

To: All Members of the Foster City Council – **VERSION 8 May**
Date: 11 May 2015
Re: Triton, Phase C Preliminary Review on 18 May 2015
Subject: Comments: Foster City Residents for Responsible Development

Foster City Residents for Responsible Development oppose the Sares Regis proposal to substitute townhomes for previously approved office-retail space at Triton, Phase C. The developer’s promotional material overstates the expected benefits and understates or omits the negative consequences of the proposal.

Table of Contents

A. Specific Reasons We Oppose This Proposal 2

1. This is classic bait & switch. 2

2. Don’t be fooled by the promise of “Affordable Housing”..... 2

3. Don’t make school overcrowding worse..... 3

4. Consider traffic impacts of the Triton, Phase C Proposal..... 5

 Tortured Logic..... 5

 The Pilgrim-Triton Point area will need office-retail..... 5

 Traffic study information is old and no longer relevant. 6

 Traffic study results have been questioned..... 6

 Both the timing and direction of the additional traffic need to be considered. 7

 We would expect some of the residents in the 730 housing units being built nearby to walk to work in the office-retail establishments..... 7

 Office space can provide overflow parking for residences..... 7

 Size and design of office-retail space can be regulated. 7

 There is no need for the average citizen to try to decipher the complicated, technical language of the traffic “experts.” 8

5. Our city-wide water consumption is being limited 8

6. Triton, Phase C may not produce truly affordable housing..... 8

 The size of the required down payment. 9

 The cost of items that must be added to the monthly mortgage payments. 9

 The Monthly Income required to qualify for any of these loans. 9

 In order to qualify for “Affordable Housing” the applicant’s family income must be below certain income ceilings. 11

 This leaves many questions unanswered..... 12

7. Don’t play “take it or leave it.” 13

8. Evaluate any offers 13

B. More General Reasons for Our Opposition to This Proposal..... 15

1. Foster City is already overbuilt. 15

2. Approval of the Pilgrim Triton Master Plan was a big mistake..... 15

3. Sares Regis should not be allowed to add 50 more town houses to Triton, Phase C because 730 units have already been approved in that small 20-acre area. 15

4. Residents want the City to take a breather on new housing approvals. 16

5. Approving this new housing would be inconsistent. 17

A. Specific Reasons We Oppose This Proposal

1. This is classic bait & switch.

Have approval for office and retail space, and then switch to the more lucrative residential housing. Sares Regis bought the property in July 2014. The City approvals for the land that Sares Regis wants to build on date back to 2008/2009, when the “Master Plan” for all four planned developments was approved. Sares Regis was not even an owner of the property at that time. Now, they say¹: “We would like to work with the City to re-envision our portion of the Pilgrim Triton Master Plan...” In fact, they propose an almost total change of plans.

2. Don't be fooled by the promise of “Affordable Housing”.

Sares Regis says that one of the “specific benefits or our proposal” is affordable housing per the Pilgrim Triton Master Development Agreement.”² This is being portrayed as a generous offer by the developer when, in truth, it increases their financial gain. This is because developers that agree to include 20% affordable units are eligible for certain concessions to existing building codes. (Interestingly, these concessions are referred to as “builder bonuses.”) Example “bonuses” include: a) increased density (up to 35 units per acre; b) reduced square footage of each residence (250 square feet in one recent proposal); c) reduced parking spaces; etc.³

Qualifying for these concessions makes any development proposal much more economical to build, and much more profitable. It should not be a surprise that the proposed 14 units of affordable housing is 20% of the total 68 town homes Sares Regis seeks to build in Triton, Phase C.

Of course the developers support ‘affordable’ housing. They have nothing to lose, only much to gain!! We are left with the impacts of increased high-rise housing density, traffic, shared sewer costs, and overcrowding of our schools.

¹ Letter from Sares Regis to Curtis Banks of City of Foster City, dated 4 February 2015, Subject: Preliminary Review Hearing Request, page2 of 3.

² Letter from Sares Regis to Curtis Banks of City of Foster City, dated 4 February 2015, Subject: Preliminary Review Hearing Request, page2 of 3.

³ See discussion at: Staff Report, Density Bonus Regulations, 15 August 2013 at:
<http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/Density-Bonus-Regulations.pdf>

If a developer agrees to produce 20% of “affordable units,” the developer gets a BONUS. The other 80% of the units are built for whatever the market can bear (think expensive). What does a BONUS look like?⁴

- Allows more dwelling units per acre than otherwise allowed on the site by the General Plan Land Use Map and Zoning;
- Use of density bonus parking standards (fewer parking places per unit than required in city code. Talk about a concession! – look at the night-time competition for curbside parking at Edgewater/E. Hillsdale, Foster City Blvd, Shell/Bounty);
- Incentives reducing site development standards or a modification of zoning code or architectural requirements that result in financially sufficient and actual cost reductions (so the developer can have a larger profit margin);
- Waiver of development standards that would otherwise make the increased density physically impossible to construct (per city codes which exist to preserve building standards);
- An additional density bonus if a childcare facility is provided (but inadequate impact fees to address overcrowding of local schools).

These builder-friendly bonuses produce economic incentives that are driving high-rise, high-density housing proposals in Foster City. And, remember, a townhouse sold at below market rate will still not be “affordable” for many families.

3. Don't make school overcrowding worse.

Sares Regis promotional materials tell us the proposed 68 townhomes will generate an estimated 19 school children. This would amount to one school child for every four townhomes. Does this sound realistic?

This projection represents yet another example of the many probable under estimates of the impacts of the proposed project. In this case, it is because the school generation rate varies widely, depending upon the number of bedrooms, the price of the units, and the income status of the buyers. These are details that Sares Regis has yet to reveal. Until these details are known it will be impossible to determine how many school children will be generated

⁴ Staff Report to the City Council dated 15 August 2013: Density Bonus Regulations at: <http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/Density-Bonus-Regulations.pdf>

by this proposed development. The actual number of school children may be much larger than the current Sares Regis estimate.

The Fehr & Peers traffic study⁵ describes three housing alternatives (page 2). The three alternatives propose adding from 80 to 95 townhomes, not 68 townhomes. This discrepancy triggers concerns that a plan for more than 68 townhomes may eventually be attempted.

In our discussion with the developer, Sares Regis has not been specific about the size of the townhomes they are proposing. But, the Fehr & Peers traffic study tells us: “The trip generation rates for single-family detached housing (ITE Land Use 210) were used for the new alternatives since the size of the proposed units (3-4 bedrooms) is larger than typical townhomes.” (Page 4). This study was completed in August 2014; one month after Sares Regis bought the property. Note the single-family detached housing rates were used for the traffic study, but they were not used to estimate the student generation rates. We assume that 3 & 4 bedroom townhomes are going to generate more students than projected.

There are no guarantees that the school children from this project will be able to attend a school in Foster City. The San Mateo-Foster City School District has written this developer, saying: “Currently the SMFCSD is experiencing enrollment growth and the schools in Foster City have reached capacity. We cannot confirm enrollment in a Foster City school, only a school within the SMFCSD.”⁶

Remember, also, that the nearby developments at the 166-unit Triton Pointe and 240-unit Waverly will be completed before Triton, Phase C. These students will need to be accommodated first. The school district has written us to say: “... the majority [from these developments] will be assigned to Audubon and



Bowditch... After Audubon is full, students will be overflowed to San Mateo schools starting with George Hall.” The District tells us that elementary

⁵ The Fehr & Peers Traffic Study can be accessed at: <http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/PT-Phase-C-Trip-Generation-Assessment.pdf>

⁶ Letter from San Mateo-Foster city School District March 12, 2015. Subject: Response to Environmental Impact Reports.

students have been overflowed out of Foster City into San Mateo this year.⁷ Yes, overflow is happening now! Do we want our kids to be forced out of Foster City and do we want to deal with the traffic getting our kids to school?

A large part of maintaining our home values is access to top performing schools. Location, Location, Location and Education are important to homebuyers. Crowded schools diminish home values and impact the quality of life.

The Next Steps Committee is considering a proposal for a bond measure of \$138 million to add more classrooms in both Foster City and San Mateo. Developer impact fees barely scratch the surface of that need. Developers earn large profits and then leave the community to finance most of the cost of the school infrastructure.

It is undeniably clear: When the City Council votes to approve more housing it makes school crowding worse.

4. Consider traffic impacts of the Triton, Phase C Proposal

Sares Regis claims the traffic that will be generated by the additional “approximately” 50 townhomes will be less than the traffic that would be generated by the office-retail space. This claim generates the following counter-arguments:

Tortured Logic.

Sares Regis is attempting to convince the City Council to accept this proposal as an alternative to something worse... provisions contained in the Pilgrim-Triton Master Plan approved by a prior City Council. Sares Regis suggests the City should approve their new plan because they believe it mitigates some of the negative traffic impacts of the previously approved plan.

The Pilgrim-Triton Point area will need office-retail.

Four separate developers are building 730 homes in this small 20-acre area of the City.⁸ [See map](http://tinyurl.com/fcrrd2). Providing appropriate office space and retail within this development, itself, will diminish the need for these new residents to get into their cars and drive elsewhere to shop, get haircuts, do their banking, pick up dry cleaning, eat out, and get other basic services. Office-retail space would help offset the office-retail space that was lost with the destruction of the original Pilgrim-Triton office-retail zone.⁹ The leases offered in large office

⁷ E-mail from Dr Cynthia Simms dated 14 April 2015

⁸ See map at <http://tinyurl.com/fcrrd2>

⁹ The promise of office-retail may, in fact, have been used to qualify for concessions when the Master Plan Approvals were

buildings are attractive to big corporations but are not as appropriate for Mom and Pop businesses. We need to support our local Mom & Pop businesses and provide adequate office and retail spaces for them!

Traffic study information is old and no longer relevant.

Sares Regis relies on a 2014 “preliminary” traffic analysis by Fehr and Peers for their traffic estimates. The 2014 traffic study was completed prior to the completion of the nearby Triton Pointe or Waverly housing, which are yet to be completed. This is an example of how the City has consistently examined impacts of the four developments, separately, rather than considering their cumulative, combined impacts. It is a major flaw.

Traffic study results have been questioned.

The results of that traffic study have been consistently questioned. This is the same firm that completed the discredited traffic study for the City that was used in the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact of the Housing Element.¹⁰ That study came to the conclusion that 756 new housing units within four renovated apartment complexes would have “no significant impact” on traffic at our major intersections. These intersections are already at gridlock during commute hours. Even members of the Planning Commission and City Council



“Isn’t it nice to see children cycling to school?”

provided. A portion of Section 65915(k) of the State Density Law says “Concessions or incentives include: (2) Approval of mixed use zoning in conjunction with the housing project if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses will reduce the cost of the housing development and if the commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses are compatible with the housing project and the existing or planned development in the area where the proposed housing project will be located.” For further information see:

<http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/Density-Bonus-Regulations.pdf>

¹⁰ Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact of the Housing Element 2014–2023, Foster City, CA The report can be accessed at: http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/Draft-Neg-Dec-12_16_14.pdf

expressed concern over the Fehr and Peers traffic study data and the way it was being used.

The Fehr & Peers traffic study¹¹ compares the traffic expected from 80-95 townhomes with the previously approved office-retail space, not 68 townhomes. This flaw may not be apparent to a casual reader of the report.

Both the timing and direction of the additional traffic need to be considered.

Traffic generated by retail establishments will be spread out through out the day. Traffic generated by office space will be coming into Foster City as residents are leaving. This process will be reversed during the evening commute hours. If housing is substituted for the office space, this favorable ebb and flow of traffic disappears. It puts residents on the road at the same time as other commuters, going in the same direction. This will have more of an impact on peak hour traffic than the traffic generated by office-retail establishments.¹²

We would expect some of the residents in the 730 housing units being built nearby to walk to work in the office-retail establishments.

This would reduce traffic impacts.

Office space can provide overflow parking for residences.

The City has provided each of the four developers with “bonuses” which permit fewer parking spaces. This does not change the number of cars requiring parking. The cumulative impact of these separate approvals creates a near certain parking space nightmare in this small 20 acre site. Competition for on street parking along Hillsdale Blvd. is already a problem. But, commercial space parking is rarely full, especially after business hours. This would provide overflow parking spaces for residential units where the parking is not adequate. Substituting more housing for the office-retail space would take away this mitigating factor.

Size and design of office-retail space can be regulated.

It may be that fifty more residences will generate less traffic than office-retail space, but limiting the size of the office-retail that may eventually be approved can mitigate this difference.

¹¹ The Fehr & Peers traffic study can be accessed at: <http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/PT-Phase-C-Trip-Generation-Assessment.pdf>

¹² Deno Milano has independently e-mailed each City Council member with a fine analysis of this flaw in the Sares Regis interpretation of the data in the traffic study.

There is no need for the average citizen to try to decipher the complicated, technical language of the traffic “experts.”

Any one who simply thinks it out will understand the implications of this proposal to substitute town houses for office-retail space.

5. Our city-wide water consumption is being limited

The rules have been changed: Previously, we were told that our water allocation was 5.1million gallons per day and that we were consuming 3.9 million gallons per day.¹³ The difference was available for additional consumption. That water is no longer available to us since Governor Brown has decreed that water consumption be reduced from recent consumption, not from prior allocations.

Housing uses MUCH more water than offices. Not approving additional housing development until sufficient water, traffic capacity and schools are provided for seems only common sense.

Unlike most of California, Foster City has physical limits. It is 3.756 square miles, largely surrounded by water. There are only three roadways in and out. We are already overbuilt. Schools are over capacity. Water supply has become a big problem. We need to ask: At what point do we begin to hit limits?

6. Triton, Phase C may not produce truly affordable housing.

Sares Regis promises 14 of the 68 for sale townhomes at the proposed Triton, Phase C project will be “Affordable Units.”¹⁴ Let’s examine what this really means and the four major obstacles that must be solved:

¹³ Information provided by Curtis Banks, Director of Community Development.

¹⁴ Letter to Foster City from Sares Regis dated 4 February 2015.
Subject: Pilgrim Triton Phase C – Preliminary Review Hearing Request

The size of the required down payment.

Table 1 shows that a family will typically need a down payment of \$80,000 to \$160,000 in order to purchase one of these townhomes.¹⁵

Table 1 - Recent Requirements to Buy a Home in Foster City With a 30-year Fixed Rate 3.5% Mortgage With a Typical 20% Down Payment¹⁶

| Purchase Price | 20% Down Payment | Loan Amount | Monthly Mortgage Payment @3.5% | Monthly Income To Qualify |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| \$400,000 | \$ 80,000 | \$320,000 | 1,436 | \$ 5,800 |
| \$500,000 | \$100,000 | \$400,000 | 1,796 | \$ 7,000 |
| \$600,000 | \$120,000 | \$480,000 | 2,155 | \$ 8,000 |
| \$700,000 | \$140,000 | \$560,000 | 2,514 | \$ 9,300 |
| \$800,000 | \$160,000 | \$640,000 | 2,873 | \$10,500 |

The cost of items that must be added to the monthly mortgage payments.

For example, homeowner association dues, property taxes (about 1.1% of the purchase price, annually), homeowner insurance, utilities and other costs incidental to maintaining the town house. While the monthly mortgage amounts in table 1 are ALL below the 30% of income “rule of thumb” used to indicate that housing costs are “affordable”, the actual monthly costs of home ownership will probably exceed 30% of the monthly income it will take to qualify for a loan.

The Monthly Income required to qualify for any of these loans.

That amount escalates sharply as the purchase price increases. (See table 1). For example, even with a very favorable 3.5% interest rate, a \$5,800 monthly

¹⁵ A realtor who reviewed a draft of these comments noted that in addition to the down payment, buyers need additional cash to pay for title and closing costs.

¹⁶ A local mortgage broker provided the qualifying income data. To qualify, the debt to income ratio is from 43% to 49% based on the borrower's financial strength. Fixed rate mortgages fluctuates every day depending upon the bond market in addition to the lender, loan amount, and borrowers credit scores. The 3.5% rate used in this example could be 3.75%. Or, the rate could be less if the borrowers are willing to pay points to lower the rate. But this entails more cash needed besides the down payment. Adjustable rate mortgages provide even more variation in the financial requirements

income is required to buy a \$400,000 home, if one could be found for that price. A monthly income of \$10,500 is required to purchase an \$800,000 town house, and it still requires making a down payment of \$160,000!

Table 2 shows representative monthly salaries for some one-earner and two-earner households. It shows that most people cannot afford these townhomes at these prices.

Table 2 - Representative Salaries in San Francisco Bay Area¹⁷

| Single Wage Earner: | Gross Monthly Income |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Senior on Social Security | \$ 1,250 |
| Minimum Wage Earner | \$ 1,387 |
| Paralegal | \$ 5,000 |
| Elementary School Teacher | \$ 6,583 |
| Software Engineer | \$ 5,500 |
| Biochemist | \$ 9,000 |
| Associate Attorney | \$15,000 |
| Two Wage Earners: | |
| Min Wage Earner and Software Engr. | \$ 8,887 |
| Biochemist and Paralegal | \$14,000 |

Given these financing conditions, the town homes that Sares Regis will be selling can only be purchased by people who can afford a hefty down payment and who have substantial qualifying incomes. This group is not likely to include first time buyers.

This brings us to the fourth obstacle...

¹⁷ This table of representative salaries appears in a January 2014 publication by the City of Foster City which quoted the source as: U.S. Department of Labor, as quoted on Foster City Website at:
http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/Foster-City-Newsletter_1_23_14.pdf

In order to qualify for “Affordable Housing” the applicant’s family income must be below certain income ceilings.

Table 3 presents, as an example, a portion of the schedule that defines the income categories used to determine “Affordable Housing” eligibility in the regional housing needs allocations.¹⁸

Table 3- 2014 income Limits for San Mateo County

| Income Category | Household size=2 | Household size=3 | Household size=4 |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Extremely Low | \$ 2,263 | \$ 2,546 | \$ 2,829 |
| Very Low | \$ 3,771 | \$ 4,242 | \$ 4,713 |
| Lower Income | \$ 6,033 | \$ 6,788 | \$ 7,542 |
| Median Income | \$ 6,867 | \$ 7,725 | \$ 8,583 |
| Moderate Income | \$8,242 | \$ 9,271 | \$10,300 |
| Above Moderate | More than \$8,242 | More than \$9,271 | More than \$10,300 |

Although these income ceilings may appear to be generous, comparing table 3 with table 1 shows a big gap between the affordable income limits and the amount of income required to qualify for a loan.¹⁹

- NONE of the households in the Extremely Low or Very Low income groups have the \$5,800 monthly income needed to qualify for the \$320,000 loan amount shown in table 1.

- NONE of the 2-person or 3-person households in the Lower Income group have the \$7,700 monthly income needed to qualify for the \$400,000 loan amount shown in table 1.

¹⁸ City of Foster City Housing Element, 2015–2023 Planning Period, page 4–21 accessed at: <http://citydocs.fostercity.org/sirepub/cache/2/rd30nseyjdg4nha31adq0tni/96911604132015082731395.PDF> Income limits are updated annually by the California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for San Mateo County, with “Extremely Low Income”, “Very Low Income” and “Low Income” schedules published by both agencies. For additional information, see the HUD website at www.huduser.org/dataset/il.html and San Mateo County Department of Housing website at: <http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/portal/site/housingdepartment/>.

¹⁹ Affordable housing, for the purposes of the Housing Element, refers to housing that is affordable to households at extremely low income, very low income, low income, and moderate- income

There are only two ways to close this gap and make these townhomes affordable to families with the income limits shown in table 3: The townhomes must either be sold at a VERY low price—a price where the monthly cost of ownership does not exceed 30% of the incomes in table 3; or, a very large portion of the monthly mortgage payment, property taxes, home owner association dues, utilities, etc. must be heavily subsidized.

Affordable units must be similar to the market rate units. The builder is not allowed to cut corners. This means they will cost about as much to build as the market rate units.²⁰

The City has stated that it will not be subsidizing the units or providing loans. We are told that the income requirements will be based on whether the units will be sold to very low, low or moderate income households and that this will be part of the negotiations with Sares Regis, if this project moves forward.²¹

This leaves many questions unanswered.

We do not yet know how many bedrooms these units will have or how the for-sale townhomes and “affordable” townhomes will be priced. If the price of the for-sale units must “carry” the below market rate units, they may need to be priced as much as 20% above market rate. It might be difficult to sell townhomes at 20% above market rate. It would certainly work against the City goal of creating more market rate housing.

levels. Generally, housing that costs less than 30% of household income is considered affordable to these groups. Source: City of Foster City Housing Element, 2015–2023 Planning Period. Page 4–7, accessed at:

<http://citydocs.fostercity.org/sirepub/cache/2/rd30nseyjdg4nha31adq0tni/96911604132015082731395.PDF>

²⁰ “Affordable units must be constructed concurrently with market-rate units and shall be integrated into the project. Affordable units shall be of equal design and quality as the market rate unit. Exteriors and interiors, including architecture, elevations, floor plans, interior finishes and amenities of the affordable units shall be similar to the market rate units. The number of bedrooms in the affordable units shall be consistent with the mix of market rate units.” Source: <http://www.fostercity.org/departmentsanddivisions/communitydevelopment/Features/upload/Density-Bonus-Regulations.pdf>

²¹ E-mail from Curtis Banks, Director of Community Development Department, Foster City, dated 3 April 2015.

The fundamental question remains: How does the developer propose to make these 14 townhomes truly “affordable?”

7. Don't play “take it or leave it.”

If the City does not approve the new, revised Triton, Phase C proposal, Sares Regis may decide NOT to build the office-retail space and the parking structure. It may be postponed, or abandoned all together. Don't cave in and regard this as a “take it or leave it” choice. Even if the developer decides to build the office/retail and parking structure, the City can control the building heights and details of the design.²²

Substituting housing for office-retail will be much more lucrative for Sares Regis. This is also an investment decision to hedge their bets. Retail establishments in the City are not doing well. And, Sares Regis is building a huge office complex at Chess Drive. Any bust in the biotech industry or downturn in the economy could leave a lot of empty office space. So this preliminary review is like a chess game! We believe the Sares Regis arguments for making this change have significant weaknesses.

Is turning down this request a risk? The answer is “yes” because Sares Regis might still attempt to build a tall office building and high-rise parking structure. Is turning down this proposal a risk worth taking? The answer is a resounding: “Yes.”

8. Evaluate any offers

Don't be surprised if Sares Regis dangles financial incentives in front of the City Council.

It could take the form of a donation from their Community Foundation: Note that the Sares Regis Preliminary Review Hearing Request letter to the City of February 4, 2015 contains the following language: “*We have been in dialogue with the San Mateo/Foster City School District for several months exploring*

²² Curtis Banks, Director of Community Development writes “ I understand you spoke with Leslie Carmichael earlier this afternoon so she may have answered your questions, but here is my response. The General Development Plan (GDP), which establishes the zoning for the Pilgrim-Triton Master Plan has been approved, but the design of the specific buildings still need to be approved by the Planning Commission. Along E. Hillside the GDP allows for 17 units with a maximum height of 35 feet. Along the interior there are two sites with ground floor commercial and office uses above with an allowed height of 35 to 85 feet (3 to 7 stories). Again, the exact heights would need to be approved by the Planning Commission as part of the design review.”

ways we can support the Next Steps program and address some of the District's needs through our firm's Community and Education Foundation."

Another possibility could involve rebates due the developer because certain mitigation costs have changed since the adoption of the Pilgrim-Triton Master Plan. There are rumors that Sares Regis might offer to give that money back to the City if it were, in some way, used to help finance new school classrooms.

These look like generous offers. While any gift helps and needs to be appreciated, the money that the developer may dangle in front of the City Council needs to be kept in perspective. The Bond Issue the Next Steps Committee may be recommending will be in the \$138 MILLION dollar range. Even that amount will not provide all that is needed.

If our City approves the current Sares Regis proposal the school impact fee will be \$370,000 of which only \$256,000 stays within the Elementary School District. This is a ONE-TIME fee. We are left to finance the year-in-year-out impacts on our schools.

The impact fee is dwarfed by the enormous/significant contributions and commitment of our local parent communities and teachers. Each of our 4 schools handles fundraising a bit differently, but each school raises about \$150K each for a city-wide total of about \$600K year-after-year.



How do they raise this money? At one school they ask each family to donate \$229 for each child in the school. Schools hold a variety of other fund-raising activities: They sponsor fund-raisers. They seek donations from local businesses, service clubs such as the Lions and Rotary. They obtain corporate donations, sometimes in the form of matching funds from employers, etc.

What they do with all this money? Each school sets their own priorities, but mostly the money is spent on: Classroom supplies, art, computer lab, tech aide, maintenance and equipment, library support, physical education, school assemblies, newsletter, etc. etc.

The bottom line is that our community pulls together and works very, very hard to generate about \$600,000 **EVERY** year to support our elementary school children. We need to understand that any money the developer might contribute is a relatively small amount. Let's keep any offers in perspective.

B. More General Reasons for Our Opposition to This Proposal

1. Foster City is already overbuilt.

Foster City was designed for 11,000 homes.²³ As of 1/1/2014, Foster City had 12,765 housing units according to the State Dept of Finance. This means the City was 16% overbuilt at that time. Since then, the City has approved an additional 844 high-density housing units which, when completed, will leave Foster City 24% overbuilt. These housing approvals are overwhelming the City infrastructure. Examples include traffic congestion, school crowding, and limited water resources.

2. Approval of the Pilgrim Triton Master Plan was a big mistake.

Many residents believe that City approval of the high density housing "Master Plan" of that small, 20-acre site was ill advised. The buildings there look out of place. It is going to be a very dense, unattractive complex. The high-rise, high-density, unattractive complex is a daily reminder of our loss of control over the "Foster City look." It takes the City in the wrong direction. It represents an assault on our quality of life.

3. Sares Regis should not be allowed to add 50 more town houses to Triton, Phase C because 730 units have already been approved in that small 20-acre area.

(See map²⁴) The Sares Regis Project is Part of the Pilgrim Triton Master Plan approved by prior councils and Planning Commissions. The Pilgrim Triton Master Plan divided up the site into four phases with four different developers. The "master plan" was for land use purposes, only. Each project has been considered and approved separately:

- The 307-unit Triton Plaza was completed in mid 2013. It is located at the end of Pilgrim Drive, adjacent to Highway 92.

²³ Foster City Living Local City Guide 2014/2015 Edition prepared by the Foster City Chamber of Commerce. Page 7

²⁴ Access the map at: <http://tinyurl.com/fcrrd2>

- Triton Point is now under construction. It is the six-story 166-unit monstrosity LEGOLAND located behind the Chevron station at the corner of Hillsdale and Foster City Blvd.
- The Waverly, another high-rise, high-density development of 240 units, will soon appear opposite the Triton Plaza development and extending to East Hillsdale Blvd.
- The Sares Regis Triton Phase C project will be located in close proximity and between the other two very large projects. Sares Regis has been approved to build office-retail space and 17 townhomes but now seeks to swap out the office-retail for an additional “approximately” 50 for sale townhomes.

The Sares Regis development is an integral part of this high-density complex. They should not be permitted to add more density by adding even more housing than has already been approved there!

4. Residents want the City to take a breather on new housing approvals.

Over 1,700 people have signed an online petition²⁵ asking the City to take a breather on new housing approvals until the City is able to absorb and evaluate the impacts of the 844 units that have already approved since January 2014. This means NO MORE approvals at this time.



²⁵ Access the on-line petition at <http://tinyurl.com/fcrrd6>

5. Approving this new housing would be inconsistent.

The Current City Council has consistently refused to approve additional housing proposed by other developers, saying they want to assess the impacts of what has already been approved. It might be interpreted as favoring this developer over others.