

Wendy Lao

From: Maxine Turner <publicmax@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 11:26 PM
To: Amourence Lee; Clifford Robbins; Ellen Mallory; Eric Rodriguez; Ramiro Maldonado Jr.; Rick Bonilla; Diane Papan; Joe Goethals; Maureen Freschet; Drew Corbett; Kohar Kojayan; Julia Klein; Wendy Lao
Subject: Vision input

Sincere thanks to the City Council and staff for taking this GP course correction. It will go a long way toward reassuring a skeptical community that broad community participation can be a reality. With strong community engagement we can grow and change in a way that brings the community together, rather than divides us. But, this can only be done if the process is perceived as legitimate and not biased toward a predetermined outcome.

The Vision and Values statement is much improved. I would like to add that preserving our history & downtown historic buildings deserve a place in the new Vision/Values statement. Especially, since we are celebrating our 125th Anniversary this year. These values were often stated during the previous input meetings and I question why there seems to be resistance to including them. Please amend the Vision to say: San Mateo is a vibrant, livable, and diverse community that respects **its history** and the quality of its neighborhoods, fosters a **robust** economy, is committed to equity, and is a leader in environmental sustainability.

The public outreach brainstorm asks how to reach more people & especially the 'marginalized' community. I support these outreach efforts and believe that the best way to do this is with a professional survey, similar to surveys the City already conducts to test support for political or financial ballot issues. A large random sample of the population can insure participation by all, including under-represented, segments of the community. Clearly, no one (or very few) wants to, or has the time to, attend meetings.

Key to a valid survey are the questions asked. Questions should be determined in a transparent, public process. The GPS must review and give feedback on them before they are asked in the survey. The questions should at least include asking why people have chosen to live here, what level of increased building heights do they prefer, as well as what other specific improvements residents would like to see.

You also ask what is important to understand for those who are new - without being clear as to whether new to the planning process or new to the community. The survey question about why people choose to live here may answer the new to the community part. But, we all know that the most contentious part of the GP update is determining how high & how dense new development should be and where will it be located. Let's get that out sooner rather than later & discuss the trade-offs and alternatives. I believe we can find more consensus than disagreement if we honestly talk about the real issues, while acknowledging that individual property owners may not get as much as they covet.

Much dis-information surrounds the issues of heights and densities. For the average citizen to responsibly participate they need to know what these words mean. Very few understand density and how it affects the size of units and the number of people who can live in any one building. I suggest that we start with defining what type of housing we want in new developments, e.g., how many family size units, micro-units or what range of unit sizes? The consultants can help us understand what densities will assure we get what the community needs, not just what maximizes profits for the developer. An important role of the consultant team should be to give the public alternatives they can understand.

Thanks for listening to my input.
Maxine Turner