

From: Michael [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2022 2:59 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: General Plan Preferred Alternative

Planning Commissioners - *I'm writing to express strong support for Alternative A.* We've recently learned that the CA State Auditor determined the HCD (the agency that determines the statewide mandated housing numbers) "does not ensure that its needs assessments are accurate and adequately supported". It logically follows then, that if the top-level numbers are unreliable and potentially very inaccurate, the RHNA allocations and their mandated compliance are also therefore unreliable and potentially very inaccurate. We should not be blindly running to overdevelop based on faulty and erroneous data.

Alternative A also respects Measure Y. Any option the city adopts will need to be acceptable to the voters. Putting the max growth options out there disregards the will of more than half the voters in San Mateo - the very people you are charged with representing and will have a high risk of failing at the polls.

More reasons to support Alternative A:

- Plan A provides the most financial benefits to the city over the long term defined by net revenue
- Plan A results in the least strain on already limited and shrinking water supplies, and is therefore more sustainable
- Plan A minimizes the impact on our precious and irreplaceable historic downtown, without which San Mateo starts to rapidly become just another generic city full of pack and stack offices and housing

Finally, any plan should focus on AFFORDABLE housing - not luxury and not office. Codify this, and look at vacant office space for conversion. Trickle down housing doesn't work - don't fall into the trap of simply "more is better".

Absent direct support for Alternative A, the survey information (the statistically valid one, not the admittedly not valid (by Placeworks) and easily manipulated online surveys) indicates significant support for maintaining existing heights and densities, but the overall message is very mixed. It would be wise I think to develop a hybrid option somewhere between A and B and put that to the public for consideration. Yes, there certainly are places to go higher and denser, and we're already seeing that with Kiku and Block 21, which is great. But if Measure Y's campaign taught us anything, it's that as a city we need to compromise - not just charge ahead with the max development we can fit into our fair city. Now let's roll up our sleeves and do exactly that.

Sincerely, Michael Weinbauer