

From: Maxine Turner [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 1:25 PM
To: Planning <planning@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Planning Commission comments for GP discussion

I support Alternative A on the broad citywide simplification of the alternatives. The population growth assumptions for all alternatives are extreme and do not have any supportable data about how necessary services can be provided. The State Department of Finance determined that "HCD does not ensure that its needs assessments are accurate and adequately supported."

1) Consider a 2-phase GP that recognizes that voter approved Measure Y expires in 2030. Staff reports confirm that current state RHNA housing mandates can be met through 2030 under Alternative A, which also provides the most revenue to the city. People may disagree on how accurate the current RHNA numbers are, but it is certain that beyond 2030 there is no way to rely on current assumptions of future RHNA needs given the unpredictability of work-at-home job preferences resulting from Covid and the voter backlash to the state takeover of local land use.

2) Support local small businesses and service providers that residents rely on, by requiring affordable rents (per the Small Business Administration) in all new mixed use developments as a public benefit for increases in heights and densities that now only benefit the developers and land owners. Most existing small businesses along El Camino Real and surrounding Downtown will be displaced by allowing maximum new development. National chains are not small businesses.

3) Be transparent that an increase to our General Plan's land use limits may and can translate to even higher and denser buildings with State bonuses (as with the Block 21 project) is crucial to community relations. Ensure that residents understand how high changes to heights & densities will actually be. Exactly what height could be built? The State takeover of land use control automatically gives developers significant height and density bonuses over and above local zoning allowances. Perhaps, our maximum heights and densities should be kept at moderate numbers, based on what will then be added per the state bonuses.

4) Recognize that most public commentary is based on the simplification of the 3 city-wide Alternatives A, B & C, even though comments can be given on an individual study area basis. There are many mix and match options, depending on Study Area, where Alternatives B & C may be preferable to A. When will these mix and match options be presented so that the public can finally see what changes are proposed to our existing General Plan?