



DEDICATED TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

February 6, 2012

Hilary Gitelman
Director
Napa County Dept Conservation, Development & Planning
1195 Third Street
Napa, CA 94559

Re: Napa Pipe

Dear Ms Gitelman:

Over the past four years, we have followed the progress of the Napa Redevelopment Partners' proposal to convert a largely abandoned 150+ acre industrial brownfield property into a thoughtfully designed, economically integrated, and ecologically sustainable village.

We understand that the Napa Pipe development proposal calendared for Planning Commission consideration in February and March is proposing that the residential scale be downsized to just over 2,000 homes, to be interspersed within a 135 acre mixed-use master-planned and multi-phased development. In our view, the soundness of the Napa Pipe proposal lies in the efficiencies of its location, its scale, its design, its integration, and its diversity and mix of uses. As a whole and complete master-plan development, Napa Pipe embodies the best of inclusionary housing policy – leveraging a realistically viable and integrated 400+ unit affordable housing production opportunity by dedicating fully improved and ready to build properties to one or more nonprofit development and management entities with the capacity and know-how to deliver. Accept this letter as SWJ Housing's support for the County's prompt and decisive action to adopt the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan Amendment, EIR Certification, and any other action necessary to conclusively approve the above summarized Napa Pipe proposal.

We understand that an alternate proposal for the site has been advanced by third-party interests which generally recommends that the property's current Industrial zoning and uses be preserved over the entire site, except for a 20-acre stand-alone residential island, reserved exclusively and solely for the future development of approximately 300 units of low and moderate income housing. This "alternative" should be viewed as an infeasible non-starter. Since the "alternative" plan would retain the underlying base Industrial zoning and uses, and therefore would not trigger an Inclusionary Housing obligation, on what economic or regulatory basis would the property owners be motivated to create a 20 acre residential land division? The isolation and warehousing of lower income households within a non-remediated contaminated industrial site is clearly not in the public interest, and even if a land division were accomplished, we can't imagine how the "alternative" proposal could be successfully underwritten to obtain the public and private sector financing commitments necessary for the development of the stand-alone affordable housing.

We encourage the County to take affirmative action to approve the Napa Pipe mixed-use project as currently proposed by Napa Redevelopment Partners, and to reject the "alternative" proposal.

Sincerely,

Scott W. Johnson
President