

**From:** Julia Klein  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 6, 2018 1:37 PM  
**To:** Lisa Maley [REDACTED]; General Plan <generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org>  
**Subject:** RE: General Plan Update comments

Hi Lisa,

Thanks for emailing your written comments again.

This is to confirm receipt and to let you know that your email will be forwarded to the General Plan Subcommittee and included in the project file along with other public comments.

Should you have additional comments, please send your emails to [generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org).

Thanks,

Julia Klein  
Principal Planner  
City of San Mateo  
(650) 522-7216

 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

**From:** Lisa Maley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 6, 2018 9:06 AM  
**To:** Julia Klein <[jklein@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:jklein@cityofsanmateo.org)>  
**Cc:** Lily Lim <[llim@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:llim@cityofsanmateo.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: General Plan Update comments

Dear Ms. Klein and Ms. Lim:

I did not receive any reply to my email below. Will you please confirm that you received it and that it was forwarded to the GP Subcommittee.

Thank you,  
Lisa Maley  
Sent from my iPad

On Oct 26, 2018, at 2:54 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:  
Dear Ms. Klein and Ms. Lim:

I attended the General Plan Subcommittee meeting of October 16, 2018 and I have the following comments:

1. I agree with the speakers who suggested that we need to quantify tax liability implications. Specifically, it is important that taxpayers understand the monetary impact of the general plan and that these ongoing costs are minimized.
2. I agree that TDM needs back checking. A lot of assumptions are made but only hard data can confirm the validity of these assumptions. While there are claims of 50% Survey Monkey employees using the train we need to substantiate these numbers.
3. It is important to address traffic in terms of LOS; a concept people are familiar with and gauges traffic congestion. VMT may be required, but how does this measure address traffic congestion,

air quality, emergency vehicle access response time, all very much quality of life and safety issues?

4. There is a daily influx of 107,000 vehicles (16,000 during peak hours alone) coming from Hwy 92 during the morning commute and a similar number leaving in the afternoon commute. The Alameda de las Pulgas is a now thoroughfare during commute hours and neighborhoods are experiencing cut through traffic. Eastbound Hwy 92 commonly backs up to beyond the Hillsdale exit. Hwy 101 towards the Hwy 92 bridge is at a standstill. San Mateo is profoundly affected by east bay traffic and we need to have data to understand if building dense rental units along traffic corridors will have any impact on the number of commuters from the east bay.
5. Hillsdale Mall is 10 only miles from Stanford Mall, a thriving shopping center that is among the nation's top 10 in sales per square foot. So why is Stanford thriving and Hillsdale Mall not when the location and demographic are so similar? Stanford Mall has innovated and kept up with the times; Simon Properties has made it a desirable place to go to, a place of community with charming gathering spots, a garden like setting, and great shops. The Hillsdale Mall is completely outdated and aesthetically appalling; it will never attract anchor tenants in its current state. The Bohannon Group has lost out on opportunities to attract the large desirable tenants leaving Burlingame Avenue due to lack of parking and high rents. Even though I live less than a mile from Hillsdale Mall I'd much rather make the trek to Stanford. I'm sure there is a heavy loss of tax revenue for all of us shopping at Stanford instead of Hillsdale.
6. If housing diversity is desirable, then the General Plan should enumerate the number one, two and three bedrooms that would create a balance. Most of the rental units that have been recently built and/or are currently proposed are studio and 1-bdrm units. This essentially is creating tech work force housing that is only desirable to a single demographic. Longer lease term availability in new projects may offer those staying longer more stability.
7. I may be mistaken but I thought I heard a speaker report that our jobs/dwelling units ratio is 1.5. Our current General Plan 2030 has buildout of 1.35 jobs/dwelling units and requires that the city monitor housing production against new job creation and report this to the Planning Commission and City Council annually. This is particularly important considering the July 16<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting where the Mayor and Council Members spoke about "the huge job growth causing the housing shortage", "the dramatic change in the economic environment that no one could have envisioned", "the housing imbalance", and in one case, "the housing shortage of epic proportions". Our current General Plan set out to monitor and report the jobs/housing balance to guide development decisions and yet we are in this predicament. I recognize this is a regional issue, but San Mateo residents should have confidence that our city and our city government are adhering to its' General Plan and that measures are included in the General Plan update to address accountability.

Sincerely,

Lisa M.Maley