



Draft Alternatives Online Survey Comments

The City collected survey responses from April 14, 2021 through May 31, 2021. This document presents the verbatim responses.

Study Area 1 - North

Higher population density along El Camino makes sense, subject to design compatibility with historic structures to be protected and preserved. But where are the new parks and open spaces for the general public being added? For example, Martin Luther King outdoor spaces are not diversified as far as age groups. Where are the parks facilities for senior citizens, who might downsize into the new El Camino denser housing units?
Not enough pocket parks
All three alternatives are heavily skewed towards Residential Medium without considering Mixed-Use Medium (envisioning retail/restaurants with housing above) - which if added to this corridor could allow those in the surrounding residential areas more opportunities to walk to shop/eat instead of getting into cars.
You need some parks / open space. Even just some miniparks. Look at more high density housing for areas within 1/2 mile of train stations (San Mateo, Burlingame).
more higher density home buildings
I don't see best place to say this, so I'll put it here: We Must Respect Passage of Measure Y in All Study Areas.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
Less people. We are heading into another drought and rolling blackouts....there is not enough water and power to support more people. EVERYONE CANNOT live in the same place!
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
How are schools and infrastructure being funded or built with such an increase to the population?
1. Create a home maximizing alternative that doesn't require any "High" mixed use or residential areas (thus sticking within bounds of measure Y) 2. Expand the study area. In the case of el camino corridor, it should be mostly mixed use medium directly on el camino, where retail/commercial/office is restricted to 1st floor, and all new developments must include at least enough residential units to cover jobs on 1st floor. Beyond that and out to at least a quarter mile from el camino should be a mix of residential low and mixed use low (with same restriction as spelled out above for medium), along with a smattering of commercial neighborhood parcels at corners.
lower net new. pandemic is changing the planning assumptions
Lower net new. Pandemic has changed the planning assumptions
more housing. Prefer alternative B because it has the most homes and fewer jobs relative to alternative C
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the

most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
Alternative B could also include the light-blue Mixed-Use medium zoning on the intersections of El Cerrito, Tilton, and El Camino. Residential low could be extended in the current SFH neighborhoods.
Alt. A or B ok.
the net new is too high and not justified with the pandemic causing people to leave the area. Also, this plan seems to compromise retail, restaurants, services for the sake of additional housing. Not good. And traffic congestion.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and Don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
There aren't any options for changes in the western neighborhoods.
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
Hard ot see the differences between the choices - except per the chart. No comments.
The space between El Camino and San Mateo Drive should also be evaluated in this scenario.
This area could handle one-three highrises-(10-12 stories) NO authority for all tall ones, just a limited few.
El Camino Real is a high-capacity corridor with easy access to many amenities including the highest capacity transit lines in San Mateo County. We need a lot more housing - high density housing in this section. We would be shooting ourselves in the foot by going against our climate goals.
Why aren't the neighborhoods west of El Camino Real being considered for new housing? So long as ECR has so much traffic, concentrating housing on ECR itself exposes those residents to all the pollution from that traffic. Just because wealthy, predominantly white neighborhoods west of El Camino Real have political power doesn't mean they should be excluded from doing their fair share to welcome new neighbors.
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Ideally, there would be more multi-use in this area so that people could walk to have their service, food, etc. needs met. Open spaces/parks?
I'd like to see more Residential High or Mixed-Use High along El Camino. Also, including more area west of El Camino for study and development.
Less office building to restore the housing balance and new reality of working from home.
Prefer Alternative B as it maximizes housing, but suggest replacing residential medium between E Santa Inez and 2nd Ave with residential high given proximity to Caltrain.
I think there might be more HIGH Residential. I picture El Camino Real one day being like Wilshire Blvd in LA.

The future with people working at home will be more common. This means fewer commuters and fewer need to provide more housing
The highlights are the same for each. The PDFs and the clips on the page show different information - the PDFs have key-less info on three separate regions. It looks like you've done the work behind the scenes but this communication effort is terrible This is super sloppy work.
Parts of El Camino is a blight with very low density commercial and broken down retail. We need to pack the El Camino corridor with more housing so people are near these businesses. I favor Alternative B because there is more housing but the other Alternatives should have more housing and higher density mixed use. The literal air above these commercial spaces is a waste and we need to build taller mixed-use buildings to increase housing.
the land marked as 'park' open space from de anza towards 280 is NOT city land, it is county land. Open space is crucial in any development. What about the freeway access and size for the increase in cars you should be planning for with this huge increase in population? What about coordinating and improving public transit in these scenarios? You can NOT build housing without PRE PLANNING for transportation needs and increase in vehicle traffic.
I would like to see how landscaping/greenspaces would be incorporated in each scenario. For example, for higher density buildings, how much green space will be incorporated?
Given the housing shortage, there should be a material amount of Residential High in at least one of the alternatives.
More Housing here seems best
Would like to see better lighting along El Camino, better placement of speed limit signs, and more visible crosswalks. It's feels unsafe to cross El Camino especially for elders, people with kids, and those with mobility challenges.

Study Area 1 – Center

Perhaps even Mixed-Use High could be evaluated along ECR, instead of solely in isolated spots on either end.
more Residential high and Mixed use high needed
additional high rise housing
I like B. With theses changes on West side of ECR Residential from High to Residential Medium. Also Mixed Use and Office on West side ECR should be changed from High to Medium. Between Barneson and Borel Mixed-Use medium.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
Definitely don't want high density residential on the east side of EC in the Hayward Park area. It's become surrounded by high density development. Can't you see, as planners, that you are squeezing the life out of Hayward Park with high density commercial and residential on the N and S ends of the area and now, with this proposal for high density on the west side, you have in effect, fenced in the entire area with the RR tracks on the east side of Hayward Park. Not acceptable at all.
Take C and eliminate all the "High" zones currently disallowed by Measure Y. So 1300 and 1700 el camino should be mixed-use medium, not high. All mixed use medium should restrict any office space to 1st floor, limit surface parking area, and require at least enough residences to cover added jobs. There should be a few more residential Medium areas in the mix. Residential Low should extend to about 1/4 mile from el camino.
lower net new. Pandemic has changed planning assumptions.
lower net new. The pandemic has changed the planning assumptions

more housing Prefer alternative B because it has the most homes
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
In Alternative B and C, the strip of light blue Mixed-Use Medium on El Camino between Aragon Blvd and Hobart Ave should be considered for Mixed-Use high on both sides.
Alt. A is preferred.
the net new is too high and not justified with the pandemic causing people to leave the area. Also, this plan seems to compromise retail, restaurants, services for the sake of additional housing. Not good. And Traffic congestion.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
More upzoning in the western neighborhoods.
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
Nothing above 5 stories in this corridor. We don't want to create a "canyon" on ECR. The existing buildings are enough height!
This area is already zoned for "high density residential" in mixed use zones. How are any of these scenarios adding zoned capacity? With measure P, the capacity for change seems extremely limited.
RHNA mandates LOTS of housing--we are not taking advantage of higher housing on EC. WE DO NOT WANT AN EL CAMINO CANYON--BUT SHOULD ADD FLEXIBILITY IN THE GENERAL PLAN TO ALLOW FOR SOME. WE MAY NEVER GET A CHANCE TO DO IT. BUT HOW DISAPPOINTING TO NEED IT AND BE BLOCKED BY OUR OWN RIGID PLAN YEARS AGO.
Why does Alt 1 have more jobs than Alt 3?
We should evaluate high density residential and mixed use alternatives here. El Camino is the highest capacity transit corridor in our region with connections to many amenities. We need more housing and more development on this corridor in order to reduce driving and better meet our climate goals.

The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. While these three alternatives give good options, the lack of addressing how schools, infrastructure, etc. could accommodate this large increase, makes it difficult to evaluate if there should be another option.
Alternative B looks great. I'd like to see more area west of El Camino for study and development.
Less office building to balance for homes and the new reality of working from home.
Prefer Alternative B since it maximizes housing but suggest replacing mixed-use medium with mixed-use high given proximity to Caltrain and downtown. If there's any place we should be maximizing housing, it's near downtown.
We do not need more housing west of el camino between Hwy 92 to Peninsula. If you want to remodel units that is fine and heights below 55, Is critical. We do not need a higher density here
What is the baseline? You need to show the section-by-section deltas, not reference 4 separate documents with no overlays. Remember we're coming to this cold.
Parts of El Camino is a blight with very low density commercial and broken down retail. We need to pack the El Camino corridor with more housing so people are near these businesses. I favor Alternative B because there is more housing but the other Alternatives should have more housing and higher density mixed use. The literal air above these commercial spaces is a waste and we need to build taller mixed-use buildings to increase housing.
I do not want to see Borel Square changed in any way to lose the function of the current businesses there. Nor do I want to see apartments built in that location or high rise buildings.
Alternative C is the best
Study area should be expanded to include all the office properties on Bovet Road and off Borel Ave.

Study Area 1 - South

It would be interesting to consider Medium Mixed-Use along 37th Ave as that could become a walkable center of this neighborhood.
no need for much additional office. need some mini parks and open space.
could you include mixed use medium in one of these alternative?
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
Not expanding housing and jobs and leave the area close to what it is now. Not reason to add office space when there is a 10 year supply after Covid
Keep service on narrow strip between el camino and train tracks. Expand Medium residential behind el-camino facing lots, more than just the one area currently in all 3 alternatives.
lowere the net new. The pandemic has changed the planning assumptions.
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.

For all Alternatives, areas that are currently Mixed-Use Low or Residential low should instead be Mixed-Use Medium or Residential Medium
Alt. B preferred.
the net new is too high and not justified with the pandemic causing people to leave the area. Also, this plan seems to compromise retail, restaurants, services for the sake of additional housing. Not good. And traffic congestion.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
More zoning options in the western neighborhoods.
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
Commercial service needs to be preserved if we don't want to have to go to Redwood City , or wherever, for such services. On shallow parcel against the tracks seems to make a lot of sense. Mixed use medium might work on the ECR frontage - perhaps no more than 3 stories, but mixed use is so undefined. Should be retail ground floor with residential above. No offices. Might also work on 37th, which actually has very little neighborhood serving use right now. But need to keep some opportunity for laundromats, barber shops and hairdressers, other small commercial uses. .
We need more housing, especially in the western neighborhoods.
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included.
I would like to see Mixed Use Medium instead of Low for this area.
Less development due to traffic constraints. El Camino is only 2 lanes and Pacific Blvd gets impacted by East Bay commuter cut through.
Prefer Alternative B since it maximizes housing, but suggest replacing the mixed-use low with mixed-use medium and mixed-use high given proximity to Caltrain station.
Like to see more housing options.
Already too dense. Too crowded. Too congested
Parts of El Camino is a blight with very low density commercial and broken down retail. We need to pack the El Camino corridor with more housing so people are near these businesses. I favor Alternative B because there is more housing but the other Alternatives should have more housing and higher density mixed use. The literal air above these commercial spaces is a waste and we need to build taller mixed-use buildings to increase housing.
putting residential units on 37th and el camino where there are currently businesses is silly. Not to mention that there is no easily accessible public transport there.
Consider adding a Privately Owned Public Open Space to all the options.

alternative B shouldn't be considered; the businesses along 37th are vital & unique to the area, (and some, like Romolo's, are historic!) and turning it into condos wouldn't benefit anyone
Suggest replacing residential area located along 37th street in Alternative 2 with commercial or mixed use. This isn't the right space for residential. Too busy.
This whole area should be studied for mixed-use medium because it's still walkable distance to Hillsdale Caltrain station and there are multiple bus routes serving El Camino Real.

Study Area 2

How about some green spaces/gathering spaces? Also, a possible location for more fields for sports to reduce traffic to Foster City parks and Los Prados. This is a city wide issue. Having trails and bike paths are great for individual commuters but for driving kids to/from San Mateo activities that take place East of the 101, e.g. SMNLL and AYSO soccer, club soccer parents are NOT going to walk or bike. This needs to be addressed as San Mateo increases density of population. Also, Bay Meadows are not well-maintained fields and not turf fields which seems to be the future for sports. And also need more baseball fields.
Medium (either Mixed-Use or pure Residential) should be considered across all the sections east of Pacific Blvd - no alternative considers this option. Additionally, all alternatives consider only Low Residential for the south-most sections (between Mollie Stone's and North Rd). An alternative of Medium Residential should be considered here as those residents would have walkable food and other access right there.
why isn't Mollie Stones shown as Commercial. It should be kept. Need some parks/miniparks/open space.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
Why is Mollie Stone's lot only being considered for residential low? Is that at request of owner? It'd be nice to see more medium mixed directly on west side of el camino
Net new too high. Pandemic has changed the planning assumptions
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
For all alternatives, Bel Mateo bow should be zoned as Residential Medium. For Alternatives A and B, parcels on the corner of Laurie Meadows Drive and Pacific Blvd should be considered for Mixed-Use Medium (as is currently in Alternative C).
Alt. B preferred.
the net new is too high and not justifi9ed with the pandemic causing people to leave the area. Also, this plan seems to compromise retail, reataurants, services for the sake of additional housing. Not good.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in reetail, service and restaurants.

Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
East vs west of ECR are apples and oranges. Again, a planning are with no cohesion. You have a hodge podge of choices here, without much cohesion. Why would a viable commercial enterprise like CVS be replaced with housing, directly on ECR? A bad location for residential, a great place for retail. This area, especially now that the Hillsdale station has moved even further north, has no reliable transit. I never count on SamTrans, since bus lines get cut or redirected at will, and many people just will not ride a bus. So trying to put high density high rise residential here (or any amount of offices), makes no sense. The mixed use low betw 31st/42nd could work. Small intensity retail that could likely relocate. Keep low rise residential on the western edge for a buffer. No justification for any use in this area to exceed 4 stories.
This area is close to El Camino, the highest capacity transit corridor in our region. We need more housing here, but we also need more housing in the western neighborhoods.
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included. Important to retain sufficient commercial areas so businesses don't all move to other cities as they are now, e.g. Redwood City. Also so people can walk to have their needs met.
Commercial services in this area are great. New Mixed-Use and Residential proposals should be Medium, not Low. Alternatives B and C need further consideration to make up for lost commercial somewhere else, since they add residential but remove services.
Area is impacted with traffic now A is the best alternative
Prefer Alternative B as it has the most amount of mixed-use development.
Would like to see some Residential High in one of the options. Also, consider adding a Privately Owned Public Open Space to all the options.
This neighborhood needs a grocery store & mixed use areas; it would be counter productive to get rid of all the business West of El Camino in favor of housing & not have walkable local business & services for the neighborhood.
Add residential medium west of El Camino.
I favor Alternative A - like the idea of a revamped commercial area on the south boundary of the city.
All are good options - I like the idea of a commercial area at the South boundary to provide services to that end of the city. A lot of parking are that can be better utilized.
Preference for Alternative A but with strong encouragement for commercial use space
Seems like more housing here would be appropriate.
This whole area should be studied for mixed-use medium.
Is it possible to retain more jobs with mixed use?

Study Area 3

<p>25th ave is a small commercial street right now very embedded in the neighborhood, surrounded by residential low and single family homes. Would want alternate options that put it as mixed use low + other areas shifting to mixed use high. For example - Option B - keep 25th avenue as mixed use Low, make Borel Mixed use Medium instead of just medium residential. That would be my preferred option if it existed. If not, option A would be. Also need more fields for sports to reduce traffic to Foster City parks and Los Prados. This is a city wide issue. Having trails and bike paths are great for individual commuters but for driving kids to/from San Mateo activities that take place East of the 101, e.g. SMNLL and AYSO soccer, club soccer parents are NOT going to walk or bike. This needs to be addressed as San Mateo increases density of population. Also, Bay Meadows are not well-maintained fields and not turf fields which seems to be the future for sports. And also need more baseball fields.</p>
<p>Alt A is the best choice for this area. Space is well used. Could become a bustling pedestrian corridor if planned correctly. It is only a 1/2 mile walk</p>
<p>All along San Mateo Drive as well as downtown. There are undeveloped lots in both areas. Really all of ECR should be looked at. Churches and other large institutions should be asked about their futures. Some might know they are moving or downsizing. The UU church, for example, owns part of a block but doesn't have funds to build a larger church. If one of the other churches is closing doors, there could be a swap and that area redeveloped. There are two empty houses on Ellsworth. So many opportunities. The city needs to send notification. I do understand that this might signal owners to jack up prices.</p>
<p>Important to look at circulation/connectivity improvements to connect Mixed Use development on South Blvd with the Station Park Green and other residential development across the CalTrain tracks. Could even Mixed-Use High / Residential High be studied around 25th Ave?</p>
<p>STOP BUILDING WHERE THERE ISN'T AN INFRASTRUCTURE TO DO SO!!!!</p>
<p>I think alternative B is the best option out of these three, because it appears to take the best parts of alternative a and alternative c, and combines them into the best alternative, which is alternative B. I think higher density housing, as close to the 101/El Camino interchange would be the highest and best use. Especially along with the area around 21st Ave. and El Camino Real. The entire block of 21st Ave. (east of El Camino Real) is perfectly situated/located for housing redevelopment.</p>
<p>Too abrupt height changes next to single family residential areas, particularly near 25th and the mall area. Would prefer solutions that consistently have lower building heights on the western side of El Camino next to current residential areas. Residential or mixed use "medium" is too tall.</p>
<p>Reductions in population additions need to be added. The minimum population addition of Alternative A is 258%. These alternatives are ridiculous increases.</p>
<p>any new development needs parks/miniparks/open space.</p>
<p>- Can we evaluate residential high next to City Hall (currently residential low & medium)</p>
<p>Alt "C" should be eliminated. It is way beyond what is needed with post pandemic changing economy and it(and B) show more total density to this area than any other, including downtown/core/SM train station where development focus should be. Replace "C" with Alt "B,adjusted" by replacing ALL Resid High & Mixed-Use High to Resid Medium & Mixed-Use Medium. Following are (7+) adjustments to Alternative "B" to make "Rail Corridor Area", pleasant to live in. Its really 4 neighborhoods which endured/absorbed Bay Meadows, Mall, train station, 92 construction, now figuring out 3 underpasses' affects to neighborhoods' traffic patterns. On West side ECR at 28/29 change Residential High to Res LOW. On East side ECR at 27,28,29 chnge MixdUse High to M-U Med. At 25th betw Hacienda & Flores chge MU-Med to MU-Low. Mall partial chge of MU-Med to MU Low at Edison as buffer. Borel Sq.: partial Com'l Reg & part Res Medium. Next to CityHall MU-high to MU-Med. Across 22 chg Res-Med to Res-low.</p>

Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
Don't want commercial jamming both ends of the Hayward Park area...the city is jamming stack at pack commercial north and south of Hayward Park leading to B St. and Palm Ave. becoming thorough fares for traffic. Also stop turning San Mateo into a commercial job nightmare. It seems that the business and union interests are running San Mateo with little to no mitigation costs. Finally, we need affordable housing NOT market rate housing. It's the elephant in the room. There is an abundance of market rate housing on the Peninsula if any of our political representatives would care to look at the availability on Redfin or Zillow.
Not sure why we are adding to these areas. pre-covid we had traffic problems, post people aren't using Cal Train. We are maxing out roads and schools.
How are schools and infrastructure being funded or built with such an increase to the population? Our neighborhoods are crowded enough. This is too much development for our neighborhoods and erodes quality of life. Please consider that many employees will be working remotely and once neighborhoods are changed there is no going back to a better quality of life.
Lower homes and population increases are more realistic. The population growth expected by ABAG(2.4 million by 2040) is unrealistically high.
There should be an alternative that sticks within measure Y, which would exclude all the High areas. Mixed use areas should have restrictions on amount of office space and minimum requirements for housing.
lower net new. the pandemic has changed the planning assumptions
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
In Alternative C, at least some parcels should be zoned as Residential High (it could be the same two parcels that are zones a Residential High in Alternative B).
Alt. A preferred.
the net new is too high and not justifi9ed with the pandemic causing people to leave the area. Also, this plan seems to compromise retail, reataurants, services for the sake of additional housing. Not good.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in reetail, service and restaurants.
Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resourses here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS

Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
More upzoning options in the western corridor.
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
This area really needs to be broken into subsets. Large with multiple uses/needs. Borel Square should stay commercial. Hands off 25th Avenue - a true neighborhood gem, should stay as is - low rise commercial. Mixed use is also inappropriate on the parking lot to the west of Hacienda by 25th. Hillsdale is, of course, the real prize. Resist all attempt to over zone it. Mid rise is PLENTY - could have parts that are mixed use, especially to the south, , but it is 1 story single family to the west, so needs big setback/buffers. New high rise is inappropriate anywhere in this section from 28th Ave south. .
Again--always put in the highest possible height limit option--we don't have to use it, but RHNA is running the show
Mix and match options are important for this area. For Borel, mixed use high might be OK for one or two buildings but want to see plazas and also lower scale residential and retail buildings. Also, limit any one use in mixed use high areas. 25th Ave should be mixed use low in all alternatives.
More housing, especially in the western neighborhoods.
Again, this is not at all racially or socioeconomically equitable to exclude most of the neighborhoods west of El Camino Real from more housing. Why is the city seeming just to cater to the whims of rich white people?
Judging by the number of people who stand in line to pick up prescriptions at CVS at Borel Shopping Center, Borel changes will be a big loss to the community.
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included.
Alternative C looks great. It has a good amount of Mixed Use Medium and High.I would like to see more area west of El Camino for study and development.
Area has already been subjected to massive development with Bay meadows. What used to be open space is a congested mess. Measure A is the preferred option.
Prefer Alternative C but encourage even more mixed-use high given proximity to Caltrain station. We should be maximizing housing development to the greatest degree possible next to public transportation.
Too much growth in residential and business.
None of these scenarios address needs of disabled and infirm in terms of being able to get around, esp. when public transport for handicapped is so limited and often doesn't work. As community ages, these needs must be taken into account. Safety improvements are fine, but have to be able to benefit from them. Lots of people have limited mobility and cannot walk or bike, but still have to go places.
Hillsdale Mall Commercial Regional and Mixed Use High along with Pet Mart/D-E Mixed Use Medium Maps are dizzying and there is no discussion on how conclusions were reached.
Too much. Density. Too crowded. Dangerous for pedestrians. Walkers. Bicyclists. Will cause backups at bovet /el camino Barneson / el camino. 20th elcamino.
Parking
without the delta and overlays there is insufficient information to ascertain this.
Where will the water come for an additional 12,500 -20,600 people? We don't have enough water now between drought and fire conditions. What about rest of the city?

I would love Borel Square to be redeveloped into High Mixed use. There's too much empty parking there and is a waste. More housing on top of commercial. We don't need more commercial in this area. There's plenty and a mall for heaven's sake. We should not sacrifice commercial for housing opportunities in any scenario. I like Alternative C.
PetSmart and Dunn-Edwards Paints designated as Mixed Use High
I would like to see a park area around the bridge connecting Hillsdale plaza to the Petsmart Parking lot. A lot of people use the area & currently it's just a magnet for trash & debris & a cut through to side streets. I recently read that there used to be an Ohlone village in that area & making it a small green space again would be nice.
Can't tell. Seems like this study area covers a larger geographical area than the others, or at least is much more complex. Where are the residential units to accommodate an additional 12,000 to 20,600 people located. Hard to detect.
The large parking lot behind Dunn Edwards and Pet Smart. I am interested in seeing multi-family housing (possibly mixed use) with a higher percentage of BMR units than generally required. A separate BMR complex would be ideal. 25th Ave -- Definitely medium mixed to maximize housing, including higher density of affordable (likely senior) low income housing on the First Presbyterian parking lot at the end of 25th at Hacienda.
I favor alternative C - but would like to see mixed-use medium v low. Also would like to have housing developed on the parking lot behind Dunn Edwards/Pet Smart. Good place to include a separate 100% affordable development. 25th Avenue - mixed use medium, including a 100% senior affordable building on the First Presbyterian Church parking lot at end of 25th at Hacienda.
Hillsdale Shopping Center should be studied for mixed-use high.
Alternate A clearly skewed towards least development (lowest number of new homes, population, & jobs); Alternate C clearly skewed towards most development (most number of new homes, population & jobs). Other study areas are much more of a mixed bag, i.e. not all highest new numbers are in one alternate, nor all lowest numbers are in one alternate.

Study Area 4

Lets concentrate residential high and medium in the downtown area - similar to Redwood City. Spreading high residential throughout really changes the character of San Mateo.
Alt A is net/net good for hobs, housing and the economy.
As/when density increases (especially with structures over 8 stories high), I would encourage greater integration with open space.
Studying Residential High for the corridor east of downtown (1st to 5th Ave, S Eldorado St to 101) would be interesting (and isn't represented in these alternatives), as there are already some Res Medium-scale buildings there and the area is extremely walkable to the downtown core and Caltrain. Similarly, looking at Mixed-Use High or Residential High from 5th to 9th Ave along S Claremont St and S B St is important to consider (and not completely represented here), as it would add housing close to downtown where a car-lite lifestyle is possible.
STOP BUILDING UNLESS IT WILL LOOK LIKE HONG KONG!!!!
In Alt. B, focus higher density projects around transit.
NA
Reduction in additioinal population. These choices are between high and extremely high.
alternatives A and B are not dense enough.
Prefer Alternative A. Would like to see Residential Low in Alternative C transferred to Alternative A. Preserve the Historic Single Family Craftsmen & Mediterranean Bungalows on south side of 4th Avenue, 5th Ave, (both sides), Delaware Street (both sides). This is part of oldest neighborhood on

<p>East side of San Mateo. We do not want to see the Residential Medium classification of 4-7 story buildings at 40-99 units per acre on these streets. Portions of North Ellsworth east side that are residential medium change to res. low. Also consider R2 - duplex for South Amphlett from 5th to 9th for residential compatibility. We need more traffic calming and pedestrian / bike safety improvements in our neighborhoods. Future grade separations and development will bring more cut-through traffic. We need more residential protection from the traffic, noise, and pollution impacts. Place Mixed Use / Residential Medium density on both sides of El Camino Real (ECR) on the SamTrans transit line.</p>
<p>I like C the best. It is concentrated in the downtown core. And provides saving the small older homes of the area. Some changes: I would make sure no R,O or M-U Highs are next to a R, O or M-U Lows. Please use a Medium height/density between all Highs and Lows. I would recommend this throughout SM. Just make sure there will be a grocery store in walking distance to serve residents.</p>
<p>Alternative A looks good.</p>
<p>I prefer Alternative A. However, I would also like to see options with buildings that have fewer stories.</p>
<p>Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.</p>
<p>This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.</p>
<p>No apartment houses along Delaware/. Eldorado. Delaware is too narrow.</p>
<p>I see no single family residences in any scenarios.</p>
<p>Parking if downtown density increased. There seems to be a mistaken impression that either shoppers/downtown restaurant goers will take public transit...but most folks who want, e.g. to dine in downtown, drive....and today parking is already near impossible. Plan must provide for auto parking</p>
<p>Everything mixed use of some sort, but via a form based code to keep most of the area's character while not worrying about what's inside the building so much.</p>
<p>lower net new. Pandemic has changed the planning assumptions. Parking impossible now.</p>
<p>Is the population really expected to increase by at least 8000? Is there an alternative that includes less development?</p>
<p>This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.</p>
<p>Alternative C should include all Residential Medium east of El Dorado street, like Alternatives B and A have. All plans should include more parcels that are zoned Residential High. Parcels West of El Camino on Arroyo Court, W 3rd Avenue, 4th Ave, Dartmouth Rd, and w 5TH avenue (extending all the way to their intersection with Eaton rd/Virginia ave) should all be upzoned by one zoning code (R4->R5, R5->R6), and included in these Alternatives. In Alternative C, the zoning for S Delaware St and S Claremont st (south of 5th Avenue), should be Residential Medium and Mixed-Use Medium, respectively.</p>
<p>Downtown is deserving of a wider range of alternatives than other study areas. There are pieces of each alternative that appeal. For example, the historic core should be kept at lower heights in</p>

<p>keeping with the predominant pedestrian-scale historic district (Alt. A). The step-down in height from residential medium to residential low in the "panhandle" area (Alt C) should be part of all three alternatives. Alt. B appeals because the area between 5th and 9th is predominantly residential rather than mixed use as in A & C. Alt. B also has some mixed use high, and might benefit from a bit more, but not too much like Alt. C. In other words, it may be worthwhile to offer some additional variations that are "in between" the seemingly polarizing Alternatives A & C.</p>
<p>the net new is too high and not justified with the pandemic causing people to leave the area. Also, this plan seems to compromise retail, restaurants, services for the sake of additional housing. Not good. And traffic congestion and parking problems.</p>
<p>Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.</p>
<p>Net new numbers are too high. Planning assumptions need to be reevaluated. People are leaving the area with the pandemic. Too dense. Presents traffic congestion and parking problems and reduction in retail, service and restaurants.</p>
<p>The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers</p>
<p>DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS</p>
<p>Use A and don't expand the study areas</p>
<p>Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!</p>
<p>We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.</p>
<p>Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones</p>
<p>I'd like to see mixed-use with residential high downtown. It's an amazing place to live, and more people should be able to enjoy it.</p>
<p>You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!</p>
<p>We need to buffers in less intense residential in the gateway. Must protect existing neighborhoods to the north and south. No additional high rise/high density uses on the west side of ECR. And in all parts, Alt C is just over the top. Way too much intensity.. Do not intensify the allowed use at the Mills Center ("Sutter Health"). Should stay as a community use. We want to keep that facility serving San Mateo. Do not make it more valuable to them to turn it into something else. BTW, my distant memory from when Mills was considering closing more completely and shifting everything to Peninsula Hospital was that there is a deed restriction from the original gift of the land by Mrs Mill way back when. Can we ask, so we can plan for what is even possible? Mixed use south of 5th toward 9th is not something to encourage. Need residential there.</p>
<p>do any of the scenarios include pedestrian improvement or continuing/expanding the outdoor restaurant experiences (which are great!!)</p>
<p>Study area 4's boundary should include all streets within a 10-minute walk from the train station. Also, based on the terminology used, it appears alternative C downzones 3rd and 4th Ave between Delaware and 101. This may not be allowed under the state's housing accountability act.</p>
<p>is it possible to add one option like a highrise 12 story behind the Ben Franklin (match the BF height). Again, DO NOT ALLOW A FLOOD OF HIGHRISES, BUT ONE OR TWO ADDS FLEXIBILITY--MAY NEVER BE APPROVED, BUT LET'S NOT PUT OUR OPTIONS IN CEMENT.</p>
<p>Medium height mixed use btw 4th-5th Ave, not high. Protect Central Park & 4th Ave retail from tall building winds & shadows. High mixed use along ECR frontage. High mixed use or residential along west side of Claremont btw. 5th-9th. Need to define maximum heights for high mixed or residential. Eliminate Alt.C - too much height and gives wrong incentives to areas that should be protected. Protect important service commercial areas and N.B St retail.</p>

<p>We need more street closures/pedestrian-oriented areas downtown and more dense apartment buildings. We're not allowing for enough density in our downtown core.</p>
<p>Please, please allow as much density as possible near the downtown Caltrain station. My wife and I are looking to buy a condo or townhome in San Mateo, and we'd like to buy within a 5-minute walk of the train, ideally in the middle of a mixed-use area. But there's hardly any supply right now. Alternative C looks great!</p>
<p>We live in a high fire zone in San Mateo, what is the evacuation plan? We would have to go east, through downtown San Mateo, a heavily populated area, as there are wooded areas to the west, north and south of us. Looks like El Camino is a wall. Also downtown parking is not available, have to walk blocks just to get to the Cleaners now.</p>
<p>The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included. Critical to do a Citywide historical structure survey and develop unifying standards and regulations to protect what we have and ensure new buildings blend in. Need to evaluate role of parklets, open civic spaces to bring community together.</p>
<p>I love seeing the amount of Mixed Use High and Residential High for downtown in Alternatives B and C!</p>
<p>Highest density should be down town as it is in all cities.</p>
<p>Prefer Alternative C but encourage residential medium between 2nd Ave and 5th Ave east of El Dorado as in the other two Alternatives. I'm a homeowner on 7th and I don't think the residential low transition is necessary.</p>
<p>There should be no LOW along El Camino in the Downtown area or along El Camino Real South of Downtown.</p>
<p>Would (non-public) senior housing qualify as residential or mixed use? Would parklets and/or public spaces be a part of new construction? Will it be a more walk-able, greener downtown?</p>
<p>I am opposed to mixed-use high in Alternatives B & C.</p>
<p>San Mateo cannot absorb this many people without major infrastructure issues and quality of life issues.</p>
<p>More Residential High and Medium in all Alternatives (especially C which is the one I prefer). We need more housing and we gotta densify our downtown. It is a missed opportunity not to add more Residential and mixed use zones in our downtown area when the rest of the city if San Mateo is all single family homes (and will be forever).</p>
<p>Would like to see if Alternative C could have even more housing added.</p>
<p>Would it be helpful to call out the residential variations along Caltrain south of 5th Avenue?</p>
<p>Looking forward to evaluation of these alternatives. Hard to determine the sites for all these additional people. Why aren't there more jobs in this study area?</p>
<p>Recommend adding the mixed-use high density zoning to alternative B near transit. There are only so many locations near transit and the general plan should propose the max density in this area. Given current zoning in Downtown San Mateo is 3.0 FAR, recommend increasing the medium density to 4.0 FAR. The City could incorporate a base line density with the ability to add additional density with a community benefit. Given the smaller size of the parcels downtown recommend reviewing the building setback and bulk zoning to allow greater flexibility.</p>
<p>Not sure where transit areas are included but seems these areas should be Mixed Use High where near transit locations.</p>
<p>Consider adding density (mixed-use etc.) near transit areas. Allow for the ability to increase density given developer community benefits. Downtown typically has smaller parcels. Consider reviewing current setback and massing requirements to allow for increased flexibility of design for new projects.</p>

<p>Max density should be encouraged in the Downtown and near transit. I don't believe the current options go far enough. We should be planning the city of tomorrow, not the past.</p>
<p>Given there are only a couple locations near transit, I feel like the density should be situated around these nodes. I would recommend adding a higher mixed-use zoning to alternative B near transit and recommend increasing the mixed-use medium zoning to 4.0, given the majority is already 3.0, with additional community benefits (density bonus). Also, most of the parcels in the downtown are very small, so I would recommend reviewing the building setback and bulk zoning to allow greater flexibility, given without it, I'm not sure how many parcels will actually be redeveloped and many of the buildings are old and out of date.</p>
<p>Given the smaller size of the parcels downtown, recommend reviewing the building setback and bulk zoning to allow greater flexibility.</p>
<p>a. Recommend adding Mixed-Use High zoning to alternative B near transit. There are only so many locations near transit and the general plan should propose the max density in these areas. b. Given current zoning in the majority of Downtown San Mateo is 3.0 FAR, recommend increasing the Mixed-Use Medium to 4.0 FAR. The City could incorporate a base line density with the ability to add additional density through community benefits. c. Given the smaller size of the parcels downtown, recommend reviewing the building setback and bulk zoning to allow greater flexibility.</p>
<p>If feasible, add mixed-use high density zones to Alternate B near the transit hubs. Given the limited number of locations near transit, the general plan should incorporate max density. Recommend increasing mixed-use medium zoning from FAR 3.0 to FAR 4.0. It would be ideal to create a baseline density, with added density through community benefits. Given the majority of Downtown parcels are infill construction, review building setback and bulk zoning requirements to allow for additional flexibility for architectural aesthetics.</p>
<p>Alternative A - The density and height ranges are too inflated for residential low, residential medium, residential high, also for commercial mixed use low, mixed-use medium, mixed -use high. In particular 4th Ave (south side), 5th Ave, S. Delaware and the Downtown. The inflated categories are detrimental to the preservation of our historic bungalows homes - 40-99 u/a is too dense and 3 stories is too tall. The historic Downtown with 99-200 a/u with 7 and 8 plus stories is too tall. Historic buildings and homes that can qualify for historic preservation need to be indicated with a dot on the Alternative A map. Complete the RHNA analysis with Measure Y parameters and add medium density mixed use housing along El Camino Real on the SamTrans line. The General Plan process has been designed for planning professionals and has been very complicated. Better explanations are needed to participate in other surveys. I could not key in data or activate the keys so I stopped.</p>
<p>In Alternative B, recommend incorporating mixed-use high zoning around the train station. There is only so much land near transit and should focus high density in these areas. Being near transit will limit the impacts of traffic. Given current zoning in the majority of Downtown San Mateo is 3.0 FAR, recommend increasing the Mixed-Use Medium to 4.0 FAR. The City could incorporate a base line density with the ability to add additional density through community benefits. The current setback and bulk zoning creates many design challenges. Recommend reviewing to allow greater flexibility. Amend the FAR definition to no longer count garage square footage as FAR. Parking is required for projects, but it is very costly. Excluding the calculation will provide greater flexibility for projects and assist with meeting the City's goals and vision for the General Plan.</p>
<p>Alternates are heavily skewed. Alternate C has the most new homes, population & jobs. Alternate A had the least new homes and population. Alternate B is the 'middle ground' in all three categories. Alternates should offer more variety. The Downtown Historic District needs strong protections, especially from Mixed-Use High (8+ stories) buildings.</p>

Allow for max density for Alternative B near transit and increase the Mixed-Use Medium to 4.0 FAR through additional community benefits. Allow greater flexibility for building setbacks and bulk zoning due to smaller downtown parcels.

Study Area 5

Alt B is a good compromise for this area.
These alternatives don't cover the option of having more Mixed-Use Medium all along San Mateo Dr, which could be a way for residents in the surrounding neighborhoods to do local shopping for daily needs without getting in their car.
I think alternative B is the best option out of the three, especially because it provides multi story housing along Peninsula Avenue which in my opinion is the highest and best use for that area, given it's close proximity to the Burlingame Avenue train station, and the upcoming work that will be taking place at the 101/Peninsula Ave. interchange.
Need some more parks/miniparks/open space
The Courthouse along Humboldt is now empty. Since Humboldt has apartment type buildings already along it, I expected to see the courthouse lot as a medium residential possibility. Next, with the planned changes to the Peninsula/101 interchange, traffic in all areas of Area 5 should increase dramatically.
Add another alternative or adjust C so that Safeway shopping area is Mixed-use medium (from low) and 4th corner of E Bellevue is also Residential Medium. Take whatever the gain in potential homes from those 2 changes are and reduce some High to Medium so total "net new" is the approx. same.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
I like alternative C.
If the Peninsula interchange gets a southern entrance for 101 keep the Poplar entrance. Maybe something similar to the two entrances to 101 for Holly St. and Britten.
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
In Alternative C, areas near Safeway that are show as Mixed-Use Low should be Mixed-Use Medium instead. Also in Alternatives A and C, the sections on El Camino shown as Office Low should be increased to Office Medium, so that any businesses displaced by the new Residential (right below), eg dentists offices, can have plenty of new office space.
Prefer Alt. A, but strongly suggest the blocks facing Catalpa, Tilton, Monte Diablo & N. Ellsworth be designated residential low. There are many historic resources in this area that need to be identified and protected.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers

DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
More overall upzoning options.
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
A truly mis-named area. Very little to do with Peninsula Ave. Changing Safeway zoning to residential creates a service problem for the area. We need to preserve land use for food suppliers. This lack of concern about basic services seems to be a pattern in the smaller neighborhood planning areas. Not an area to introduce anything over 4-5 stories, but overall a desirable area for low intensity offices and residential. .
This is not the right range of alternatives. While upzoning existing apartment buildings is not on its face good or bad, and we definitely need a lot more zoned capacity in San Mateo, it is seriously questionable to upzone areas with relatively lower income and relatively more racially diverse populations while leaving generally wealthier and less racially diverse, low-density areas untouched. This will likely be found in violation of the AFFH act, and may be contested by community members who want to see the AFFH act fully carried out.
A few taller high density residences in this area--near tracks or general area, not in neighborhoods.
We need to allow for higher density housing here. Also, we need more housing options in the high opportunity western neighborhoods.
Why isn't the whole corridor along N San Mateo Dr being considered for mixed-use? That's the perfect place to allow more coffee shops, corner stores, and other neighborhood-serving retail on ground floors.
The streets are not able to handle much more traffic and parking is already limited.
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included.
Good area for more density due to its close proximity to downtown.
Prefer Alternative C but suggest replacing the Office Low with more Residential High given proximity to Caltrain station. Over the past decade we've built 1 unit of housing for every 11 jobs - we don't need to accommodate more office space.
More green spacr
I like Alternative C. More housing and dense housing. Interesting to include a commercial area at the intersection of Popular. It is currently a blight. It should really not be offices but mixed use medium to add more housing. Maybe that intersection could have some important services like a small grocery store that is walkable.
Consider adding a Privately Owned Public Open Space to all options.
More stand-alone commercial choices

Study Area 6

This zone seems particularly like a good one for the sports issue - Need more fields for sports to reduce traffic to Foster City parks and Los Prados. This is a city wide issue. Having trails and bike paths are great for individual commuters but for driving kids to/from San Mateo activities that take place East of the 101, e.g. SMNLL and AYSO soccer, club soccer parents are NOT going to walk or bike. This needs to be addressed as San Mateo increases density of population. Also, Bay Meadows are not well-maintained fields and not turf fields which seems to be the future for sports. And also

need more baseball fields. Please include parks and rec as well as private soccer clubs for example in providing input.
The biggest challenge in this area is transportation - as increasing density without more transit will put more cars onto 92. One thing not captured in these alternatives would be introducing more density to the Laurelwood Shopping Center of a Mixed-Use type, so it could become a self-sustaining mini-village for people to live and do their regular shopping.
My God!!! Isn't this area crowded enough already??? NO MORE BUILDING!!!! Give people air to breath and shoulder room to walk!!!!
need strong public shuttle service to ECR and Caltrain. Need more parks/Open space
Using C here are ideas: Change current 92 side of commercial neighborhood to Mixed Low. Use Office area as in B except 1/2 Medium and 1/2 Low .
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
How are schools and infrastructure being funded or built with such an increase to the population?
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
In Alternatives A and B, the area that is zoned for Residential Low in the plan should instead be Residential Medium
Prefer Alt. C because it adds more housing and maintains neighborhood commercial.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
A basic question you ask in all areas is "is this the right range of alternatives"? Identifying what is missing, when faced with 3 complicated scenarios, is an almost impossible task. Too distracting/distracted to notice. This applies across the board to all areas. . The Laurelwood center provides a vital set of services for this area, which keep people from having t commute much longer distances for groceries and other personal services. It should not be tampered with. Retain as is. A major part of the offices is already proposed for townhouses. The offices are not tha much of a contributor to the city as a whole (although the workers do support the Laurelwood businesses). The entire area could become townhouses - not med to high density high rise. Nothing taller than 3 stories. After all, there is no decent transit to the site, so everyone would be in their cars all the time.
College of SM parking areas should be included. With proposed, improved transit from Caltrain this area can also serve for residential or mixed use, low or medium.
We need to consider more dense housing both in this neighborhood and throughout the city.

The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included. Important that people living here have sufficient places to shop and strong transportation options as the area is fairly cut off.
Good area for denser housing to replace obsolete office buildings.
Prefer Alternative C as I don't believe we should be accommodating more office space given our past decade of severe housing / job growth imbalance.
Need green space
Is there potential for subsidized educator/govt employee housing in this neighborhood?
I like Alternative C. More housing. I don't think we should have commercial office spaces in a corridor without any mass transit. People will be driving to these commercial offices along the 92 which should be discouraged. As a rule, allow office buildings along transit like Caltrain.
Add some Residential High to Alternative C. Also, this seems like an area to add some R&D.
Favor Alternative B - more housing
Given this area is not near transit, I recommend a lower density alternative. The current residential project is unique being for sale housing and it would be great to have a consistent zoning to potentially transform additional older office density to for-sale residential that fits with the character of the approved housing project. The office at the top of Campus Drive is newer vintage and higher density, so this should remain office.
Given the need for for-sale housing, recommend similar zoning in this area to increase supply. Lower density in this area will mesh nicely with the recently approved housing project and create a great neighborhood.
Lower density housing is the most sought after segment of the housing market and will fit in with the established neighborhoods in the area. Higher density development should be reserved for the Downtown and near transit hubs.
The currently approved residential project is for-sale housing which is one of the most underserved segments of the market and will help reverse the jobs-housing imbalance. With millennials starting to have kids and look for more space to raise families, there will be even greater demand, and a huge lack of supply of homes. It would be great to have a consistent zoning in this area to provide the opportunity for additional redevelopment to for-sale housing given this area feels like a neighborhood and not a more urban location. It is also not near transit. The office at the top of Campus Drive is newer vintage and higher density, so recommend keeping this as office.
The office at the top of Campus Drive is newer with high density. This should remain as office.
Recommend lower density given distance from transit hubs. Given the recently approved project in this area as for-sale housing, lower density will be a better fit with the new project and established neighborhoods.
Given this area is not near transit, I recommend a lower density alternative. A lower density zoning would be in-line with the recently approved housing project in this area and will fit in with the established neighborhoods. The office at the top of Campus Drive is newer vintage and higher density, so recommend keeping this as office
I would recommend lower density and zoning throughout this area for further re-development of for-sale homes.

Study Area 7

Maintaining area in the city for Commercial Service businesses is important, and some of the stretches in this area are better for that type of use than residential giving the proximity to the freeway and the lack of access to other transit. Studying more Mixed-Use and higher density residential around S Norfolk St / 3rd Ave area is important, given that area is close to the FCX

express SamTrans stop (for commutes into San Francisco), and the pedestrian bridge over 101 makes walking to the downtown core an option.
need miniparks/open space. Try to make creek area more natural.
Alternative B is more what I'd like to see in the N Shoreview area adjacent to 101. Less commercial and more residential works well with the pedestrian overcrossing and access to Bay trail. Plus, it's just outside the 0.5 mile radius to a train station, still very walkable/bikeable to encourage public transit. Another area I'd like to propose a conversation is: a westbound only one-way street along Monte Diablo Ave (E side of 101) from Bayshore to Huron Ave. It is such a skinny portion of Monte Diablo and, with the ped overcrossing and access to Bay trail, there are many many bikers/walkers....that portion of Monte Diablo could be one-way for cars with a bike lane, preventing dangerous L-hand turns from Kingston, while still allowing for residents to park on both sides of the street. After Huron the street becomes wider....it's just that little block that is so skinny
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
Alternative B + mixed use high at the Fiesta Market shopping center
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
Alternative C should incorporate more Residential High, like the strip of Residential High on N. Amphlett Blvd on Alternative B.
Favor Alt. A because it retains most of the service commercial. Consider dropping Idaho St. to residential low.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
More overall upzoning options.
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
East of 101 vs west of 101 bear little relationship to each other. Once again, just lines drawn on a map to make a box. Not a true planning area. The shopping area needs to be preserved to serve the neighborhood. We can't create a plan to create a food desert! Similar for plans that remove commercial service. These businesses serve the community, which would have to travel long distances if they were encouraged to be removed/replaced. We need a balanced community. Poking anything "high" in the south end in Shoreview is a complete intrusion without proper buffers or planning.
This is not the right range of alternatives. While we definitely need a lot more zoned capacity in San Mateo, it is seriously questionable to locate medium and high density residential zones - zones that would contribute to our low-income housing needs in our next two housing elements - along a

major freeway. 101 is a major source of pollution. Locating our new higher-density housing next to this highway is unwise. This will likely be found in violation of the AFFH act, and may be contested by community members who want to see the AFFH act fully carried out.
We need more dense housing both in this study area and in the areas that San Mateo decided not to study (the western, high-opportunity areas).
Other than hwy 92, our only escape route to the east is W.3rd
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included. Critical to maintain existing commercial areas to provided needed services
North Shoreview would benefit from a more conveniently located corner store / commercial neighborhood area with the loss of Fred's Market. North Central could use one as well if La Hacienda is redeveloped into residential.
Good area for more development to replace end of life buildings.
Prefer Alternative C as I think designating Shoreview Shopping Center as mixed-use high would make it a great place to live and hang out.
Prefer option A as this is a congested area. More green space
Consider adding some Privately Owned Public Open Spaces to all options.
Hotel uses should be studied for properties east of HWY 101.
Consider mixed use for current neighborhood commercial strip on Kingston
This Study Area needs to be renamed. Half, if not more, of the area being discussed is west of 101 and in the North Central neighborhood.

Study Area 8

Another good area to think about including fields - especially where the business park currently is. We need more fields for sports to reduce traffic to Foster City parks and Los Prados. This is a city wide issue. Having trails and bike paths are great for individual commuters but for driving kids to/from San Mateo activities that take place East of the 101, e.g. SMNLL and AYSO soccer, club soccer parents are NOT going to walk or bike. This needs to be addressed as San Mateo increases density of population. Also, Bay Meadows are not well-maintained fields and not turf fields which seems to be the future for sports. And also need more baseball fields.
Evaluating Residential High on S Amphlett Blvd and around The Crossroads offices is not captured in these alternatives - and that would fit in with the height of the Crossroads. It will be important to evaluate the circulation of that residential proposed on S Amphlett Blvd so people moving in there could be connected (ideally via walking or biking) to Hayward Park Caltrain and the other new development on Concar Dr (Trader Joe's).
more parks/miniparks/ open space. Particularly near water.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.
Too many proposed people and traffic
Too many jobs and not enough housing in any of the alternative in this study area.
Do not lose the commercial services at Parkside Plaza. These are vital to local neighborhoods.
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand

<p>petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.</p>
<p>In Alternative B, the area zoned for Residential Low should instead be zoned for Residential Medium. Both Alternative A and C should change the area in the north section of this map, on S Amphlett Blvd from Residential Low to Residential Medium (especially since that strip is right up against the freeway and is a perfect place to put Residential Medium without neighbors getting mad about the height)></p>
<p>Prefer Alt. C.</p>
<p>The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers</p>
<p>DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS</p>
<p>Use A and don't expand the study areas</p>
<p>Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!</p>
<p>We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.</p>
<p>Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones</p>
<p>You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!</p>
<p>Again, the various parts of this 'Box" bear no planning relationship to each other. The area s of 92, practically under the FWY, is not a good site for anything. Certainly not residential. Parkside center needs to be retained for neighborhood commercial uses. Otherwise you create a support retail. food desert in that part of town. The Bayside Corporate Common could likely ne replaced with residential. But i l do not support anything over 4 stories there. Even that impinges on 1 story single family too much.</p>
<p>We need more housing, in this neighborhood but especially in the high-opportunity, western neighborhoods.</p>
<p>not much change here, investors will snap up the new units being built on the Fish Market site, more rental units.</p>
<p>The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. Open space and schools needs not included.</p>
<p>Alternative A is terribly underdeveloped and should be reconsidered. Residential and Mixed-Use applications should be at least Medium height in this area. Alternative B has too much residential without enough Mixed Use or Commercial to have convenient access to services for local residents.</p>
<p>Good area for development to replace obsolete office buildings and shopping mall that is being less used.</p>
<p>Prefer Alternative B but would make all of Parkside Plaza mixed-use medium or mixed-use high and make the residential low south of 92 residential medium. We should be maximizing housing near the 101 to reduce surface street traffic. The area along the waterfront would make for a fantastic mixed-use development.</p>
<p>Keep Fish Market as it's the few restaurants on the bay. Consider developing lot next to restaurant into a Berkeley Bowl type use</p>
<p>At least one option should have a Residential High component.</p>
<p>Recommend Alternative B given housing optionality.</p>

Study Area 9

I feel like there's not a lot that can be done with this area, as adding homes to Marina Plaza can't practically be done without traffic impacts.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
Jobs-to-housing ratio is way off on all of the current alternatives. Add more residential medium or mixed use medium.
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
In Alternative B, the section of Residential Low on the south side of E Hillsdale Ct should be Mixed-use Low.
Favor Alt. B for housing, but Alt. C for it's neighborhood commercial.
The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
The problem with this site, and others, is that you have drawn a box on a map tha ignores the major differences between what development could/should be (or is) on opposite sides of a major "barrier", in this case 101 and also Hillsdale. But, admittedly, very little likelihood of major changes here. The Marina center functions as commercial neighborhood. It might work for part of it to be redeveloped with some mixed use., with an emphasis on affordable housing. We need an affordable housing overlay in future plans all over the city , to require more than the basic Measure Y floor of percentage. The residential in B is very undesirable - That Hillsdale frontage is a bad location for R. .
an alternative that provides for some parks/open space, particularly that incorporates the neighboring lagoon areas.
We need to consider higher density housing and more housing options in the western, higher opportunity neighborhoods.
The neighborhood depends on the businesses that are there now, would be sad to see them go.
The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise. I would suggest both alternatives B and C are good to evaluate. Need more context re today & future needs, however.
I would like to see all proposed Residential and Mixed Use as Medium, not Low.
Hillsdale Blvd is unusable during rush hour and fire trucks cannot access the west side of the freeway Measure c is the best option as the infrastructure here cannot handle any more development, Bay Meadows has pushed it to the limit.

Prefer Alternative B as we should be maximizing housing near the 101 on-ramps so as to minimize surface traffic. I also think more mixed-use developments near Saratoga / Park Place will create a nice little live-work neighborhood.
Limit growth in this area as Hillsdale and 101 are too congested would like to see pedestrian and bike overpass to improve safety and encourage less autos
Feels like much more could be made of the Marina Plaza Area as a Mixed Use High.
Please remember that the Los Prados-La Selva neighborhood has only one way to go in and out of this area. Adding additional housing will only make traffic conditions worse, especially during commute times during week and during errand/recreational pursuit time on the weekends. If you want to add more housing in the area, you should consider extending La Selva along the sound wall going south to Redwood Shores as a secondary means to access this neighborhood.
Study Area 9 represents the 2 worst traffic areas is South San Mateo. Hillsdale/Saratoga's South side is a mess, and adding more residential would require reworking the entire intersection. The Hillsdale/Norfolk intersection is an even bigger mess, and Marina Plaza was poorly laid out but is a great location for high density commercial; mixed use would make the parking even more of a nightmare unless below-ground parking is added.
Identified in Alternative A, B and C, The area labeled for "residential low" on Hillsdale court should be considered as mix-use low. Marina Plaza should be mix-use high. Of all three alternatives, I would select Alternative A

Study Area 10

how about some green space or gathering spaces?
Given its lack of proximity to transit, it is important to study transitioning Bridgepoint to a primarily Mixed-Use (ideally High) village that could be relatively self-sustaining and self-contained, with everything within the neighborhood very walkable or bike-able. It would be good to study an alternative with much more Mixed-Use, which would also allow for an evolution of the area depending on post-pandemic conditions (e.g. demand for office space versus larger homes with frequent remote working).
need parks and open space
For Fashion Island Blvd. Mixed Use High for office/R&D Residential High or mixed use for both
Using B, Change land use space for mixed use low by adding part more commercial regional on 92 side and other part mixed use medium.
Remove B and C do what the people have legally allowed under A. Don't expand any study areas.
This set of maps is an insult to the housing need in the Bay Area. We should be studying all of San Mateo, not just these little areas. We need more multifamily housing! Multifamily housing does not diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. These carve outs are the narrowest possible study area, hijacked by our Council in a late night decision over and against the will of more than a thousand petitioners and hundreds of commenters in the name of "respecting the process" of the few dozen people who participated in drawing these original maps. These study areas benefit most only the most well to do and well established among us. Study the whole city. At least study what your own Planning Commission recommended. This approach is unjust and hostile to those who are uncomfortable or unfamiliar with local government processes.
Would it be possible to put some residential high in this area, in zones currently being considered for Residential Medium, especially the ones up against Office High zoning?
Alt. C preferred for providing more housing, but needs to include parks, schools and neighborhood commercial.

The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers
DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS
Use A and don't expand the study areas
Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!
We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.
Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones
You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!
This area is pretty much as it should remain. The only option is to downsize the retail at the shopping center. The way the line is drawn in the Bridgepointe area, you would be eliminating the ice rink. Too valuable a resource to lose. Let's not go through that battle again. Find a way to save that part of the center, as is (redraw the lines?) . I do not support going over 5 stories for office redevelopment here, nor for market rate housing or mixed use.
Maintain part for Commercial Regional with emphasis as transit hub for east-west linkages and to Caltrain. Remainder of site should be Mixed Use High creating a smart growth neighborhood with neighborhood serving retail.
This area has a great opportunity to be converted to a lot of housing. We also must affirmatively further fair housing by studying housing changes to the western neighborhoods.
Owner of Bridgepointe has done nothing to help the businesses there, so much potential wasted.
We should evaluate turning a greater portion of the area into mixed use, provided there is the requisite transit and infrastructure to support it. The existing General Plan Land Use Map should be on the same page as the alternatives. Difficult to imagine otherwise.
I would love to see Bridgepointe become a Mixed-Use Medium or High neighborhood of homes and services, not Mixed-Use Low.
Need much more high density housing here and minimal office building.
Suggest an Alternative that converts Bridgepointe Shopping Center to Mixed-Use High. We should be maximizing housing and commercial near all of that office space to create a great little live-work neighborhood. Generally speaking, I think the Study Areas need to be expanded to include the R1 neighborhoods. We are legally obligated to affirmatively further fair housing and excluding the wealthiest and whitest neighborhoods from consideration does not seem like it would meet that obligation.
Growth far exceeds infrastructure due to proximity to 101/92 interchange which is very congested affecting all traffic north and south bound. No green space
I like Alternative C, more housing. BUT again, we should not encourage office space in an area without mass transit. It encourages people to drive along the 92 and increase traffic. Plus it is such a sprawling area without single family homes, all Alternatives should have Residential High or Mixed Use High zones. Housing here should be as high as the office buildings already present.
Higher density housing
I favor alternative C -- retail has never been a strong presence on this site. I would, however, also retain the Target store and site as it is a key retailer in the area that provides a good range of product for the neighborhood. a good area to include a 100% affordable development.
Alternative S - However also retain the Target store/site as it is a key occupancy. Retail has never been a great performer hers - housing and possibly some mixed use is the best alternative. good place for stand-alone 100% low-income affordable

Alternate A does not rank highest or lowest in any of the three categories (homes, population, jobs). Perhaps the 'burden' or lack thereof should be distributed more equitably across the three alternatives.

Draft Circulation Alternatives

Any opportunity to create teen/young adult friendly transportation routes from San Mateo West of 101 to East of 101, especially in late PM at peak traffic hours to get to-from sports activities? This would help reduce traffic. Also, if not new roads can be built to-from San Mateo West of 101 to East of 101/Foster then what about carpool lanes during specific hours? limitations to only local traffic so that parents can get kids to-from sports without being in commuter traffic.

I see these as an "all of the above" need as San Mateo continues to grow. Making the city more walkable, more bike-able, with better transit connections within and to reach destinations outside of the city is crucial to reducing individual vehicle miles traveled to combat climate change. Promoting - and making people feel safe using - active transportation will lead to a healthy, happier city!

Alternative 3 is the only one that really makes any sense. We really need to vastly improve the circulation infrastructure, no matter what you do with land use. It's a mess right now. Think Big for the future!!

None of the alternatives plan for the changes resulting from the 101/Peninsula interchange up. Humboldt, Delaware, Peninsula can be expected to have much heavier traffic flows. Providing for the car traffic, as well as the safety of the pedestrians crossing those streets, should be a major goal. The residents living on those streets will experience difficulty getting in and out of their residences.

Safety should be a priority!!!!

This survey is confusing and feels to be purposely structured to restrict input contrary to its implied purpose. I wish to lower the NET NEW criteria in each of the 3 options and i am unable to do so. I do not want any increase in new homes in this area.

Has any of the city staff actually been on B St in the Hayward Park area? It sure doesn't seem like it as all the alternatives call for a proposed bikeway along that whole stretch of B. If anyone did, they would see a narrow road with no room for bike lanes and no parking most days and every night. LOOK at the stacked commercial and residential development proposals on the North and South end of Hayward Park and you will see that traffic counts on B will increase substantially, such that bike lanes on the narrow, car packed B St will be a hazard for both bicyclists and drivers. Palm Ave. is a completely different street in terms of it's width. There are existing bike lanes on this stretch of road in Hayward Park that are completely underutilized. It doesn't make sense to duplicate a bike land on an inferior, unsafe street just one block away.

Don't like any of them, need to keep El Camino drivable, We have a train for North South public transit. I walk a lot in San Mateo don't see a great need to change much

I believe there is a mistake in the map, legend or description of Alternative 2: it refers to BRT on El Camino, but doesn't show it with a green line. I'd like to see more detail about what the Bikeways and shared Bike & Ped Paths would look like. Low level of trust here given the current state of bike access under the new 28th underpass and pedestrian access around new Hillside Caltrain station. Maybe it isn't done yet?

Alternative 1 focusing only on pedestrian concerns misses completely the problem of traffic congestion. Last I checked a lot of people around here drive, and sitting in traffic is one of the top quality of life complaints. Every circulation alternative should include strategies to improve traffic flow and reduce travel time.

<p>Alternatives 1 & 2 appear to be very beneficial and worth pursuing. However, the Alt. 3 idea of Barcelona "superblocks" seems more suited to large, very high density cities with plentiful and adequate transit options than it does to San Mateo. Barcelona has a population of 1.6 million and the "superblock" areas, like the Eixample neighborhood, are uniformly 6 stories high. San Mateo's population is 100,000 and most neighborhoods are single family homes and some taller buildings along the transportation corridors. So, I'm wondering if this notion is really applicable to San Mateo. I don't see how it would be an improvement over the pedestrian/bicycle measures of Alternative 1.</p>
<p>The lowest numbers of all building /urban spread as possible. Natural resources here are threaten. Request that our City staff/Council challenge the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers</p>
<p>DONT EXPAND STUDY AREAS</p>
<p>Use A and don't expand the study areas</p>
<p>Use A; DO NOT, UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE, EXPAND THE STUDY AREAS!</p>
<p>We have seen so much growth already! There is no need to expand the study areas.</p>
<p>Don't let big money real estate destroy our neighborhoods - NO EXPANDING the study zones</p>
<p>I like these alternatives, but I want them to be more aggressive. This plan is for 2040, and I want to see more bike paths, safer walking areas, and fewer areas for cars much much sooner.</p>
<p>You dont need to expand the study areas - so dont!</p>
<p>"Transit" up Hillsdale west of Alameda is not sensible. Looks great on paper, but the terrain and lack of use on that route is against it. If you need to get any higher density in the west, if Campus Drive or CSM area is a draw, use 92. The neighborhood is not a truck route. It should not support a transit route either. The very few people who walk or cycle Hillsdale/31st/, 28th/ Alameda south of Hillsdale, do it for exercise, not getting from point to point. Once everyone goes back to work, those exercisers will go too. So I have no idea what "improvements you have in mind, but they have not been informed by the reality of the situation. The fact throughout all of the south west part of San Mateo is that the terrain argues against much transit or bicycle or pedestrian activity. You can't create solutions by the paper map as if everything were flat. ECR is a poor, dangerous choice for a bicycle way. We need to plan to avoid hazards and conflicts, not encourage them.</p>
<p>"calming can equal choking....be careful not to over emphasize bicycle/pedestrian at the expense of an efficient traffic/parking pattern. WE are too geographical spread to make efficient use of public transit for all. Provide parking for rail/bus hubs so people can use them.</p>
<p>Be realistic about traffic improvements feasible in 20 year GP time frame. Tie increased development land use options to transit improvements as implemented and proven successful. Maintain parking requirements for transit stops and downtown. Develop data for numbers of commute bike riders and transit users. Maintain ECR for vehicles while providing for bus rapid transit. Do not remove ECR vehicle lanes for bicycles.</p>
<p>We have too much parking in San Mateo. We need to create a parking policy that disincentivizes driving (whether in electric vehicle or gas-powered vehicle) and make sure that we reduce cars throughout the city to move towards our vision zero goals. Also, we should evaluate more pedestrian-only spaces, especially downtown. I like the superblocks idea, and think it should be expanded to outside of downtown. We absolutely need to have full bus rapid transit on El Camino, in addition to a bikeway. This would make it safer to cross El Camino for pedestrians by reducing the width of the roadway. In terms of an autonomous people mover, that is a high-tech solution to a low-tech problem. We need to make our downtown more walkable, which means that cars shouldn't be allowed except for persons with disabilities, who can ride paratransit or be exempted to enter with a vehicle. Our downtown core is small and if made appealing and safe to walk through it, people will do so.</p>

There needs to be more pedestrian and transit improvements through the entire city.
All these ideas are great, but the "autonomous vehicle shuttle" is not worth considering until the technology is proven. I know there are startups around here that try to pitch that they're the future, but we know that walkability and frequent bus service get people out of cars. Focus on those priorities.
Given the extensive housing changes that are proposed in each of the three alternatives, we should be able to envision a circulation alternative that delivers on all three of these options. If we want to urbanize much of San Mateo, there must be safe bike and pedestrian ways; substantial local and regional transit improvements; and support for future transportation options. We also need to fight for more improved grade crossings or there will be so much traffic stopped in downtown SM and the bike/ped options won't work. This is where we must go BIG and BOLD so that people can see that we can change our city and still make it a better place to live for all.
Alternative B should have B Street closed to traffic as well, like Alternative A.
Measure A is the preferred option to make our city more walkable and protect pedestrians. We have a flat city and perfect weather for walking.
I LOVE all of the pedestrian-only space in Alternative C as well as the proposed bikeways. We should have protected bike lanes connecting Burlingame's downtown to Bay Meadows, along California / San Mateo Dr / Delaware.
Prefer 1 & 3 as these promote biking and walking.
All plans are majorly deficient in considering the disabled and infirm. People who cannot walk or bike but still need to be able to get around, especially those who cannot rely on limited public transit options for handicapped. As people live longer and community ages, and more people remain in their homes, need to consider these issues. Safety enhancements are great but not meaningful if cannot get around to begin with.
I cannot tell if prior comments actually recor
Please do a better job with circulation than you did with extension of 28th Ave., which is woefully inadequate in width in the vicinity of Bay Meadow Park after you channel all the traffic through the new underpass. When park is busy and cars are parked on both sides of street/moving in and out the situation is a nightmare.
More traffic ticketing for phone talkers while driving. Also for erratic driving
Will there be handy EV charging stations strategically placed around the city -- for a full range of electric cars, bikes, wheelchairs, etc? Will wifi be readily available throughout the City?
It's impossible to answer question 1 correctly, as the right range for what? Also, what you're saying is we can have A. B or A+B, what is the tradeoff for A+B? What are the budget impacts? Timelines? You also assume we know what "Superblocks" are, but there are no proposed boundaries for these superblocks.
In each alternative, we should envision a two-block pedestrian-only space downtown, connections to Caltrain stations, and implement Bus Rapid Transit along the El Camino.
There are few defined transit or micro mobility options included for properties both West in the hills and East on the flats connecting to the North-South transit corridors. We need much stronger East-West connectivity.
Alternative 3 is the best
Great work! I would love to see #3; I currently can't walk my children to the park or library because there aren't sidewalks along parts of Edison and even the streets with sidewalks have such soft curbs that cars park on the sidewalk & I can't get a stroller by, and the streets are too narrow to safely push a stroller along them. I would also like to see Family Passes for local public transit.
It is difficult to determine from the brief descriptions provided. Is there a source where I can find more detail?

How shall we account for self-driving cars?
Not enough emphasis on egress and ingress from freeways as well as congestions on main roads (ie. Hillside Boulevard, 3rd Avenue, etc.)
Number One priority should be improvements that increase pedestrian and bicycle safety throughout the City of San Mateo. Period. El Camino Real is state owned; therefore any improvements along that corridor will require cooperation and approval by Caltrans, which may take years, if not decades to achieve .