

HOUSING ELEMENTS COMMENTS

Comments by Bob Myhr

On the draft ordinance itself (031609.doc)

- Background

Section E. 6. Change the word “will” to “may”

Section E. 7. a. Change “is driving out” to “creates hardships for”

Section E. 7. b. Change “is keeping” to “makes it economic challenging for”

Section E. 7. c. Begin the sentence with the words “Much of [o]ur population

Section E. 7. d. Rewrite all of d. to read as follows: “ The county can take steps now to encourage affordable housing for our working population to help address concerns some have expressed as potentially radical changes to the community.”

- Staff Report, March 27, 2009, for March 31, 2009, Council Meeting

Section 5.2.A, Item 13, iv. Change spelling of ‘principle’ to “principal”

Other comments: correct safe house numbers; provide date on rental inventories on April 7

- Com Plan, Section B, Element 5, Housing, March 2009, Exhibit 1

Page 5, in general: Housing should be tied to projected employment, not population.

Page 5: Sentence in the middle of the page should read as follows: “Affordable housing need to be provided on each of the islands in proportion to growth in full-time population and employment.”

Page 5, bottom of page: What happens to houses of those nearing retirement is only hearsay.

Page 6, top of page. I do not understand the basis for the first three sentences underlined at the top of the page. I do know that most recent hires of the county have come at “mid-career” or early retirement or with equity from a prior location. I have not seen good indicators that the county or other employers are not finding capable employees. Besides first time home buyers, it seems that rental might, indeed, provide for needed housing---not just first time home buyers in the county.

Updating on 2010 Census---perhaps this element should have 2012 or 2013 “sunset” clause, or at least mandatory revision based on most recent data.

Page 7, middle of the page: What is the real number of all parcels in the county? How many are built on? How many still buildable?

Page 8, what does “gentrification” mean? Yes, anecdotal. I think this whole paragraph should simply state that the San Juans are a desirable place to live and the market has pushed up prices---and avoid value judgments as to who the buyers are.

Page 8, middle of the page. I take exception to rural residential clusters and request that it be taken out of the plan. Clusters in UGAs, hamlets, villages, Lamrids are appropriate. Rural clusters tend to create sprawl (no matter how well designed or done), They are inconsistent with a key priority of the county: “Protecting our natural, scenic, and open space resources.” They add to the islands becoming “suburbia” outside of population centers.

Top of Page 9 first full sentence at the end: Change “will drive families” to “may continue to make it economically difficult for families in the county.”

Page 10: We still keep putting off what is meant by the term “permanently affordable”

Page 11: 5.2.A.

Put original no. 3 back in

Page 12: 5.2.B

2.-3 Change to read as follows: Review advantages and disadvantages of a SJC Housing Authority. Consider, instead, trying one or two projects with another adjacent Housing Authority to learn from the experience

Page 13-14, 5.2.B. 15. Make the first sentence read as follows: ” Provide for no more than 10 small-scale residential cluster developments of no more than twelve dwelling units each within designated Village, Hamlet, and Residential Activity Centers.” Take out the word “rural” and not allow said clusters on rural lands.

Page 14, Item 20. Pretty much is at the state level and the county cannot affect much.