



CITY OF SAN MATEO

City Hall
330 W. 20th Avenue
San Mateo CA 94403
www.cityofsanmateo.org

Agenda Report

Agenda Number: 16

Section Name: {{section.name}}

File ID: {{item.tracking_number}}

TO: City Council
FROM: Drew Corbett, City Manager
PREPARED BY: Community Development Department
MEETING DATE: April 18, 2022

SUBJECT:
General Plan Update – Selection of the Preferred Land Use and Circulation Scenario

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve a preferred land use and circulation scenario and direct staff to finalize the land use and circulation maps that will go into the draft General Plan Update.

BACKGROUND:

The City's General Plan Update (GPU) kicked off in the fall of 2018 and began with a series of visioning workshops and community meetings. From April 2019 through January 2022, the General Plan team held a series of meetings and events to establish the General Plan study areas, create the range of land use and circulation alternatives, confirm the draft alternatives, and receive feedback on the preferred land use and circulation scenario with the community. This City Council meeting will be the final step in the land use and circulation alternatives selection process. More information about the outreach process, including meeting materials and recordings and public comment letters, is available at www.StriveSanMateo.org.

Overview of Alternatives Process

The land use alternatives explore different possible growth scenarios for how to accommodate future housing, jobs, commercial and retail establishments, and parks and open space. The City is proactively planning to meet the requirements of State housing law, identify solutions to transportation and housing affordability issues, be prepared for the projected population and job growth in the region and locally, and other issues such as improving community health, equity, and access to services. This work is guided by the General Plan Vision and Values established at the outset of the project ([Attachment 1](#)).

The process to create the land use and circulation alternatives and to ultimately select a preferred land use and circulation scenario has taken approximately two years and been shaped by community input at every significant step of the process. In general, each step of the alternatives process includes a similar series of meetings: first, community workshop(s) and outreach events, then General Plan Subcommittee (GPS) meeting(s), followed by Planning Commission meeting(s), and culminating in City Council direction. For additional information about the steps to create the alternatives and ultimately select a preferred land use and circulation scenario, please refer to the [July 27, 2021 Planning Commission agenda report](#).

DISCUSSION:

Overview of the Land Use Alternatives

The land use alternatives explore a range of residential growth within the 10 Study Areas based on both response to community input and the need to accommodate the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) of 7,015 housing units for the next housing cycle (2023-2031). In addition, since the General Plan is planning for the next 20 years, the

preferred land use scenario should account for residential growth beyond the current RHNA to cover future housing cycles.

The three land use alternatives explore growth of approximately 12,000, 16,000, and 21,000 new residential units. By comparison, San Mateo currently has just over 39,000 housing units. All land use alternatives keep job growth constant despite varying residential growth, with the assumption that the City would not implement policies to either significantly stimulate, nor significantly dampen, job growth. The Alternatives Evaluation Report includes an assessment of future jobs/housing balance given these assumptions. Table 1 provides a summary of the three land use alternatives plus an estimate for the Planning Commission’s recommended land use alternative. The land use alternatives are included as [Attachments 2 and 3](#).

Table 1 – Summary of Draft Land Use Alternatives

	Existing (2019)	Alternative A (Net New)	Alternative B (Net New)	Alternative C (Net New)	Planning Commission Recommendation (Net New)
Homes	39,200	+11,810	+16,070	+21,080	+22,160
Population	104,500	+29,500	+40,260	+53,500	+56,304
Jobs	52,800	+15,430	+15,430	+14,990	+15,183

Source: PlaceWorks, 2022

Measure Y and the Land Use Alternatives

Measure Y is a ballot measure that was passed by voters in November 2020. It retained existing height and density limits that were adopted pursuant to Measure P on new development and has a sunset date of 2030. Overall, the Measure Y height limit is set at up to 55 feet, with a density limit that allows up to 50 dwelling units per acre. The height limit allows for exceptions in certain locations and under certain circumstances, and State Density Bonus law allows projects to exceed both limits when certain percentages of affordable units are provided. As noted above, some of the land use designations in Alternatives B and C include building heights and densities that exceed the limits set by Measure Y. Any GPU components that are inconsistent with Measure Y will require voter approval before they could take effect.

Overview of the Circulation Alternatives

The circulation alternatives explore different ways people could travel throughout San Mateo, improving bicycle, pedestrian, vehicular and transit access to connect residents to regional transportation systems. All the alternatives assume pedestrian and bicycle improvements consistent with adopted City planning documents such as the Bicycle Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan. The circulation alternatives ([Attachment 4](#)) are generally described as follows:

- **Alternative A: A Walkable City.** This alternative aims to create walkable communities throughout San Mateo by prioritizing pedestrian corridors, pedestrian improvements to challenging intersections, and implementing traffic calming and safety improvements near highway on-ramps, and would go beyond the pedestrian improvements contained in the Pedestrian Master Plan.
- **Alternative B: Prioritizing Regional Connections.** This alternative aims to increase and improve transit access to and from major connections in San Mateo by adding transit connections east/west from Study Areas 3, 6, and 10 to the Hillsdale Caltrain station, prioritizing dedicated High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) and bus lanes, and adding Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements to El Camino Real.
- **Alternative C: Supporting, Walking, Regional Connections, and Emerging Mobility Solutions.** This alternative combines the local and regional transportation improvements of Alternatives A and B, while using inventive urban design, inspired by Barcelona’s “superblocks”, to create a pedestrian focused, car-light space in Downtown. In addition, this alternative would explore future transportation technologies, like on-demand rideshare services or an autonomous vehicle shuttle.

Alternatives Evaluation Report

The Alternatives Evaluation Report, which is included as [Attachment 5](#), was prepared to help the community and decisionmakers understand the implications of three different approaches to land use and transportation planning for the

next 20 years. The report considered a range of topics including Urban Form, Traffic and Multimodal Network, Community Services, Utilities, Environmental Sustainability, Equity and Public Health, Fiscal Sustainability, Market Feasibility and Community Benefits.

The Summary of Key Findings identified that potential impacts to water supply, the wastewater system, stormwater system, sea level rise, flooding, wildfire hazards, and the ability to secure community benefits would be similar or the same under any of the alternatives. All three land use alternatives are estimated to generate more General Fund revenues than expenditures under the City's current cost structure and service levels. The major differences amongst the land use and circulation alternatives include:

- Circulation Alternative B paired with Land Use Alternative C scored the highest in terms of transit benefit.
- Circulation Alternative C paired with Land Use Alternative C had the highest multi-modal benefit.
- Land Use Alternative A would likely not be able to meet future RHNA cycles, would have the highest per capita VMT, would propose the fewest changes to the Downtown historic district, and would have the most positive annual net fiscal impact for the City.
- Land Use Alternative B would likely be able to fulfill future RHNA cycles, but with a smaller buffer than Alternative C would result in the most changes to the Downtown historic district and would have the best feasibility in the current market, which favors medium densities (40-99 units/acre).
- Land Use Alternative C would likely be able to fulfill future RHNA cycles within the horizon of this General Plan; would have the lowest per capita VMT; would produce the most affordable housing, but could also expose the most new residents to diesel particulate matter; would have the lowest net annual fiscal surplus; and would have lower feasibility in the current market due to the higher cost of construction for taller buildings.

Environmental Justice

Environmental justice is defined in California law as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Environmental justice issues often emerge from structural or geographic inequities that negatively affect low-income areas that are disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation. Neighborhoods that are disproportionately impacted by pollution and contamination often face an ongoing lack of representation and participation in the city's decision-making process, despite direct impacts on their neighborhood. Throughout California, inequities exist in neighborhoods with higher percentages of racial or ethnic minority households and lower-income households when those residents bear a disproportionate burden of the region's environmental hazards and corollary health conditions.

In response to these conditions, in 2017, California's legislature adopted Senate Bill (SB) 1000, which added a new requirement for local jurisdictions that include "disadvantaged communities" to address environmental justice as a required topic in the General Plan. In addition, the State developed and is maintaining various tools to help identify "disadvantaged communities" as defined under SB 1000. One prominent tool is [Cal EnviroScreen](#), which was developed by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment on behalf of the California Environmental Protection Agency to help identify communities disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution and with population characteristics that make them more sensitive to pollution. Updates to the data and methodology used in CalEnviroScreen in summer 2021, finalized in fall 2021, identified new "disadvantaged neighborhoods" in San Mateo that were not identified earlier in the General Plan Update process, specifically the Census tract that includes the North Central neighborhood.

Given that there is an SB 1000 disadvantaged neighborhood in the City, by law, the San Mateo General Plan Update will be required to identify objectives and policies:

- To reduce the unique or compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities, including reducing pollution exposure, improving air quality, and by promoting public facilities, food access, safe and sanitary homes, and physical activity.

- To promote civic engagement in the public decision-making process.
- That prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities.

In summer 2022, the City will implement an outreach program targeted to the San Mateo neighborhoods identified as disadvantaged communities. The primary outreach goal will be to hear the impacted communities' ideas about how to prioritize and improve the most pressing issues facing these residents, in order to develop effective environmental justice policies and actions for the updated General Plan.

Jobs-Housing Balance

Throughout the General Plan Update, the San Mateo community has been interested in how the land use changes and anticipated future growth would affect the city's jobs-housing balance. Although this topic is often described as "jobs-housing" balance, comparing the number of jobs to the number of residents is a more direct comparison of individuals, rather than comparing people to homes. The jobs-employed residents ratio is calculated by dividing the number of jobs in the community by the number of employed residents in the same area. A high number of jobs relative to residents typically indicates that workers are commuting into the community. A low number of jobs and high number of residents typically indicates that workers are commuting out of the community for work. Theoretically, an ideal jobs-to-employed residents ratio for a city like San Mateo would be 1.0. However, the ratio of jobs to employed residents indicates a numerical match, not a qualitative match in job type vs. resident skills and abilities. Even with an ideal jobs-to-employed residents ratio of 1.0, due to personal choices about where to live and work, many residents will continue to commute outside of San Mateo while workers that do not reside in San Mateo will continue to commute in. The Alternatives Evaluation compared existing conditions as of the baseline year of 2018 plus net new employees and new population projected through 2040 under each alternative.

- Alternative A would result in more jobs than employed residents, with a ratio of 1.18.
- Alternative B result in slightly more jobs than employed residents, with a ratio of 1.05.
- Alternative C would result in slightly fewer jobs than employed residents, with a ratio of 0.95.

Water Supply

This section presents additional detail about the water supply analysis of the land use alternatives evaluation. The City's water purveyor is California Water Service (Cal Water), a privately owned water utility company. In all of the alternatives, based on the projections in Cal Water's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), Cal Water would not have sufficient supply to meet the projected demand. This is primarily because all alternatives contemplate population increases that exceed the 2040 population projection used for Cal Water's UWMP. Cal Water has indicated that they calibrate water supply closely to demand so as not to put ratepayers in the position of paying for supplies years or decades before they are actually needed. The next update of the UWMP, which will happen in 2025, will be created with reference to the projected development allowed under San Mateo's updated General Plan 2040. The preferred scenario and updated General Plan will be an important input for Cal Water into ongoing future supply planning efforts along with other future conservation measures that could result in decreased water demand.

Environmental Sustainability

The Alternatives Evaluation Report also analyzed how hazards associated with climate change could affect the land use alternatives. In San Mateo, there are three primary climate-related hazards that could affect the physical environment: sea level rise (and associated saltwater intrusion) in the northern and eastern portions of the city, flooding along the eastern shoreline and along Marina Lagoon, and wildfire in the western and southern portions of the city. The eastern side of the city, including portions of Study Areas 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, and 10, could be subject to sea level rise impacts depending on the rate of sea level rise that occurs over this century. In addition, portions of these same study areas are within the FEMA 100-year flood zone and could be susceptible to flooding risks. Since sea level rise and flooding impacts would be localized to the first floor of a structure, all alternatives would be similarly affected by these impacts.

To proactively address the potential impacts of sea level rise, the City of San Mateo is working with regional, state, and federal partners. For example, the City participated in San Mateo County's 2018 *Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment*

Report; collaborated with the City/County Association of Government's process to form the new Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency Agency/OneShoreline; created a new assessment district to fund necessary flood protection improvements; is in the process of completing the North Shoreview Levee and Pump Station Improvement project to provide flood protection to North Shoreview residents; and designed the upgrade and expansion of the wastewater treatment plant to provide protection from the 100-year base flood and 3.4 feet of sea level rise. The City is also engaged through the BayCAN collaborative, a Bay Area-wide collaborative network of local governments and organizations focused on responding effectively and equitably to the impacts of climate change.

Areas in San Mateo that are at risk of wildfire are located west of Alameda De Las Pulgas. Study Area 6 is located within the Wildland Urban Interface, a zone that includes dense housing and vegetation that can burn in a wildfire. However, there are no study areas that are within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as currently mapped by CAL Fire. Land Use Alternative C would add the most housing units and Land Use Alternative A would result in the fewest new housing units in Study Area 6.

Alternatives Process Community Input

Beginning in March 2021, and ongoing through the April 2022 City Council meeting, the City's community engagement process is providing a range of forums, events and surveys, both in-person and virtual. These outreach efforts, for both the General Plan and Housing Element, have included the hosting of 15 virtual workshops and three online surveys. In addition, the General Plan team has focused targeted outreach to the City's harder-to-reach demographics, including a Spanish language workshop hosted on February 24, 2022, and conducting three pop-ups in the North Central and Shoreview neighborhoods. A summary of the community engagement and public input on the land use and circulation alternatives and preferred scenarios is included in Attachment 6. Workshop materials and meeting recordings can be found at: www.strivesanmateo.org/workshops-pop-up-events/.

Following the publication of the Alternatives Evaluation Report at the beginning of the year, an online survey to collect resident and stakeholder input on the preferred scenario was launched on Friday, January 21, 2022 and closed on March 7, 2022. In total, the City collected 404 individual responses. The online survey settings limited participants to one response per user. The Community Engagement Summary in Attachment 6 includes a summary report of responses received from the online survey. In addition, over 65 public comment letters from residents and property owners were submitted to the General Plan Subcommittee and Planning Commission. Those comment letters, along with all written public comments submitted during the GPU process, can be found at: www.strivesanmateo.org/documents/publiccomments/.

As part of the public input that staff has received, there have been a number of individual land use designation requests from property owners for specific parcels around the City. A summary of these requests, along with their current land use designation, is included as Attachment 7. Many of these requests were considered by the General Plan Subcommittee and the Planning Commission and generally the requests were received favorably (see discussions below).

2022 Community Opinion Survey

The City of San Mateo also conducted a statistically reliable survey about a range of topics including land use and housing in the beginning of 2022. The survey sample size included 775 San Mateo adult residents and was administered in English and Spanish between January 21 and February 2, 2022. The complete 2022 Community Opinion Survey Report is included in Attachment 8. A summary of the main factual findings from the land use and housing questions included:

- Approximately two-thirds of residents indicated that there is currently too little housing that is affordable for middle-income (67%) and low-income families (64%) in the City of San Mateo.
- When asked to prioritize among a list of factors the City could consider as it plans for additional housing units as required by State law, ensuring adequate water supplies (98% at least somewhat important) was viewed as the most important factor, followed by preserving open space and creating new park lands (97%), minimizing vehicle trips and traffic congestion (95%), creating pedestrian-friendly areas that encourage people to walk rather than drive (94%), and minimizing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions (93%).

- When compared to the other items tested, respondents indicated that keeping building heights low (68%) and minimizing the number of new units added to single-family neighborhoods (68%) were the least important when planning for future housing in the City.
- When presented with the opportunity to reserve more land for parks, recreation areas, and community amenities and minimize change to existing neighborhoods, 63% of San Mateo residents indicated they would support concentrating new housing in higher-density buildings downtown and near transit up to 12 stories. A higher percentage (68%) indicated they would support buildings up to eight stories.

General Plan Subcommittee Meetings

The General Plan Subcommittee (GPS) held two public meetings on February 17, 2022 and March 3, 2022 to consider the results of the Alternatives Evaluation Report and the community input on the preferred circulation and land use scenario. Although the GPS was not asked to come to consensus, there was agreement on many topics.

Most GPS members preferred Circulation Alternative C as the most thorough response to San Mateo’s current and future transportation needs. Individual GPS members also supported Circulation Alternative A because focusing on pedestrian improvements is responsive to what residents prefer and is more likely to be achieved with future financing than the other two circulation alternatives. Those GPS members who expressed support for Circulation Alternative B cited the need for improved bus transit to meet the needs of service workers. Subcommittee members emphasized the importance of improving first and last mile connections to transit under any preferred circulation scenario.

The GPS reviewed the draft land use alternatives by study area. Each Subcommittee member expressed their individual feedback about the preferred scenario in each study area. In most study areas, Subcommittee members preferred either Land Use Alternative B or C, or a combination of these two land use alternatives. The matrix below summarizes the preference for each alternative by study area.

Table 2 – GPS Member Preferences on the Land Use Alternatives

Study Area	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Other
1 – El Camino Real North		6		1 – B & A
1 – El Camino Real Central		3	1	3 – B & C
1 – El Camino Real South	1	5		1 – B & C
2 – Bel Mateo/Mollie Stone’s		1	6	
3 – Rail Corridor		2	5	
4 – Downtown			4	2- B & C, 1 – A & C
5 – Peninsula Avenue		1	3	3 – B & C
6 – Campus Drive	1	2	4	
7 – North Shoreview and Shoreview		1		1 – C & A, 5 – mix
8 – Parkside Plaza	3		3	1 - mix
9 – Hillsdale/Norfolk		2	4	1 – C & B
10 – Bridgepointe	n/a	n/a	n/a	

The Subcommittee also stressed the importance of objective design standards to create beautiful spaces, allowing a mix of uses to provide for future flexibility, and considering air quality impacts to potential residential uses located along US 101 or SR 92.

Planning Commission Meeting

On March 22, 2022, the Planning Commission held a public meeting to review the draft circulation and land use alternatives. The Planning Commission made a recommendation for the preferred circulation scenario and a recommendation for the preferred land use scenario by study area. In most cases, the recommendation was made unanimously (4-0 vote), except for Study Areas 3, 6, and 7 where the recommendation passed with a 3-1 vote.

For the preferred circulation scenario, the Planning Commission recommended that the General Plan include Circulation

Alternative C and prioritize the implementation of the pedestrian improvements from that alternative, highlighting the need to prioritize pedestrian/bicycle crossings over US 101 and SR 92. As part of this motion, the Planning Commission recommended the City create a Specific Plan for the North Central neighborhood in the context of SB 1000.

For the preferred land use scenario, the Planning Commission primarily recommended a combination of Land Use Alternatives B and C by study area, except for Study Area 7, where they recommended Land Use Alternative A. For the majority of their recommendations, the Planning Commission recommended targeted changes as noted in the table below.

Table 3 – Planning Commission Recommendations on the Land Use Alternatives

Study Area	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Notes
1 – ECR North		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Commercial Neighborhood at East Poplar Ave to Mixed-Use Medium Incorporate the Mixed-Use High at El Cerrito Ave/Tilton Ave from Land Use Alternative C Change 7 De Sabla Rd site from Residential Medium to Residential High
1 – ECR Central			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Mixed-Use Medium west of El Camino Real to Mixed-Use High Change 1700 El Camino Real site from Office High to Mixed-Use High
1 – ECR South		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change Residential Low along 37th Ave to Mixed-Use Low
2 – Bel Mateo/ Mollie Stone’s			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change Olympic Village site (42nd) from Residential Low to Residential Medium Change sites south of 43rd Ave from Mixed-Use Medium to Mixed-Use Low
3 – Rail Corridor			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Concar Passage and State Park Green as Mixed-Use Medium to reflect pending projects Change the area west of the Hayward Park Caltrain station from Mixed-Use High to Mixed-Use Medium Change the Safeway site from Mixed-Use Medium to Mixed-Use High Change the Commercial Service along Palm Ave to Mixed-Use Medium Reflect the requested designations from the Bohannon Group’s comment letter on the Hillside Mall sites
4 – Downtown			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Residential Low on 3rd and 4th Ave east of Delaware St to Residential Medium Change the Residential High along B St south of 5th Ave to Mixed-Use High Support the preparation of an updated Downtown Specific Plan in the future
5 – Peninsula Avenue		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Residential Medium along Peninsula Ave east of Woodside Way to Mixed-Use Low Change the Residential Medium along North San Mateo Dr between E Santa Inez Ave and Tilton Ave to Residential High
6 – Campus Drive		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change 2600 Campus Dr site from Residential Low to Residential Medium
7 – North Shoreview and Shoreview	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the Commercial Service south of 3rd Ave to Mixed-Use Medium Change the Mixed-Use Low south of 3rd Avenue to Mixed-Use High
8 – Parkside Plaza		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the PS Business Park sites from Residential Medium to Mixed-Use High to reflect the property owner request Change 1900 S Norfolk St site from Mixed-Use Medium to Commercial Service
9 - Hillside/Norfolk			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No modifications recommended
10 – Bridgepointe			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow residential uses directly adjacent to SR-92

An updated land use alternative, by study area, that reflects the recommendation made by the Planning Commission has been prepared and is included as [Attachment 9](#).

City Council Direction and Next Steps

Based on the results of the Alternatives Evaluation, the community input collected over the past year, the feedback from the General Plan Subcommittee and the recommendation from the Planning Commission, staff is seeking City Council’s direction on the preferred land use and circulation scenario that will go into the General Plan Update. For land use and circulation topics that are not directly related to the maps, such as allowed uses or circulation policies, Council can provide direction to staff and it will be addressed when the GPU goals, policies and actions are drafted as part of the next phase.

Staff is also seeking direction on the property owner requests contained in Attachment 7 and if they should be incorporated into the preferred land use scenario.

Following the Council's direction on the preferred land use and circulations scenario, the General Plan team will update and finalize the Draft Circulation Map and Draft Land Use Map. To confirm that the draft maps reflect the Council's direction, they will be brought back to Council for confirmation in July. This meeting will be the final step in the Preferred Scenario phase of the General Plan Update.

The next phase of the project includes preparation of the goals, policies and actions that go into each Element of the General Plan. The draft goals, policies and actions will be published this summer and presented to the public as part of the next round of community engagement. Community workshops and General Plan Subcommittee meetings will be held over the summer, with meetings before the Planning Commission and City Council in the fall. Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) to analyze potential environmental impacts from the General Plan Update will be happening concurrently with this phase. Publication of the Draft General Plan is targeted for the first half of 2023.

BUDGET IMPACT:

There are no direct budgetary impacts to taking this action.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

Once the City Council selects the preferred land use and circulation scenarios, preparation of the DEIR for the General Plan Update will commence. Publication of the DEIR for public review is anticipated in the first half 2023 and will be finished prior to any formal decisions on the updated General Plan. The DEIR will have a 45-day public comment period once it is published.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

All comments submitted on this topic are available online at www.strivesanmateo.org/documents/publiccomments. This link includes all comments that have been submitted since the beginning of the GPU effort in September 2018.

NOTICE PROVIDED:

All meeting noticing requirements were met.

ATTACHMENTS

- Att 1 – General Plan Vision Statement
- Att 2 – Land Use Alternatives Citywide
- Att 3 – Land Use Alternatives by Study Area
- Att 4 – Circulation Alternatives
- Att 5 – Alternatives Evaluation Report
- Att 6 – Summary of Community Outreach and Public Input
- Att 7 – Summary of Property Owner Land Use Requests
- Att 8 – 2022 Community Opinion Survey Summary Report
- Att 9 – Planning Commission Recommended Land Use Alternative by Study Area
- Att 10 – Public Comments: www.strivesanmateo.org/documents/publiccomments

STAFF CONTACT

City of San Mateo

Zachary Dahl, AICP, Deputy Director
(650) 522-7207

generalplan@cityofsanmateo.org

PlaceWorks

Joanna Jansen, AICP, LEED AP, Principal