

Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2022 9:58 PM

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

Subject: To the Council For Monday's City Council Mtg...thanks

Under the preferred general plan, what are you going to do about the traffic that will be generated in and through the now planned "land locked" Hayward Park area?

Railroad tracks on the East and 4 plus story, high density buildings on the North, South and West with only two streets through Hayward Park: Palm Avenue and B Street.

Larry Patterson promised that when Bay Meadows and the TOD overlay was approved, there would be no net increase in terms of traffic on Palm Ave and B St. He said that on the record.

But that is clearly not going to be the case when this GP update is implemented.

Did planning forget to look at these planning issues comprehensively? Or did they just look at various sections of the City, separately - Downtown, El Camino and 92/101, without looking at the cumulative impacts that each of those 3 individual high density sections might have on one particular neighborhood?

For the GP update, were cumulative traffic studies done on the impact of high density being built on the north, west and south sides of Hayward part or were they just done separately on the downtown, El Camino and Hayward Park TOD sections?

The problem is the cumulative impact of each of those separate sections on Hayward Park itself. This issue happens nowhere else in the City under the preferred GP update.

I would appreciate your response as to the cumulative traffic impact on Hayward Park, if the present preferred GP is passed.

A quick final note, it also seems that you're giving up on solar access for a wide swath of Hayward Park residents along the El Camino Real.

Sincerely Yours,

Laurence Kinsella



San Mateo, CA 94402