

Sheila de la Guerra **Public Comment-Group 1** #1

From: Dick Flacks <rflacks@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2024 3:54 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: SB CAN Executive Director; nancy@sbcacn.org; Megan Turley
Subject: SBCAN public comment on rezoning priorities



Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Chair Williams and members of the Board of Supervisors:
I'm writing as co-president of Santa Barbara County Action Network (SBCAN). We express support for planning staff recommendations for priorities and criteria for up-zoning aimed at enabling achievement of RHNA goals. We second the careful analysis of the League of Women Voters, which concludes that up-zoning must serve the goal of maximizing development of low income and missing middle housing. Nonprofit development, by the Housing Authority and private non-profits, aimed at 100% below market, deed restricted housing, is necessary to meet the desperate human need, as well as state mandates. Private development that partners with the Housing Authority, or with major employers would be a helpful strategy. "Local preference" provisions should be enforced to the extent possible. We urge immediate priority on your part to seek a county wide affordable housing trust fund that can bolster local capacity to produce affordable housing on the requisite scale.

SBCAN has sought ways to get UCSB to fulfill its plans and pledges to develop employee housing, and we were encouraged by the county court action on this matter. We urge continuing efforts on this front; the benefits to the community and the campus were these plans to be realized are obvious-- and the continuing failure is tragic.

The 'builders remedy' framework is hardly an optimal way to meet the housing needs we face--and indeed may result in an oversupply of housing that worsens the crisis. We hope ways can be found to encourage the "builders" to make their plans meet community benefit standards.

SBCAN will work to support your efforts to achieve housing opportunities for all.
Sincerely,
Richard Flacks
SBCAN co-president

Sheila de la Guerra

From: Linda Honikman <linda.honikman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2024 4:58 PM
To: sbcob
Cc: Plowman, Lisa
Subject: Jan 9 item #4 - Evaluating potential upzone sites for the County HEU
Attachments: How to evaluate County sites for upzones.docx

Caution: This email originated from a source outside of the County of Santa Barbara. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify the sender and know the content is safe.

Please distribute to the Board of Supervisors.

Thank You!

Linda Honikman
Future Housing Communities

(805) 683-0408 cell (8am-8pm PST)

Hello. I am Linda Honikman, co-founder of the non-profit Future Housing Communities, and member of the League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara but speaking as an individual today who lives at the intersection of Hollister and San Marcos Rd.

It is hard not to get caught up with the depressing reality of the many Builder's Remedy projects that could produce thousands of small rentals for above moderate incomes that will propel more local renters and workers out of the County. But if we can start thinking beyond what we can't control right now and focus on where we want to get to in 10 years it may help in the final selection of sites.

Put on your Future hat.

It's 2031 and we are all still living in the County with less stress. We have a national reputation for reversing our housing crisis and being an innovator in the areas of

- Zoning and planning that encourage pro-people and pro-environment neighborhoods
- Housing design and manufacturing that improves affordability and sustainability
- Jobs/housing balance so workers have quality time out of their cars while also contributing to our local economy and resiliency
- Systems that allow for more housing security such as limited equity cooperatives or lease to own programs
- Community investments and funding sources that help all the above outcomes

Our economy has flourished since 2024 in part because we were able to tap into the decade of home formation for millennials and offered low and moderate income workers a chance to get more permanent housing security. We also attracted boomers who had extra money to spend and we brought in hefty revenue from our housing related businesses, especially in the North County where many jobs were created.

OK. So how do we get there?

- 1) We need to see a Countywide commitment to improve housing security for local residents and workers and also show tolerance for some innovation during 2024. That will give renters in the South County a little hope that there may be a reason to stay. And nonprofits, planners, advocates and housing related businesses can start building cross-sector coalitions to help with that.
- 2) The obvious priorities for sites to upzone start with those owned by the County and faith communities.
- 3) For privately owned sites we need to assess their willingness to consider different unit types and ownership models.

The situation we are in is not the fault of local planners or Supervisors. It's also not the fault of developers and property owners. BUT developers and property owners of the upzone sites should be part of the solution.

Questions I would like to ask the investor/developer teams -

- Are you willing to consider a variety of housing types such as 3 and 4 bedrooms for families or taller buildings perhaps for purchase condos (with increase of open space or environmental/recreational amenities)
- Would you consider offering a high percent of moderate income units (that also have new state laws offering incentives?)
- Will you be pro-community and respond to needs - ideally have a nearby employer partner ?
- Does your company typically have a long term relationship (including future management) with a project or do you sometimes sell after zoning is obtained?
- If you can't provide plans for more than the bare minimum 20% affordable or desirable options such as home ownership for moderate incomes or deed restrictions that ensure the residents are local, are you willing to subdivide and sell some acres to a non-profit developer?

Thank you!