From: Lisa Vande Voorde Sent: Monday, October 30, 2023 3:28 PM To: City Council (San Mateo) <<u>CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org</u>>; Patrice Olds <<u>polds@cityofsanmateo.org</u>> Subject: Comments for 2040 Draft General Plan Land Use Element

## Dear Honorable City Council Members,

Please accept the following comments as you provide direction to staff tonight regarding the Land Use Element of the 2040 General Plan. I urge you to REJECT the element as presented, and basically go back to the drawing board.

The premise of the Land Use Element is faulty. It does not take into consideration San Mateo County's projected DECLINING growth between now and the year 2060. It does not take into consideration the variety of State density bonus laws which allow for 50%-100% height/volume ABOVE local zoning. It does not take into consideration Measure Y, which is in effect until the year 2030. It does not consider what the majority of residents want, which is both affordable housing AND measured growth. You can get BOTH by choosing the Lowest Growth Alternative, General Plan Land Use Alternative A, and that is what I urge you to do.

Why is the General Plan not transparent when it comes to the all-important density bonus laws? Sounds to me like you want to have your cake at maximum growth alternative, and eat it too by slipping in these required density bonus laws on top, thereby making San Mateo a developer's paradise. Current density bonus law allows a project to be 50% higher than submitted. On top of this, you also have the recently signed-into-law AB1287, which allows a building project to receive a second stacked 50% bonus. This is atop the EXISTING 50% density bonus law, for a 100% increase in building height/density. So with Residential/Mixed Use High II of 8-10 stories, we can be looking at 15 stories with regular density bonus and 20 stories with AB1287. But with Land Use Alternative A, which incorporates Measure Y limits of 5 stories, your 8story density bonus building now becomes the doubledensity bonus 11 stories. That is already MORE than enough to satisfy RHNA numbers (already inflated given negative growth projections), allows developers to get their building heights and the profit that goes with it, and EVERYONE to get affordable housing with measured growth in keeping with the suburban character and quality of life here in San Mateo. Sounds like a winwin to me.

The future of San Mateo is at stake. Please, I urge you to take the time, and do it right. Thank you.

Lisa Vande Voorde San Mateo Resident