

From: [Lubiana Cernobori](#)
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: City Council Meeting
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 1:30:35 PM

Subject: City council meeting 7/15

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I don't support the proposed 2040 San Mateo General Plan or the City's proposed Ballot Measure to overturn Measure Y.

No valid, public reason has been given for rushing a vote to overturn Measure Y in 2024, instead of keeping it in the General Plan until its legal expiration date of 2030.

1. There is no legal rush for higher heights and densities to meet state housing requirements.

Development under Measure Y can meet the City's cycle 6 Housing Element and state RHNA requirements, valid until 2031. The next housing cycle is likely to have reduced requirements since the State Department of Finance has released new population projections showing CA growth is flat through 2060.

2. There is no economic rush for higher heights and densities. Many already approved projects have asked for extensions and are not being constructed. There are high rates of office and retail vacancies throughout the Peninsula and Bay Area.

3. Measure Y expires in 2030 and is currently part of the existing 2030 General Plan. In 2031 a majority of the City Council can revise the 2040 General Plan height and density limits without a vote to comply with the next Housing Element cycle. This is how General Plan changes were always made prior to the Measures H, P and Y voter initiatives.

4. Measure Y's zoning allowances (55 foot height and 50 units per acre density) are but a small percentage of construction costs. Buildings exceeding 5-7 stories (50'-70') are substantially more expensive to construct. The increased cost of land (directly related to increasing heights and densities) and the high cost of construction (labor, materials, financing, insurance) make construction of new buildings unaffordable, not Measure Y. Construction of new housing costs almost \$1M per unit - increased zoning and taxpayer subsidies cannot build enough affordable housing to make a significant difference with these extreme development costs.

5. The General Plan study areas do not protect key community serving land uses that residents rely on, such as grocery stores, car repair, independent restaurants, small businesses and service providers. Most existing small businesses along El Camino Real and surrounding Downtown will be displaced by allowing maximum development. The cost of new construction significantly raises rents.

6. The Council and the residents need to review a fiscal analysis PRIOR to General Plan adoption. The DEIR makes clear that the large increase in population and structures will require additional funding for services. There is no data about how much revenue will be lost or gained by the Project land use changes. How much sales tax revenue will be lost by upzoning downtown and El Camino Real small businesses for housing or office?

7. The DEIR does not provide the public nor decision-makers with the data they need to approve the Project. There is no information about how water will be provided, traffic impacts reduced, the jobs/housing balance maintained, and displacement of affordable housing and small businesses avoided. Voters and the Council deserve to know the truth BEFORE approving the General Plan.

The majority of San Mateans have consistently supported the construction of more housing, particularly

affordable housing, continued job growth and economic development. But they don't believe it is necessary, nor are they willing, to sacrifice their homes, neighborhoods, quality of life, or character of their historic downtown in the process.

Thank you for taking this feedback into consideration.

Renato and Lubiana Cernobori (San Mateo resident and homeowner)

Sent from my iPhone

From: diana_c_flores@yahoo.com
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: City council meeting 7/15
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 1:00:21 PM

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I don't support the proposed 2040 San Mateo General Plan or the City's proposed Ballot Measure to overturn Measure Y.

No valid, public reason has been given for rushing a vote to overturn Measure Y in 2024, instead of keeping it in the General Plan until its legal expiration date of 2030.

1. There is no legal rush for higher heights and densities to meet state housing requirements. Development under Measure Y can meet the City's cycle 6 Housing Element and state RHNA requirements, valid until 2031. The next housing cycle is likely to have reduced requirements since the State Department of Finance has released new population projections showing CA growth is flat through 2060.

2. There is no economic rush for higher heights and densities. Many already approved projects have asked for extensions and are not being constructed. There are high rates of office and retail vacancies throughout the Peninsula and Bay Area.

3. Measure Y expires in 2030 and is currently part of the existing 2030 General Plan. In 2031 a majority of the City Council can revise the 2040 General Plan height and density limits without a vote to comply with the next Housing Element cycle. This is how General Plan changes were always made prior to the Measures H, P and Y voter initiatives.

4. Measure Y's zoning allowances (55 foot height and 50 units per acre density) are but a small percentage of construction costs. Buildings exceeding 5-7 stories (50'-70') are substantially more expensive to construct. The increased cost of land (directly related to increasing heights and densities) and the high cost of construction (labor, materials, financing, insurance) make construction of new buildings unaffordable, not Measure Y. Construction of new housing costs almost \$1M per unit - increased zoning and taxpayer subsidies cannot build enough affordable housing to make a significant difference with these extreme development costs.

5. The General Plan study areas do not protect key community serving land uses that residents rely on, such as grocery stores, car repair, independent restaurants, small businesses and service providers. Most existing small businesses along El Camino Real and surrounding Downtown will be displaced by allowing maximum development. The cost of new construction significantly raises rents.

6. The Council and the residents need to review a fiscal analysis PRIOR to General Plan adoption. The DEIR makes clear that the large increase in population and structures will require additional funding for services. There is no data about how much revenue will be lost or gained by the Project land use changes. How much sales tax revenue will be lost by upzoning downtown and El Camino Real small businesses for housing or office?

7. The DEIR does not provide the public nor decision-makers with the data they need to approve the Project. There is no information about how water will be provided, traffic impacts reduced, the jobs/housing balance maintained, and displacement of affordable housing and small businesses avoided. Voters and the Council deserve to know the truth BEFORE approving the General Plan.

The majority of San Mateans have consistently supported the construction of more housing, particularly affordable housing, continued job growth and economic development. But they don't believe it is necessary, nor are they willing, to sacrifice their homes, neighborhoods, quality of life, or character of their historic downtown in the process.

Thank you for taking this feedback into consideration.

Diana Flores (San Mateo resident and homeowner)



July 15, 2024

Re: Comment on Item #29

Potential Ballot Measure – Consideration of Placing a Land Use Measure on the November 2024 Ballot

From: Faith in Action Bay Area - El equipo organizativo de Padres Unidos en Acción de la ciudad de San Mateo (*The Parents United in Action Organizing Committee of the City of San Mateo*)

Dear Mayor Diaz Nash, Deputy-Mayor Newsom and City Councilmembers of San Mateo:

We appreciate the City Council's efforts to address the housing affordability crisis in San Mateo through the proposed land use ballot measure. We also don't want the council to miss this important opportunity to increase the amount of required affordable housing, require deeper affordability, and pass real tenant protections for San Mateo families. We are concerned that without these additions to the proposed ballot measure and city policy, this measure that is intended to improve our housing situation could unintentionally worsen the high rents and displacement pressures our families are experiencing.

We are residents of San Mateo and leaders of Faith in Action Bay Area, a network of more than 150 congregations and schools in San Mateo County and San Francisco. We develop our leadership and build power by developing intentional relationships in our community. We work collectively to make changes that improve our lives and to combat systemic economic and racial injustice, guided by those of us experiencing those injustices. We are a team of leaders from San Mateo worried about the security and stability of our families. Most of our families use MediCal and according to HUD, we are in the "ELI" income category.

First, we need the City to increase affordable housing required in new developments to 25% of all units and ensure that 20% is reserved for families at the ELI income level in the inclusionary housing requirement. This will ensure that affordable housing is actually affordable, and created for families like ours who are most acutely experiencing the challenges of high rents in San Mateo. Without this, we fear that the land use plan will not create new affordable homes that our families will have access to.

In the last Housing Element Cycle, San Mateo needed to plan for 430 ELI units. Unfortunately, only 49 or 11% got built. Planning for new affordable homes alone does not guarantee their construction, but requiring developers to build them or increasing funding to pay for them will.

Second, we need the Council to pass tenant protections *before* increasing development to ensure that we can stay in our homes and in our community for the long run. Without tenant



protections, more high-density development by corporate owners in San Mateo will drive up rental prices and incentivize landlords to push our families out in search of higher paying tenants through renovations, intimidation, unsustainable rent increases, or other means. These displacement pressures affect the health of our families and children, our safety and security, and make it clear that we are not welcome in this community.

Many of our families rent rooms, share apartments with multiple families, or live in older apartment buildings that charge lower than the current market rent in order to keep a roof over our heads. We need to pass protections so that our families can stay in these homes and so these homes stay affordable. According to the California Housing Partnership, there are 10,850 units of unsubsidized affordable housing in the City of San Mateo. About 200 units have been lost between 2020 and 2023, and they estimate about 3,200 units are at high risk of losing affordability in the near term. There is significantly more below-market-rate “unsubsidized affordable” housing on the private market (where there are families like ours at risk of being priced out or displaced by increasing rents or eviction) than the City of San Mateo is able to build through the financing of affordable housing.

Tenant protections — for example, rent control, just cause for eviction and anti-harassment — will limit excessive rent hikes, maintain the affordability of our homes, prevent evictions for renovation, and ensure we can live with dignity. The protections we secured through state law are not enough.

Higher density development will also increase corporate ownership, which has a dangerous impact on affordability. A [recent report](#) published by the Anti-Eviction Mapping Project about Redwood City, a neighboring community that has incentivized high-density development in the downtown area, demonstrates that corporate owners charge the highest rents, determining the upper limit of what can be charged, which thereby drives up rental prices among other owners.

We know how important this measure could be for our families, and we aim to support the proposed measure with the higher inclusionary housing requirement, deeper affordability and expedited tenant protections. If we don't do these things prior to incentivizing development, we will not benefit from this housing plan and our families risk being displaced. Our community cannot wait for the Council to take these actions until development is underway. Our families deserve to live in San Mateo with peace, dignity, and stability.

Sincerely,

Faith in Action Bay Area - El equipo organizativo de Padres Unidos en Acción de la ciudad de San Mateo (*The Parents United in Action Organizing Committee of the City of San Mateo*)

From: [Jon New](#)
To: [City Council \(San Mateo\)](#)
Cc: [Clerk](#)
Subject: Please consider repealing Measure Y
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 11:06:09 PM

Honorable Council,

My name is Jonathan New, and unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the July 15th City Council meeting. But, I'll cut to the chase: I hope you consider a full repeal of Measure Y for the November ballot. [San Mateo is the most expensive county in the US](#) and recently named one of the [country's most NIMBYest cities](#).

Measure Y only serves to keep San Mateo unaffordable. Additional density, particularly downtown, adds vibrancy and resilience to our local businesses. Furthermore, I think allowing new people to share our neighborhood is part of the responsibility of living in a civil society.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jonathan New
San Mateo

From: [Jeremy Poindexter](#)
To: [City Council \(San Mateo\)](#)
Subject: November 2024 ballot initiatives
Date: Sunday, July 14, 2024 10:11:36 PM

Dear San Mateo City Council,

Thank you for your previous work to ensure reliable and cost-effective housing for residents of our city. I would like to urge you to put a full repeal of Measure Y on the November 2024 ballot to further support our city's housing needs.

I moved to San Mateo in July 2021, just a few months after Measure Y originally passed. I live with my partner and four other housemates in a single-family home. It is a somewhat unusual housing arrangement, but such a communal lifestyle works well for us, and keeps housing costs low enough for us, a group of renters.

But our arrangement shouldn't be so unusual in the first place. It should not be so hard to find townhouses or large apartments for groups of renters in our city. Yet, most of the city remains zoned exclusively for single-family homes.

We desperately need more housing, especially near transit and near the heart of the city. It is a no-brainer to build more such housing, and we should do all we can to support it, including revisiting whether policies like Measure Y still make sense (or ever did at all).

Thanks for your considerations,
Jeremy Poindexter

[REDACTED]

From: [Lisa Vande Voorde](#)
To: [Clerk; City Council \(San Mateo\)](#)
Cc: [Zachary Dahl](#); [Alex Khojikian](#); [Travis Dunn](#)
Subject: Do Not Place the Land Use Measure on the Ballot This November
Date: Monday, July 15, 2024 2:45:07 PM

RE: 7/15/24 City Council Meeting Agenda Item #29: Potential Ballot Measure – Consideration of Placing a Land Use Measure on the November 2024 Ballot

Dear City Council,

I have attended two City presentations about this ballot measure, and I remain unconvinced. It's clear to me that the City can achieve its RHNA numbers, plus a significant buffer, with Measure Y in place as is. Measure Y expires in 2030, which is before the next RHNA cycle begins in 2031. Since it doesn't impact future cycles, there is no need to change Measure Y. If the State requires that the City plan for additional units should the measure not go on the ballot in November, surely that is possible without rezoning single family neighborhoods west of El Camino, while staying within Measure Y parameters. Some examples of potential sites:

- The former Marriott hotel site
- The City corporation yard
- The office park behind/below Laurelwood Shopping Center
- The underutilized Bel Mateo commercial area
- 1900 and 2000 Alameda de las Pulgas

Please respect the will of the voters of San Mateo who approved Measure Y in 2020, and do not go forward with placing this Land Use Measure on the ballot this November.

Yours truly,

Lisa Vande Voorde
San Mateo Resident

From: [Shirley Weathers](#)
To: [Clerk](#)
Subject: July 15, 2024 Meeting Agenda Item 29: Request to Put Repeal of Measure Y on the November Ballot
Date: Friday, July 12, 2024 11:51:39 AM

Dear Councilmembers,

I recently moved to San Mateo from out of state and am stunned by the severity and impact of the housing shortage. I've been a homeowner in both Utah and Oregon since 1993, but have found that here, my only option is to rent. It's clear from market conditions that I am fortunate to be paying slightly under \$3,000/month for a one-bedroom apartment in District 3 (base rent plus utilities). I'm grateful for what I hope is a steadily improving infrastructure supporting micromobility (I ride a bicycle primarily for transportation), as well as nearby public transit via SamTrans and CalTrain. I know many others are not so fortunate.

I've followed the progress of the development of the most recent Housing Element and it seems clear that the City's goals and requirements cannot be achieved without repeal of Measure Y, nor can doing the right thing to ensure safe and affordable housing for all.

Please vote in support of placing on the November 2024 ballot Measure Y's repeal to allow essential increases in the City's affordable housing stock to occur.

Respectfully submitted,

Shirley Weathers

San Mateo,