

Sent: Sunday, August 15, 2021 4:24 PM

To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>

Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: Written Public Comment for Item 28 of Aug 16 City Council Regular Mtg (General Plan Update – Overview of Draft Land Use and Circulation Alternatives)

Dear San Mateo City Council:

Though I am a Sustainability & Infrastructure Commissioner for the City of San Mateo, the comments below are solely my opinions as a San Mateo resident.

I urge you to find that the current land use alternatives do *not* represent the right range, as they include an alternative ('A') that does not reasonably prepare San Mateo to meet expected state housing requirements through 2040. Please direct staff and the consultant to either: edit Land Use Alternative A until it can do so; or remove it from consideration.

In the last Planning Commission meeting, Commissioner John Ebnetter asked staff whether Land Use Alternative A would give the city the ability to meet Regional Housing Needs Allocations beyond the upcoming cycle (2023 - 2031). Community Development Director Christina Horrisberger said "with Alternative A, it doesn't provide the housing capacity that we would anticipate to get through future RHNA cycles. If we land on something that closely mirrors Land Use Alternative A...we find ourselves possibly in a situation where we need to go back...and reopening some parts of the General Plan that we would need to look at again...that comes with other ripple effects on other aspects of the General Plan." ([here's a link](#) to that segment of the recording for reference).

This is unacceptable. If Land Use Alternative A cannot reasonably prepare San Mateo for housing needs after 2031, it should not be considered viable for this 2040 General Plan Update! It's as simple as that.

I understand the interest and logic in having an alternative that would represent "the least amount of change needed to meet future growth needs," but Land Use Alternative A does not currently meet this standard: it is significantly below it. Please direct staff to either revise it appropriately, or remove it from the list of viable, serious alternatives designed to help San Mateo plan for a future beyond 2031. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Adam Loraine