

Danielle Staude

From: Peter Emblad <emblad@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 12:52 PM
To: Planning
Subject: RE: march 25th meeting

CAUTION: External Sender

To whom it may concern,
I am registered, and hope to make it to the meeting regarding the proposed multi unit low income housing that is possibly going to be built by the public safety buildings.

I would like to submit the below comments for review prior to the meeting, as I may not make it personally to the meeting.

I OPPOSE the planned building site by the safety building.

I fully support having more low income housing in MV, and expanding our community to include those unable to afford the crazy cost of housing here.

The proposed location by the public safety building would NOT be a good place for this for the following reasons:

1. There are already low income housing units in Shelter Hill, right around the corner from this potential space. For low income housing to be really effective, they should not all be congregated in one area, as we learned from Chicagos Cabrini Greens experiment. Too many housing units together creates a lower rent district which adversely affect the living experience, the perceptions of those around there, and the property values of adjoining areas. It is much better for the residents, and the city, to spread the units around to make everyone feel more a part of the community.
2. Hauke park is home to many after school and weekend children sports. That area is already very congested, with poor parking. Children are constantly crossing the streets in this area, so more cars make it much more dangerous. Putting the units by the safety building will decrease parking spots, increase traffic, and increase the risk of accidents with the children crossing these areas.
3. The area up on Edgewood is currently not being used for anything. Seems like a much better location for this

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely
Peter Emblad
50 Millay place

Danielle Staude

From: Gail Katz <gkatz00@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 4:11 PM
To: John McCauley
Cc: Jim Wickham - Mill Valley mail; Danielle Staude; city clerk
Subject: Fw: 1 Hamilton

CAUTION: External Sender

Hi John,

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed 1 Hamilton location for an affordable housing project in Mill Valley.

Per my correspondence with Danielle who was very responsive, it seems that 1 Hamilton is the only site being considered at this time. That being the case, I sent her a number of questions to understand how they would squeeze in 40 units and parking into a .75 acre site. Per her response she indicated that parking and height standards can be reduced because it is an affordable housing project.

Our neighborhood is pretty surprised to say the least, to hear that the city planners would actually consider building a **4 story building** in such an inappropriate site. The aesthetic appeal of Hauke/Bayfront park is beloved by our neighborhood and we all cherish the views and openness of the park. At this point, our neighborhood is not feeling properly represented by city officials.

We already had city-approved (thru incompetence) clear cutting around the electrical substation by PGE, which included tearing down over 130 trees including a dozen protected redwood trees. That foliage took 3 decades to grow (I moved here in 1984). Three of my neighbors had to spend 18 months working on a project to get PGE to replant a small portion of what they negligently tore down on the city's watch..

I am supportive of affordable housing however I fail to see how you can do all that analysis and come back with just one recommendation for 40 units while there are 169 lots available to build on. The weekend and afternoon parking situation due to the use of the park by all the athletic teams and their parents already causes a lot of parking infringement on the neighboring streets and adding an "apartment building" to the mix will worsen the situation.

Regards,
Gail Katz
89 Keats Drive

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Danielle Staude <dstaude@cityofmillvalley.org>
To: gail katz <gkatz00@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021, 10:29:42 AM PDT
Subject: RE: 1 Hamilton

As part of the overall project, there will have to be rezoning to Multi-Family Bayfront, (RM-B) similar to Eucalyptus Kjwickham@cityofmillvalley.orgnolls. Because it is an affordable housing project, State Density Bonus Law allows the

Danielle Staude

From: dward1144@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2021 8:19 PM
To: Danielle Staude
Subject: Affordable Housing next to MV Public Safety Bldg.

CAUTION: External Sender

Planning Division

Danielle Staude

Senior Planner, Advanced Planning

415-388-4033 x 4812

dstaude@cityofmillvalley.org

To: Danielle Staude, Senior Planner, Mill Valley

From: David and Renée Ward, 1 Eucalyptus Knoll Mill Valley 94941 415 389-0871

My wife and I want to register our strong objection to the possibility that a 30 unit plus affordable housing building be located in the present parking lot next to the Public Safety Building

First, this lot is totally jammed on weekends and holidays and used in evenings even when there are no events in the nearby soccer fields. During the daytime yesterday there were 12 cars parked there and others by the electric outlets for cars. And, needless to say, the restrooms are frequently used on weekends and often during the week. Where would the large number of young people and their parents find parking. And, don't even think of putting a parking lot in the Bayfront Meadow to which many of us donate money and time.

Aren't there enough services in this small corner of Mill Valley? =-the Sewer Treatment Plant, the Dog Park, the Public Safety building, the Community Garden, Bayfront Meadow and multiple soccer fields. You may not know that the traffic along Hamilton is very heavy from 3 to 7 PM when drivers seek to avoid the Blithdale exit from 101 and use this road to get to greater Mill Valley. In this area we already have enough traffic and more facilities than anywhere else in this town. For a large amount of space without the complicating factors described above, find space in the Mill Valley golf course.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views on this important matter.

Danielle Staude

From: Jeralyn Seiling <seilingj@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Danielle Staude
Cc: Suzanne Bohan; Paul Sidorenko; Kelly Jane Rosenblatt; A. Rosenblatt; Andreas Nicholas; Beth Newman; Glenn Thompson; Kathy Bakhshandeh; Staci Nicholas; Alan Chui; Wei Wei Chui; Doug Newman; Gabrielle Tierney; Gary Batroff; Tom & Toni Benoit; Jim Devitt; Rodi; Steve Jaber; Joy and David Wygant; Penny White; Mill Valley Beautiful; Gail Katz; Cheryl Reiss; gbatroff@hotmail.com; Kelly Drury; Sashi McEntee; max@maxperrey.com; kirkjknauer@gmail.com; gigi_eric@hotmail.com; jhds@sbcglobal.net; christine@christinedonohue.com; anita.scott@gmail.com; gunnel.strom@comcast.net; rodib@yahoo.com; craigviolin@sbcglobal.net; judith@p-r-g.com; kthulquist@gmail.com; sbatroff@hotmail.com; riaboff@comcast.net; david@techcontracts.com; joanprigian@hotmail.com; jgassman@gmail.com; kspencxr@gmail.com; jhdevitt@yahoo.com; samanthac.monge@gmail.com; davidmlevin@yahoo.com; Ingrid Woods; staci_nicholas@yahoo.com; tom.benoit@comcast.net; csheyder@gmail.com; autria.christensen@gmail.com; ahmad@nanawall.com; jill_lebsock@gap.com; clebsock@hausfeld.com; Sandra Mardigian; gillianemblad@gmail.com; Daniel Karner; hans_fallant@comcast.net; kjrosenblatt@gmail.com; carriesher@yahoo.com; Nana Meyer; anicholas@yahoo.com
Subject: Affordable Housing at Hauke Park

CAUTION: External Sender

Dear.Ms. Staude:

In connection with the May 25th online hearing concerning the Hauke Park site for affordable housing, I respectfully submit the following questions and request that they be addressed at the meeting:

1. While I strongly support affordable housing in Mill Valley, a four-story building with 40+ units would have a massive impact on traffic along the most congested corridor in Mill Valley - the East Blithedale bottleneck, from Camino Alto to 101. Mill Valley residents have consistently identified traffic as their number one concern. Yet the impact of the project on the most congested area of Mill Valley is not mentioned in the consultant's report. Can you please describe the City's plan to address the traffic implications of using the Hauke Park site?
2. The additional cars from 40+ units would also create massive congestion along Roque Moreas, which is only one lane and already beyond maximum capacity during high traffic hours. The project will:
 - a. dramatically impact access to and from the Enchanted Knolls neighborhood, forcing more cars along the East Blithedale bottleneck,
 - b. impede police cars, fire trucks and other safety vehicles traveling to and from the Public Safety Building on Hamilton, and
 - c. create a serious safety hazard for children using Hauke Park and walking to and from the middle school and the Rec Center.

No safety concerns are mentioned in the report. Would you please address?

Also, have the police and fire departments vetted this proposal for impacts to emergency response time?

3. Enchanted Knolls, the neighborhood most impacted, has fought (and repeatedly won) a decades long battle to assure that Hamilton stays one-way in order to preserve the neighborhood, as originally agreed by the City. Can you assure residents that a 40+ unit project and resultant traffic will not result in pressure to open Hamilton to two-way traffic? Was

the consultant made aware of this issue, or did she assume traffic patterns could be changed? This issue is of immense concern to residents – opening Hamilton to two-way traffic will cut Enchanted Knolls off from the City and surround it on all sides with high traffic corridors feeding Highway 101.

4. The Hauke Park site is not currently served by public transit. Yet the consultant’s report assumes only 1.5 cars per unit will spill onto local streets. Is this realistic? Would it not make more sense to locate such a large project along an existing public transit route to minimize additional traffic in Mill Valley? Would it not make more sense to locate additional housing along the recently widened Miller Avenue corridor, which is served by public transit buses and has other services such as Safeway, restaurants, etc.? I realize the City is looking at parcels currently owned, but there are other solutions.
5. Per the consultant’s report, the proposed four-story building would have no dedicated parking, but rather a total of only 12 new parking spaces (for 40+ units). Even if we assume 1.5 cars per unit, this would indicate a need for at least 60 additional parking spaces for such a project. It seems obvious that the additional cars will spill over to the neighborhood, potentially block access to the Public Safety Building, and create a pedestrian hazard for entering and exiting the Park. Why is this not addressed in the report?

Also, to which location will the existing bathrooms will moved to accommodate the additional parking? Will they be moved to take up open space on the Park grounds?

6. The Hauke Park site is adjacent to the wetlands and protected plant and animal habitats - - one of the jewels of Mill Valley. On what basis does the consultant conclude that the site would “likely” pass environmental review?
7. A four-story, charm-free structure like the example proposed by the consultant is completely out of character with the neighborhood. (In fact, it is difficult to think of any existing building that tall in Mill Valley.) It is worth noting that the example provided by the consultant is virtually identical to an example she provided for a project in Los Angeles. See photo below. Is this *one-size-for-every-city* approach appropriate for Mill Valley, or would a more refined solution be better? Would it not make more sense to have smaller projects throughout the City, which would not only minimize traffic impact, but also preserve the character of neighborhoods and assure that the project (and future residents) won’t be stigmatized? Is cost efficiency the only consideration that was taken into account? What are other possible avenues that the City might pursue to be more sensitive to the environment and the future residents?



On left is example proposed by consultant for a Los Angeles project, taken from consultant’s website. On right, the Hauke Park proposal.

Thank you very much for your consideration. Sincerely, Jeralyn Seiling, J.D.

Danielle Staude

From: Danielle Staude
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 11:55 AM
To: Jeralyn Seiling
Subject: RE: Affordable Housing at Hauke Park

Hi Jeralyn,

Thank you for your comment letter. I will forward it to the Committee for their review.

Also, I just wanted to note that the concept provided in Attachment 2 is an example project, located in Healdsburg, not the actual design proposed for the site. The design and location of existing uses (restrooms, EV charging, public parking) would be determined as part of site design, which would occur after the selection and partnership is established with a non-profit developer. The site design phase would include various public meetings and workshops to consider the various items you mention below.

Sincerely,

Danielle L. Staude
Senior Planner
City of Mill Valley
26 Corte Madera Avenue
Mill Valley, CA 94941
(415) 388-4033

www.cityofmillvalley.org

From: Jeralyn Seiling <seilingj@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Danielle Staude <dstaude@cityofmillvalley.org>
Cc: Suzanne Bohan <sbohan@stanfordalumni.org>; Paul Sidorenko <psidorenko@gmail.com>; Kelly Jane Rosenblatt <kjrosenblatt@gmail.com>; A. Rosenblatt <alexrosenblatt1@gmail.com>; Andreas Nicholas <anicholas@yahoo.com>; Beth Newman <munnbeth@gmail.com>; Glenn Thompson <glenn94941@yahoo.com>; Kathy Bakhshandeh <kspbakh@gmail.com>; Staci Nicholas <staci_nicholas@yahoo.com>; Alan Chui <awchui@hotmail.com>; Wei Wei Chui <eastwell99@hotmail.com>; Doug Newman <velodoug@gmail.com>; Gabrielle Tierney <gigi_eric@hotmail.com>; Gary Batroff <gbatroff@hotmail.com>; Tom & Toni Benoit <tom.benoit@comcast.net>; Jim Devitt <jhdevitt@yahoo.com>; Rodi <rodib@yahoo.com>; Steve Jaber <sjaber@pacbell.net>; Joy and David Wygant <joy_guidi@yahoo.com>; Penny White <mill31@comcast.net>; Mill Valley Beautiful <millvalleybeautiful@gmail.com>; Gail Katz <gkatz00@yahoo.com>; Cheryl Reiss <cherylbreiss@gmail.com>; gbatroff@hotmail.com; Kelly Drury <braddrury@me.com>; Sashi McEntee <smcentee@cityofmillvalley.org>; max@maxperrey.com; kirkjknauer@gmail.com; gigi_eric@hotmail.com; jhds@sbcglobal.net; christine@christinedonohue.com; anita.scott@gmail.com; gunnel.strom@comcast.net; rodib@yahoo.com; craigviolin@sbcglobal.net; judith@p-r-g.com; kthulquist@gmail.com; sbatroff@hotmail.com; riaboff@comcast.net; david@techcontracts.com; joanprigian@hotmail.com; jgassman@gmail.com; kspencxr@gmail.com; jhdevitt@yahoo.com; samanthac.monge@gmail.com; davidmlevin@yahoo.com; Ingrid Woods <ingridw@pacbell.net>; staci_nicholas@yahoo.com; tom.benoit@comcast.net; csheyder@gmail.com; autria.christensen@gmail.com; ahmad@nanawall.com; jill_lebsock@gap.com; clebsock@hausfeld.com; Sandra Mardigian <smardigian.kilili.self.help@gmail.com>; gillianemblad@gmail.com; Daniel Karner <dbkarner@att.net>; hans_fallant@comcast.net; kjrosenblatt@gmail.com; carriesher@yahoo.com; Nana Meyer <nana@nanameyer.com>;

Danielle Staude

From: Kim Hettena <kimhettena@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2021 6:01 PM
To: Danielle Staude
Cc: ctubbs@smfd.org
Subject: Housing Advisory Committee Meeting; 05/25/21;Objection to building affordable housing at 1 Hamilton Drive, Mill Valley

CAUTION: External Sender

I am appalled that the Housing Advisory Committee would propose to build high-density housing* on one of the few Primary Evacuation Routes ("Ready Mill Valley: Are you ready for evacuation?" courtesy Mill Valley Fire Department) out of Mill Valley to the south. Given the high wildfire danger in Marin (and Sonoma, to the north), I think it is essential that Mill Valley preserve evacuation paths to the south and not to add to existing traffic burdens. Our lives may depend on this.

* potentially 4 floors, 39+ units, 2 BR each, I have heard

Kim Hettena
8 Eucalyptus Knoll St.
Mill Valley, CA 94941-2282

Burton Miller, FAIA
211 Elm Avenue
Mill Valley, California 94941
burtonmilleraia@gmail.com

May 21, 2021

Housing Advisory Committee
City of Mill Valley
26 Corte Madera Avenue
Mill Valley, California 94942

**Re: Identification of City-Owned Site to Leverage
100% Affordable Housing Project**

To: Members of the Housing Advisory Committee:

I have read Danielle's Memorandum dated May 25, 2021 and The Housing Workshop reports:

- Analysis of Tax-Exempt Sites for Affordable Housing Development
- Financial Analysis of Example Affordable Housing Projects

My comments will focus on the site analysis exercise.

The report is well-conceived and constructed – concise, clear with sensible criteria.

The analysis identifies four (4) candidate sites – one viable and three that I would characterize as straw dogs – sites that bend The Housing Workshop's selection criteria to establish alternatives and, by comparison, to lend added validity to the PSB site. I generally agree with The Housing Workshop's *Summary of Findings*.

Boyle Park Tennis Courts is a non-starter for the reasons noted – the park is a beloved and heavily-used, highly-valued public asset.

The Mill Valley Golf Course site is remote. Multi-family housing is an incongruous use.

I'm not familiar with the Mill Valley Reservoir site. That speaks to its remote, isolated and inappropriate location.

So, we're left with one site standing – not surprising. I agree that the PSB site is the single seemingly viable development site. I think it important to note that site

selection is the product of highly-specific requirements – City-owned, minimum “flat” site area of 0.75 acres, slope limited to no more than 10%, clear of Floodplain/Floodway, etc., and not “good planning.” I don’t believe the site would have occurred to anyone as particularly appropriate for multi-family development absent the selection criteria.

Lastly, a word about density. Densities are generally understood in terms of market-rate unit sizes, so higher densities tend to be associated with added height and bulk. That should not be the case here. Smaller, more attainable, more affordable, affordable-by-design units can achieve greater densities *without* adverse impacts to height, bulk and mass. A smaller-unit 40-unit development can be achieved within an envelope comparable to a market-rate development of 20-units. Parking would be a wash. For example, two spaces per unit for market-rate or one space per unit for affordable. I understand that the maximum number of units at 29 units per acre with the maximum density bonus applied is 39 units. I would support no more than forty (40) “small” units provided that Design Review achieved an appropriately-sized and well-designed solution (i.e., character and fit).

I leave it to the neighbors and the vast number of Hauke Park sports and recreation users to offer their assessments of the proposal.

Respectively submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Burton Miller", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Burton Miller, FAIA