

From: Wm Carey Chenoweth [i_rowboat@mac.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 12:40 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Cc: Jann Johnson
Subject: ADU process streamlining?

Hi Lilly

I'm sorry that I no longer have the ability to attend public meetings these days due to an injury my wife sustained requiring my 24/7 attention of her at home. This makes me especially pleased I am glad these e-links to both your office and the neighborhood groups enables one to at least enter one's opinion albeit informally.

A recent highlighted example of what might be on table with the ADU planning group has certainly caught my eye.

(2) P4 line 21-27

"Views. xxx Up to 10% of a primary view from a neighboring property may be impacted by a new accessory dwelling unit. A "view" is defined by Chapter 10.88 of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to determine view impact story poles will be required to be erected and notices will be sent out to properties within 100 feet inviting staff to visit the site. Staff will determine where the primary views in a neighboring property are and if the new ADU will impact greater than 10% of the view. The method for determining 10% (i.e. lineal vs. area) will be determined by staff."

This means an accessory dwelling unit of 500 to 700 square feet, up to 15 to 18 feet high, and obstructing 10% of your view can be built next door, in front of, or in back of your property without your consent, input, Design Review, Planning Commission consideration, or City Council appeal.

My thoughts....

In a town where Trees & Views can trigger heated entitlement suits and cause folks to sell their otherwise life-long properties when compromises are not reached, it seems odd we would consider removing reviews and hearing steps related to Bldg or Planning department processing. I can only presume this "less than 10% view obstruction" means to avoid minor or perhaps insignificant view impacts. My earliest engineering training certainly taught me the value of process improvements, though the test was whether the product might be improved as a result. Seems this 10% rule shortcut leaves the City and neighbors open to more frivolous suits not less. Due process takes time, but outcomes are rarely improved when confirmation, validation, and acknowledgement steps are eliminated to ensure all parties are pleased with the intended outcomes.

I would argue NO ONE buys a property in Sausalito without being well aware that our neighbors have a very active say in how we develop and maintain our properties. The only reason such an oblivious owner might exist is if their broker were negligent in making a prospective buyer aware of what they are buying in to. If that is the case, let the broker be sued not the City or neighbor to neighbor. Keep the dialogue process open, full transparency with all agency processing and avoid temptations to take short cuts. Views matter in Sausalito, that should not be news to anyone working in these impacted departments. If a staffer wishes to cut through all the red tape perhaps they need to find a town where folks don't care about their views.

Thanks for soliciting community input on these matters. I'm certain the resulting regulations will serve the community and the agencies well.

Stay tuned, Carey

Lilly Schinsing

From: patriciahale@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 1:00 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: ADU View Issues

Dear Ms. Schinsing;

I have just been made aware of the proposed ADU "policies" re the obstruction of 10% of a residential view Without, notice, hearing, INPUT of ANY KIND from the resident. This reeks of another side run around public hearing/ political unpleasantness for members of City government who are "tired of this after 6-7 years."

It also precludes any individual approach to a given affected parcel. CASE IN POINT.

Last year our neighbors were in "Tree Council" with Linda Pfeiffer over her refusal to trim her trees. When my husband bought this house 25+ years ago, there WERE NO TREES. We are not bound by our neighbor's trimming agreement with her, and I can initiate proceedings against her anytime, with my photos, our evidence, etc.

QUESTION: How is this three man committee to determine 10% of OUR view.. The original UNOBSTRUCTED view to which we are legally entitled, and I can enforce anytime, or the (impaired) view to which my neighbors unilaterally agreed?

This is just one example of the "can of Worms" your proposal would open. Rather, a legal Pandora's box.

Plus, it appears to be unconstitutional, for lack of ANY process, not to mention "due" process.

The Constitution means process is our DUE. Please provide it, and scrap this ridiculous idea. Thank you

Very truly,

Patricia Hale
Allen Arieff
Homeowners, taxpayers and voters, 299 South Street.

Sent from Xfinity Mobile App

Lilly Schinsing

From: Darshan Brach [darshanbrach@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 3:28 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Housing Element Comment re Views

Hi Lilly,

I'm hoping you will pass along my thoughts to the Planning Commission:

I would like to comment on what I understand is a regulation that will allow accessory dwelling units to impact 10% of a neighbor's view. I am strongly opposed - our views are the most valuable part of home ownership in Sausalito. Personally, I would be devastated to lose any small part of my view as it was the primary reason I bought my house, and very critical to its (resale) value. I think this would be universal among the many Sausalito residents with views.

I'm also very concerned about ideas to further develop Old Town. It seems really obvious that the character of Old Town is what draws the hordes of visitors to Sausalito, and that new development would mar this character and adversely impact our influx of tourists. The Town knows better than I the benefits of visitors to our businesses and coffers. We also already have serious traffic and parking issues on this end of Sausalito, and anything that exacerbates that would be unwise, not to mention unsafe (evacuation from fire and/or earthquake events).

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Norma Darshan Brach
112 Marion Ave
Sausalito, CA 94965
415-332-3111

From: jannjohnson@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 5:51 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: ADUs

Dear Ms Schinsing.

Please convey this message to the ADU Working Group.

Dear ADU Working Group,

My views, air, and light are very important to me. I appeal to the ADU Working Group to change the following 2 proposed regulations which will have serious negative impacts on our lives and our properties.

(1) P1 line 337

"Any application for an accessory dwelling unit that meets the location and development standards contained in this Section shall be approved ministerially without discretionary review or public hearing unless otherwise specified."

(2) P4 line 21-27

"Views. xxx Up to 10% of a primary view from a neighboring property may be impacted by a new accessory dwelling unit. A "view" is defined by Chapter 10.88 of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to determine view impact story poles will be required to be erected and notices will be sent out to properties within 100 feet inviting staff to visit the site. Staff will determine where the primary views in a neighboring property are and if the new ADU will impact greater than 10% of the view. The method for determining 10% (i.e. lineal vs. area) will be determined by staff."

I believe any new ADU construction should have to meet the same Design Review criteria and Planning Commission consideration and approval and have the same City Council appeal processes as primary residences now have.

I am opposed to 10% obstruction of views by neighboring ADUs with only ministerial approval. Sausalito is views. Our home values and our enjoyment of them are dependent on our views, light and air. Obstructing 10% of our views is equivalent to stealing 10% of our home values.

I urge you to reconsider this folly and make all view obstruction 0%, as it is now. ADUs should be subject to the same design review, planning commission approval, and city council appeal as primary residences now have.

Sincerely,
Jann Johnson

Lilly Schinsing

From: John Fredericks [johnfredericks@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 7:04 AM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Comments on Proposed ADU Regulations

Dear Ms. Schinsing,

I wanted to voice my opposition to two aspects of the proposed ADU regulations being considered. First, I am opposed to the changes being considered that would allow an ADU to impact up to 10% of a primary view. Understanding that the zoning regulations have always recognized the importance of primary views, I was surprised that the ADU working group would consider making an exception for ADU's. This is particularly troublesome because my understanding is that the decisions with respect to a proposed ADU will not be subject to oversight or challenge, so affected owners would have no recourse if they disagreed with staff's determination in this regard. Second, I am opposed to the proposed reduction to the notice radius from 300 feet to 100 feet for an ADU project. There is little question that property owners within 300 feet might be affected by these types of projects, so it seems particularly important to give these people an opportunity to have their concerns heard, particularly given that the decisions by staff would be final.

Thank you for sharing this with the working group.

John

John D. Fredericks
216 2nd St.
Sausalito, CA 94965

From: Peter Avritch [pavritch@pcodynamics.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 9:07 AM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Housing Element - comments

Hello Ms. Schinsing,

I live at 295 South Street and I wanted to express my opinion about the below-referenced citations from the proposal.

Simply stated – I’ve attended both the May and June hearings and have followed some of the work product along the way, and I simply cannot believe what the committee finds to be acceptable to the community. No right-minded citizen from Sausalito would make or allow such decisions.

I am new to Sausalito – only purchased in April. Maybe I don’t know all the history, but I can say for sure that after having observed two city meetings, it’s disturbing to see how much animosity there is amongst the council members.

I’m also still trying to figure out this Housing Element consultant – who has now done two PowerPoint presentations to the community and not once mentioned the actual number of units needed nor shown a map on screen of where all these zones are. Seems so simple. The only “real” information coming out at the meetings is from the citizens who have chosen to speak.

Peter Avritch

(1) P1 line 337

“Any application for an accessory dwelling unit that meets the location and development standards contained in this Section shall be approve ministerially without discretionary review or public hearing unless otherwise specified.”

(2) P4 line 21-27

“Views. xxx Up to 10% of a primary view from a neighboring property may be impacted by a new accessory dwelling unit. A “ view “ is defined by Chapter 10.88 of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to determine view impact story poles will be require to be erected and notices will be sent out to properties within 100 feet inviting staff to visit the site. Staff will determine where the primary views in a neighboring property are and if the new ADU will impact greater than 10% of the view. The method for determining 10% (i.e. lineal vs. area) will be determined by staff. “

Lilly Schinsing

From: Vernel Larner [vhlarner@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 11:45 AM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Objection to P1 line 337 and P4 line 21-27 in the new ADU Regulations Proposal

Dear Ms. Schinsing,

Please include my objection to the following in the packet that will be forwarded to the Working Group.

(1) P1 line 337

"Any application for an accessory dwelling unit that meets the location and development standards contained in this Section shall be approve ministerially without discretionary review or public hearing unless otherwise specified."

(2) P4 line 21-27

"Views. xxx Up to 10% of a primary view from a neighboring property may be impacted by a new accessory dwelling unit. A " view " is defined by Chapter 10.88 of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to determine view impact story poles will be require to be erected and notices will be sent out to properties within 100 feet inviting staff to visit the site. Staff will determine where the primary views in a neighboring property are and if the new ADU will impact greater than 10% of the view. The method for determining 10% (i.e. lineal vs. area) will be determined by staff. "

We have design review and public hearings in order to preserve the character of the city and the property values and quality of life for existing property owners.

A 10% obstruction of my view with a building is enough to destroy it completely and to substantially impact my property value. The same will be true for any other property owner with a view, however large or small.

Vernel Larner

545 Easterby St.
vhlarner@gmail.com

From: Barbara Nelson [tendinggrowth@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 11:08 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Resident Opinion on ADU Proposals for City Council

Dear City Council members:

On Monday, June 19, I attended the meeting at which the Accessory Dwelling Unit Draft was discussed. While it is obvious that a great deal of thought and consideration has gone into the draft, I was shocked to learn of several proposals that would impact unfavorably on the character of our uniquely beautiful town. They are the height allowance, the 10% impact allowance on neighboring views, the minimal 100 feet for which that impact may be considered, and the ease and lack of review with which these allowances would be approved. I implore you to disapprove these proposals. Please do not be the council that will allow such a document to forever change the character of our town, because it will add density and surely encroach on our views.

Just the way such changes can be made with minimal review brings to mind the 16 foot extension on my neighbors house that now blocks my view. The contractor made sure he had a seat on the planning commission at the time this extension came before them. He smugly sat there while the four other members allowed this to happen in spite of my protests. He refrained from voting but knew full well that the others weren't going to go against his wishes.

But even more important than one person's view is the bigger picture of what it would mean if we allow Sausalito to increase in density while disappearing our views. If and when the time came that I had to leave Sausalito because I couldn't afford to live here, I would gladly make that sacrifice before I would want the character of Sausalito to change for the worse. There just aren't many places in the United States that are this beautiful or unique and I believe we have a moral obligation to preserve it for everyone. Surely the preservation of Sausalito is as important, if not more important to the good of us all, than making every corner of America "affordable". I hope you, as my elected officials feel the same and will act accordingly.

Sincerely,

Barbara Nelson
Resident since 1962

Lilly Schinsing

From: Hugh J Kolowich Jr [kolowich@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 1:42 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: The Housing Element for ADUs

To the three member of the ADU regulations,

My wife and I object to the outright abdication of our neighborhood and town to the directives from the State of California. We believe that all ADUs must be subject to public discussion and scrutiny not just staff approval. There should be no fast tracking. All requirements that presently exist such as height, parking, views, coverages should be adhered to so as not to destroy the historic character of our town. You need to reject the State dictates that rob us citizens of any say over these ADU projects. The citizens of Sausalito need to be represented here and not the homogenous dictates of the state.

Hugh J Kolowich Jr
kolowich@comcast.net
Phone (415) 332-8030
Cell (415) 272-0130

Lilly Schinsing

From: Vernel Larner [vhlarnr@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2012 3:20 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: New ADU Regulations

Dear Ms. Schinsing,

When the Working Group has finished their recommendations for ADU Regulations, will there be an opportunity for public review?

Thanks.

Vernel

Vernel Larner
545 Easterby St.
Sausalito, CA

Lilly Schinsing

From: Samantha Chatham [samantha.chatham@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2012 4:07 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Oppose Accessory Dwelling Unit

Hi Lilly,

Please include the following statement in the packet that is being delivered to the working group. Thank you!

To the ADU Working Group,

We strongly oppose the two proposed regulations that could possibly effect 10% of our view. We bought our house to enjoy the beautiful view that it has and if these proposed regulations of accessory dwelling units are passed not only could our view be obstructed but the value of the house could also decrease. We **STRONGLY** oppose these regulations.

Thank you,

Matt and Samantha Chatham
216 4th Street Sausalito, CA

From: cynthia.hopkins@ubs.com
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2012 4:13 PM
To: Lilly Schinsing
Subject: Objection to P1 line 337 and P4 line 21-27 in the new ADU Regulations Proposal
Attachments: Legal Disclaimer

Dear Ms. Schinsing,

Please include my objection to the following in the packet that will be forwarded to the Working Group.

(1) P1 line 337

"Any application for an accessory dwelling unit that meets the location and development standards contained in this Section shall be approve ministerially without discretionary review or public hearing unless otherwise specified."

(2) P4 line 21-27

"Views. xxx Up to 10% of a primary view from a neighboring property may be impacted by a new accessory dwelling unit. A " view " is defined by Chapter 10.88 of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to determine view impact story poles will be require to be erected and notices will be sent out to properties within 100 feet inviting staff to visit the site. Staff will determine where the primary views in a neighboring property are and if the new ADU will impact greater than 10% of the view. The method for determining 10% (i.e. lineal vs. area) will be determined by staff. "

We have design review and public hearings in order to preserve the character of the city and the property values and quality of life for existing property owners.

A 10% obstruction of my view with a building is enough to destroy it completely and to substantially impact my property value. The same will be true for any other property owner with a view, however large or small.

Regards,

Cynthia Hopkins

543 Easterby St

cynthia.hopkins@ubs.com