

From: [Janet Davis](#)
To: [Kanoa Kelley](#)
Cc: [Warren Slocum](#); [Michael Callagy](#); [Christina Corpus](#)
Subject: OBJECTION Planning Mtg. 2567 El Camino Real
Date: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 7:51:03 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of San Mateo County. Unless you recognize the sender's email address and know the content is safe, do not click links, open attachments or reply.

Planning Commission Meeting July 26 2023

"5. Owner: Commons Hotels LLC Applicant: Dazhi Chen

File Number: PLN2021-0008

Location: 2567 El Camino Real, North Fair Oaks

Assessor's Parcel No: 054-261-220,054-261-230, 054-261-210

Consideration of a General Plan Map Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Use Permit, and Lot Merger for a new 18,715 square-foot hotel with 69 guest rooms and 48 parking spaces. The project requires a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone one of 3 project parcels from R-3 to CMU-1 and amend the parcel's corresponding General Plan land use designation from Multi-family Residential to Commercial Mixed Use; minimal grading and no tree removal is proposed. In conjunction with the requested permits, it is recommended that the Planning Commission provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that no additional environmental review is required pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15168(c). Application deemed complete: October 19,2022. Project Planner: Kanoa Kelley, kkelley@smcgov.org."

OBJECTION:

(a) This Proposal Conflicts with the entire purpose of the Housing Element:

To change the zoning of one part of the proposed parcel from residential to commercial defies the entire purpose of the main intent of the Housing Element: i.e. to provide more housing especially in low income areas. This project is also egregious in that it removes three (albeit non approved) low income residences above the store.

b) To state:

"Staff evaluated the project in the context of the Program EIR and determined that no new effects will occur, and no new mitigation measures are required."

and that this project would be immune from the requirements of CEQA: is totally irresponsible, and downright wrong. Section 15168(c) only allows this where there is **no** environmental impact. That is a totally incorrect assumption with no data to support it.:

First: it would remove much needed housing/housing potential in a disadvantaged neighborhood. Rezoning in itself is grounds for an environmental review.

Second: It replaces a small business catering to locals, with a huge hotel that does NOT serve local residents. This certainly has ramifications, particularly in terms of traffic.

Third: It provides only 48 parking spaces for 69 guest rooms and the many staff that would be required to run the hotel. This is beyond egregious since parking in the South Fair Oaks area is at a premium and so scarce that local residents often leave their vehicles across driveways and in the middle of the side streets. If the developers are counting on using the Target parking lot that is not likely to be feasible since that parking lot is often crowded by the customers at the various stores. It is not permissible to count parking at another location as suitable to accommodate parking for another development. Even if it were to be assumed that patrons would use Uber drivers or taxis, there is still no place for those vehicles. The only public transportation is the Samtrans bus that is reputed to be used at night by the homeless. The bus stops are not sheltered and that is not the type of transportation that people using a hotel would choose to patronize. This has not been evaluated.

Fourth: It makes absolutely no sense to have a hotel in that position, since there have been many motels/hotels in that immediate vicinity that have failed or become sites for flagrant prostitution/trafficking. It is only recently that several brothels were removed from that very area. At least one Motel across the road is being used to accommodate homeless people. This is not a site that will attract clients, yet it will contribute and exacerbate problems in the area. This has not been evaluated.

Fifth: There are homeless encampments at the Woodside Road ramps that Caltrans that the RWC police have been unable to move, and recently there were significant fires caused by the homeless across the road, behind the U Haul building. The land adjacent to the off ramps leading from the West side of Woodside Road to El Camino, have been piled high with huge rocks in an attempt to prevent more homeless encampments on that land. Having underground parking may be an invitation to more encampments. No study done on this.

Sixth: That specific area has been and is, a high crime/drug area. There were two shootings recently at a nearby Mexican restaurant and CrimeGraphics.com reports many crimes in that area. A hotel could well be a magnet for yet more criminal activity.

Seventh: Given the number of alcohol offenses in the vicinity, it makes absolutely no sense to import another large scale alcohol outlet. This could increase the already frequent drunk and disorderly cases in the area. This was not addressed.

Eighth: There was no unanimous approval by the NFOCC with the dissenting votes voicing the same objections that I am stating. Also, the members of the NFOCC rarely take the trouble to examine the facts or the appropriate ordinances related to a subject. This is especially true with respect to items related to SOUTH Fair Oaks. The specific environment of the area needs evaluation.

Ninth: If this project is approved it makes a mockery of all that Sr. Christina has achieved over the last 25 years for the population in that area in terms of availability of high quality, low income housing; reduction in crime; elimination of brothels and gangs; and safe places for children to learn and to play.

SUMMARY: The Planning dept. needs to go back to the drawing board on this one. The applicant is apparently an investor. The dept. needs to do due diligence on the owner and the president of that company. This is NOT a development that will, in my opinion to anything to enhance the area, it goes against the basis of the Housing Element's goals, and needs a CEQA evaluation.