

APPENDIX A
SUMMARIES OF PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
October 25, 2007 TAC Meeting #7**

TAC Comments

The following list represents comments made by the TAC on the staff recommendations contained in the Housing and Land Use Study Draft Report, prepared by the Community Development Department, dated October 2007. The comments have been organized by topic and also by grouped staff recommendations contained in the report that were utilized by staff as the basis for discussion by the TAC. Where noted, some comments were submitted in writing by TAC members that were not able to attend the meeting. These comments were added where the specific written comment was not addressed at the TAC meeting.

Note: Some of the recommendations contained in the October draft Report, as discussed by the TAC in this summary of comments, have been modified or eliminated in the January 2008 draft Report.

I. General Comments

Several TAC members asked for clarification as to the source of the recommendations contained in the report. They wanted to make sure that the recommendations were not represented as coming from the TAC at previous meetings. Staff clarified that these are City staff recommendations, and were based on the following: information and comments from public workshops; discussions at TAC meetings; letters and other communication received from the public during the process; information obtained from the City's economic consultant; and staff research and analysis of the individual issues.

II. Below Market Rate (BMR) Program

Recommendations:

- A. Increase the BMR requirement to 15% citywide at current income targets of "lower" income for rentals, and "moderate" income for ownership. Rental option: 10% "very low" income.
- B. Apply the citywide BMR income targets to the Redevelopment Areas.
- C. Adopt fees for fractional units for projects sized between 4 – 10 units. Adopt fees for fractional units of 0.1 – 0.4 for projects with 11 or more units.

TAC Comments:

1. A 15% BMR unit requirement would put the City in the moderate range when compared to other cities.
2. An increase in the BMR requirement is strongly suggested (several TAC members). One TAC member suggested a 20% requirement.
3. Should increase to 15% and track development. Revisit percentage after a certain number of years.
4. The 15% level would conform to State redevelopment law (written comment).
5. Like the option of 10% for very low income rentals. Given that until recently market rate rents were relatively affordable to the 60 – 80% income range, it seems appropriate to enable only 10% BMR units if they are targeted lower in this way (written comment).
6. The Chamber of Commerce does not support an increase to the existing BMR requirement.
7. Don't discourage development in the City. Don't want to increase the BMR percentage to where developers will go somewhere else. Consider use of redevelopment funds to provide additional affordable housing.
8. Leave the existing BMR requirement at 10%, allowing for negotiation with developers for more depending on the size and scope of the project. May be able to support an increase to 12% (written comment).
9. Would be helpful to track persons/families using the current BMR program. Who really lives there? Does the program work?
10. Measure P limits what we can do.
11. Use redevelopment standards and funds citywide.
12. Starting the use of fractional fees at 4 units is fair.

Recommendations:

- D. Allow developers to justify economic infeasibility based on specific criteria and require the offsite BMR requirement to be 20%.

- E. Allow developers to justify economic infeasibility based on specific criteria and allow a land dedication option as described in California density bonus law as an alternative to offsite construction.

TAC Comments:

- 13. There was objection to using “economic” means to define infeasibility.
- 14. Not in favor of off-site construction of BMR units. By allowing off-site construction, these units would be built in lower income neighborhoods, where these areas are already overburdened.
- 15. Off-site construction is a good thing.
- 16. Need to follow State law in regards to off-site construction of affordable units.
- 17. Examine the City’s overall goal on the location of off-site units.
- 18. The infeasibility language should stay as it currently is stated.
- 19. Should further define infeasibility criteria.
- 20. The increase from 15% to 20% for off-site BMR units is not appropriate. Seems like a penalty (several TAC members).

Recommendations:

- F. Require 10% of the 15% proposed BMR requirement be constructed onsite, and allow an option for an in-lieu fee payment at the current market rate for affordable units to meet the obligation for the additional 5% unit requirement.
- G. Allow smaller units by square footage but establish minimum sizes in relation to market rate units.
- H. Allow flexibility of product type in single family detached projects as long as the exterior design is compatible.
- I. Allow different bedroom size distribution if the City determines it meets a need. At all times, at least 10% must be provided and a minimum total bedroom count must be provided.

TAC Comments:

- 21. If you allow the additional 5% BMR requirement to be paid for as an in-lieu fee, developers will choose this option all the time.

22. Off-site option. Due to increasing construction costs over time, the City may not be able to get the same number of units in the long run if you do not use the money right away.
23. Does this off-site option violate Measure P?
24. Can in-lieu fees be tied to percentage of land costs?
25. Smaller unit sizes should not be less than a specific percentage of the market rate unit sizes (70% suggested, also no less than 15% of standard size units suggested).
26. Unit size is good, but you should also look at bedroom sizes. Establish a minimum bedroom size to make sure you are not getting substandard size rooms.
27. Need flexibility in product type especially in single family homes. The economics are such that more people can be helped at a wider range of incomes if an in-lieu fee can be used (written comment).
28. Could allow flexibility in unit size/design by requiring same number of overall bedrooms for BMR units in a development while getting more units.

III. Density Bonus

Recommendation:

- J. Update the City's Density Bonus Ordinance to fully address recent legislation, including more specific language on concessions and incentives.

TAC Comments:

29. There was some discussion over clarity of this recommendation. Staff explained that we would need to update the City's ordinance anyway to comply with State law. No additional discussion.

IV. Land Use

Recommendations:

- K. Amend the Zoning Code to require a special use permit for residential development on E-1, Executive Park, zoned properties.

- L. No change to existing density standards as established in the General Plan and Zoning Code.

TAC Comments:

30. What would the timeframe be on revising the zoning ordinance to require a special use permit for residential use in the office zone?
31. The public process should allow for sufficient public input without making housing impossible. Use traffic studies to show impact of housing vs. office development (written comment).
32. If there will be no citywide density reduction at the present time, the City should periodically review density in San Mateo, perhaps during General Plan updates.

V. Commercial Linkage Fee

Recommendation:

- M. Adopt a commercial linkage fee on new office and hotel developments at a rate that is slightly below that of similar cities, and taking into consideration other new development fees imposed by the City.

TAC Comments:

33. Should compare San Mateo with other cities. Menlo Park is the only city in San Mateo County with a commercial linkage fee. We should be the same as other cities in the County.
34. Look comprehensively at all fees and benefits before making a new commercial linkage fee. Commercial use brings in people that shop in the City.
35. Should not recommend adoption of a fee. Revise the language in the recommendation from "adopt" to "look at" ...
36. Commercial development should share in providing affordable housing. It is not equitable for residential development to bear all the cost of providing affordable housing.
37. Commercial developers should at least pay a token amount toward housing. Currently, with the commercial market rebounding, they can pay more for land since their development costs are less than residential developers, making it more difficult for residential developers to purchase sites.
38. Talk to commercial developers to get their perspective on fees.

39. What happens in a mixed-use development? Consider some form of credit if BMR units are provided as part of the residential component.
40. Not opposed to a fee, but need more study.
41. Measure P calls for a contribution by uses that put a demand on housing.
42. This fee may correct the jobs-housing imbalance. Look at working with other jurisdictions to implement a program countywide, or at least with other jurisdictions (written comment).
43. Is there a way to balance the impact of the fee with City policy changes? Possibly expediting the entitlement process (written comment).

SUMMARY REPORT

CITY OF SAN MATEO HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOP #1

**Tuesday, August 29, 2006
City Council Chambers**

City of San Mateo Community Development Department
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

**HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOP #1
SUMMARY REPORT**

Table of Contents

Workshop Summary	Page 1
Agenda	Page 3
Workshop Comments:	
Housing Comments (from flip chart)	Page 4
Comment Cards	Page 7
Other Comments (parking lot flip chart).....	Page 11

Attachments:

Workshop Handouts

- Presentation on Affordable Housing Requirements, Policies, and Housing Needs.
- Report on Inclusionary Housing Policies from Other Jurisdictions, prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. – August 2006.
- Legal Overview of Density Bonus Law, Measure P, and BMR Program.

Letter from Home Builders Association of Northern California

CITY OF SAN MATEO

HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY

PUBLIC WORKSHOP #1

Tuesday, August 29, 2006
City Council Chambers

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The City of San Mateo is holding a series of public workshops on the Housing and Land Use Study. The purpose of these workshops is to provide a forum for members of the San Mateo community to discuss issues pertaining to affordable housing, the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) program, density bonus law and its impact on citywide densities, and existing regulations that permit residential development on commercially zoned properties in the City.

The topics for this first workshop were:

- 1) Affordable housing needs and trends, and
- 2) The City's BMR program.

Approximately 57 persons attended the first workshop which was held in the City Council Chambers. Principal Planner Bill Wanner welcomed the public to the workshop and briefly explained the format for the meeting. Robert Muehlbauer, Neighborhood Improvement and Housing Manager, made a presentation on the purpose of the Housing and Land Use Study and discussed the topics for the first workshop. He also explained the role of the City's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in the public process and in assisting staff in the development of policy recommendations on the various housing issues.

Senior Management Analyst Sandy Council gave a Powerpoint presentation on existing City goals, policies, and requirements for affordable housing. She also explained housing affordability levels, the BMR program, and available resources to provide housing. Walter Kieser from Economic & Planning Systems (SPS), the City's economic consultant, presented information on inclusionary housing requirements from other jurisdictions in the County. He also briefly explained his role in assisting the City in evaluating its affordable housing regulations and policies. Assistant City Attorney Mike Ogaz provided a legal overview of density bonus law, Measure P (the voter approved amendment to the General Plan), and the BMR program.

There was a wide variety of comments from the public at the workshop. Comments were captured on flip charts. In summary, the topics included housing needs, City growth and the location of housing, the BMR program, housing policies, infrastructure and traffic concerns, and density of housing. The individual comments and information received on

comment cards handed out by staff at the meeting have been attached to this workshop summary. Comments received at the workshop that pertain to future topics that were not on the first workshop agenda were captured on a separate flip chart (called “parking lot”) and are also attached to this summary.

At the end of the evening, staff stated that there is no specific date for the next public workshop, although, it would most likely occur in October or November. All persons who signed in will receive notice of the next workshop. Staff urged all attendees to go to the City’s website to find more information on the Housing and Land Use Study. The next TAC meeting will be held on September 27, 2006.

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
Public Workshop No. 1**

**Topics: Affordable Housing Needs and Trends,
and Below Market Rate Program**

**August 29, 2006, 7:00 p.m.
City Hall Council Chambers
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo CA**

AGENDA

- 1. 7:00 – Welcome**
- 2. 7:05 – Purpose of Workshops and Review of Work Program Topics**
- 3. 7:15 – Review of Existing City Requirements/Policies for Affordable Housing and Housing Needs**
 - Presentation from Community Development Dept.**
- 4. 7:35 – Review of Market Trends and Economic Study Work Program**
 - Presentation by City's Economic Consultant**
- 5. 7:55 – Overview of Density Bonus Law, Measure P, and Below Market Rate Regulations**
 - Presentation from City Attorney's Office**
- 6. 8:15 – Public Comments and Questions**
- 7. 8:45 – Next Steps**

Housing and Land Use Study Workshop #1

Housing Comments/Questions (from flip chart)

Housing Needs

- Bay Area is a desirable place to live. Job growth is a measure of the economic vitality here but due to high housing costs, many people commute long distances, even though they would like to live here.
- What is the job/housing balance in San Mateo? That should be looked at now.
- County wide 27% of the households are single persons which may suggest that some housing stock is underutilized. Home sharing is a solution to better use the existing housing units.
- We need affordable rentals. Someone who loves to live here and loves a job that doesn't pay enough cannot afford to live here. The location of the units is not as important as the cost.

Growth and Location of Housing

- There is an inequitable distribution of below market rate units in Central and North Central neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have traditionally been the most affordable neighborhoods and they need to be protected to preserve the neighborhood quality.
- Where does the future housing go? There is only so much land in San Mateo. How can the City accommodate any more growth other than the El Camino/ Rail Corridor?
- Non Profits who build affordable housing are looking for locations close to transit and services for the residents to decrease dependency on cars. The El Camino is underutilized and has good potential for the future.
- When does over-saturation occur? There is not enough room for more growth.
- “No growth” does not help the situation because it will increase the demand for housing and increase costs more. The BMR program just patches the problem since not enough units are created to address the need. Perhaps the only way to solve the problem is to raise money to buy land for high density affordable

housing to serve as many people as possible. Perhaps raise taxes or float bonds to pay for the land.

- We need to preserve the quality of life in San Mateo by limiting growth.
- The basic premise of Measures H/P is to scatter affordable units throughout the city so neighborhoods are not over impacted. You cannot distinguish the affordable units from the market units and it becomes an equitable impact all over town. This is a sound policy that should be retained and Council has the ability to increase the percentage.
- Affordable housing looks good in neighborhoods; anyone who drives by Rotary Floritas would not be able to distinguish it from a market rate project.

Below Market Rate Inclusionary Program

- The current BMR policy which requires all affordable units to be built onsite is too restrictive. There should be more flexibility to the program.
- There is a real need to get more affordable housing. Increase the BMR percentage to make more housing affordable.
- The BMR program costs are passed onto the market rate units within the project and make housing more expensive for the market rate residents.
- BMR costs are not passed onto market rate buyers. Developer will sell the units for what the market will bear. The BMR costs are more reflected in the price of the land a developer is willing to pay. At some point if the percentage of BMR's is too high it could make a project infeasible for a developer, but doubt that will happen in San Mateo.

Housing Policies/Development

- Look at ways to increase density within single family neighborhoods such as “in-law” units, and encourage more attached homes.
- Encourage more vertical buildings with mixed use such as live/work units.
- Land is too expensive here. Need more incentives to encourage mixed use developments.
- What are other cities doing across the country? Can we look at other innovative ideas like Home Sharing?

- Encourage small units with less parking close to transportation. An example is a complex nestled between Tilton and Catalpa at the north end of B Street.
- Seems like the Housing Element goals are unrealistic—how can that many units be built in San Mateo?
- What are the consequences of not meeting the Housing Element requirements?
- How do we meet all three Housing Element Goals? They seem to be in conflict.
- What is the vision by leaders for future growth? What are the impacts on the quality life, such as overcrowding?

Housing and Land Use Study Workshop #1

Comment Cards

(Comments are organized by each card received - 14 cards)

1. Tell us about Hillsborough. I have been told that they make no effort to provide affordable housing units. Doesn't their "decision" to "not play fair" place an increased burden on surrounding cities?

What are the ramification(s) of not complying with the State requirement? (i.e. no approved Housing Element)

2. If the City can not control the prices of houses, then why provide the land?

It seems that greed is overridden by need.

We are willing to increase traffic, noise, dirty streets, over crowding, gangs, and a city of high density houses, which are equal to Projects for low income families.

I too have attended meetings seeking answers from our City officials.

3. Why is it that San Mateo is doing all the building? If each City is allocated a certain amount for housing – then each city should be required to use it.

What happens when San Mateo runs out of land? Will single family parcels be rezoned for denser housing?

There will never be enough affordable housing.

4. A minimum of 10% Below Market Rate should be inclusive within a development (11 units or more). This would spread the BMR equitably around San Mateo and not target specific neighborhoods such as Central, North Central and North Shoreview for off-site construction of BMR's.

Reduce the tear-downs of our historic stock of single family homes. Not enough is being done to preserve our single family neighborhoods and our property values.

Rezone South Amphlett from Fifth to Folkstone from Service Commercial to Residential R3.

Downzone to R1 – Fifth to Ninth. Idaho to Delaware – Central neighborhood.

Reduce the high densities on Third and Fourth and reduce densities citywide.

No mixed use on South Amphlett from Fifth to Folkstone and Third and Fourth Avenues. Neighborhood commercial businesses bring more parking, pedestrian debris, and street cleaning issues.

The Central neighborhood needs a “Neighborhood Specific Plan” to preserve our single family neighborhood character.

The over-concentration of in-home landscaping businesses and other industrial businesses impact residential parking and our residential property values. Residential should be residential.

I will e-mail more.

5. Your affordable housing program is great!

Why is affordable housing planning to be built near railroads and freeways? Is this supposed to be positive or negative?

Get more public involved. How was this workshop advertised?

What is an example of an increase in allowable density? For example: normally 2 bedrooms holds X amount of people. With the increase in allowable density it would be 2 bedrooms holds X amount of people.

6. Need more multi-family units.

More condo conversions w/10% BMR.

More mixed use development.

More live/work lofts.

Spread BMR across more neighborhoods.

7. Meeting was a bully pulpit for Special Interest.

The TAC group is stacked w/special interest groups. More “citizens” need to be included.

Must have plan in place to guarantee that quality of life of existing neighborhoods are not effected.

Traffic, I believe is being ignored as part of these workshops. Traffic is very important and must not be ignored.

Housing costs/rates are controlled by supply and demand – government always tries to manipulate economics and fails.

Due to recent and past development, our neighborhood now has crime and gang activity. It will get worse.

City's only concern is providing affordable housing. City does not care about existing low density housing.

8. The Technical Advisory Committee consists of realtors, trades, builders, developers, Chamber of Commerce. Why? This is very similar to the CAC's. Why not make it regular citizens instead of weighted in developers favor.
9. I would like to see our neighborhood stay single family homes to keep the character of the neighborhood – Central neighborhood.
10. How will you maintain the character and physical quality of existing neighborhoods by destroying it?

Who has decided what is affordable? Fixed income? No jobs?

Where do you expect people to park?

Are those of you who are doing the planning going to insure that existing homeowners will not be impacted?

Did we vote for a study? Is this being done because of the money or are we concerned about people and their welfare at all? Did we get an opportunity to participate before this presentation? If so, when? How much did we pay for the study?

More information on the density problem!

Where will all of these units be located?

What kind of impact will construction have on traffic and the environment?

Composition of groups need to be diverse! (ethnically, age, gender, communities).

If answers are given to these questions/concerns, please disregard! Thank you for the opportunity.

11. I live in a below market rate unit (Santa Inez Avenue). Please for future complex, please build or include storage closets – ours doesn't have.
12. BMR subsidized by other market rate units.
13. What generated these workshops?
14. Can we have cookies at the next public workshop? And bottled water.

Housing and Land Use Study Workshop #1

Other Comments (from “parking lot” flip chart)

1. Need to look at the capacity of the current infrastructure.
2. Jobs vs. population. Review jobs/housing balance. Lessen commute.
3. Must look at traffic and parking issues.
4. Too much housing. There are multi-family developments on every block.
5. Density is too high. When is enough, enough.
6. The City should purchase housing sites to construct affordable housing. Create a tax to pay for these units.
7. Build studio units that will fit into the neighborhood with reduced parking.
8. Put some sort of requirement in the code to meet the BMR ratio or stay close to it.
9. Measure H/P. Allowed for more than 10 percent affordable units, and nothing has been done by the City. Requires BMR units to be spread throughout a development so that you can't point to a specific place and say “that's where the poor people live”.
10. Developers will sell/rent units for whatever the market will bear.
11. Build along El Camino Real where the one and two story commercial uses are located (underutilized properties).
12. Home share concept. Build secondary units.
13. Need additional code enforcement.
14. More attached homes.

SUMMARY REPORT

CITY OF SAN MATEO HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOP #2

Thursday, November 9, 2006
Beresford Recreation Center

City of San Mateo Community Development Department
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

**HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOP #2
SUMMARY REPORT**

Table of Contents

Workshop Summary Page 2

Agenda Page 4

Workshop Comments:
(from flip chart) Page 5

Attachments:
Workshop Handouts

CITY OF SAN MATEO HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOP #2

**Thursday, November 9, 2006
Beresford Recreation Center**

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The City of San Mateo is holding a series of public workshops on the Housing and Land Use Study. The purpose of these workshops is to provide a forum for members of the San Mateo community to discuss issues pertaining to affordable housing, the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) program, density bonus law and its impact on citywide densities, and existing regulations that permit residential development on commercially zoned properties in the City.

The topic for this second workshop was:
Affordable Housing. How Do We Get More?

Approximately 25 persons attended the second workshop which was held in the activity room at Beresford Recreation Center. Principal Planner Bill Wanner welcomed the public to the workshop and briefly explained the format for the meeting. Walter Kieser from Economic & Planning Systems (EPS), the City's economic consultant, presented information on the City's current Below Market Rate program and density bonus law. The consultant reviewed five test scenarios pertaining to the economics of density bonus provisions, indicating that while a density bonus may enhance development feasibility through increased revenues from added market rate units, it may not always be feasible to obtain the maximum density bonus due to the need for increased subsidies for the affordable units.

Fran Wagstaff, President of Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition made a presentation on the publication titled "On Common Ground: Joint Principles on Inclusionary Housing Policies", prepared by Home Builders Association of Northern California and Non-Profit Housing Association (2004). This document is a policy paper that provides recommendations to increase the amount of affordable housing through inclusionary housing programs.

Senior Management Analyst Sandy Council led the public discussion and questions portion of the agenda. There was a wide variety of comments from the public at the workshop. Comments were captured on flip charts. There were several comments on the applicability of the "On Common Ground" publication to the City of San Mateo. Comments were made about keeping the BMR program as it currently exists, as well as

comments about allowing a greater number of smaller BMR units where larger BMR units would be required, and in balancing any potential changes to the program between the interests of both developers and residents. There were a number of questions and comments about the rental market.

At the end of the evening, staff stated that there is no specific date for the next public workshop, although, it would most likely occur in January or February.. All persons who signed in will receive notice of the next workshop. The next TAC meeting will be held on November 29, 2006.

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
Public Workshop No. 2**

Topic: Affordable Housing. How Do We Get More?

**November 9, 2006, 7:00 p.m.
Beresford Recreation Center, Activity Room
2720 Alameda de las Pulgas, San Mateo CA**

AGENDA (*Revised*)

- 1. 7:00 – Welcome and Overview of Workshop 1.**
- 2. 7:05 – Economics of Affordable Housing and Density Bonus.**
 - **Presentation by City's Economic Consultant.**
- 3. Inclusionary Housing Programs. What Cities Can Do To Encourage Developers To Provide More Affordable Housing.**
 - **Presentation by Fran Wagstaff, President, Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition.**
- 4. 7:45 – Public Comments and Questions.**
- 5. 8:45 – Next Steps.**

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOP #2
November 9, 2006**

Public Comments

General Comments

- Build BMR units on-site.
- The Metropolitan example is to build condos & rent them for 10 years. After the 10 years are up, then the developer may sell them.
- The TAC should be able to read “National Housing Coalition” papers.
- We don’t want more BMR units in Central & N. Central.
- Have you talked to the financial lenders and analyzers to see whether or not the people who live in the BMR units can really afford to be there? Creative financing is already causing problems for some owners.
- Use Bay Meadows as an example to achieve the 10% BMR units spread throughout the market rate units with the addition of a 1 acre of land for an all BMR unit building. We should apply this example to the KMART site.
- The social objective of providing single family and large BMR units may be worth the large financial costs. We should think about targeting specific groups.
- We should address the economic and social diversity BMR units have on a neighborhood.
- “HIP” Housing is a good model to build from, but do not concentrate the BMR units in North Central.
- If the rental market comes back the developers will build luxury rentals not market rate rentals.
- The current BMR policy allows for off-site development of BMR units if it is determined to be infeasible to develop them on-site. We should define “Infeasible”.
- We need to change the BMR policy, so we have the ability to trade large BMR units for multiple smaller units.
- The current Inclusionary Program works.

Response to EPS Study

- Figure 1 is for the For Sale Market, however the Rental Market is the exact opposite.
- Develop a matrix with all of the options. There are too many variables to understand.
- We need to find the middle ground so that the developers and residents can be happy.
- High Density with the Density Bonus option is not good.

- What happens when the interest rates change? What happens to the chart (figure 1)?

Response to On Common Ground

- On Common Ground's ideas and suggestions should not be used for San Mateo.
- The American Canyon example provides both BMR rentals and BMR for sale units to make a project work.
- Can't and shouldn't compare Napa to San Mateo. However, some principles could apply to smaller units and developments in San Mateo.

“Parking Lot” Comments

- Traffic? – dealt with EIR
- Be careful with the combination of high density with affordable housing,
- Locate the high density sites on east side of city (ECR).

SUMMARY REPORT

CITY OF SAN MATEO HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3

Thursday, February 15, 2007
Central Recreation Center

City of San Mateo Community Development Department
330 West 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403

**HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3
SUMMARY REPORT**

Table of Contents

Workshop Summary Page 2

Agenda Page 4

Workshop Comments:
(from flip chart) Page 5

Attachments:

Powerpoint Presentation

The presentation may be viewed on the City's website (www.cityofsanmateo.org – go to Departments/Planning/Housing and Land Use Study/Public Workshops/ February 15, 2007 presentation).

CITY OF SAN MATEO HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3

**Thursday, February 15, 2007
Central Recreation Center**

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

The City of San Mateo is holding a series of public workshops on the Housing and Land Use Study. The purpose of these workshops is to provide a forum for members of the San Mateo community to discuss issues pertaining to affordable housing, the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) program, density bonus law and its impact on citywide densities, and existing regulations that permit residential development on commercially zoned properties in the City.

The topics for this workshop included:
Citywide Densities and
Residential Development in Non-Residential Areas

Approximately 30 persons attended the third workshop which was held in the activity room at Central Recreation Center. Principal Planner Bill Wanner welcomed the public to the workshop and briefly explained the current status of the Housing and Land Use Study. The study has moved from discussions on affordable housing and the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) Program into the land use phase, specifically residential densities and residential development in areas that are designated for non-residential land uses.

As part of a PowerPoint presentation, City staff discussed the format for the meeting. The presentation was developed to address some of the land use questions and comments received at previous public workshops and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings, while providing the technical background on the issues to be discussed. The presentation may be viewed on the City's website (www.cityofsanmateo.org – go to Departments/Planning/Housing and Land Use Study/Public Workshops/ February 15, 2007 presentation).

This meeting was the first public workshop on the Housing and Land Use Study attended by several members of the public. As such, there were many questions about the City's current BMR Program, Measure P standards, and density bonus law, topics that were covered in previous workshops. Chief of Planning, Ron Munekawa and Senior Management Analyst Sandy Council addressed the questions from the public and

provided background information on the applicable codes, policies, and standards. Staff also informed the public that Economic & Planning Systems (EPS), the City's economic consultant, will be preparing a report on the topics covered in the public workshops, and the report will be made available to the public prior to public hearings on the Housing and Land Use Study.

Regarding land use issues, public comments included: reducing citywide residential densities; impacts of residential development on schools, traffic and roadway capacities, parks and open space; concern over the compatibility of new development with existing land uses and neighborhood character; requiring a special use permit for residential development in non-residential areas; retention of neighborhood commercial areas; maintaining a healthy jobs/housing balance; the need for more housing in the downtown; and retention of mixed use residential and commercial policies with guidelines for new developments.

This is the last scheduled public workshop for the Housing and Land Use Study. At the end of the evening, staff stated that the next TAC meeting will be held on February 28, 2007, as a follow-up to this public workshop.



**CITY OF SAN MATEO
HOUSING AND LAND USE
STUDY
Public Workshop No. 3**

**February 15, 2007, 7:00 p.m.
Central Park Recreation Center
50 East Fifth Avenue, San Mateo CA**

AGENDA

**Topics: Citywide Densities and
Residential Development in Non-Residential Areas**

- 1. 7:00 – Welcome and Review Status of Housing and Land Use Study.**
- 2. 7:05 - Introduction of Workshop Topics.**
- 3. 7:10 - Background on Residential Densities, General Plan Policies on Land Use, and Residential Development in Commercial Areas.**
- 4. 7:30 – Public Comments – Density and Residential Development in Non-Residential Areas.**
- 5. 8:45 – Next Steps.**

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
HOUSING AND LAND USE STUDY
PUBLIC WORKSHOP #3
February 15, 2007**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Workshop Topics: Citywide Densities and Residential Development in Non-Residential Areas

Citywide Density Comments

1. Concern about extensive density citywide at expense of parks/open space.
2. Impact of increased development on schools.
3. How long can duplexes be demolished and redeveloped into higher density projects?
4. Consider reducing densities to 40 units per acre as the maximum density to compensate for density bonus provisions (as promised in prior years). Would be able to get 50 units per acre with a density bonus.
5. Use new ABAG projections for current development projects (traffic). Fair share housing allocation. Work with the County to allocate a portion of San Mateo's fair share to another jurisdiction.
6. Long range planning (20 years) is needed, rather than short term cycles. Look at resources (gas, oil, etc.).
7. Stronger consideration of existing character of neighborhood when reviewing development proposals. Design guidelines.
8. Impacts on certain neighborhoods that are close to higher density zoning.
9. Look at dividing lines between zoning districts. Some R2/R3 and R1/R2 borders are mid-block rather than at the street.
10. High traffic areas at intersections that can not be fixed: Concar/Delaware & SR 92, El Camino Real & SR 92, El Camino Real & Borel – Quality of life/trade-offs.
11. Roads are at capacity.
12. Cars generated by large projects.
13. Need more space for recreation (soccer and little league). More development means more children and more need for recreation space. Quality of life – lower ratio of parks per resident.
14. Bay Meadows Park is too small. Look at everyone to be served. Passive vs. active parks.
15. Who will live in the new dwelling units? Where do children play in multi-family developments? (on-site open space)
16. Reduce density and manage growth – anticipate growth.
17. Manage growth through funding of mass transit.

Comments on Specific Areas of the City (density)

18. Look at 42nd Avenue (BelMateo) area.
19. Aragon area – Office area at Borel.
20. Need more housing downtown.
21. Rezone to R1: 5th to 9th, Delaware to Idaho.

Residential Development in Non-Residential Areas

22. Restrict housing in the Bovet/Borel office area.
23. Many Executive Office (E1) developments were built as single projects. The land is subdivided and individual parcels are sold for redevelopment to other than office use. Creates inconsistent land uses. Entire land area of original subdivision should be redeveloped as a unit, not parcel by parcel with different land uses.
24. Review jobs/housing balance and goals when considering residential in non-residential areas.
25. There is a compatibility issue with residential next to commercial. Mixed-use developments are ok. Set guidelines for uses.
26. Require a special use permit for change in use from commercial to residential land use.
27. Be careful of allowing residential in commercial areas. Need neighborhood retail/commercial. Take holistic approach. Quality of life – sustainability, not just economics.
28. Residential use of land does not give many benefits to the City. Residential property is more expensive to serve.

Other Comments

29. In-law unit at Lindbergh and Cypress (legal?).
30. Maple Street is a freeway. Traffic calming - need speed humps to slow traffic.
31. Use park space in Bay Meadows 2 for little league.
32. Collect fees for fractional BMR units.
33. Look at secondary unit parking standards.