

---

**From:** Maxine Turner <publicmax@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 27, 2019 5:31 PM  
**To:** General Plan  
**Cc:** Ellen Mallory  
**Subject:** GP#5

Please include my comments/questions for distribution to the Subcommittee for tonight's meeting & for the record.

1) **Manage the jobs.** The 25+% increase in tech jobs in the past 5 years has created an unsustainable imbalance. Throughout the region this excessive imbalance has increased the cost of everything, especially construction costs which is one of the primary reasons housing cannot be built affordably. **The jobs/housing balance must be restored with a jobs timeout so that communities can absorb all the new development.**

2) **Democracy demands that voters have a seat at the development table.** Do existing residents get a say in what makes a desirable quality of life for themselves or do they have to accommodate the glut of jobs imposed on communities by the richest, global corporations on the planet? **Policy discussions must specifically identify what benefits all this new development will bring to the existing community, not just to the property owners & developers who financially gain from building more.**

3) **Make 'demand creators' pay.** There's always tension/balance between the forces of development & those of conservation, whether talking about the environment or land use planning. Right now, global corporate job generators, like the resource extractors of the last century, come into areas with desirable qualities for their needs & then dump their externalities, which have negatively impacted the existing community. **The job creators must pay their fair share of providing the services & infrastructure required to support the new population. How is SM addressing these costs now...how much is being collected, from what sources and where is this money being spent? Are business license taxes collected from shared rides, shared housing & shared workspaces?**

4) **Increasing heights & densities does not ensure affordability.** More market rate housing that the average worker cannot afford makes matters worse, not better. What is needed is AFFORDABLE housing, not more market rate or luxury housing. The background information confirms that SM has done a good job of providing high density units compared to SM County & the Bay Region. [Table 12: 1-unit 54%; 2 to 4 units 8%; 5 or more units 38%] To meaningfully discuss development density trade-offs, GP participants need to understand what density means and how it relates to the number & kind of units that can be built in new buildings. **Provide examples at different high densities of what housing looks like and what mix of units can occur. How can a variety of unit sizes (singles to families) in each new building be guaranteed if densities are increased?**

5) **Where are important sales tax revenues generated?** Historically, ECR has provided high sales tax revenue with small, businesses that rely on good visibility and on-street parking. **Provide sales tax information by distinct subareas such as Hillsdale & Fashion Island Malls, Downtown, along El Camino Real, and in neighborhood shopping centers like 25th Avenue and Laurelwood. Evaluate how plans to eliminate parking and displace these small businesses with high density housing will affect city revenues.**