

From: [Laurence Kinsella](#)
To: [General Plan](#)
Subject: GP update comments
Date: Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:19:03 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

Respectfully, it seems to me that a couple of basic questions are missing in the present 2040 General Plan Update discussion, and that the update itself, is slowly devolving into a density update based on real estate and NGO input and interests.

One basic question that I don't see adequately addressed anywhere is, how much of the higher density proposed, by developers like Bohannon and their paid consultants, is going to be affordable housing?

Is anyone in this update process, asking how building more market rate housing is going to solve the problem of affordability?

It's an important question because if the proposed high density housing, being advocated for by developers and NGO's, is not affordable housing; then in fact, it will do nothing to solve our housing crisis. It will simply lead to more gentrification on the eastside of the Peninsula.

Station Green, and all of the 1000's of units being proposed in the surrounding area of San Mateo, will not lower the price of housing in the City of San Mateo. They are market rate developments, not affordable projects. Something on the order of 95% or more of what has been built, including TOD and Bay Meadows and what is being proposed in the GP comments San Mateo are market rate developments.

The fact is that there is plenty of market rate housing available in San Mateo and on the Peninsula already (and in the rest of California). And further, the actual numbers required to build our way out of the present affordability crisis would entail a doubling of the size of the Bay Area and that's not going to happen anytime soon.

Second, why if this is a document with a 2040 timeframe/window, are we not looking at other transportation corridors, such as highways 92 and 280? And also at other modes of transportation?

Are we locked into a 16th century technology and the notion that Caltrain is the only solution to a sustainable transportation future? And an GP update that is focused so heavily on the eastside of San Mateo?

What about the possibility, and even more than that the probability, of the development of other sustainable transportation modes in the next 20 years?

What if Musk's HyperloopOne turns out to be feasible...why wouldn't the area around 280 be an excellent fit for a hyper loop system?.

Caltrain may be a convenient narrative for developers, like Bohannon who have vested interests in the Hillsdale area, but it has no more legitimacy in a 2040 update than other potential future transportation narratives.

Actually the inconvenient fact is that Caltrain ridership has been down for the last 3 years, while existing evidence shows that self-driving cars and smart roads are a near certainty within the GP update timeframe.

So maybe the 92 and 280 transportation corridors should be added as be appropriate topics for research and discussion in the update?

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Laurence Kinsella
San Mateo, CA.