, employees and the public and private sectors. The public participation requirement of housing element law¹ presents an opportunity to engage constituents in a dialogue. Successful public participation is important because a diverse cross section of the population can be engaged in defining the housing problem and in crafting community sensitive solutions.

The County initiated public engagement in February of 2014 with stakeholders meetings to gather advice on effective outreach, and followed this with a range of methods to involve the public, as described below. A Board of Supervisors Hearing was held in March to review the work plan for completing the Housing Element and to provide an overview of the public outreach plan.

1. **Stakeholders Meetings:** Two meetings were held with members of the public who had been very engaged in the previous housing element to seek input on ways to engage the public. Recommendations from these meetings helped guide the County's outreach and structure the community workshops. Many of their ideas were included, for example it was suggested that the County seek advice from the community, hold evening and weekend meetings, advertise in the Marin Independent Journal, and share stories from the community about housing in Marin.
2. **Design Review Boards, Community Service Districts and Community Organizations:** The Stakeholder meetings were followed by a series of meetings with local design review boards, community service districts and community organizations, where staff shared information on the housing element update, timeline and schedule and gathered suggestions on reaching residents of specific communities.
3. **Surveys:** The County launched the 2014 Marin Housing Survey online from late February through June 1. The Survey asked participants about their personal housing situation and needs, and what type of housing they would like to see in unincorporated Marin in the future. There were 579 community members that participated in the Survey and shared their perspectives.
4. **Experts Meeting:** Staff held a meeting with invited housing experts and providers to discuss barriers, challenges, and solutions to constraints that provide affordable homes for lower income households.
5. **Community Workshops:** The County held five community workshops during evenings and weekends in various locations throughout the County which are described in detail below.
6. **Planning Commission Hearings:** Following the workshops, staff began work on the draft housing element, which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at hearings later this summer. The public has the opportunity to provide feedback, comments and address concerns during the hearings, both in person or in writing.
7. **Board of Supervisors Hearings:** The Board of Supervisors will review the draft Housing Element at hearings in the winter of 2014-2015. These hearings will have the same format as the Planning Commission, where the public will have the opportunity to provide feedback, comments and address concerns during the hearings, both in person or in writing.

¹ Government Code 65583(c)(7) "The local government shall make a diligent effort to achieve public participation of all economic segments of the community in the development of the housing element, and the program shall describe this effort."

Community Workshop Overview

The Community Workshops were a different kind of public meeting than those typically held by the County; they were structured to have community members play active roles. The goals for the workshop were for participants to:

- Sit in the seat of a County decision-maker.
- Listen and share perspectives on housing, including discussing possible housing site.
- Receive an update about the Housing Element.

Staff began with an overview of the housing element and a short video on the need for housing, which was produced by the County to illustrate local needs for housing from the perspective of different community members. Following this, participants asked clarifying questions and then worked in small groups to share their ideas about housing. Participants were asked to be part of a creative process to identify sites where they thought future housing should be located. There were strong feelings on both sides of the issue, and the exercise gave participants a place to share those perspectives with fellow community members in the context of discussing the future of housing in unincorporated Marin.

Planning Exercise

The purpose of the exercise was twofold: for community members to share different perspectives about housing in Marin; and to collaborate in identifying locations for at least 185 homes in unincorporated Marin County. As part of the design of the exercise, staff held 4 test runs, which resulted in refining, improving, and simplifying based on feedback received. Volunteers who had received professional facilitation training helped guide the process during the exercise. These small group facilitators were there to encourage the dialogue and to insure everyone had a voice.

Materials

Workshop materials included:

- An instruction sheet explaining the exercise.
- A scenario card to record the group's recommendation on locating housing.
- A large table-sized map with the locations of the 15 sites under consideration.
- Location fact sheets (a one page description of key elements of each site).
- A sheet with information on the housing requirement for each city and town in Marin.
- Information on income levels in Marin.
- A sheet with sample photos of housing at different income levels in Marin.

Methodology

The planning exercise asked participants to use their collective knowledge to identify, among 15 sites evaluated in the previous housing element, which are best suited to accommodate our community's need for a minimum of 185 homes for this planning period. The participants nominated a Recorder to take notes and record the group's discussion and takeaways. Another participant used a Scenario Card to keep a running tally of the homes that were placed on the map. The groups had approximately 45 minutes for the planning exercise, followed by 15 minutes to debrief with their table. Finally, the Recorders shared their small group's takeaways with all the workshop participants, and staff typed these up on a screen so that participants could see their comments recorded.

Community Workshop Outcomes

Approximately 180 people attended the five Workshops. Although extensive outreach was done, attendance was much less than anticipated. The attendance ranged from the smallest at the Marin City Senior Center of about 20, to the largest of about 60 at the Mill Valley Community Center. A core group of about 5-8 attended multiple workshops.

There were a collective total of 32 small table groups at all five Workshops, ranging in size from one to eight members each. Of all groups, 14 groups (44% of the total) completed and turned in Scenario Cards to reflect their recommendations for placing homes. Three of these groups intentionally placed no homes, while the remaining 11 recommended a diverse range of housing types and locations.

Of the groups that made recommendations, the following sites were most frequently recommended for future housing: Marinwood Plaza, Oak Manor, California Park, St. Vincent's/Silveira, Easton Point, Golden Gate Seminary, and Marin City CDC.

However, the specific recommendations for the number of homes in each income category that should be placed at each site were inconsistent among the groups. This limited and varied input makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the broader community's perspectives on future housing locations, types and numbers.

Feedback from Community Workshop participants

Participants were offered a variety of ways to provide feedback, including a debrief to the large group, notes from the small groups, and an evaluation form. This information is all available on the County's website at www.marincounty.org/housingelement. To summarize the input received, the themes within the feedback have been identified here.

At the first workshop held at the Marin City Senior Center, groups worked effectively together and felt that they had constructive and fruitful conversations about housing issues. Others had engaging conversations, learned about perspectives and histories, and talked about possibilities. By focusing on issues, the group was able to reach consensus and make progress through the exercise. Some participants felt that the County had not adequately represented the actual need for housing in Marin, especially for extremely low income households. They were concerned that the 185 homes required by the State was not sufficient to address the real needs of lower income residents and the local workforce. In addition, there was some frustration because participants wanted to see how and when homes would be built on the possible sites rather than simply planned for as required by State law. There was a common misunderstanding among participants who expected that the workshop would only focus on housing in Marin City.

The second workshop was held at the Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Marin in San Rafael. There was a diverse range of opinions and positions represented in the small groups. One group focused on logic and was able to compromise. Many groups were able to reach consensus, and people felt heard, even when participants disagreed. Some participants found the video portraying some of the needs for housing in Marin off-putting and subjective. Many felt that more information was needed on the sites and that there should be coordination between the County, cities and towns to consider holistic impacts of housing plans.

At the third workshop at Albert J. Boro (Pickleweed) Community Center in San Rafael, some participants found the exercise helped them understand why it is hard to make decisions about housing issues, and they needed more time to build trust and consensus in their groups. All felt that there was a variety of opinions and views shared. Some found it confusing and felt they were not informed enough to make recommendations. The dialogue was inspiring for some and challenging for others.

The fourth workshop was held at the Mill Valley Community Center. Overall the groups shared that they had active engaging conversations, strong-willed exchanges, and lively back and forth discussions. Overall, people listened to the varied perspectives at the table. One group felt the process was excellent and everyone had a lot to contribute. However, some group members shared that their opinions were not included in the large group debrief because they disagreed with the Reporter for their

group. Many participants expressed that the sites in Tam Valley should be removed from consideration and felt that there was not enough information on the other sites to make recommendations. They shared that the process was disingenuous and they felt pressured to make recommendations.

The fifth and final workshop was held at the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Tiburon. Groups felt that they had exciting; exhilarating conversations and that they really respected and listened to each other carefully. Many felt that they had civil discussions and that they agreed on most things, as most participants shared similar opinions. Some participants felt that there was not enough information on the sites to make recommendations and that it was not appropriate to comment on sites that are not in one's own community. Some participants thought alternatives to planning for housing should be explored and that an analysis should be conducted on the costs to communities if housing is developed on housing element sites.

Overall, participants in all workshops reported that they appreciated the opportunity to sit down and discuss their perspectives with fellow community members. Small group dialogs were considered worthwhile, informative, and even enjoyable in many cases. While many participants did not agree with the particulars of the planning exercise, it did not impede the crucial goal of eliciting thoughtful feedback from the community about the future of housing in unincorporated Marin.

2014 Marin Housing Survey

The 2014 Marin Housing Survey was open for public participation from late February through June 1. A total of 579 responses were received, of which 569 were submitted online through Open Marin (the County's online civic engagement forum) and 10 were received in the mail. The Survey asked participants to answer 13 questions about their own housing situation and needs, and about the housing needs of the greater community of unincorporated Marin.

The majority of responses indicate that housing costs and a lack of affordable housing opportunities are the most significant housing concern in Marin. Participants indicated that more affordable housing in the form of rentals, single-family homes for sale, and senior housing is the most needed type of housing. Over half of all participants reported that they are currently paying more than 30% of their income toward housing costs. However, more than 60% of respondents stated they have no plans to move from their current residence. Of those who do have plans to move, 28% said their reason for moving is the cost of their rent or house payment, and 37% stated they will be looking for a new home outside of Marin County.

While the majority of respondents agreed on the need for affordable housing options, there was less consensus about where such housing should be located and what form it should take. The majority stood at 35%, who said that they would prefer either multi-family housing in centralized locations or mixed-use housing in specific areas of unincorporated Marin. This was followed by 27% who preferred that single-family homes be built on vacant and under-utilized land.

Next Steps in the Housing Element Process

The community workshops were one of many ways the public can share thoughts and feedback on how the unincorporated County can best meet our housing needs. After the workshop, there are a numerous ways to continue to share input:

- Write an e-mail or letter
- Planning Commission hearings (summer 2014)
- Board of Supervisors hearings (late fall – early winter 2014)
- For more information, visit the website at www.marincounty.org/housingelement
- Contact staff at housingelement@marincounty.org

Background Materials:

The following additional background materials are available online at

www.marincounty.org/housingelement

- Stakeholders meetings, Design Review Boards, Community meetings.
- Housing Element Frequently Asked Questions
- Workshop materials
- Large group debriefs
- Evaluations and feedback
- Summary of public outreach
- 2014 Housing Survey and summary of results

**Attachment 2:
Regional Housing Needs Allocation**

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a State-mandated process which distributes responsibility for housing needs throughout the State of California. The RHNA is established by allocating a specific number of housing units to each region in the State. The Bay Area's regional housing need is first allocated by the California State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and the distribution for each local jurisdiction is then finalized by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) through a committee comprised of local representatives from the affected communities. Unincorporated Marin County has been allocated 185 units for the 5th RHNA cycle of 2015-2023.

Each jurisdiction in the Bay Area region (101 cities, 9 counties) has been allocated a share of the anticipated regional housing need (187,990 total units) across a range of income levels. According to ABAG, the regional housing need is determined by estimating both the existing need and the projected need for housing. Existing need is the amount of housing needed to address existing overcrowding or low vacancy rates. Projected need relates to housing needed for the growing population. This determination is based on population projections provided by the California Department of Finance (DOF), which also take into account the uncertainty regarding the economy and regional housing markets. For this RHNA cycle, HCD made an adjustment to account for abnormally high vacancies and unique market conditions due to prolonged recessionary conditions, high unemployment, and unprecedented foreclosure rates. As a result, the Regional Housing Need Determination (RHND) from HCD for this RHNA cycle is lower than the RHND for 2007-2014.

ABAG adopted the allocation methodology based on objectives developed to meet the overlapping goals of Senate Bill 375 (the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008) and Housing Element Law. These objectives include increasing the supply, diversity and affordability of housing; promoting infill development and a more efficient land use pattern; promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing; protecting environmental resources; and promoting socioeconomic equity.

Marin County Final Regional Housing Need Allocation (2014-2022)

	Very Low 0-50%	Low 51-80%	Moderate 81-120%	Above Moderate 120%+	Total
Belvedere	4	3	4	5	16
Corte Madera	22	13	13	24	72
Fairfax	16	11	11	23	61
Larkspur	40	20	21	51	132
Mill Valley	41	24	26	38	129
Novato	111	65	72	167	415
Ross	6	4	4	4	18
San Anselmo	33	17	19	37	106
San Rafael	240	148	181	438	1,007
Sausalito	26	14	16	23	79
Tiburon	24	16	19	19	78
Unincorporated County	55	32	37	61	185
Total	618	367	423	890	2,298

Attachment 3: Site Evaluation Criteria

SITES:		100 Marinwood Ave San Rafael (Marinwood Plaza)	2400 SFD Blvd Fairfax (Oak Manor)	Woodland at Auburn San Rafael (California Park)	204 Flamingo Road Mill Valley (Old Chevron)	St. Vincent's Drive San Rafael (St. Vincent's/ Silveira)
Livability Criteria						
<i>Access to services and amenities</i>						
Grocery 1/2 mile	Full service grocery, farmers market	x		x		
Parks/Recreation 1/2 mile	Accessible parks or open space				x	
Transit services 1/2 mile	Proximity to bus service	x	x	x	x	
Walkability/Bikeability	Safety, ease and destinations	x	x	x		
Proximity to Employment	Likelihood of local employment: jobs within 5 mile radius of the site	x	x	x		x
<i>subtotal score for livability</i>		4	3	4	2	0
Economic Feasibility Criteria						
<i>Potential feasibility for lower income development</i>						
Operational cost efficiencies	Number of units and economies of scale of on-going management	x		x		x
Likelihood to develop 2014 - 2022	Property for sale or owner pursuing development	x		x	x	
Zoning in place for lower income	Zoning will accommodate 20-30 DUA	x	x	x	x	x
<i>subtotal score for economic feasibility</i>		5	1.6	5	3.4	3.4
Geographic Equity Criteria						
<i>Benefit to housing diversity</i>						
Proximity to proposed HE sites	No other Housing Element sites located within a 1 mile of the site?		x	x		
Proximity of affordable homes within the community	No other affordable housing sites located within a 1 mile of the site?	x		?		x
<i>subtotal score for geographic equity</i>		2.5	2.5	2.5	0	2.5
Environmental Constraints Criteria						
Slope (<15%)	Geography, ease of site design	x	x	x	x	x
Streams/Wetlands	Are there documented streams and/or wetlands on the site?	x	x	x	x	
Hazards	Are there known hazards on the site, such as flooding or contamination?					x
Sensitive species/habitat	Are there sensitive species or habitats documented on the site?	x	x	x	x	
Air Quality	Significant documented health risks?		x			
<i>subtotal score for environmental constraints</i>		3	4	3	3	2
TOTAL SCORE:		14.5	11.1	14.5	8.4	7.9

SITES:		Paradise Drive Tiburon (Easton Point)	12 Tamarin Lane Novato (Tamarin Lane)	1970 Indian Valley Rd Novato (Indian Valley)	150 Shoreline Hwy Mill Valley (Manzanita)	11101 State Route 1 Point Reyes Station (Grandi Building)
Livability Criteria						
<i>Access to services and amenities</i>						
Grocery 1/2 mile	Full service grocery, farmers market					x
Parks/Recreation 1/2 mile	Accessible parks or open space	x			x	x
Transit services 1/2 mile	Proximity to bus service				x	x
Walkability/Bikeability	Safety, ease and destinations					x
Proximity to Employment	Likelihood of local employment: jobs within 5 mile radius of the site					x
<i>subtotal score for livability</i>		1	0	0	2	5
Economic Feasibility Criteria						
<i>Potential feasibility for lower income development</i>						
Operational cost efficiencies	Number of units and economies of scale of on-going management	x				
Likelihood to develop 2014 - 2022	Property for sale or owner pursuing development		x	x		x
Zoning in place for lower income	Zoning will accommodate 20-30 DUA				x	
<i>subtotal score for economic feasibility</i>		1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Geographic Equity Criteria						
<i>Benefit to housing diversity</i>						
Proximity to proposed HE sites	No other Housing Element sites located within a 1 mile of the site?	x	x	x		x
Proximity of affordable homes within the community	No other affordable housing sites located within a 1 mile of the site?	x	x	x		
<i>subtotal score for geographic equity</i>		5	5	5	0	2.5
Environmental Constraints Criteria						
Slope (<15%)	Geography, ease of site design			x	x	x
Streams/Wetlands	Are there documented streams and/or wetlands on the site?	x	x		x	x
Hazards	Are there known hazards on the site, such as flooding or contamination?	x	x	x		
Sensitive species/habitat	Are there sensitive species or habitats documented on the site?		x	x	x	x
Air Quality	Significant documented health risks?	x	x	x	x	
<i>subtotal score for environmental constraints</i>		3	4	4	4	3
TOTAL SCORE:		10.6	10.6	10.6	7.6	12.1

	SITES:	Seminary Drive Mill Valley (Golden Gate Seminary)	441 Drake Ave Sausalito (Marin City CDC)	217 Shoreline Hwy Mill Valley (Armstrong Nursery)	Lucas Valley Rd San Rafael (Grady Ranch)	30 Roosevelt Ave San Rafael (Roosevelt)
Livability Criteria						
<i>Access to services and amenities</i>						
Grocery 1/2 mile	Full service grocery, farmers market					x
Parks/Recreation 1/2 mile	Accessible parks or open space		x	x	x	x
Transit services 1/2 mile	Proximity to bus service		x	x		x
Walkability/Bikeability	Safety, ease and destinations		x			x
Proximity to Employment	Likelihood of local employment: jobs within 5 mile radius of the site	x	x			x
<i>subtotal score for livability</i>		1	4	2	1	5
Economic Feasibility Criteria						
<i>Potential feasibility for lower income development</i>						
Operational cost efficiencies	Number of units and economies of scale of on-going management	x		x	x	
Likelihood to develop 2014 - 2022	Property for sale or owner pursuing development	x		x	x	
Zoning in place for lower income	Zoning will accommodate 20-30 DUA	x	x			
<i>subtotal score for economic feasibility</i>		5	1.6	3.4	3.4	0
Geographic Equity Criteria						
<i>Benefit to housing diversity</i>						
Proximity to proposed HE sites	No other Housing Element sites located within a 1 mile of the site?	x	x		x	x
Proximity of affordable homes within the community	No other affordable housing sites located within a 1 mile of the site?	x			x	
<i>subtotal score for geographic equity</i>		5	2.5	0	5	2.5
Environmental Constraints Criteria						
Slope (<15%)	Geography, ease of site design			x		x
Streams/Wetlands	Are there documented streams and/or wetlands on the site?	x				x
Hazards	Are there known hazards on the site, such as flooding or contamination?	x	x		x	x
Sensitive species/habitat	Are there sensitive species or habitats documented on the site?	x	x	x		x
Air Quality	Significant documented health risks?	x	x	x		x
<i>subtotal score for environmental constraints</i>		4	3	3	1	5
TOTAL SCORE:		15	11.1	8.4	10.4	12.5

**Attachment 4:
Housing Element (2015-2023)
Site Alternatives**

In addition to the recommended sites list, staff is providing three additional alternatives for consideration which are included in Attachment 4. Alternative 1 carries forward the sites from the 2007-2014 Housing Element Inventory, and provides the greatest flexibility of all proposed alternatives. Alternative 2 relies on the maximum potential at five sites to address the County's need for low income housing, and provides greater flexibility than the Staff Recommendation. Alternative 3 would meet the County's low income RHNA requirement assuming a reduced default density of 20 dwelling units per acre.

Alternative 1:

This option carries forward the site list from the 2007-2014 Housing Element, with minor modifications as follows: the site located at 650 North San Pedro Road in San Rafael has been removed from the list because the property was purchased in March 2014 to preserve it from future development; the number of units at 100 Marinwood Ave has been reduced to reflect the current application; the units allocated at 2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd and 204 Flamingo Road have been moved from the lower income category to the moderate income category to meet the current RHNA. This site list provides more sites than required to meet the total RHNA of 185 for unincorporated Marin; however, it does not represent an increase in the number of potential housing units currently allowed on these sites by the County's zoning and/or general plan. At this point we are only identifying opportunities that already exist. Regardless of whether these sites are included in the Housing Element, they have potential to be developed.

Alternative 1: Housing Element Sites 2015-2023

Sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	Lower Income Units (subtotal)	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units
100 Marinwood Ave, San Rafael (<i>Marinwood Village</i>)	72		10
2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, Fairfax (<i>Oak Manor</i>)		10	
Woodland at Auburn, San Rafael (<i>California Park</i>)	50		
204 Flamingo Road, Mill Valley (<i>Old Chevron</i>)		10	
St. Vincent's Drive, San Rafael (<i>St Vincent's/Silveira</i>)	100		121
Paradise Drive, Tiburon (<i>Easton Point</i>)			43
12 Tamarin Lane, Novato (<i>Tamarin Lane</i>)			3
1970 Indian Valley Road, Novato (<i>Indian Valley</i>)		2	3

150 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley (Manzanita Mixed-Use)	1	2	
11101 State Route 1, Point Reyes Station (Grandi Building)	2		
Seminary Drive, Mill Valley (Golden Gate Seminary)	25		20
441 Drake Ave, Sausalito (Marin City CDC)	15		15
217 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley (Armstrong)		10	
Lucas Valley Road, San Rafael (Grady Ranch)	240		
30 Roosevelt Street, San Rafael (Roosevelt)	2		
Second units	21	10	9
TOTAL units allocated	528	44	224
RHNA minimum requirement for 2015-2023	87	37	61
Units allocated above RHNA for 2015-2023	441	7	163

Alternative 2:

This alternative would meet the RHNA for unincorporated Marin and provide increased flexibility beyond the Staff Recommendation by allocating the maximum possible units to the highest scoring sites with low income housing potential.

Alternative 2: Housing Element Sites 2015-2023

Sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	Lower Income Units (subtotal)	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units
Paradise Drive, Tiburon (<i>Easton Point</i>)			43
12 Tamarin Lane, Novato (<i>Tamarin Lane</i>)			3
1970 Indian Valley Road, Novato (<i>Indian Valley</i>)			5
150 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley (<i>Manzanita Mixed-use</i>)		3	
204 Flamingo Road (<i>Old Chevron</i>)		10	
217 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley (<i>Armstrong</i>)		10	
2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, Fairfax (<i>Oak Manor</i>)	10		
441 Drake Avenue, Marin City (<i>Marin City CDC</i>)	15		
Seminary Drive, Mill Valley (<i>Golden Gate Seminary</i>)	60		
100 Marinwood Ave, San Rafael (<i>Marinwood Village</i>)	72	5	5
Woodland at Auburn, San Rafael (<i>California Park</i>)	50		
Second units*	21	10	9
TOTAL units allocated	228	38	65
RHNA minimum requirement for 2015-2023	87	37	61
Units allocated above RHNA for 2015-2023	141	1	4

Alternative 3:

Alternative 3 would meet the RHNA for unincorporated Marin assuming a reduced default density of 20 dwelling units per acre, and would be contingent upon adoption of proposed State legislation (Assembly Bill 1537) or State approval of a feasibility analysis for the 2015-2023 Housing Element.

Alternative 3: Housing Element Sites 2015-2023

Sites to accommodate the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)	Lower Income Units (subtotal)	Moderate Income Units	Above Moderate Income Units
Paradise Drive, Tiburon (Easton Point)			43
12 Tamarin Lane, Novato (Tamarin Lane)			3
1970 Indian Valley Road, Novato (Indian Valley)			5
150 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley (Manzanita Mixed-use)		3	
204 Flamingo Road (Old Chevron)		10	
217 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley (Armstrong)		10	
2400 Sir Francis Drake Blvd, Fairfax (Oak Manor)		10	
Seminary Drive, Mill Valley (Golden Gate Seminary)	40		
100 Marinwood Ave, San Rafael (Marinwood Village)	72		10
Woodland at Auburn, San Rafael (California Park)	36		
Second units*	21	10	9
TOTAL units allocated	171	43	70
RHNA minimum requirement for 2015-2023	87	37	61
Units allocated above RHNA for 2015-2023	84	6	9

**Attachment 5:
Appendix B: Evaluation of 2007-2014 Housing Element Programs**

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
Goal 1	Use Land Efficiently	On-going		Carry forward as is
Policy 1.1	Land Use			Carry forward as is
Policy 1.2	Housing Sites			Carry forward as is
Policy 1.3	Development Certainty			Carry forward as is
Policy 1.4	Design, Sustainability and Flexibility			Carry forward as is
1.a	Establish Minimum Densities on Housing Element Sites	Complete	Successfully implemented	Carry forward as is
1.b	Conduct a Comprehensive Affordable Housing Sites Inventory	Completed through the community Housing Element Taskforce. Over 35 sites evaluated for the multifamily housing at increased	Successfully implemented	Delete; successfully completed.
1.c	Establish an Affordable Housing Combined Zoning District	Complete. New AH coming district added to the CWP and Dev Code and 3new sites rezoned.	Successfully implemented	Delete; successfully completed.
1.d	Streamline the Review of Affordable Housing	Complete. Changes made to the Dev Code in 2010 and 2012	Successfully implemented	Delete because it was successfully completed.
1.e	Study Ministerial Review for Affordable Housing	Not yet implemented	Not implemented due to staffing resources because of delay in completing the Housing Element	Carry forward as is

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
1.f	Develop Multi-family Design Guidelines	Complete. Adopted by the BOS December 2013	Successfully implemented	Delete because it was successfully completed.
1.g	Undertake Adjustments to Second Unit Development Standards	Partially completed with the 2012 Dev Code changes	Partially implemented. Time and resources prevented completion	Carry forward with modifications to delete subprograms c and g because they are complete, and subprogram f because it was considered by the PC and not implemented.
1.h	Allow Rental of Detached Accessory Structures	Completed with 2012 Dev Code Amendments	Successfully implemented	Delete; successfully completed.
1.i	Review and Update Parking Standards	Not yet implemented	Not implemented due to staffing resources because of delay in completing the Housing Element	Carry forward as is
1.j	Zone and Provide Appropriate Standards for SRO Units	Complete with 2013 Dev Code Amendments	Successfully implemented	Delete; successfully completed.
1.k	Zone and Provide Appropriate Standards for Homeless Shelters	Complete with 2012 Dev Code Amendments	Successfully implemented	Delete; successfully completed.
1.l	Enable Transitional and Supportive Housing	Complete with 2012 Dev Code Amendments	Successfully implemented	Delete; successfully completed.
1.m	Codify Affordable Housing Incentives Identified in the Community Development Element	Partially completed with the 2012 Dev Code changes	Partially implemented with 2012 Dev Code changes, included in 22.24.020. Time and resources prevented completion	Carry forward with modifications. Delete subprograms "a" and "d" they were completed.
1.n	Promote Resource Conservation	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
1.o	Simplify Review of Residential Development Project in Planned Districts	Not yet implemented	Delay in implementation due to staffing and resources. Scheduled for implementation in FY 15/16.	Carry forward as is

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
1.p	Adjust Height Limits for Multi-family Residential Buildings	Partially implemented. Height limits established in conventional districts but not planned zoning districts.	Implementation in Planned Zoning Districts will be part of an extensive package of Development Code amendments.	Carry forward as is
1.q	Clarify Applicability of State Density Bonus	In process	Scheduled for implementation in 2014	Delete after it is successfully completed.
Goal 2	Meet Housing Needs Through a Variety of Housing Choices			Carry forward as is
Policy 2.1	Special Needs Groups			Carry forward as is
Policy 2.2	Housing Choice			Carry forward as is
Policy 2.3	Incentives for Affordable Housing			Carry forward as is
Policy 2.4	Protect Existing Housing			Carry forward as is
2.a	Encourage Housing for Special Needs Households	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.b	Enable Group Residential Care Facilities	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.c	Make Provisions for Multi-Family Housing Amenities	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.d	Foster Linkages to Health and Human Services Programs	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.e	Support Efforts to House the Homeless	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.f	Engage in a Countywide Effort to Address Homeless Needs	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
2.g	Ensure Reasonable Accommodation	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.h	Require Non-discrimination Clauses	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.i	Modify Development Code to Reflect Williamson Act	Complete	Complete with the 2014 Dev Code changes	Delete; successfully completed.
2.j	Promote the Development of Agricultural Worker Units in Agricultural Zones	Partially completed and on-going	Partially implemented with 2012 Dev Code changes and Marin Ag Housing Program to fund housing. Time and resources prevented completion other programs.	Carry forward with modifications. Delete subprogram e; successfully completed
2.k	Promote and Ensure Equal Housing Opportunity	Currently implementing.	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.l	Deter Housing Discrimination	Currently implementing	County partners w/ local nonprofits and advocacy groups on diversity and equal opportunity issues and works w/ CDBG Priority Setting Committee	Carry forward as is
2.m	Implement the Inclusionary Housing Policy	Currently implementing	On-going	Carry forward as is
2.n	Apply Long-Term Housing Affordability Controls	Currently implementing	On-going. The County requires long-term affordability restrictions on all inclusionary and funded units	Carry forward as is
2.o	Encourage Land Acquisition and Land Banking	Currently implementing	Limited success because of lack of available funding and limited developable land	Carry forward as is
2.p	Expedite Permit Processing of Affordable and Special Needs Housing Projects	Currently implementing	Limited success because of lack of affordable housing developments seeking permits	Carry forward as is
2.q	Consider CEQA Expedited Review	Currently implementing	Complete with the Housing Element SEIR	Delete as it was successfully completed.

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
2.r	Continue First Time Homebuyer Programs	Currently implementing	Limited success because of lack of available funding and limited developable land	Carry forward as is
2.s	Link Code Enforcement with Public Information Programs	Currently implementing	on-going	Carry forward as is
2.t	Assist in Maximizing Use of Rehabilitation Programs	Currently implementing	On-going. The County used Rehab funds for the Gates project which is bringing 38 houseboats for lower income households up to code.	Carry forward as is
2.u	Monitor Rental Housing Stock	Currently implementing	Ridgeway Apartments successfully converted to 100% affordable housing and all requirements met.	Carry forward with revision. Delete subprograms "c" and "d" and omit references to Ridgeway Apartments as the conversion had been finalized.
Goal 3	Ensure Leadership and Institutional Capacity			Carry forward as is
Policy 3.1	Coordination			Carry forward as is
Policy 3.2	Research, Monitoring and Evaluation			Carry forward as is
Policy 3.3	Funding			Carry forward as is
3.a	Explore Housing at the Civic Center	Complete.	Housing proposed by staff and considered and rejected by the Planning Commission.	Delete. Planning Commission opted not to pursue housing on the Civic Center campus.
3.b	Advance Organizational Effectiveness	Currently implementing	On-going. Staff has worked with other local governments and staff to address barriers to providing affordable homes in Marin	Carry forward as is

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
3.c	Provide and Promote Opportunities for Community Participation in Housing Issues	Currently implementing	On-going. Staff conducted an intensive outreach process to update the housing element, including hands-on interactive community workshops.	Carry forward as is
3.d	Perform Regional Transportation and Housing Activities	Currently implementing	On-going. Staff worked closely with Transportation Authority of Marin and will continue to look for opportunities to coordinate with regional transportation agencies.	Carry forward as is
3.e	Coordinate with Other Agencies	Partially implemented	No progress on subprogram "a" because of limited affordable developments. Subprogram b has been completed.	Carry forward with revisions, delete subprogram "b" because it was implemented.
3.f	Promote Countywide Collaboration on Housing	Not yet implemented	Not completed because of limited resources and delay in completing the 2007-2014 housing element.	Carry forward as is and explore having BOS take the initial lead on engaging with other local jurisdictions.
3.g	Preserve Existing Housing Stock	Partially implemented	Subprograms a currently being implemented and staff is working on preserving a mobile home park which is at risk of conversion. Subprograms b, c and d not yet implemented.	Carry forward as is
3.h	Monitor Inclusionary Housing Programs	Currently implementing	On-going.	Carry forward as is
3.i	Undertake Housing Element Monitoring, Evaluation and Revisions	Complete and on- going	Housing Element certified in December 2013. Annual reports have been submitted annually. Update in progress	Carry forward as is
3.j	Provide and Participate in Local Affordable Housing Training and Education	On-going	Staff regularly speaks about housing with community groups and stakeholders	Carry forward as is

2007-2014 Housing Element Program	Goal, Policy or Program Title	Achievements / Results <i>quantified if possible</i>	Evaluation Barriers to Implementation <i>Was it successful? Reasons why it was or was not implemented or not able to meet its objectives</i>	Recommendations for the Housing Element Update <i>Carry forward as is / carry forward with modifications (specify) or delete</i>
3.k	Update Affordable Housing Trust Fund Operating Procedures	Complete	Housing Trust fund operating procedures updated in 2009.	Delete as it was successfully completed in 2009 with update.
3.l	Provide Leadership to the Marin Workforce Housing Trust	On-going	Staff have represented the County on the Board and currently hold the position of Secretary of the Board	Carry forward as is
3.m	Assist with Local Funding for Affordable Housing	On-going	Staff regular coordinates with funders and continues to work with affordable housing providers, especially small local organizations in west Marin.	Carry forward as is
3.n	Raise Funds from a Variety of Sources	Partially implemented	Staff continues to monitor and collect inclusionary, impact and commercial impact fees but additional sources have not been explored.	Carry forward as is
3.o	Coordinate Among Project Funders	Complete and on-going	Regular funders collaborative meetings held	Carry forward as is
3.p	Utilize Federal Grants Division Funding	Complete and on-going	Regular funding NOFAS issued and funds allocated	Carry forward as is

Attachment 6:
Housing Element (2015-2013)
Goals, Policies and Programs

[Proposed changes to the 2007-2014 Housing Element shown in ~~strike through~~ and underline]

Housing Objectives

State law requires each jurisdiction to address how it will satisfy the objectives for new residential units as represented by the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Means of achieving the development of these units should be outlined through policies and programs in the Housing Element. The County's housing provision objectives are described in Figures IV-2 and IV-3.

Marin County's housing policies and programs have been revised to reflect the major themes identified through the County's community outreach process and a critical evaluation of the programs and policies from the 2003 Housing Element (found in Appendix B: Evaluation of 2003 Housing Element Programs). Implementing programs are grouped by the housing goals described below.

Goal 1 Use Land Efficiently

Use Marin's land efficiently to meet housing needs and implement smart and sustainable development principles.

Goal 2 Meet Housing Needs Through a Variety of Housing Choices

Respond to the broad range of housing needs in Marin County by supporting a mix of housing types, densities, prices, and designs.

Goal 3 Ensure Leadership and Institutional Capacity

Build and maintain local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments so as to respond to housing needs effectively over time.

~~In addition to public workshops, focus group discussions with stakeholders were conducted in the preparation of the Housing Element Update. Feedback received at the meetings (Appendix C), identified Policies are organized around three central ideas for facilitating development of housing affordable to lower income households in Marin:~~

- ~~Provide clear development standards and incentives for affordable housing developments to minimize risk to funders and developers.~~
- ~~Minimize discretionary review; streamline the permitting process.~~
- ~~Establish programs appropriate to various Marin locations (urban vs. rural) and be responsive to the local community.~~

~~These ideas have been carried through incorporated into the Housing Element update. For example, in direct response to input received from the development community and the housing advocacy community programs are included to build support for moderate and lower income housing. and to establish a sound affordable housing inventory criteria, a program is included in this Housing Element to facilitate and streamline the development of affordable housing to accommodate the County's low income housing needs and RHNA objectives (*1.d Streamline the Review of Affordable Housing*). Through implementation of this program, the Development Code was amended to establish the residential density for affordable projects at the high end of the Countywide Plan density range rather than the zoned density, and to eliminate for affordable projects the master plan, and precise development plan review requirements.~~

A summary list of programs, responsible entities, funding, and implementation timeframes are identified in Appendix G: Housing Element Program Implementation. Policies and programs from other elements of the Countywide Plan are displayed parenthetically in cases where they either demonstrate consistency with Housing Element programs, or are further implemented through the Housing Element. An evaluation and status update of programs from the 2007-2014 Housing Element is included in Appendix B.

Housing Goal 1: Use Land Efficiently

Use Marin's land efficiently to meet housing needs and to implement smart and sustainable development principles.

Policy 1.1 Land Use

Enact policies that encourage efficient land use regulations which foster a range of housing types in our community.

Policy 1.2 Housing Sites

Recognize developable land as a scarce community resource. Protect and strive to expand the supply and residential capacity of housing sites, particularly for lower income households.

Policy 1.3 Development Certainty

Promote development certainty and minimize discretionary review for affordable and special needs housing through amendments to the Development Code.

Policy 1.4 Design, Sustainability, and Flexibility

Enact programs that facilitate well designed, energy efficient development and flexibility of standards to encourage outstanding projects.

Implementing programs

1.a Establish Minimum Densities on Housing Element Sites. The County shall not approve development on sites identified in the Housing Element with fewer units than shown in the Site Inventory Analysis, unless physical or environmental constraints preclude development at the minimum density and the findings in Government Code Section 65863 can be made. If development on a site is to occur over time, the applicant must show that the proposed development does not prevent subsequent development of the site to the density shown in the Site Inventory Analysis. If a reduction in residential density for any parcel would render the sites inventory inadequate to accommodate the County's Regional Housing Need Allocation, the County must identify sufficient additional, adequate, and available sites with an equal or greater residential density in the jurisdiction so that there is no net loss of residential unit capacity.

1.b Conduct a Comprehensive Affordable Housing Sites Inventory⁴. ~~Involves the community in a planning exercise to designate appropriate sites for future housing by initiating a Housing Sites Inventory in preparation for the next Housing Element cycle. The process may include:~~

- ~~a. Convene a Housing Sites Inventory Taskforce representing a wide segment of the community, including affordable housing advocates, environmentalists, and people of a range of incomes, backgrounds, and geographic areas. The Taskforce should undertake a detailed planning exercise.~~

⁴ Completed by Housing Element Task Force and through Housing Element update.

- b. ~~The Taskforce should evaluate appropriate zoning, environmental and site characteristics, access to public services and amenities, potential environmental issues, and adjacent land uses.~~
- c. ~~Develop a sites inventory that will include enough sites to meet the projected housing needs of the community over the next two RHNA cycles.~~

1.c Establish an Affordable Housing Combining District.

- a. ~~Amend the Development Code to establish an affordable housing combining zoning district that increases residential density on certain sites specified in the housing element to 30 dwelling units per acre, in order to meet future RHNA need. Incentives are available consistent with Chapter 22.24.~~
- b. ~~Amend the Countywide Plan land use section to add a cross-reference to the combining district.~~

1.d Streamline the Review of Affordable Housing². Encourage the development of housing for low, very low and extremely low income households by making the review process more efficient and clarifying permitted density. Amend the Development Code to do the following:

- a. ~~Exempt deed-restricted housing developments that are affordable to extremely low, very low and low income households from the Master Plan and Precise Development Plan review and permit procedures. Qualifying projects are subject to design review and other state law requirements.~~
- b. ~~Allow the density of deed-restricted housing developments that are affordable to extremely low, very low or low income households to be established by the maximum Marin Countywide Plan density range in zones that allow residential uses, subject to all applicable Countywide Plan policies.~~

1.e Study Ministerial Review for Affordable Housing. Study the implications and opportunities for establishing a ministerial review process for affordable housing. A ministerial process could employ multi-family design guidelines and incorporate environmental protection measures consistent with the Countywide Plan. Upon completion of the study, either permit affordable housing projects ministerially or through a streamlined process of discretionary design review.

1.f Develop Multi-family Design Guidelines. Develop multi-family and residential mixed-use design guidelines to establish clear and comprehensive design recommendations for multi-family residential development in the unincorporated communities of Marin.

- a. ~~Multi-family design guidelines should emphasize essential principles of development, particularly site planning, preservation of natural features, resource conservation, compatibility with neighboring development, location of buildings in relationship to pedestrian paths and streets, landscaping, general building form, massing, and scale and standards which will increase the feasibility of housing affordable to lower income households.~~
- b. ~~Develop clear design criteria to help expedite the permit review process for developers, planners, and the public.~~
- c. ~~Develop standards to facilitate some ministerial permit review of multi-family, transitional, and supportive housing developments.~~
- d. ~~Allow duplexes through ministerial review within R2 and multi-family zones by applying streamlining thresholds, and apply similar design review triggers as single-family homes.~~

² Completed with 2012 Development Code amendments.

1.g Undertake Adjustments to Second Unit Development Standards³. Consistent with SB1866, continue to enable construction of well-designed second units in both new and existing residential neighborhoods as an important way to provide workforce and special needs housing. Also pursue the following:

- a. Consider amending Development Code Section 22.56.050.I to permitting larger sized second units of up to 1000 square feet to increase flexibility and to provide housing for families and for individuals in need of in-home care services. Consider deed restrictions on units larger than 750 square feet to preserve affordability.
- b. Reduce fees for second units in recognition of their small size and the low impact of second units. Pursue reductions in road impact and traffic fees, coastal permit fees, and design review fees.
- c. ~~Consider developing standards to allow the height limit for primary residences to be applied to second units that are located over detached garages.~~
- d.c. ~~Develop standards to allow flexibility of second unit parking requirements, such as off-site parking, and curb and shoulder parking along a property's frontage.~~
- e.d. ~~Consider adjustments in septic standards for second units.~~
- f. ~~Consider requiring Master Plans, Precise Development Plans and Coastal Permit applications that include development of 3 or more single family residences to include second units at an appropriate ratio, such as three primary residences to one second unit (3:1).~~
- g. ~~Amend the Development Code Section 22.32.140 G to insure consistency with State Law in all planning areas, and eliminate the prohibition in Bolinas related to water adequacy for primary units.~~
- e. Consider amending Development Code Section 22.56.050.A to remove the owner occupancy requirement for the primary residence.

1.h Allow Rental of Detached Accessory Structures⁴. ~~In order to encourage efficient land use in existing neighborhoods and to increase the stock of homes affordable to a range of incomes, allow long term rental of detached accessory structures.~~

1.i Review and Update Parking Standards. Analyze the parking needs of infill, transit-oriented, mixed-use, special needs, group homes, convalescent homes, multi-family, senior and affordable housing developments. In order to facilitate these housing types and to reduce vehicle dependence, amend Marin County Code Title 24 to reduce parking standards wherever appropriate. Possible amendments could include but are not limited to:

- Reduction of onsite vehicular ratios for multi-family housing;
- Allowance of tandem parking and other flexible solutions such as parking lifts;
- Allowance of off-site parking, such as on-street parking and use of public parking, to satisfy a portion of the parking needs for new housing units, particularly affordable units; and
- Establishment of parking standards for mixed-use developments such as shared parking.

1.j Zone and Provide Appropriate Standards for SRO Units. ~~Establish opportunities for development of SROs in appropriate locations as lower cost rental alternatives for one person and extremely low income households.~~

³Partially completed with 2012 Development Code amendments.

⁴Completed with 2012 Development Code amendments

- ~~a. Review and revise zoning regulations to identify Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units as a permitted residential use in multi-family and mixed-use areas.~~

~~**1.k Zone and Provide Appropriate Standards for Homeless Shelters**⁵. Consistent with SB 2, amend the Development Code to allow the development of Homeless Shelters as a permitted, non-conditional (permitted) use in Commercial Planned (CP) and Retail Business (C1) districts. This amendment will ensure that emergency shelters are subject to the same development standards as other residential and commercial uses within the same zone. Establish appropriate parking, development, and management standards.~~

~~**1.l Enable Update definitions of Transitional and Supportive Housing**⁶. Consistent with AB 745, update the Add to the Development Code definitions of transitional housing and supportive housing as a residential use to further simplify existing practice, clarify the zoning code, and aid in the development of design guidelines. These definitions can be found within this Housing Element update in Section IV: Sites Analysis.~~

~~**1.m Codify Affordable Housing Incentives Identified in the Community Development Element**⁷. Amend County Code to implement the provisions of the Countywide Plan by codifying certain affordable housing incentives. These should include:~~

- ~~a. Allow additional units of senior housing on a Housing Overlay Designation (HOD) site if the units are affordable to low and very low income households, and if the projected peak hour traffic impacts of the total project fall within the maximum peak hour traffic level permissible on the site. (CD-2.d.7)~~
- ~~b.a. _____ Adjust parking requirements for senior and affordable housing using criteria established in the URBEMIS model to encourage transit-oriented development. (CD-2.d.8)~~
- ~~c.b. _____ Exempt affordable housing projects and second units from paying the full cost of impact fees. (CD-5.j)~~
- ~~d. Allow housing for low and very low income households to exceed the FAR on mixed-use sites. Allow moderate income housing to exceed the FAR on mixed-use sites within areas of acceptable levels of traffic service. (CD-8.7.5)~~
- ~~e.c. _____ Identify incentives to strongly encourage residential and mixed-use development in commercial zoning districts. (DES-2.c)~~
- ~~f. For affordable housing projects, mixed-use projects that include affordable housing, second units, and projects developed in accordance with the Housing Overlay Designation, allow densities above the low end of the range in areas with LOS D, E and F: In accordance with the Countywide Plan Policy CD-8.7, residential units on mixed use sites in the Tamalpais Area Community Plan area shall be restricted to 100 residential units, including any applicable density bonus. Such units are not subject to the FAR exemption described in CD-8.7 (5).~~

~~**1.n Promote Resource Conservation**⁸. (EN-1.b-f, EN-3.a, EN-3.e-i and EN-3.k) Continue to promote development and construction standards for new and rehabilitated dwellings that encourage resource conservation through materials selection, water conservation, community design, energy efficiency, and the use of renewable energy through the following:~~

⁵ Completed with 2012 Development Code amendments

⁶ Completed with 2012 Development Code amendments

⁷ Partially implemented with 2012 Development Code amendments

⁸ Currently implementing

- a. Adopt green building requirements for new single-family and multi-family residential construction projects, additions, and remodels that require compliance with energy efficiency and conservation requirements that exceed State standards. Require verification of these measures.
- b. Consistent with the Countywide Plan, adopt Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification requirements for development and major remodels of public buildings where feasible.
- c. Evaluate the feasibility of carbon neutral construction for new single-family dwellings.
- d. Continue to enforce the Single-Family Dwelling Energy Efficiency Ordinance that requires new residential projects, additions, and remodels to exceed Title 24 requirements by a minimum of 15%.
- e. Explore a program consistent with AB 811 that provides to homeowners loans repayable through the property tax bill for energy efficiency, water conservation, and renewable energy generation upgrades.
- f. Work with the Marin Housing Authority to provide applicants for rehabilitation loans for upgrading their residences with green materials and energy conserving measures.
- g. Continue to provide free technical assistance to architects, developers, green businesses, homeowners, and other agencies.

1.o Simplify Review of Residential Development Projects in Planned Districts.

- a. Consider amending the Development Code to establish criteria for ministerial review of residential development projects in planned zoning districts. Criteria may be established for characteristics such as setbacks, height limits, floor area ratios, buffers from sensitive habitats, and slope constraints, among others.
- b. Consider amendments that would allow Master Plans to establish site specific criteria for ministerial review of subsequent development projects.

1.p Adjust Height Limits for Multi-family Residential Buildings. Consider amending the Development Code to increase the allowable height for multi-family residential development. Consider allowing increases to height limits depending on certain side yard setbacks.

~~**1.q Clarify Applicability of State Density Bonus.** Evaluate policies in the Countywide Plan and Development Code for housing opportunity site to ensure consistency with Government Code Section 65915. Amend the Countywide Plan and Development Code as appropriate.~~

Housing Goal 2: Meet Housing Needs Through a Variety of Housing Choices

Respond to the broad range of housing needs in Marin County by supporting a mix of housing types, densities, affordability levels, and designs.

Policy 2.1 Special Needs Groups

Promote the development and rehabilitation of housing for special needs groups, including seniors, people living with disabilities, agricultural workers, individuals and families who are homeless, people in need of mental health care, single-parent families, large families, extremely low income households and other persons identified as having special housing needs in Marin County. Link housing to programs of the Department of Health and Human Services in order to coordinate assistance to people with special needs.

Policy 2.2 Housing Choice

Implement policies that facilitate housing development and preservation to meet the needs of Marin County's workforce and low income population.

Policy 2.3 Incentives for Affordable Housing

Continue to provide a range of incentives and flexible standards for affordable housing in order to ensure development certainty and cost savings for affordable housing providers.

Policy 2.4 Protect Existing Housing

Protect and enhance the housing we have and ensure that existing affordable housing will remain affordable.

Implementing programs

2.a. Encourage Housing for Special Needs Households⁹. Continue to work with affordable housing providers and funders on opportunities to construct or acquire a variety of types of affordable housing appropriate for special needs groups and extremely low income households. Specific types of housing include:

- Smaller, affordable residential units, especially for lower income single-person households.
- Affordable senior housing to meet the expected needs of an aging population, including assisted housing and board and care (licensed facilities).
- Affordable units with three or more bedrooms for large-family households.
- Affordable housing that can be adapted for use by people with disabilities (specific standards are established in California Title 24 Accessibility Regulations for new and rehabilitation projects).

2.b. Enable Group Residential Care Facilities¹⁰. Continue to comply with State and Federal law by allowing group homes with special living requirements consistent with the County's land use regulations.

2.c. Make Provisions for Multi-family Housing Amenities¹¹. Continue to ensure that adequate provisions are made in new developments for families with children, including consideration of amenities such as tot lots, play yards, and childcare.

⁹ Currently implementing

¹⁰ Currently implementing

¹¹ Currently implementing

2.d. Foster Linkages to Health and Human Services Programs¹². Continue to seek ways to link services for lower income people to provide the most effective response to homeless or at-risk individuals.

2.e. Support Efforts to House the Homeless¹³. Support Countywide programs to provide for a continuum of care for the homeless, including emergency shelter, transitional housing, supportive housing, and permanent housing. Participate in efforts and allocate funds, as appropriate, for County and non-profit programs providing emergency shelter and related support services.

2.f. Engage in a Countywide Effort to Address Homeless Needs¹⁴. Continue to actively engage with other jurisdictions in Marin to provide additional housing and other options for the homeless, supporting and implementing *Continuum of Care* actions in response to the needs of homeless families and individuals.

2.g. Ensure Reasonable Accommodation¹⁵. Consistent with SB 520 enacted January 1, 2002, reduce barriers in housing for individuals with disabilities through the following actions:

- a. Establish a written Reasonable Accommodation procedure for providing exceptions in zoning and land use for housing for persons with disabilities.
- b. Amend the Development Code to clarify that retrofitted access ramps are permitted in setback areas.
- c. Develop guidelines encouraging the principles of universal design. Evaluate possible incentives to developers who incorporate principles of universal design and advance visitability.
- d. Consider allowing up to 50% reduction in parking requirements for disabled housing, as allowed for senior housing.

2.h. Require Non-discrimination Clauses¹⁶. Continue to provide nondiscrimination clauses in rental agreements and deed restrictions for housing constructed with County participation.

~~**2.i Modify Development Code to Reflect Williamson Act. Modify the Development Code to reflect the section of the Williamson Act (Section 51230.2) that allows landowners to subdivide up to 5 acres of the preserved land for sale or lease to a nonprofit organization, a city, a county, a housing authority, or a state agency in order to facilitate the development and provision of agricultural worker housing. This section of the Williamson Act requires that the parcel to be sold or leased must be contiguous to one or more parcels that allow residential uses and are developed with existing residential, commercial, or industrial uses.**~~

2.j Promote the Development of Agricultural Worker Units¹⁷. Pursue policy changes that promote the development of agricultural worker units.

- a. Consider ministerial review of applications for agricultural worker units in order to expedite the permitting process and facilitate the development of legal agricultural worker units.

¹² Currently implementing

¹³ Currently implementing

¹⁴ Currently implementing

¹⁵ Currently implementing

¹⁶ Currently implementing

¹⁷ Partially implemented

- b. As the County undertakes an update of the Local Coastal Program (LCP), revise the C-APZ zoning district to allow certain agricultural worker housing as a permitted agricultural use, demonstrating consistency with California Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6.
- c. Consider a program to facilitate the legalization of agricultural worker housing units.
- d. Seek funding opportunities to assist with rehabilitation and replacement of agricultural worker housing units.
- ~~e. Amend the Development Code to insure consistency with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.5.~~

2.k Promote and Ensure Equal Housing Opportunity¹⁸. Continue to promote equal housing opportunities for all persons and assure effective application of fair housing laws. To the extent possible, the County will ensure that individuals and families seeking housing in Marin County are not discriminated against on the basis of race, color, religion, marital status, disability, age, sex, family status (presence of children), national origin, or other arbitrary factors, consistent with the Fair Housing Act.

- a. Provide written material at public locations and on the County's public website. Information regarding equal housing opportunity laws shall be made available to the public. A pamphlet on equal housing opportunity shall be prepared and distributed to the public at the Civic Center and government outlets.
- b. Continue to collaborate with Fair Housing of Marin, such as ongoing representation on the Fair Housing Task Force by a member of the County staff.
- c. Conduct public outreach and complete an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing to identify private and public barriers to fair housing choice.

2.l Deter Housing Discrimination¹⁹. Continue to refer discrimination complaints to Fair Housing of Marin or other appropriate legal services, County or State agencies.

2.m Implement the Inclusionary Housing Policy²⁰. Continue to implement Development Code Section 22.22 regarding inclusionary housing for low income households in order to increase affordable housing construction, as follows:

- a. Apply flexibility to allow for maximum affordable housing outcomes (either units or funds).
- b. Maintain targets for very low income rental units and low income ownership units, such as 30% to 60% AMI for rental units, and 50% to 80% AMI for ownership units.
- c. Inclusionary units shall be deed-restricted to maintain affordability on resale to the maximum extent possible (preserve existing policy of in perpetuity or at least 55 years).
- d. Update Section 22.22 to reflect the 2009 California Court of Appeal decisions commonly referred to as Palmer and Patterson.

2.n Apply Long-Term Housing Affordability Controls²¹. The County or its designee(s) will continue to apply resale controls and rent and income restrictions to ensure that affordable housing provided through local funding, incentives, or as a condition of development approval remains affordable over time to the income group for which it is intended.

¹⁸ ~~Currently implementing~~

¹⁹ ~~Currently implementing~~

²⁰ ~~Currently implementing~~

²¹ ~~Currently implementing~~

2.o Encourage Land Acquisition and Land Banking. Encourage land acquisition and land banking for future affordable projects as a way to assist development of affordable housing.

2.p Expedite Permit Processing of Affordable and Special Needs Housing Projects²². Define fast-tracking and establish milestones for expedited permit processing for affordable housing projects, as well as green projects, childcare facilities, special needs housing, and agricultural worker housing projects. Specific timelines for fast-tracked projects that will result in expedited review will be established. Coordinate this process with appropriate County departments and outside agencies to establish clear and specific timelines for review. Employ updated information technology to track turn-around times and monitor the permitting process.

~~**2.q Consider CEQA Expedited Review.** Consider an area-wide Environmental Assessment or Program EIR assessing area-wide infrastructure and other potential off-site impacts to expedite the processing of subsequent affordable housing development proposals.~~

2.r Encourage First-Time Homebuyer Programs²³. Continue to support first-time homebuyer programs for low and moderate income households, as funding is available, and combine such programs with housing counseling programs whenever possible.

2.s Link Code Enforcement with Public Information Programs²⁴. Continue to implement housing, building, and fire code enforcement to ensure compliance with basic health and safety building standards. Provide referrals to rehabilitation loan programs and subsidized housing programs for use by qualified residents.

2.t Assist in Maximizing Use of Rehabilitation Programs²⁵. Continue to promote use of low-income homeowners' assistance for housing rehabilitation. Utilize Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, administered by the Marin Housing Authority, that are available for this purpose, or other sources to the extent possible, given program funding criteria and local need.

2.u Monitor Rental Housing Stock²⁶. Ensure that existing ~~subsidized~~ housing is conserved as part of the County's affordable housing stock, including State, Federal and locally-assisted ~~subsidized~~ developments. ~~(See Figure IV-4 on page IV-7 for more detail about the Ridgeway Apartments conversion.)~~

- a. Identify and monitor affordable properties at risk of conversion to market rate.
- b. Continue to work with and provide technical assistance to property owners and non-profit organizations to acquire and rehabilitate affordable rental housing units in order to maintain ongoing affordability of the units and to convert market rate units to affordable units.
- c. Provide support ~~and committed funding~~ to purchasers of the ~~Ridgeway Apartments~~Coast Guard residential facility to facilitate conversion of ~~153 units of market rate rental existing~~ housing to long-term deed restricted units affordable to low and moderate income households.
- d. Commit to provide relocation assistance in the event of displacement of residents ~~of the Ridgeway Apartments as well as any other residents~~ who may be displaced as a result

²² ~~Currently implementing~~

²³ ~~Currently implementing~~

²⁴ ~~Currently implementing~~

²⁵ ~~Currently implementing~~

²⁶ ~~Currently implementing~~

of conversion from market rate to long-term affordable housing with committed assistance from the County.

- ~~e. Ensure that all units receiving committed assistance from the County for conversion from market rate to affordable carry affordability restrictions of 55 years, or the maximum allowed under the State or Federal funding source, including the Ridgeway Apartments.~~
- ~~f.e. Submit a written report to the Board Supervisors and the California Department of Housing and Community Development documenting progress towards and committed assistance to the conversion of the Ridgeway Apartments. This report will be provided during the third year of the planning period (2012) in conjunction with the annual report on housing element progress.~~

Housing Goal 3: Ensure Leadership and Institutional Capacity

Build and maintain local government institutional capacity and monitor accomplishments to respond to housing needs effectively over time.

Policy 3.1 Coordination

Take a proactive approach in local housing coordination, policy development, and communication. Share resources with other agencies to effectively create and respond to opportunities for achieving housing goals.

Policy 3.2 Research, Monitoring, and Evaluation

Perform effective management of housing data relating to Marin County housing programs, production, and achievements. Monitor and evaluate housing policies on an ongoing basis, and respond effectively to changing housing conditions and needs of the population over time.

Policy 3.3 Funding

Aggressively and creatively seek ways to increase funding resources for lower income and special needs housing.

Implementing programs

~~3.a Explore Housing at the Civic Center²⁷. Work with the City of San Rafael to consider affordable housing at the Civic Center site. Collaborate with San Rafael and HCD to facilitate possible sharing of affordable units for the RHNA process between the County and San Rafael.~~

3.b Advance Organizational Effectiveness²⁸. Continue to seek ways to organize and allocate staffing resources effectively and efficiently to encourage and implement effective housing policy Countywide. Opportunities to enhance Marin County's capabilities may include:

- Sharing or pooling resources and coordinating tasks among multiple jurisdictions in implementing common housing programs.
- Initiate regular dialogue with Marin jurisdictions related to affordable housing policies, practices, and development updates.
- When requested, provide technical assistance related to housing development and funding to local Marin jurisdictions.
- Enhancing relationships and partnerships with non-profit service providers.

²⁷ Complete. Reviewed but not recommended by Housing Element Task Force and Planning Commission

²⁸ Currently implementing

3.c Provide and Promote Opportunities for Community Participation in Housing Issues²⁹.

Continue to undertake effective and informed public participation from all economic segments and special needs communities in the formulation and review of housing issues. Include the following:

- a. Coordinate community meetings. Strongly encourage developers to hold community meetings with stakeholders and County staff as part of any major development pre-application process.
- b. Conduct community outreach activities. Provide ongoing outreach and a forum for discussion of housing issues through presentations and increased awareness of housing programs.
- c. Provide public information to improve awareness of housing needs, issues, and programs through websites, fact sheets, and presentations.
- d. Coordinate with interested groups including local businesses, housing advocacy groups, and neighborhood groups to build public understanding and support for workforce and special needs housing.

3.d Perform Regional Transportation and Housing Activities³⁰. Continue to coordinate with regional planning bodies, such as the Association of Bay Area Governments, Congestion Management Agency, Transportation Authority of Marin, Sonoma Marin Area Rapid Transit, and Metropolitan Transportation Commission to facilitate transit-oriented housing development by using the incentives and other means provided through regional transportation plans.

3.e Coordinate with Other Agencies³¹. Coordinate with other regulatory agencies and special districts to facilitate and streamline the development of affordable and special needs housing. Pursue fee waivers and expedited review.

- a. Pursue fee waivers and expedited review for affordable and special needs housing.
- ~~b. Coordinate with pertinent departments in their efforts to amend the Safety and Conservation Elements of the Countywide Plan to include analysis and policies regarding flood hazard and flood management information.~~

3.f Promote Countywide Collaboration on Housing³². Work with Marin cities and towns to address regional planning and housing issues.

3.g Preserve Existing Housing Stock³³. Strive to protect existing housing stock that offers a range of housing choice and affordability.

- a. Work with residents, property owners, agencies, and non-profit groups to seek ways to assist in the long-term protection of rental and low cost housing, including mobile homes, mobile home parks, and manufactured housing.
- b. Consider an ordinance to require developers to provide relocation assistance for current residents when units are converted to other uses.
- c. Conduct a comprehensive analysis of legal non-conforming multi-family properties to establish the extent to which the County's existing rental stock may be compromised by the underlying zoning. If determined appropriate, institute a program whereby legal non-conforming properties with existing multi-family housing may maintain the existing

²⁹ ~~Currently implementing~~

³⁰ ~~Currently implementing~~

³¹ ~~Currently implementing~~

³² ~~Currently implementing~~

³³ ~~Currently implementing. Fireside preserved in 2011 (50 units of affordable housing)~~

residential intensity on the property, and encourage income restrictions for affordable housing through incentives (CD-2.o).

- d. Identify funding and other resources to preserve affordable units at risk of conversion to market rate.

3.h Monitor Inclusionary Housing Programs³⁴. Regularly evaluate the progress and effectiveness of the inclusionary housing programs in the Development Code.

- a. Monitor the residential inclusionary programs in Development Code Chapter 22.22 for their effectiveness, including the number of units constructed and amount of fees collected and deposited in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- b. Update on a regular basis the in-lieu fees for residential development (Development Code Section 22.22.080.C).
- c. Continue to monitor the Jobs/Housing Linkage Ordinance (Development Code Section 22.22.095), and ensure that commercial and industrial projects provide either on-site employee housing or fees to develop housing.
- d. Update on a regular basis the in-lieu participation fees for commercial and industrial development.

3.i Undertake Housing Element Monitoring, Evaluation, and Revisions³⁵. The County will establish a regular monitoring and annual update process to assess housing needs and achievements and to provide a process for modifying policies, programs, and resource allocations as needed in response to changing conditions.

- a. Undertake housing element updates as required, in accordance to State law.
- b. Conduct an annual housing element review.

3.j Provide and Participate in Local Affordable Housing Training and Education³⁶. Continue to encourage and participate in training sessions with local groups, decision makers, and staff to review potential constraints on and opportunities for creating affordable housing. Issues may include housing needs, financing, density, developmental delays, and management.

~~**3.k Update Affordable Housing Trust Fund Operating Procedures³⁷.** Update Trust Fund operating procedures.~~

- ~~a. Publish application and funding guidelines on the County website. Specify that monies paid into the fund will be used to develop or rehabilitate units affordable to very low and low income households.~~
- ~~b. Periodically report Affordable Housing Trust Fund activities and status to the Director. Include total amount of funds available, recent use of funds, and details of deed restrictions that ensure that housing costs are affordable to lower income persons.~~

3.l Provide Leadership to the Marin Workforce Housing Trust³⁸. Participate on the Board of the Marin Workforce Housing Trust. Continue to ensure that housing for extremely low income and special needs populations is prioritized in funding.

3.m Assist with Local Funding for Affordable Housing³⁹. Continue to seek ways to reduce housing costs for lower income workers and people with special needs by continuing to utilize

³⁴ ~~Currently implementing and additional proposed changes with 2013 Development Code amendments~~

³⁵ ~~On going, housing element under revision~~

³⁶ ~~Currently implementing~~

³⁷ ~~Completed 10/2009. Procedures and applications materials on web site~~

³⁸ ~~Currently implementing~~

local, State, and Federal assistance to the fullest extent possible to achieve housing goals and by increasing ongoing local resources. This would include efforts to:

- a. Provide technical and financial resources to support development of affordable housing in the community, especially housing that meets the needs of the local workforce, people with special housing needs, and people with extremely low incomes.
- b. Partner with philanthropic organizations to help finance affordable housing developments and continue to participate in other rental assistance programs.

3.n Raise Funds from a Variety of Sources⁴⁰. Maintain and monitor existing and seek additional streams of financing to add to or match Housing Trust funds. Work with community and elected leaders to identify potential revenue sources, considering the following:

- In-lieu fee payments under inclusionary requirements (residential and non-residential developments).
- Transient Occupancy Tax increase.
- Affordable Housing Impact Fee on single-family homes.
- Document Transfer Fee.
- Transfer Tax increase.

3.o Coordinate Among Project Funders⁴¹. Continue to ensure access to, and the most effective use of, available funding in Marin County by providing a mechanism for coordination among local affordable housing funders. Include regular meetings of local funders such as:

- Marin Community Foundation
- Federal Grants
- Marin Workforce Housing Trust
- Marin County Housing Trust
- Transportation Authority of Marin

3.p Utilize Federal Grants Division Funding⁴². Continue funding activities through the Federal Grants Division for affordable housing purposes throughout eligible Marin jurisdictions.

- a. Fund the Rehabilitation Loan Program that allows low and very low income homeowners to access forgivable loans to upgrade their homes.
- b. Fund affordable housing projects through the CDBG and HOME programs.
- c. Administer the Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids Program (HOPWA) to provide ongoing deep rental subsidies for individuals and families throughout the County.

³⁹ ~~Currently implementing~~

⁴⁰ ~~On going. Affordable Housing Impact Fee established 10/2008.~~

⁴¹ ~~Currently implementing through Funders Collaborative~~

⁴² ~~Currently implementing~~

**SUSTAINABLE TAMALMONTE
215 JULIA AVENUE
MILL VALLEY, CA 94941**

July 10, 2014

Marin County Board of Supervisors
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 329
San Rafael, CA 94903

Re: The Spring 2014 Public Workshops pertaining to the Marin County Housing Element Update (2015 to 2023)

Dear Marin County Board of Supervisors,

We are greatly dismayed with the process and format of the public workshops held in Spring 2014 pertaining to the Marin County Housing Element Update 2015 to 2023. We request that this letter be included in the public record regarding the Housing Element Update and hope that the upcoming Housing Element public hearings will provide a better opportunity for more thorough consideration of public input.

We believe there are constructive solutions for meeting the housing needs of all Marin's constituents, including lower-income households, in a manner that upholds community character; respects the limits of our infrastructure, public services, financial capabilities, and natural resources (E.g. water); protects the environment and public health and safety; and enhances quality of life. Unfortunately, the format of the Housing Element workshops did not allow such constructive solutions to be discovered or even discussed. On the contrary, the workshops failed to provide vital information for intelligent decision-making and only offered one predetermined housing solution - a forced choice of preselected housing sites.

Our specific concerns regarding the Spring 2014 Housing Element workshops are:

General Format

1. We are concerned that the workshop format did not give Marin residents an opportunity to have questions answered and to offer constructive solutions;
2. We are concerned that the County hired a very expensive outside consultant to chair the workshops, which was entirely unnecessary;

3. We are concerned that the only solution discussed for meeting Marin's Housing Needs was new housing development (much of it high-density multifamily units) on preselected sites. There was no mention of alternative approaches to meeting Marin's housing needs, such as:
 - A. Conversion of existing market-rate units to affordable units;
 - B. Second units;
 - C. Rent vouchers;
 - D. A living wage;
 - E. Low interest loans, etc.

Presentation

4. We are concerned that the presentation lacked vital information and that comments by facilitators were misleading, such as:
 - A. The presentation focused on affordable housing but did not point out that the Housing Element sites could be developed with mostly market-rate housing;
 - B. The presentation talked about Marin's strong environmental protections but failed to mention the Countywide Plan Amendment that allows for more potential high-density housing in the Baylands Corridor, the Ridge and Upland Greenbelt, and other environmentally sensitive areas;
 - C. The presentation indicated that future proposed development would receive thorough review but failed to mention the State laws that allow for streamlining and exemption of environmental review;
 - D. The presentation indicated that future proposed development would need to adhere to local design guidelines and development standards but failed to mention the State Density Law that supersedes County regulations and allows for greater densities and exceptions to height restrictions, setbacks, and parking regulations. The presentation also failed to mention County regulations and development codes that allow exceptions for affordable housing;
 - E. Facilitators stated that housing should be placed near transportation but failed to mention that many studies by respected institutions prove that living near busy roads emitting large amounts of Toxic Air Contaminants over large periods of time significantly increase the risk of developing serious and life-threatening illnesses (E.g. Cardiovascular mortality, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer, miscarriages, asthma, autism, etc.);

Selection of Sites

5. We are concerned that participants were asked to select sites for housing from a pre-selected list of sites but were not provided critical information about the proposed housing sites, such as the maximum potential buildout at each site and how development at each site would impact:

- A. The environment;
 - B. Public health and safety;
 - C. Traffic;
 - D. Public services (E.g. schools);
 - E. Public infrastructure;
 - F. Water supply;
 - G. Traditional neighborhood character, etc.
6. We are concerned that participants were asked to "vote" about neighborhoods where they did not reside.

We DID appreciate the fact that the comments from the audience were recorded as they were made. That helps to build trust, and trust needs to be restored.

Moving Forward

As previously described, each Housing Element workshop was orchestrated to rush participants to a pre-determined conclusion, rather than allow for an open discussion, an exchange of information and ideas, intelligent decision making, and the discovery of innovative solutions about how to provide for Unincorporated Marin's Housing Need in a manner that would be more acceptable to all interested parties.

In order to prevent similar unproductive and financially wasteful workshops, we urge you to direct the Community Development Agency to revise the process and format of future workshops.

Moreover, the County Planners stated that public input from the Housing Element workshops would be conveyed to the Marin County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Therefore, we request that this letter be included in the public record regarding the Marin County Housing Element Update (2015 to 2023).

Most importantly, we ask you to ensure that the upcoming Housing Element public hearings provide a better opportunity for more thorough consideration of public input.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Sharon Rushton

Chairperson

Sustainable TamAlmonte

Cc: Marin County Planning Commission