

From: Kenneth E Abreu <>

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2021 5:14 PM

To: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>; Eric Rodriguez <erodriguez@cityofsanmateo.org>; Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Joe Goethals <jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rick Bonilla <RBonilla@cityofsanmateo.org>; Amourence Lee <alee@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: General Plan and Housing Element- Next steps (January 19, 2021, Item 17)

Dear Mayor and Members of the San Mateo City Council,

Subject: General Plan and Housing Element- Next steps (January 19, 2021, Item 17)

Our region is in a deep housing crisis and the General Plan 2040 (GP) process must be done well to position our city and region for success in the future. The proper shaping of the GP will provide long term benefits in addressing housing, jobs, environmental, traffic, financial and racial issues that need to be addressed.

I recommend that that the GP process be revised to reflect the following:

1. Don't plan on Measure Y as a long-term constraint. Instead develop a GP that is optimal with input from all and provides the best plan for San Mateo thru 2040.
2. Develop a GP for the *long term*, out to 2040 and beyond. *Do it right*, don't take shortcuts. It's too important.
3. Expand the study areas to include the entire city.
4. Preserve the 50 % buffer.

Here is the reasoning for each of recommendations:

1. The Measure Y proponents said that it was not intended to constrain the GP, but instead to be a "placeholder" while a thorough, high quality GP is developed with strong community input. The place holder is now in place. So, let get going on a high-quality GP that will serve the city well thru 2040 and beyond. The density and height limits of Measure Y may not be best in the long run.
2. As noted in the staff report, if you stick with the Measure Y constraints and the current study areas, we are not likely to have a GP that works thru 2040. Indeed, the report indicates we may need to start the GP updates in 4 to 5 years after the GP is completed. This is a waste of time and resources and will only confuse the citizens, as we keep redoing the plan. Let's do it right the first time.
3. To do the GP properly we need to look at the entire city and consider how best to meet future needs without preconceived limits. The current study areas were an attempt by the City Council to calm the proponents of Measure Y and avoid the need for a ballot measure to finish the GP. This self-imposed constraint did not work, as Measure Y passed and so it's time to open the GP process back up and take a holistic view of the best long-term approach for the city.
4. The 50% is what has been used in the past and is what the housing consultant recommends. Given the dire need for housing and the damaging impact of a lack of housing, the GP need to make sure it has a strong plan to meet the long-term housing need.

Please seriously consider these recommendations. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Ken Abreu, 38-year San Mateo resident and small business owner.

From: Ellis Berns <

Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 12:58 PM

To: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: January 19 - Old Business - Item 17 General Plan and Housing Element- Next steps

Dear Mayor Rodriguez and Members of the San Mateo City Council:

You will be discussing this evening next steps and feedback for the General Plan and Housing Element for our entire San Mateo community. The voter approved Measure Y imposes height and density limits through 2030. Given this "constraint" I would like to urge the City Council to reconsider the proposed Study Areas for the General Plan and Housing Element and study the entire San Mateo community.

Our community is being challenged to meet our housing, economic and quality of life needs now and into the future. Our General Plan and Housing Element needs to be balanced and reflect who we are, an inclusive community for all!

Thank you.

Ellis M. Berns - 29 year San Mateo resident



August 19, 2019

Honorable Mayor Diane Papan and Members of the City Council
City of San Mateo
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

Dear Mayor Papan and Members of the City Council,

The Home Association of North Central San Mateo (HANCSM) is committed to the Vision Statement that our City adopted for its General Plan Update:

San Mateo is a vibrant, livable, diverse, and healthy community that respects the quality of its neighborhoods, fosters a flourishing economy, is committed to equity, and is a leader in environmental sustainability.

We stand behind it and want our City to realize the values of this new Vision Statement.

HANCSM supports the inclusion of our North Central neighborhood as an area of study. The rest of the city should be studied as well, and all areas of the city that are transit-adjacent or in transit corridors should be studied in equal measure.

North Central should not be exclusively singled out as the only residential neighborhood for study. We believe no neighborhood should be exempt from change and no neighborhood should be subjected to radical change. To do anything else shifts too much of the obligation and responsibility for change onto our most vulnerable communities. We cannot laud values such as diversity, inclusivity, and equity and at the same time undermine them from the very beginning of our planning stage by excluding all other single-family zoned neighborhoods from the areas of study.

North Central is San Mateo's densest neighborhood, with the largest percentage of renters, people of color, and the greatest concentration of the city's "affordable housing" stock. Our neighborhood has already experienced significant displacement, and our residents and businesses are at the highest risk of displacement in the coming decades. Therefore, as we strive to achieve the values of diversity, inclusivity, and equity, we advocate for the protection of our vulnerable community members. When we study our city and consider changes here, countering displacement must be a key driver on par with the other values of our Vision Statement and a major focus of study for North Central.

The City Council, Planning Commission, and General Plan Subcommittee unanimously called for "robust and meaningful" community input. The community outreach efforts to identify the study areas presented at the Planning Commission Meeting failed to yield the levels of participation or engagement that our electeds requested and that our community deserves. HANCSM advocates for expanding the formats for participation to reach a more diverse group of community stakeholders. We encourage the



use of panels and round tables to promote community dialogue. The Subcommittee could bring together community leaders who hold differing perspectives to foster dialogue and education. In this planning process we must connect vision, values, and goals with community needs and implementation strategies. We have a chance to empower our diverse city through this process and map our values to measurable goals that are tied to clear, data-based metrics - metrics that tell the story of our community's current and future needs.

We want our homes to be part of a vibrant, livable, diverse, and healthy community where all members feel welcome and have the ability to reside in San Mateo with dignity - today and in 2040. HANCSM calls on you, our elected officials, to correct course and uphold your commitment to our stated vision and values.

Respectfully Yours,

Estimado Alcalde Diane Papan y miembros del Ayuntamiento,

La Asociación de Hogares de North Central San Mateo (HANCSM) está comprometida con la Visión que nuestra Ciudad ha propuesto en la actualización del estudio de "Plan General":

San Mateo es una comunidad vibrante y llena de vida, diversa y saludable, que respeta la calidad de vida de sus vecindarios, fomenta una economía floreciente, está comprometida con la igualdad y es un líder en la protección del medio ambiente.

La Asociación de Hogares de North Central San Mateo respaldamos y queremos que nuestra Ciudad se dé cuenta de los valores de esta nueva visión.

HANCSM apoya la inclusión de nuestro vecindario de "North Central" como una área de estudio. Sin embargo, consideramos que el resto de la ciudad también debería ser parte de este estudio, así como todas las áreas adyacentes a la ciudad, y también tomar en cuenta el tránsito y los corredores de tránsito que deberían estudiarse con misma medida.

North Central no debería ser exclusivamente seleccionado como el único vecindario residencial para este estudio. Nosotros creemos que ningún vecindario de San Mateo debería estar exento de cambios, y también que ningún vecindario debería estar sujeto a cambios radicales. Al no hacer nada, cambiaría nuestra obligación y responsabilidad para cambio en nuestras comunidades más vulnerables. No podemos apoyar los valores como la diversidad, la inclusión y la igualdad, y al mismo tiempo quebrantarlos cuando al comienzo de nuestra etapa de planificación se está excluyendo a otros vecindarios zonales como las zonas de una familia dentro del alcance de este estudio.

North Central es el vecindario más denso de San Mateo, con el mayor porcentaje de inquilinos, personas de color y la mayor inventario de "viviendas accesible" de esta ciudad. Nuestro vecindario ya ha sufrido un desplazamiento significativo, y nuestros residentes y negocios corren el mayor riesgo de desplazamiento en las próximas décadas. Por lo tanto, a medida que nos esforzamos por alcanzar los valores de la diversidad, inclusión e igualdad, pedimos por la protección de los miembros vulnerables



de nuestra comunidad. Cuando nosotros tomamos en cuenta a nuestra ciudad y considerarnos los cambios, también deberíamos tomar en cuenta acciones para contrarrestar el desplazamiento y esto debería ser un factor clave que estaría alineado con el otros valores de nuestra Visión y ser un enfoque principal de Estudio para North Central.

Todos los miembros del Ayuntamiento, la Comisión de Planificación y el Subcomité del Plan General pidieron a la comunidad su "firmes y significativos" comentarios/críticas. Los esfuerzos de la Comisión de Planificación para conseguir la participación de la comunidad e identificar las áreas de estudio no logró los niveles de participación o compromiso que nuestros miembros del Ayuntamiento solicitaron y que nuestra comunidad merece. HANCSM pide expandir los formatos de participación para llegar al grupo más diverso de partes interesadas de nuestra comunidad. Exhortamos el uso de paneles de discusión y mesas redondas para promover el diálogo comunitario. El subcomité podría traer juntos líderes comunitarios que tienen diferentes perspectivas para fomentar el diálogo y la educación. En esto proceso de planificación debemos conectar la visión, los valores y las metas con las necesidades y la implementación de la comunidad estrategias. Queremos la oportunidad de darle voz a nuestra diversa comunidad y a través de este proceso y planear que nuestros valores sean objetivos medibles y vinculados a claras métricas que estén basadas en datos y que revelen la historia de las necesidades actuales y futuras de nuestra comunidad.

Queremos que nuestros hogares y familias sean parte de una comunidad vibrante, con una buena calidad de vida, diversa y saludable donde todos nosotros podamos sentirnos bienvenidos y tengamos la capacidad de vivir en San Mateo con dignidad, hoy y en 2040. HANCSM exhorta a, nuestros funcionarios electos, a corregir el rumbo y cumplir con su compromiso con nuestra Visión y valores.

Respetuosamente,

Adam Nugent, HANCSM President
Binh Thai, HANCSM Vice President
Carolina Nugent, HANCSM Secretary
Joanne Bennett, HANCSM Treasurer
Amourence Lee, HANCSM Communications & Love North Central Campaign Chair
Bennito Angeles, HANCSM Board Member
Mike Caggiano, HANCSM Board Member
Dorothy Chow, HANCSM Board Member
Noelia Corzo, HANCSM Board Member
Emanuel Huff, HANCSM Board Member
Jonah Lee, HANCSM Board Member
Wesley Taoka, HANCSM Board Member
Ben Toy, HANCSM Board Member
Dianne Whitaker, HANCSM Board Member

Rev. Marlyn Bussey, Pastor, St. James AME Zion Church
Rev. Henry Toryo Adams, Resident Minister, San Mateo Buddhist Temple



Rev. Dr. Penny Nixon, Senior Minister, Congregational Church of San Mateo
Rev. Jorge P. Bautista, Associate Minister, Congregational Church of San Mateo
Marty Hoffman, President of Unitarian Universalists of San Mateo
Shaun Collins, Vice President of Unitarian Universalists of San Mateo
Barb Du Mond, Member of Unitarian Universalists of San Mateo
Jose A. Mendez, NAACP Branch 1068, Executive Committee Member
Cynthia Eagleton, 20+ year Teacher, San Mateo Adult School

Peninsula for Everyone
Faith In Action Bay Area

Ethel Batiste, President of North Central Neighborhood Association
Anita Webb, Financial Sec. of North Central Neighborhood Assoc. & Trustee of Pilgrim Baptist Church
Arnold Webb, Member of North Central Neighborhood Assoc. & Usher of Pilgrim Baptist Church
Michael Green, North Central Resident & Deacon of Pilgrim Baptist Church

Brenda Sell, St. Bartholomew Catholic Church
Jim Sell, St. Bartholomew Catholic Church
Elizabeth Traubman, San Mateo Resident & Co-founder Elders Action Network
Lionel Traubman, San Mateo Resident & Co-founder Jewish-Palestinian Living Room Dialogue

John Fyfe, One San Mateo Chair
Karyl Eldridge, One San Mateo Vice Chair
Esther Conrad, One San Mateo Policy Chair
Gloria Moreno, One San Mateo Outreach Chair
Justin Alley, One San Mateo Communications Secretary
Chris Sturken, One San Mateo Records Secretary
Imelda Navarro, One San Mateo Treasurer

Claire Mack, North Central Resident & Former Mayor of the City of San Mateo
Nicole Fernandez, North Central Resident & City of San Mateo Community Relations Commissioner
Dave Leecho, North Central Resident & Los Prados Community Garden Board Member
Joshua Hugg, North Central Resident & Former City of San Mateo Planning Commissioner
Tracey Kobayashi, North Central Resident & Former HANCSM Board Member
Gloria R. Brown, North Central Resident & Consultant Bay Area Community Health Advisory Council
Tony Samara, North Central Resident & Program Director of Land Use and Housing Urban Habitat
Jennifer Martinez, North Central Resident & Chief Strategy Officer, PICO California
Richard Lin, North Central Resident
Meredith Bergman, North Central Resident
Janette Shuba, North Central Resident
Michelle Oberes-Padre, North Central Resident
Ramil Padre, North Central Resident



John Aikin, North Central Resident
Kevin Simpson, North Central Resident
Dorie Suzuki, North Central Resident
Trina M Pierce, North Central Resident
Nancy Martin, North Central Resident
Angel Enriquez, North Central Resident
Dale Boles, North Central Resident
Rev. Jerold Nugent (retired), North Central Resident
Nancy Nugent, North Central Resident
Amy Wong-Thai, North Central Resident
Nick Kovaleski, North Central Resident
Maria Martinez, North Central Resident
Aleli Stock, North Central Resident
Jonathan New, North Central Resident
Elizabeth Hall, North Central Resident
Amy Grace, North Central Resident
Thomas Occhiuto, North Central Resident
Craig Anderson, North Central Resident
Aura Solorzano, North Central Resident
Luis Chaves, North Central Resident
Jose Chavez, North Central Resident
Christine Chai, North Central Resident
Robert Whitehair, San Mateo Resident

Gustavo Hornos, Owner Motion Arts Center
Jesica Hornos, Owner Motion Arts Center
Minerva Pulido, Owner Mi Rancho



Sign the HANCSM Position Letter to the City Council (8/19/19) by adding your information below:

| FIRST & LAST NAME | TITLE | AFFILIATION | North Central Resident |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| Christian Batiste | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Ethel Batiste | (duplicate) | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Cheryl Batiste | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Joseph Keeton | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Lester Keeton | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| William Young | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Anna Young | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Pattie Young | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Wayne Young | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Kili Young | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Michael Green | (duplicate) | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Camea Green | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Shanina Miller | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Anthony Brown | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Tandrick Jordan | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Tania Peace | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Ethel Bainside | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Jackie Daily | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Brenda Brown | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |



Sign the HANCSM Position Letter to the City Council (8/19/19) by adding your information below:

| FIRST & LAST NAME | TITLE | AFFILIATION | North Central Resident |
|--------------------|-------|-------------|---|
| QUANITA WHEELER | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Cathy Robinson | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Dorothy Bates | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Martha Wilberforce | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Gwendolyn Rhett | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| MARTHA Gray | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Terry McDowell | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Raedell Nyer | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Lafayette Nyer | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Linda Chideme | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Juanita Bryant | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Larry Pong | NC | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| John Brown | | Pilgrim | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Jamie Crumb | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| DANA ROBINSON | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Carolyn Collins | | Pilgrim | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Petrina Ferguson | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Carolyn Ferguson | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Lavell Ferguson | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

From: Adam < >

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2021 10:27 PM

To: Eric Rodriguez <erodriguez@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rick Bonilla <RBonilla@cityofsanmateo.org>; Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>; Amourence Lee <alee@cityofsanmateo.org>; Joe Goethals <jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org>; Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>; Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: HANCSM Position on the General Plan Study Areas

Honorable Mayor Rodriguez, Vice-Mayor Bonilla, Councilmembers Papan, Goethals, and Lee:

As the City Council assesses the state of the General Plan Update in light of measure Y's recent victory and the housing requirements provided by the upcoming RHNA process, I would like to share with you the North Central community's position statement on the study areas, developed in 2019.

I encourage you to read the entire position, as it is as relevant today as it was when we first developed specific study areas for the General Plan Update. Our position regarding our inclusion as a study area reads as follows:

"HANCSM supports the inclusion of our North Central neighborhood as an area of study. The rest of the city should be studied as well, and all areas of the city that are transit-adjacent or in transit corridors should be studied in equal measure.

North Central should not be exclusively singled out as the only residential neighborhood for study. We believe no neighborhood should be exempt from change and no neighborhood should be subjected to radical change."

While we support our inclusion as a study area, it should be clear that it would be wholly inappropriate to delimit part or all of North Central as the only neighborhood to experience change in the coming decades. The need to create opportunities for more housing, especially income-restricted affordable housing, is very evident. Let's create a General Plan for our city as a whole that will make it happen, together.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our place within the General Plan Update process.

Respectfully,

Adam Nugent

President, Home Association of North Central San Mateo

From: Lisa Vande Voorde <
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 2:30 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Tonight's City Council Meeting Agenda -- Brown Act Violation & General Plan Input

Dear Members of the San Mateo City Council,

I just finished watching the December 9, 2020 Housing Leadership Council Post-Election Decompression Meeting, in which Councilmembers Joe Goethals, Rick Bonilla, and Amourance Lee were in attendance and also made remarks. I was outraged not just by what might be perceived as a Brown Act violation, but by how OUR City Council is so closely aligned with an organization whose leadership (Evelyn Stivers and Leona Tanjuatco-Ross) does not even LIVE IN OUR CITY, and whose remarks clearly do not align with the will of the voters of San Mateo. Apparently, these three City Council Members have no respect for the 23,038 Yes On Y voters who passed Measure Y, and no commitment to honoring those San Mateans that they were elected to represent. Yes, it was a close vote. But if it were not for the Bohannon-backed Measure R confusing voters with a very similar ballot measure, Measure Y may have passed by many more votes and provided a more compelling mandate. But that's not the point. Measure Y won, it was NOT a tie. And our elected City Council members have a duty to honor that vote and FIND A WAY to work it into the General Plan process as we move forward. As a 30-year resident of San Mateo, a member of YOUR constituency, this is what I expect.

I will attend tonight's meeting, but rather than speaking, I ask you to please consider this letter as public comment. I hope you will take these comments to heart, with my thanks.

Yours truly,

Lisa Vande Voorde

From: Bob Whitehair
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 1:49 PM
To: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: General Plan and Housing Element on Tonight's agenda

Honorable MayorRodriguez and Members of the San Mateo City Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Council on housing, the Housing Element and the General Plan update on the agenda tonight. And especially I would like to thank you for taking the City's housing needs so seriously. The agenda staff report demonstrates the depth of understanding and professionalism that is supremely necessary for the successful completion of this complicated and difficult assignment.

While we have strong elected leadership and outstanding staff support for housing in San Mateo, the simple truth is that for so many reasons, we haven't built enough homes to keep up with the demand over the last decade. This means we now have more people trying to find homes they can afford near transit, their jobs, and good schools. The consequence of this shortfall drives up costs for everybody and we simply cannot afford to invest in half measures.

The demographics of our region are changing rapidly, forcing us to rethink the types of housing we need versus what is being built today.

Our environmental concerns are elevated, forcing us to rethink how we adaptively re-use materials and buildings to help sustain our planet and the beauty of the community.

Our values around the environment, social equity and the economy are systematically linked, meaning that we are interested only in creating racially and economically unified neighborhoods across our community.

If we do not create a vibrant, thriving community available to all, then not one of us will have a vibrant thriving community.

I urge you to:

- Fully fund the general plan process so that all three options – A, B and C - are studied in depth.
- Make the study areas as large as possible. We may never be able to overturn the height and density limit, so we MUST come up with a plan that provides more housing. I fully support the concept of study areas, as well as making them as large as possible.
- Preserve the 50% buffer. This general plan should be looking 20 years into the future, not eight. We need to make sure we have adequate sites not just to comply with increasing state requirements but because it will make San Mateo a great place to live.
- Stop torturing our workers who have to drive incredible distances to work here. I also note that finding craftspeople to do work is getting harder and harder, at greater expense.

Housing is one of the smartest investments we can make because it pays dividends that our city desperately needs in times like this – it strengthens our resources for wellness, it improves our competitive advantage in a national economy that is rapidly changing, and it helps us end the long legacy of segregation and exclusionary housing practices.

Please continue down the path of proving strong, decisive leadership on housing and preparing a well done Housing Element and a General Plan Update.

Thank you , Robert Whitehair

From: San Mateans for Responsive Government SMRG <limitheights2018@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 2:40 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Re: Items #17 & #20 on Tonight's Agenda

Dear Mayor & City Council,

San Mateans for Responsive Government (SMRG) notes that there are 2 separate, but related, items on tonight's agenda: Potential violation of Brown Act and General Plan-Next Steps.

PUBLIC TRUST - is the important connecting link between these two items. It has been disappointing, but perhaps not surprising, that no one from the City Council has reached "across the aisle" to us to acknowledge Measure Y's passage, and to confirm the Council's commitment to the General Plan update being the place where changes to heights, densities and affordable housing would be discussed and perhaps modified. The Council has promised that the General Plan process would be fair and allow residents to fully help in shaping the future of San Mateo.

SMRG has always supported the General Plan update as the place where potential changes to the height, density and affordable housing requirements of Measure Y would be debated. Measure Y assures that the residents and taxpayers of San Mateo will have a seat at the development table normally dominated by the special interests who financially benefit from land use changes. The Council promised that the General Plan process would be fair and allow residents to fully help in shaping the future of San Mateo.

Yet now, how can residents have faith in a fair General Plan process when councilmembers talk about continuing to work against Measure Y at a meeting that was not open to the public. At this meeting hosted by HLC, a special interest advocacy group, Councilmember Goethals said he was "glad to be a part of the ...No on Y coalition." Councilmember Bonilla encouraged marching the No on Y campaign right into the General Plan update process. And Councilmember Lee said "...I'm in this with you - the fight is not over."

There has also been talk about including single family residential neighborhoods in the General Plan Study Areas, a threat that promotes community divisiveness not inclusiveness. However, the excellent staff report for the General Plan makes clear that up-zoning single family residential neighborhoods is unnecessary to meet current and future state housing requirements through 2040 in all currently outlined General Plan scenarios.

SMRG suggests that the focus of the General Plan discussions should be on identifying the specific areas where changes to heights and densities will result in good projects that address community needs, especially affordable housing. SMRG also suggests that ABAG RHNA housing targets, created during one of the Bay Area's most extended economic booms, are no longer realistic in a post-pandemic world. Therefore, we ask that the City of San Mateo, like many other municipalities, push back against housing targets that have increased more than 250%.

In the end, the General Plan update process should seek quality not only quantity. It is an opportunity for the community to guide new development towards better quality and a more vigorous urban fabric by using improved urban design guidelines, a menu of architectural styles and a robust respect for the existing built environment. We ask you to put down your No on Y pitchforks. Let's work on this together.

MICHAEL WEINHAEUER

San Mateans for Responsive Government (SMRG)
 FPPC ID #1402267

<https://smartergrowthsm.com> - PLEASE DONATE or VOLUNTEER TODAY!
limitheights2018@gmail.com

Twitter @limitheight2018

From: Michael Nash <>

Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 3:52 PM

To: Eric Rodriguez <erodriguez@cityofsanmateo.org>; Rick Bonilla <RBonilla@cityofsanmateo.org>; Joe Goethals <jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org>; Amourence Lee <alee@cityofsanmateo.org>; Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>

Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: Comments on. "General Plan and Housing elements - Next Steps"

Dear Council Members:

Having read the advance materials for the General Plan and Housing elements - Next Steps topic, it is clear that San Mateo can achieve its 2040 plan requirements with the study areas selected by the earlier plan process and within Measure Y rules. In fact, the analysis ignores that Measure Y allows for additional height construction provided there is adequate benefit to the City. Also, state laws increase height and density limits beyond Measure Y's restrictions based on the percent of units that are affordable. These conditions should be included in the analysis.

The materials then go on to downplay the demographic and social changes in the area and assume that things won't change due to COVID-19. While that debate may be interesting, as this claim is surprising given current events, it won't be needed as choosing Alternative A would allow for plan 2040 to proceed with a high likelihood of success - especially if the factors mentioned above are considered. California lost population recently and several tech companies have moved headquarters. Oracle, HP and Tesla are going elsewhere and many companies are seeking work from home programs for at least part time. There is much evidence to suggest there will be a decline in demand for offices, leaving more land for housing construction. Housing demand is also high for single family homes due to the lack of private open space in apartments. That may be more enduring as the issues with sheltering in place proved to be daunting if you only have 80 sq. ft. of private outdoor space. A backyard is currently a popular feature. Certainly these factors can impact demand for housing. Time will help clarify these trends.

Also, a significant number of California cities are protesting the HCD housing demand process, as the current method includes significant double counting. (See Embarcadero Institute [double-counting-in-the-latest-housing-needs-assessment](#)) While the State may be able to sustain this protest, that is not certain. Assuming inflated housing numbers going forward, as is done in this analysis, and assuming continued demand for housing are risky choice. Instead, proceeding with Option A while these factors, which are mostly COVID based, resolve as the pandemic is controlled is the best course of action. This will hopefully enable a better prediction of future demand.

As a former executive who oversaw the completion of annual 5-10 year plans, along with annual action plans, I see no issue and much benefit in beginning the next general plan 4-5 years after the completion of plan 2040. It seems there is an attempt to make this sound more onerous than it is. Alternative A is the best choice.

Finally the recent HLC meeting makes this topic more provocative as the comments made by the Council Members in attendance clearly indicated an animosity to Measure Y. The tone of the meeting clearly showed an intent to open development to all areas of the City and to eliminate height limits. Measure Y passed and the City does not need to change height limits to meet the increased goals of its RHNA targets.

I encourage the Council to direct staff to pursue Alternative A.

Michael Nash