

From: Dana Dillworth <earthhelp@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2022 2:54 PM
To: Swiecki, John <johnswiecki@ci.brisbane.ca.us>; Padilla, Ingrid <ipadilla@ci.brisbane.ca.us>;
Sayasane, Pamala <psayasane@ci.brisbane.ca.us>
Cc: O'Connell Terry AT SBC <toconnell11@sbcglobal.net>; warburto@sonic.net
Subject: Housing element workshop

TO: Planning Commissioners
FROM: Dana Dillworth
RE: Housing Element Workshop February 24, 2022

Balanced Brisbane?

Spot-rezoning the entire town for no-limit housing without sufficient reference to other General Plan Elements, Goals, and Plans and ignoring State laws in motion is not balanced.

Something fishy here. If the Tuntex Speculation Group doesn't submit a plan by date certain for the Baylands, then we have to rezone other property, give away OUR Public Trust-endowed waterfront Open Space to meet a planning goal that admittedly doesn't work. We've rezoned our entire town with a shopping list of overriding considerations of environmental impacts to meet this same goal. But we can't guarantee that the Baylands will meet any RHNA's?

We voted, or not questioned, doubling the size of our town over and over, with ADU ordinances (which at 1 ADU per R-1 unit city-wide, should produce more than 274 units and should be considered affordable), with overlay zones, with rezoning our Bayshore thoroughfare to mixed-use while ignoring unsafe neighbors (Tank Farm,) known landslides, opportunities for potential habitat corridors and that still doesn't meet the goal?

There is something specious about the premise and information you have been provided for engaging in this legislative planning, this discretionary act. I get it, no action tonight. But something wrong, something missing... by approaching this issue with the same reasoning that got us here and ignoring all we have already done.

"Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results."

There is so much not being told here. I'm not a lawyer, but many of you are. You know about fairness and balance. You know about laws meant to protect the public, to serve the public where they haven't been or otherwise wouldn't be served.

Spot-zoning can be allowed to serve a specific class or under-served community... are biotech employees underserved, a protected class? Where are the statistic's for that?

Is the City truly promoting Sierra Point and VWR (Southeast Bayshore) to include no- limits housing on a foundation of toxin-filled jell-o ... or to be down wind from an unknown source of persistent deadly toxic vapors as meeting a mandate to serve the already underserved? There's a potential you may have to

look at environmental justice laws if you answer yes.

When I saw Sierra Point on the list, I had so hoped that you were announcing a new live-aboard community, a car-free community, with regulations on size or ownership to prohibit mansion yachts, something to truly serve low and moderate income communities. A houseboat community might survive an earthquake, but a high-rise building full of thousands of 24/7 residents and employees must have a stellar evacuation plan in the event of an earthquake.

Were any alternatives of houseboat community or tiny home villages provided as options in the Brisbane Balance survey? Did you present it as one way in, one way out for many thousands more people? Adjacent to our designated Emergency Evacuation Area? Somehow Public Safety, Recreation, and the Environment gets overlooked in this Sacramento/Developer/City-driven quest to meet a questionably derived, bloated, unattainable housing number. How many times do we double this town without looking at the consequences?

By law, full disclosure is required. It is hard to believe that an housing application has been received from Sierra Point without knowledge of the conditions and reasons for its prohibition. Similarly, Southwest Bayshore is at the base of known slide areas. One could get the wrong impression by this exercise, absent the information required for the Public to make an informed decision. One could question, if you know, how many survey entries were city employees or tests.

From the tone of the Staff report, garbage in, garbage out, “everything goes” we’ll do the environmental review piecemealed, later. I think that is still frowned upon under CEQA.

Isn’t it time to stop the non-sense and reflect on the current conditions?

Please define Market Rate housing under today’s conditions.

Significant studies, particularly a Sustainable Community Environmental Assessment should be required and the stability of Bayshore Boulevard from the Main Street to South San Francisco needs a look-see. It has been thirty years since we looked at the whole picture and even then, it was cursory.

Our community [imho] is getting unfair treatment in the guise of helping the poor. Will anyone consider whether the Sierra Point, Bayshore, and Brisbane acres soils can withstand impacts from future extreme climate, environmental, earthshaking events and the densities proposed? Your waffled language that can’t guarantee 20% low-income housing is despicable. The 100-year model for Public safety is obsolete.

Housing, in the absence of any other General Plan Elements and site conditions not accurately reported, means you have failed to do the minimal requirement... of serving the underserved communities. There is not one mention of maintaining the units we create, as the 1 San Bruno property, formerly meeting our RHNA goals, is now out of service.

There is so much wrong with this procedure. Accurate information and a range of alternatives have not been utilized. I would hope that you can bring this back into balance.

Thank you.

Sorry for the re-formatting, there is a pdf attachment as well. I would appreciate that each commissioner gets a copy and all or portion be read into the record. I remain disabled and low computer capacity.

TO: Planning Commissioners
FROM: Dana Dillworth
RE: Housing Element Workshop
February 24, 2022

Balanced Brisbane?

Spot-rezoning the entire town for no-limit housing without sufficient reference to other General Plan Elements, Goals, and Plans and ignoring State laws in motion is not balanced.

Something fishy here. If the Tuntex Speculation Group doesn't submit a plan by date certain for the Baylands, then we have to rezone other property, give away OUR Public Trust-endowed waterfront Open Space to meet a planning goal that admittedly doesn't work. We've rezoned our entire town with a shopping list of overriding considerations of environmental impacts to meet this same goal. But we can't guarantee that the Baylands will meet any RHNA's?

We voted, or not questioned, doubling the size of our town over and over, with ADU ordinances (which at 1 ADU per R-1 unit city-wide, should produce more than 274 units and should be considered affordable), with overlay zones, with rezoning our Bayshore thoroughfare to mixed-use while ignoring unsafe neighbors (Tank Farm,) known landslides, opportunities for potential habitat corridors and that still doesn't meet the goal?

There is something specious about the premise and information you have been provided for engaging in this legislative planning, this discretionary act. I get it, no action tonight. But something wrong, something missing... by approaching this issue with the same reasoning that got us here and ignoring all we have already done.

"Insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results."

There is so much not being told here. I'm not a lawyer, but many of you are. You know about fairness and balance. You know about laws meant to protect the public, to serve the public where they haven't been or otherwise wouldn't be served.

Spot-zoning can be allowed to serve a specific class or under-served community... **are biotech employees underserved, a protected class?** Where are the statistics for that?

Is the City truly promoting Sierra Point and VWR (Southeast Bayshore) to include no-limits housing on a foundation of toxin-filled jell-o ... or to be down wind from an unknown source of persistent deadly toxic vapors as meeting a mandate to serve the already underserved? There's a potential you may have to look at environmental justice laws if you answer yes.

When I saw Sierra Point on the list, I had so hoped that you were announcing a new live-aboard community, a car-free community, with regulations on size or ownership to

prohibit mansion yachts, something to truly serve low and moderate income communities. A houseboat community might survive an earthquake, but a high-rise building full of thousands of 24/7 residents and employees must have a stellar evacuation plan in the event of an earthquake.

Were any alternatives of houseboat community or tiny home villages provided as options in the Brisbane Balance survey? Did you present it as one way in, one way out for many thousands more people? Adjacent to our designated Emergency Evacuation Area? **Somehow Public Safety, Recreation, and the Environment gets overlooked** in this Sacramento/Developer/City-driven quest to meet a questionably derived, bloated, unattainable housing number. How many times do we double this town without looking at the consequences?

By law, full disclosure is required. It is hard to believe that an housing application has been received from Sierra Point without knowledge of the conditions and reasons for its prohibition. Similarly, Southwest Bayshore is at the base of known slide areas. One could get the wrong impression by this exercise, absent the information required for the Public to make an informed decision. One could question, if you know, how many survey entries were city employees or tests.

From the tone of the Staff report, garbage in, garbage out, “everything goes” we’ll do the environmental review piecemealed, later. I think that is still frowned upon under CEQA.

Isn’t it time to stop the non-sense and reflect on the current conditions?

Please define Market Rate housing under today’s conditions.

Significant studies, particularly a Sustainable Community Environmental Assessment should be required and the stability of Bayshore Boulevard from the Main Street to South San Francisco needs a look-see. It has been thirty years since we looked at the whole picture and even then, it was cursory.

Our community [imho] is getting unfair treatment in the guise of helping the poor. Will anyone consider whether the Sierra Point, Bayshore, and Brisbane acres soils can withstand impacts from future extreme climate, environmental, earthshaking events and the densities proposed? Your waffled language that can’t guarantee 20% low-income housing is despicable. The 100-year model for Public safety is obsolete.

Housing, in the absence of any other General Plan Elements and site conditions not accurately reported, means you have failed to do the minimal requirement... of serving the underserved communities. There is not one mention of maintaining the units we create, as the 1 San Bruno property, formerly meeting our RHNA goals, is now out of service.

There is so much wrong with this procedure. Accurate information and a range of alternatives have not been utilized. I would hope that you can bring this back into balance. Thank you.