

From: Laurie Hietter [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 3:39 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>; Alex Khojikian <akhojikian@cityofsanmateo.org>; Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Comments on the Land Use Element of the 2040 General Plan

Dear City Council and Mr. Khojikian:

The San Mateo community has organized against urban density for many years. The previous City Council members have ignored our many letters urging measured growth and avoiding dense urbanization. The citizens voted three times to limit height and density in the City. Please consider our many comments tonight and received in writing.

My key comments are below.

- The community does not want the intense growth allowed under Alternative C.
- The City should not approve the maximum growth scenario because the housing allocation numbers are grossly inflated, the new density bonus law (AB 1287) will allow taller buildings, and the state is losing population.
- Approve Alternative A for more moderate growth.
- The Land Use Element for the General Plan must be substantially revised to reflect the new regulations passed this year.
- The housing numbers in the 2040 General Plan Land Use Element (and the Housing Element) need to be recalculated to account for the new housing density bonuses.
- Recently passed AB 1287 increases the density bonus to 100%. If the General Plan allows for 10 stories will the new density bonus law allow for 20 stories?
- The 2040 General Plan and Land Use Element must be revised make it clear to the community what is really being authorized by the height and density proposed and the effects of the new density bonuses should be clearly stated.
- The City can meet the inflated housing allocation without overturning Measure Y. Measure Y sunsets in 2030.

The 2040 Draft General Plan initially considered low, medium, and high growth scenarios. The Council chose the maximum growth option at every turn. The community does not want this level of density. Choose the low-density alternative. The people of San Mateo have spoken three times in voting to limit building heights and densities. The most recent vote was only 3 years ago for a 10-year limit on height and density.

The recent survey by the City is an embarrassment. How is it valid to give residents a choice of high-rises downtown or medium-rise buildings everywhere including single-family neighborhoods? The low or moderate growth scenarios could meet housing needs. Why does the City need another survey when the last vote to limit growth was three years ago. We also don't need a ballot measure or to vote again when the ballot measure is valid for 10 years (to 2030). The "statistically valid" surveys should not override a recently-passed ballot measure.

Please consider the views of the San Mateo residents who oppose the excessive growth proposed in the General Plan and take the time to participate in Council meetings by reading these complex documents and providing thoughtful comments.

Thank you,
Laurie Hietter