

From: Kim Follien [<mailto:follien.kim@gene.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 8:04 PM
To: Spediacci, Sheri
Subject: Public Comment Regarding Item G for 08/25/2016 Planning Commission Meeting

Hi Sherri,

The comment below is in response to Item G, Brisbane Baylands. General Plan Amendment and the proposed Brisbane Baylands Specific Plan. Could you please forward this to the Planning Commission and the City Council. And if possible, I would like it to be given to the Planning Commission in time for their meeting tomorrow evening. Thank you.

Dear Planning Commission.

I support amending the General Plan to allow housing as an approved use on the Baylands, so that the City can begin working with UPC to develop a feasible plan that will provide benefits to Brisbane, such as containment and remediation of the site, open space for habitat, trails, sports fields and parks, grocery store, drug store, renewable energy, and restoration of the round house.

I don't agree with your reasons for rejecting the General Plan amendment to allow housing in the Baylands. The Baylands can be made safe for housing, as it would be subject to the standards required by the State of California. There are many examples across the US demonstrating that former rail yards can be made safe for housing (Mission Bay, Bridgecourt Emeryville are just 2 examples). The community survey results indicate that 50% of the voters who responded feel that some level of housing on the Baylands would be appropriate, so there is support for housing. The assessment regarding the effect on community character appears to assume it would be negative. What evidence is that assessment based on? The Ridge is physically separated from Central Brisbane, and has had nothing but a positive impact. Regarding municipal cost-revenue considerations, the City has many tools at its disposal to protect Brisbane from financial harm. This was described in detail in the Financial Impact Assessment.

Locating high density housing near transit follows best practices (National, State, and Regional) for smart growth and helps lower regional greenhouse gas emissions by reducing regional commute traffic by providing housing closer to jobs. High density housing is more sustainable than the way Brisbane residents are living today. The cost of housing in the bay area is continuing to increase, forcing people (like our children) to live further and further away from their jobs, increasing greenhouse gas emissions, and negatively impacting health and happiness due to long commutes.

I'd also like to point out some other results of the community survey:

78% felt the City should proactively work with potential developers to ensure that any development is consistent with Brisbane's character and values.

81% place a high priority on remediating and containing contaminants.

66% feel that developer funds should be used for remediation and containment.

Without working with UPC on a plan that benefits both Brisbane and UPC, there won't be any containment or remediation of that site, and little (if any) development that will benefit Brisbane residents. In closing, please note that also in the community survey, only 16% felt that the City should remain passive (not work with a developer), and simply review and reject or approve submitted developer proposals, and yet that appears to be the way the Planning Commission is behaving.

Kim Follien (Brisbane Resident for the last 26 years)