

From: lillian christian <>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 11:21 AM
To: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Lillian Christian <>
Subject: ADU

TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF SAN MATEO ON MARCH 7TH, 2022 AT 11:20 AM SENT

PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING TO PRESERVE OUR NEIGHBORHOODS:

ADU's WOULD TAKE AWAY THE CHARACTER AND THE DESIRABILITY OF THE QUALITY OF LIVING IN OUR COMMUNITY. *SEE FOLLOWING LIST BELOW

HAVING BUILDINGS PUT WITHIN FOUR FEET ON PLATE LINE AND 16 FEET HIGH WITH WINDOWS LOOKING INTO OUR HOMES AND YARDS AND WITH POTENTIALLY CAUSING NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES, SUCH AS NOISE , LOSS OF PRIVACY, LIGHTNING, VALUE, MARKETABILITY, ESTABLISHED PRIVATE VIEWS, PARKING,TRAFFIC, AND THE QUIET USE AND ENJOYMENT OF ONES PROPERTY WOULD ALL CHANGE IF THIS IS PASSED.

I HAVE LIVED HERE FOR 50 YEARS AND HAVE KEPT MY SPACE OPEN WITHOUT ISSUE. MY PROPERTY HAS FIVE HOMES ON ONE SIDE OF THE PROPERTY LINE.

IN PASSING THIS ACCESSIBILITY OF THE ADU'S TO PUTTING IN THE ADDITION YOU ARE POTENTIALLY .DESTROYING THE COMMUNITY WHETHER ITS BECAUSE OF THE TECH COMPANIES OR SOME OTHER FACTORS THIS IS POTENTIALLY PUTTING A BURDEN ON US HOMEOWNERS AND THE COMMUNITY.

A SUGGESTION MIGHT BE TO HAVE THE TECH COMPANIES BUILD THEIR OWN HIGH RISE UNITS IN ESTABLISHED HIGH RISE ZONING RATHER THAN ENCROACHMENT ON THE R-1 LOTS.

LILLIAN CHRISTIAN

BERESFORD MANOR

From: Linda Bogue <>
Subject: Height allowance for ADUs over garages
Date: March 2, 2022 at 10:56:10 AM PST
To:

Dear Council Member,

It appears Council is moving toward an ordinance for ADUs that limits heights to 16'/24' for new-built accessory units, and 24'/32' for those built over existing garages. I urge you to rethink, based on the following considerations:

The original logic for allowing taller units over garages was for flexibility, given that some garages are tall enough that the 16'/24' height limit would preclude building reasonable dwelling space above them.

- But Planning Staff informed that very few existing garages are capable of supporting a 2nd story, nor could comply with code for a dwelling. So they would effectively need to be rebuilt. In that process, the 16'/24' height limit could be adhered to, even if a garage is reinstalled.

- The direction mooted at your last meeting was to allow 24'/32' height over existing garages, but not require that the garage be maintained (as long as another part of the property is paved over for parking). So for those wanting a 2-story, fully residential ADU, an incentive is created to build over an existing garage.

- San Mateo has many legal, non-compliant (grandfathered) garages built on or within inches of property lines before current setback requirements were adopted. In terms of intrusion on neighbors, these are the most sensitive areas to build as they don't even afford the 4' setbacks State law, and new builds, require.

- Current zoning code recognizes this sensitivity in that it allows for some horizontal extension of existing, grandfathered structures, but not vertical extension.

- Neighbors of such garages are used to relatively low, one-story structures with no windows. A 24'/32' tall, two-story residential building looming, typically over a neighbor's backyard, is another matter entirely. It would be a big difference for a neighbor.

Why provide a significant incentive to build ADUs in the places most sensitive for neighbors' enjoyment of their property? The 'offsetting' benefit -- that parking be replaced if the existing garage is not maintained — does not offset this extra intrusiveness and worsens the several environmental problems from over-paving.

A member of your Sustainability Commission pointed out that recent State housing laws upend the premises on which single family residential homeowners bought their homes and expected to enjoy them. So be it. We adjust. But as she pointed out, you can take measures that make the adjustment easier for San Mateans. This height exception approach doesn't do that.

Respectfully submitted for your consideration,
Linda Bogue

From: Chris Conway <>
Sent: Friday, March 04, 2022 7:19 AM
To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: ADU's and SB9/SB10

City Council of San Mateo

In another attempt to thwart the city council from going against the will of San Mateo voters, I would recommend placing all decisions about SB9 and SB10 on the back burner until the California voters have time to make their desires known and repeal both of these two unconstitutional and illegal laws. If you cared, you would realize that 70% of Californians do not support either bill and want them both repealed.

Listening to the meetings regarding both ADU's and implementation of SB9, it is clear that city hall is once again going against the wishes of those who live in San Mateo.

Besides Eric Rodriguez, who really has shown himself as someone who gets it and cares about San Mateans, the rest of the city council eagerly proposes taller, bigger and more development in our single-family neighborhoods.

Sad when you know that council members are working for their own special interest groups and trade groups rather than the electorate of the city. It is so obvious.

A voter initiative is coming out of southern California by United Neighbors to overturn SB9 and SB10 immediately and I am very confident it will pass and end the illegal and unconstitutional land grab by the state.

I know this city council does not care about San Mateans and aligns themselves with the state and the legislative march toward state control. These two Senate bills will be repealed by the voters of California and you might want to wait until that happens before implementing SB9.

However, based on your terrible track record, I also know that you will ignore this advice and build as much housing as quickly as possible and destroy our Single-Family neighborhoods and the character of San Mateo. Why don't you for once listen to voters instead of corrupt politicians with the same far left agenda in Sacramento.

SB9 and SB10 will be history. In the meantime, expect a full-on frontal assault on every member of this city council that perpetuates and stands behind the state's new housing laws. Looking forward to the continuation of these meetings and watching as council members talk their agenda instead of caring for San Mateo's voters.

San Mateo City Council is completely out of touch which has been apparent since the council fought against the citizen initiative Measure Y. There is no accountability from council members and a complete lack of outreach. Not surprising from council members who want to divide our city based on racial and socio-economic differences.

Our side has yet to begin to fight. I demand that in-person council meetings resume and that enough time is spent on outreach to our community regarding San Mateo's implementation of these draconian laws. Stop doing the city's work on Zoom, it is bad governance, anti-democratic and far from transparent.

Chris Conway

San Mateo

From: Clyde Preston <>
Sent: Sunday, March 6, 2022 2:48 PM
To: Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: ADU Height

Diane,

ADU's should not take away the quality of life and privacy from nearby properties.

There is a reason cities have rear and side yard setback requirements. The state legislature has taken that all away with ADU's.

PLEASE – the maximum height needs to be **16 feet to the roof, not plate line** when in the rear yard setback area. Please maintain daylight plane requirements too!

How would you like to walk out your back door and see that your neighbors have built one of these only 4 feet from your rear or side fence? *Now imagine that being 16 feet tall to the plate line and 24 feet to the roof line, with windows looking right into your rear yard.*

Remember, as residents, it is not our fault that we have a housing imbalance. Put the housing burden on the bio-tech and hi-tech companies that flood our region with high paying jobs. Please don't destroy our neighborhoods. It doesn't matter if it is one or 20 ADU's being built a year in San Mateo, when you have to live next to one that is two stories in height in the rear yard setback, I am sure you will agree that is one too many!

Please don't make neighbors enemies with each other. We have established rear yard setbacks and daylight planes for a reason.

Clyde Preston

Beresford Manor

From: >

Sent: Friday, March 04, 2022 10:52 AM

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

Subject: RETAIN THE STATE LEGISLATURE'S PARAMETERS FOR HEIGHT AND MASS: 16' AND 800 SQ FT AND TAILOR THE LOCAL ORDINANCE TO THE NEEDS & PREFERENCES OF THE NEIGHBORHOODS

To the City Council:

With the State's mandated allowances as the baseline for all of us, I am asking the City Council to tailor the local ADU ordinance to the specific needs and expressed interests of its residential neighborhoods. This City historically has valued the diversity and character of its neighborhoods as reflected for example in its various single family zoning codes, R1A, R1B, and R1C. Code-based differentiation already exists for the Council to use to make the code for ADU's responsive to local voters, and this would be consistent with the values and responsive governance the City Council says it aims for. As a resident of San Mateo Park, I urge you to retain the height and square footage parameters the State has already legislated which will spur new housing in my neighborhood, but do NOT overwhelm the privacy and outdoor spaces so characteristic of the park and valued by The Park's residents by allowing the daylight plane to be broken, balconies overlooking neighbors, lack of privacy glass where needed, and architecture inconsistent with the primary dwelling. One size does NOT fit all in the City of San Mateo.

N. D'Arcy Roche



March 2, 2022

Dear City Councilors,

The San Mateo Park Neighborhood Association requested that City Council consider and respect the character of our neighborhood by tailoring ADU ordinance terms specifically as they will apply in our R1A zoned area, in accordance with our expressed needs and preferences. This formal request has not been acknowledged, much less considered seriously by Council — at least so far as the public record shows.

We have asked that Council:

- not expand the State's mandated height and square footage allowances;
- retain the daylight plane requirement;
- require ADU architectural compatibility with the main home.

One size does not fit all in a City with diverse neighborhoods and an accordingly differentiated set of residential zoning rules. R1A code applies to The Park neighborhood. With the State's specifications as the baseline with which we all comply, why would you not seek to accommodate The Park's reasonable interests? These are easily handled via San Mateo's differentiated, R1A residential zoning code.

In hopes that Council will address our request explicitly, thoughtfully and transparently.

Respectfully,

Board of Directors
San Mateo Park Neighborhood Association

From: stephanie twomey <>
Sent: Saturday, March 05, 2022 8:33 AM
To: Diane Papan <dpapan@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Re: 16'ADU's & 800 sq ft Mass Mandate

When all the nearby cities (except Redwood City) are abiding by the Legislature's guidelines on housing, what some on the San Mateo City Council want to do is infuriating, especially when two seemed poised to benefit. Thank you for copying Patricia.

From: stephanie twomey <>
Sent: Thursday, March 3, 2022 5:11 PM
To: City Council (San Mateo) <CityCouncil@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: 16'ADU's & 800 sq ft Mass Mandate

Dear City Council Members:

The State legislature has decided that ADUs should not be higher than 16' nor greater than 800 sq feet.

Why are some of you on the Council trying to increase the height limit and the mass mandate, which the voters have decided? It smells suspiciously like self-interest and personal benefit. Not good. It will be remembered in the next election.

And while you are putting the City's ADU ordinance together, here are things you should include that are important to San Mateo Park and other neighborhoods in the City as well:

1. R1 Daylight Plane to reduce impacts on adjacent properties
2. No balconies overlooking neighbors
3. Privacy glass where necessary
4. And architecture consistent with the primary house

Please do the job you were elected to do: uphold the legislation from the State of California and make sure ADUs conform to the needs and preferences of the local neighborhoods with daylight planes, balcony restrictions, privacy glass, and consistent architecture.

Stephanie C. Twomey

From: Rafa Sonnenfeld < >
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 3:58 PM
To: Clerk <clerk@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Compliance Review@HCD <compliancereview@hcd.ca.gov>
Subject: Comment RE: City of San Mateo ADU ordinance amendment - SB-330 violation

Good Afternoon San Mateo City Council,

It is our understanding that on your agenda today, you will be discussing a modification of the accessory dwelling unit height limit. Staff has proposed reducing the maximum height limit from the current 24/32 ft plate, to 16/24ft. This appears to be a violation of the Housing Crisis Act of 2019's no-net loss provision.

YIMBY Law is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization whose mission is to increase the accessibility and affordability of housing in California. When cities break the law, it is our mission to ensure that justice prevails. YIMBY Law will not hesitate to take legal action to ensure that the law is enforced. By way of this comment letter, we are also alerting the Department of Housing and Community Development of the city's impending action; HCD has enforcement authority over the HCA.

I am signing this letter both in my capacity as the Director of Legal Advocacy of YIMBY Law, and as a resident of California who is affected by the shortage of housing in our state.

Rafa Sonnenfeld he/him
Director of Legal Advocacy

