From: Douglas Handerson < >
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 5:53 PM
To: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Doug Handerson < >; Amourence Lee <alee@cityofsanmateo.org>; Amourence Lee
<amourence@gmail.com>; Mayor@cityofsanmateo.org
Subject: General Plan Agenda Item 1/19/2021 City Council meeting

1/19/2021

Please provide these comments to the City Council for consideration at tonight's General Plan agenda item discussion:

Housing Progress is Possible After Measure Y Passage.

As the City Council moves forward with the General Plan Update, it is possible to accomplish a significant number of new housing opportunities, without tearing down our City.

Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation numbers from the Association of Bay Area Governments for City of San Mateo for 2023-2031 are 6,697 new units (Source: ABAG Executive Board/ Item 7a 2 Appendix 2/October 15, 2020).

Unknown to many, the State of California's elected leaders have mandated that the cities allow potentially one accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU) per single family (R1) zoned lot.

On December 3, 2020, the City's Community Development Director responded to my inquiry through a City Council member that "There are 16,201 parcels that are zoned R1."

The Director indicated that "Theoretically, 15,954 R1 lots could have both an ADU & JADU, and 38 could have only a JADU".

This totals a potential 15,992 new units, which can be expected to be more affordable than traditional housing as they are less expensive to construct.

As San Mateo updates the City's ADU ordinance in the coming year, the Council must explore more proactive ways to facilitate and streamline their creation.

This should be prioritized by every City Council member for 2021-2023.

Starting immediately, the City should publicize this potential to all residents and local contractors. The City can provide housing to meet identified needs.

Thank you, Doug Handerson From: Seema Patel < >
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 11:45 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Comments on General Plan

Hello City Council Members,

First, I wanted to thank you for taking the time to hear from your constituents, during Tuesday's Regular Meeting and via conversations with housing advocates, neighborhood associations and other interest groups. As I mentioned during my public comment, I think it's really important to understand all of the perspectives in order to find compromises, and I appreciate you working to find those compromise solutions.

I also wanted to follow up my public comment with more detailed comments on the General Plan:

1. If possible, expand the area under consideration from 10 study areas to the entire city

In my opinion, eliminating the wealthy, SFH neighborhoods from consideration will perpetuate and exacerbate racial disparities caused by previous redlining and exclusionary deeds. The burden of solving our housing crisis should not be borne solely by the neighborhoods that are disproportionately low-income and people of color.

2. Eliminate Alternative A from consideration and pursue Alternative C

Alternative A only accommodates Cycle #6 of RHNA. Assuming we are allocated more than 0 units of housing in Cycle #7, the General Plan would have to be updated halfway through its period. That feels like an inefficient use of resources.

Alternative C would accommodate RHNA projections through Cycle #7, with a 39% buffer.

3. Maintain (at least) a 50% buffer, and consider an Alternative D that would accommodate RHNA projections through early Cycle 8 with a 50% buffer

After decades of a severe jobs/housing imbalance, I'd like San Mateo to be proactive in planning for future housing needs, so we're not waiting until we're experiencing pain to address the problem.

Thanks again for taking our comments into consideration!

Regards, Seema Patel (Resident of Central)