

From: John A Matthews < >

Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2021 8:47 AM

To: Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org>

Cc: Al Landucci ; John Lucchesi ; Murat Kaya

Subject: Re: JADU

Good morning Rendell,

Thanks for your timely responses. For what it is worth I think the proposed change for height for

ADU's is a mistake. Second floor additions over detached garages would not be allowed. More open

space in back yards will be used to accommodate ADU's. The City should allow two story ADU's with

design review. That would protect neighbors from unreasonable impact on their privacy similar for

additions for main structures.

Best regards,

Jack

From: Michael Nash <>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 1:23 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>

Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: ADU Ordinance

Dear City Council:

I am writing to comment on the ADU Ordinance planned for consideration during tonight's Council meeting.

I applaud the staff recommendation to develop virtual outreach strategies to collect community input on the process. This is essential and while the need to conform to state ordinances requires rapid action, it should not prevent a thoughtful analysis of the complex issues that arise with ADU construction. I therefore agree with the approach of adopting the state rules until proper analysis can be done. The residents of San Mateo deserve to be involved in this process. The advance materials provide ample reason to do this as the complexity of issues associated with ADUs and JADUs are significant and numerous. Some of these are as follows:

Ministerial approvals assume there is no reason to object to anything that is being built as the abbreviated process of approval ignores CEQA and neighbor input. While some think of ADUs as "granny flats" the law allows, from 1/1/202 to 12/31/2024, the development of a primary residence and ADU where the owner does not live in either structure. It is unclear from the advance materials if any relationship between the residents of the two structures is even required. Avoiding unintended consequences of non-owner occupied ADUs should be studied. This also eliminates a key appeal of ADUs which is the understanding that a neighbor is involved in making decisions on the structure. If the owner resident is not making these decisions will the structure have the same consideration for impact on its neighbors?

The 16' minimum for the maximum height of an ADU is stipulated in the state law but a city can increase this, as I understand it. This may be useful for creating an ADU on top of a garage. This concept has appeal as it can mitigate the need to convert a garage with the loss of off-street parking, by creating the ADU above the existing structure. However, in some cases the resulting structure could be obnoxiously intrusive to its neighbors who have no recourse based on the ministerial approval provision. That situation should be avoided and public input sought to determine how to proceed. The second ordinance should help protect people from harm from a poorly conceived ADU next door.

The loss of trees is not mentioned in the advance materials, but would the 4' set backs and size of the ADU's allow trees to be removed to create the space for the unit? Reducing the shade that the canopy of trees that grow in our neighborhoods provides will impact the environment. While the assumption is that the ADU program will not create a need for CEQA analysis, the impact on trees needs study and a policy developed.

The same applies to permeable surfaces. Will ADU construction reduce the amount of water that can be absorbed into the ground to any significant degree?

Parking requirements are also in need of review. It is logical to assume that different areas of the city will have different parking needs based on conditions that change with the availability of public transit. The second ordinance needs to consider parking impacts on the City of these ADU rules as well as the above. We cannot simply ignore that people will have cars that need to be parked somewhere. The front lawn of a home is not a good solution.

In conclusion, I encourage the council to accept staff's recommendation to approve the ordinance based on state parameters followed by a significant effort to collect public input and address the issues that arise as a result.

Regards,
Michael Nash

From: Michael <

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 2:47 PM

To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>

Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>

Subject: ADU Ordinance - Please do NOT short-circuit the public input process!

Mayor Rodriguez and Members of the City Council:

I am writing to comment on the ADU Ordinance being considered at tonight's Council meeting.

The outreach strategy developed by staff to collect community input is critical, and should not be abridged or short-circuited. We should agree to adopt the state rules until this input is obtained, and a proper analysis completed. The residents of San Mateo deserve to be involved in this process. There are many complex issues associated with ADUs/JADUs such as heights, parking requirements, etc., and they need to be examined before a decision is made.

Please accept staff's recommendation to approve the ordinance based on state parameters followed by a significant effort to collect public input and address the issues that arise as a result.

Regards,

Michael Weinbauer