

**From:** Michelle Maccarra [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 30, 2023 3:48 PM  
**To:** City Council (San Mateo) <[CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org)>  
**Subject:** Strongly Opposed to Urban Density/Continued Development in San Mateo

The move towards urban density is appalling and will cause irreversible strain on our resources, traffic congestion, and significant decrease of our quality of life.

The housing numbers in the 2040 General Plan Land Use Element need to be recalculated to account for the new housing density bonuses, which developers are regularly using (developers can use density bonuses to add more units and additional stories to buildings when they include affordable housing).

The General Plan must be revised to reflect the housing provided with the new density bonuses.

Density bonuses currently raise heights from 5 to 7 stories and greater density. Recently passed AB 1287 increases the density bonus to 100%, which is ridiculous.

<https://www.coxcastle.com/publication-ab-1287-legislature-creates-an-additional-density-bonus-for-very-low-and-middle-income-households>

The 2040 General Plan and Land Use Element **must** make it clear to the community what is really being authorized by the height and density proposed.

The 2030 General Plan incorporated Measure Y's measured approach to growth. Measure Y capped building heights at 55 feet and density at 50 units per acre.

The City says they need taller buildings to meet the state housing allocation for San Mateo; however, the City can meet the inflated housing allocation without overturning Measure Y.

The City should not approve the maximum growth scenario because the housing allocation numbers are grossly inflated, the new density bonus law will allow taller buildings, **and the state is losing population.**

The 2040 Draft General Plan initially considered low, medium, and high growth scenarios. WHY did they choose the maximum growth option?? The community does not want this level of density. The low-density alternative is the what the community would have voted for.

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 City has conducted "statistically valid" surveys. The choices in the survey are ridiculous--do you want high-rise buildings downtown or mid-rises everywhere in the City? What kind of a choice is that? How valid is that compared to the vote 3 years ago? Ridiculous!

"Would residents prefer to spread future housing throughout the City in medium height buildings, which means allowing more units per parcel in existing residential neighborhoods with higher-density infill projects OR concentrate future housing in taller buildings in locations that are closer to transit, jobs, services, stores and restaurants, including downtown, along El Camino Real, and near Cal Train stations?"

The "statistically valid" surveys should not override a recently-passed ballot measure.

What is really necessary to meet housing requirements, given the new housing laws passed this year?

Please don't ruin the City of San Mateo. Please listen to the community and stop all of this needless development.

Concerned Citizen,

Michelle Maccarra