

Objective Design and Development Standards  
ABAG 2023 2031 Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan  
Public Comments

Are we not worried about the two articles in the paper that state that everyone has misinterpreted the law concerning the 120-day grace period? Seems from the articles that HCD made it clear that it is not what everyone thought it was.

[https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/san-francisco-could-lose-millions-by-missing-key-housing-deadline/article\\_6e9c9df6-498c-11ed-8b7b-a75ad690202a.html](https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/san-francisco-could-lose-millions-by-missing-key-housing-deadline/article_6e9c9df6-498c-11ed-8b7b-a75ad690202a.html)(External link)

<https://www.bizjournals.com/sanfrancisco/news/2022/10/14/bay-area-housing-element-deadline.html>(External link)

‡=

I support adding the proposed 490 new housing units to the General Plan. It's time that Fairfax racists and segregationists start to make up for their decades of discrimination against people of color and lower income families and individuals.

The northern most and southern most portions of area 18 may be able to support development but have you gone out to take a look at the central portions of 18? It's a steep, overgrown hillside and a high fire hazard area. I don't think you really gave that area much thought before you added it to the draft EIR.

Good luck!

Scott Williams

I have been dying to leave my feedback. Here goes.. # 1. Vacant commercial spaces listed for lease- all over Marin.. Some have been vacant for 10+ years. Many of those buildings can and should be re-purposed to house people. Landlords/owners of these buildings, whether they are llc or corporate owned, should be taxed and fined in order to finance the creation of rentals. 2. second story development..everywhere especially in Fairfax and San Anselmo ..legalize it, subsidize it. 3. deal w the traffic argument..people need to live near where they work- gardeners, grocers, pharmacists, teachers, police, firefighters, doctors, vets, attorneys- all need to be able to walk, ride, drive to work in less than an hour.. 4. derelict lots and buildings-deal.. 5. charge absentee landlords for maintenance.. and finally.. help homeowners build adus..right now local planning departments exist only to deny and fine homeowners trying to add safe, attractive rentals... fix it..do it..this has been going on for 35 years!

Veggiegardener

The Objective Design and Development Standards (ODDS) being proposed are prohibitively limiting of multi-family housing development. The current ODDS proposal is far more detailed and onerous than other post-SB 35 objective design standards generated by less wealthy and less segregated municipalities. Notably, the proposed ODDS limits the possible architecture styles to five - craftsman, "Main Street classical," mediterranean, Tudor, and Victorian - all of which are more suitable to single-family homes and none of which easily accommodate cost-effective pre-fab or modular constructions. Moreover, these architecture styles comprise a very small fraction of existing housing - either single- or multi-family - in the Town of Fairfax. It seems clear to me that the towns participating in this ODDS creation are trying to limit affordable housing development by using the carve-out for objective design review standards in Gov Code section 65913.4(a)(5). In fact, city council members and town employees have overtly stated that these requirements are designed to curb the streamlined review process of SB 35. Not only is this contrary to the spirit of SB 35, but actually may violate both federal and state constitutional standards given the existing level of segregation in the County (Marin is both the least diverse and most segregated county in California). Fairfax should seriously reconsider participating in this clearly racially motivated and anti-inclusionary effort to limit multi-family housing development.

anonymous