

To: Brisbane City Council

Subject: Brisbane Baylands public comments July 19, 2018

submitted by Tony Verreos, resident: 122 Warbler

1. What started out as a question of what to do many years ago, has changed to what Brisbane will be forced to do very soon IF the state takes over via passage of special targeted legislation.
2. The threat of loss of both revenue and control, has caused a dramatic change among the BCC from No Housing on the Baylands to we will accept from 1,800 to 2,200 units there.
3. For some accepting housing is easier than accepting doubling to tripling our City's population and creating a new largely separated voter block which could easily further change future growth questions by ballot.
4. Many options to address the various concerns have been suggested by Brisbane residents, but none has been publicly debated here on the record, or in a town hall format. Instead we are being told in essence there is NO other choice. This choice is best. I can't tell you how many disagree – maybe not enough?
5. The options we have heard outside of these chambers are not to say NO with the intent of doing nothing, and preventing the developer from doing anything. Instead they are all aimed at Choosing better alternatives from where to put new housing, to how to make it far more affordable, and how to actually bring our currently split housing together in Crocker Park over time, while moving most of the commercial occupants to the Baylands and other suitable locations.

To: Brisbane City Council

Subject: Brisbane Baylands public comments July 19, 2018
submitted by Tony Verreos, resident: 122 Warbler

6. Unless I got a totally wrong understanding of the Sacramento position from Senator Jerry Hill, their primary concern was a) to remove needless barriers to residential construction, and b) to not make the current crisis even worse by adding more jobs without adding adequate housing.
7. That means you can say NO to housing on the Baylands as long as you do not say NO to housing elsewhere.
8. Additionally, the failure to fully explore the potential for working deals to trade the developer's originally requested housing number into Daly City where the homes, and the voters could get most of the same benefits, but not cause the imbalance of dramatically changing Brisbane seems worthy of discussion.
9. The developer and Sacramento are 100% right about only one thing: the current planning process is not designed to bring out the best designs as soon as possible. Of course it was never designed to do that.
10. Some think that cleaning up the polluted lands is a goal in itself. And that we should be willing to accept whatever development level that we are told is required in order to justify those clean up expenditures. Others think none of it was bothering us until the City agreed to allow the developer to build a mountain in exchange for a mountain of cash.
11. Now we are told many unknown factors could de-rail any specific project plans to be submitted IF we VOTE yes to allow housing on the Baylands. But in this environment and political climate thinking that those homes will never be built is likely very wrong. And as seen at the last BCC mtg. the developer is already asking for MORE! VOTE NO!