

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 13, 2010**



The meeting convened at 7:32 p.m. in the City of San Mateo Council Chambers and was called to order by Chair Massey, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Those present were Chair Massey, Commissioners Freschet, Moran and Whitaker.

A motion was made by Freschet, and seconded by Whitaker to approve the minutes of the Regular meetings of June 8, 2010 and June 22, 2010.

Vote – Passed 4-0

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Massey opened the public comment period.

(No persons wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.)

ITEM 1

+ STUDY SESSION

PA 10-001, ST. MATTHEW CATHOLIC PARISH PRE-APPLICATION, St. Matthew Catholic Parish and School, 1 Notre Dame Ave, (APN 034-232-340, -350, -370)

The applicant has indicated that they will be requesting the following approvals during the subsequent formal planning application process: Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) for the design and construction of the gymnasium building and parking areas; Reclassification to add an overlay zone designation on the property to establish development standards for the campus, including the maximum allowed floor area ratio; Special Use Permit for the approval of a master plan to regulate uses on the site; and a Site Development Permit for the removal of major vegetation. An environmental document will also be prepared during the formal planning application process.

The property encompasses three parcels and is approximately 310,400 sq ft (7.12 acres). The site is located west of El Camino Real between Notre Dame Ave. and Aragon Blvd. The property is zoned R1-B.

PROJECT PLANNER:

William Wanner, Principal Planner
330 W. 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403
(650) 522-7208
bwanner@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE:

Brian Swartz
Cascade Consulting
240 Cascade Drive
Mill Valley, CA 94941
Phone: (415) 272-6897
brian@cascadecapitalllc.com

PROPERTY OWNER:

Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco
C/O Father McGuire
1 Notre Dame Ave
San Mateo CA 94402

William Wanner gave the staff presentation, which included a power point presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for staff:

- There were comments indicating that the community felt that the City would set a precedent regarding the overlay zone which would allow a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in excess of that normally permitted. Are there other cases like this, is this unusual?
STAFF: There are several overlay zones in the City, and their development standards all vary. The Serra High School overlay zone allows for more floor area than what is requested by St. Matthews. However, approval of an overlay zone is a legislative act, and in no way sets a precedence of any type.
- As to parking, clarify that the parking count on site includes playground? Are all spaces available all the time? Will they meet the requirement if not all spaces are available all the time? TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: We checked the number of spaces available throughout the day and compared it to the numbers of spaces that would be used for different activities, including noon mass. There are graphs in the report that compare parking demand with the spaces available. We would have to ask the applicant that if there is re-orientation of new spaces and restriping as part of the Master Plan, would they still intend to use part of the parking lot as a playground?
- Can the parking area also be used as a playground and a parking area at separate times? Do these dual uses conform to our code? STAFF: A lot of areas, mainly schools have this dual use. We would look at what is the actual use of this area during the school day. We probably have to put restrictions on the use of this area.
- What else is different between the community center building and the gym besides the parking issues? STAFF: Principally the proposed use of the building and the resultant parking requirement. It is about 1000 square feet smaller.
- Some documents refer to six special events per year and six special events per semester. STAFF: It is six special events per year.
- The elevations shown in the presentation, the east and west elevations reflect the original design with meeting rooms? STAFF: The gym building is similar to the original design; the applicant will make modifications based upon input from the Commission.

- The pedestrian signal with countdown timer, City or applicant pays for this? STAFF: The applicant would pay for this.
- We received correspondence with photographs of parking during church services, is that a problem or not. Are there legal concerns about the on site parking layout and use of those spaces? PUBLIC WORKS: There is nothing codified about that. However, police or fire may have issues related to emergency vehicle access. Some photos show people parking in crosswalks, which should be enforced.
- What about parking in red zones on their property? PUBLIC WORKS: If it's a fire lane, they should not be parking there. Some red zones might be for other reasons.
- How would the revisions to the master plan or overlay zone be enforced and how would that differ from conditions of approval in most projects? STAFF: Even with conditions of approval they are primarily by on site observation. If they are not conforming we would follow up similar to the method used with Serra High School. Issues are brought up at community meetings held two to four times a year, talked about between neighbors and church with a plan put in place to correct problems, then reviewed at the next meeting. The worst case is that the Special Permit can be called back for review by the Planning Commission. ATTORNEY: In the conditions of approval we add a statement that violations are municipal code violations, with standard code enforcement measures including administrative citation process, community nuisances.
- St. Matthews is said to be already over its FAR, how is that determined? STAFF: St Matthews located in an R1 zoning district. The FAR is .5 for the first 6,000 sq. ft. of lot area then is reduced to .2 for the lot area over 6,000 sq. ft. This type of FAR limit was imposed primarily due to concerns expressed in the 1990's regarding "mansionization" of San Mateo's neighborhoods, as new dwellings and dwelling additions appeared to be much larger than the existing dwellings. This is the only zoning district with an FAR that is reduced for larger lots.
- Because the site is in a single family residential zone, you are applying the FAR that would be used to evaluate single family dwellings? STAFF: Correct.

Joan Claybrook, Jim Walsh and Brian Swartz gave the applicant presentation.

St. Matthews made two key decisions: 1) to scale back the project, and 2) to work collaboratively with the neighborhood and staff to make best project possible. The school parents really wanted a gym that was adequate. There is now barely enough space around the perimeter of the building to allow clearance. We cannot have competitive games inside, it is too small. The only other element that still remains is one additional room next to the gym for before and after school care. We followed the planning commission and staff directions to reach out to the neighbors since last November and this pre-application process.

St. Matthews is very committed to improve parking and traffic procedures and to abide by the limitations included in our application, including the limit of simultaneous use; the gym/auditorium is locked and shut during mass.

The City's pre-application process provides a framework to receive feedback on this project. The proposed requirements for special events are acceptable to us. We are agreeable and ready to act upon all four recommendations of the Hexagon draft report. St. Matthews is also open to implement the following ideas from neighborhood outreach: closing the pedestrian gates between Castilian and Notre Dame, funding police and parking enforcement or private security during peak periods, working with the neighborhood for a parking permit program, and adding a neighborhood representative to St. Matthews parking and traffic advisory committee. We also agree with neighbor requests to tighten some of the wording within the draft master plan meeting some specific concerns. Our core value is to be a good neighbor.

Since June of last year we have sought to respond to all of the issues raised in the June 2009 staff report and the Hexagon report from 2008, which includes development of a master plan that can be codified into an overlay zone, work with neighborhood groups and homeowners associations proactively reaching out, provisions of onsite parking that meets minimum requirements and future demands, analysis of an underground parking garage, an evaluation of use and examination of the existing auditorium building including consideration of addition to the auditorium instead of a new building, and determining how St. Matthews can better use the existing building so that less new construction is needed.

We are also agreeable with the four new recommendations in the revised Hexagon report. The pre-application submittal and St. Matthews' future plans do not create any new uses beyond those that occur today. Want to ensure that available parking meets the City requirements and future demands per the use limitations. The current and future maximum use numbers, individual events will be controlled by use limitations. We are proposing to a ceiling of 625 students and 63 staff. St. Matthews currently has 2616 registered households on our mailing list. St. Matthews is willing to commit to add 110 parking spaces for a total of 308.

The proposed use limitations are: St. Matthews shall not use the gym or auditorium one half hour before or after Saturday evening or Sunday masses until noon. St. Matthews shall not use the gym or auditorium during 11 major masses. Any event or simultaneous combination of activities excluding the masses that are anticipated to draw more than 275 cars at any one time shall be considered a special event and limited to 6 per year.

The applicant's civil engineer spoke; examined provisions to provide additional onsite parking spaces and improve traffic and pedestrian circulation, reviewed the municipal code parking requirements and parking supply/demand. Because the auditorium and gym may not be used simultaneously, there will be less parking spaces needed per the code. Up to 110 spaces can be added to the site, accommodating all the parking needs for the non-concurrent use limitations. The project would improve parking conditions over existing conditions.

As to the question about are we proposing solely a school gymnasium? The building will be used for St. Matthews and elementary and junior high uses only. It is not to be used by any outside groups and shall not be rented out for non St. Matthews uses or used for any non St. Matthews events. St. Matthews will pay for parking enforcement to patrol the area during any special events and possibly during other peak periods. St. Matthews will also agree to a verifiable process that all buildings are to be locked according to use limitations. The City can impose fines in accordance with the municipal code.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- Regarding the recommendation of parking spaces at the bank across the street, is there a letter of agreement? Have you explored a contractual agreement with them?
APPLICANT: We beginning to explore this. We accept the recommendation to move to a more formal contract.
- As to performances in the auditorium, what kind of traffic will that bring? How many people can be accommodated concurrent with gym use at same time? APPLICANT: The only performances that have occurred historically or in the future are student plays, and musical performances. There is no intention to have concurrent use of the gym and auditorium.
- Is there some kind of calendar system in place to make sure St. Matthews never goes beyond parking the capacity? APPLICANT: Yes, the gym is used for practices during week and games on the weekend. The auditorium today is our multipurpose facility for dinners, pretty much everything else. That won't change. The gym is for athletics only, which we can control.
- As to non-concurrent use, what about weddings, would that be a simultaneous use? APPLICANT: Yes, we're happy to clarify that you can't use other facilities at the same time.
- As to hiring of law enforcement officers for special events, would this include larger events with larger crowds? For example the Guadalupe event could draw 800 people. APPLICANT: We're open to that, when a lot of people will come.
- The 11 special event mass days, six special events, that a total of 17. Plus large weddings and funerals, could they exceed this parking level? APPLICANT: If a wedding is over 275, that would be one of those six slots.
- What about musicals, dances? Applicant: If more than 275 then that would be one of the six. It could be any type of event.
- Why not put in parking now since its just restriping? APPLICANT: We spoke with the City about proceeding with the parking improvements. The City says we cannot because of CEQA issues, we couldn't bifurcate it. STAFF: That is correct. CEQA requires that the whole of a project be evaluated, not just a smaller component part.
- The new gym would be bigger than the current auditorium? APPLICANT: Yes, the gym right now is tiny.
- Why just have a gym other than it is bigger? Then, you could be having events in the auditorium and the gym at same time? APPLICANT: The auditorium today is a small gym.

In the new gym we can have two teams practicing at the same time; we currently have 32 teams and many practice off site due to space constraints.

- What are the odds that the auditorium might get more and more uses? APPLICANT: The possibility is rather small, because we are limiting it to only St. Matthews uses.
- The auditorium is used for parish activities also? APPLICANT: Yes. The required parking for auditorium in use is 125. All that could happen at the same time in the gym is practice. Also, the church is not being used at that time. There would be a surplus of parking.
- There will also be on-street parking? APPLICANT: Yes.
- As to weddings and special events, a funeral or other unanticipated service? APPLICANT: The only one that comes up is funerals. We don't have a perfect solution, if that does happen you can count it towards the six. We probably won't use all six, we don't have that many large events. We will stagger other events in case of funerals so they are not concurrent, perhaps cancel a game. In the last 10-15 years, the average funeral was 40-50 cars. The largest in my memory was last year. A student passed away, there was nothing else was occurring on the property. We should have hired traffic enforcement. We're open to suggestions on how to deal with them. The intent is not to do anything simultaneous with a large funeral.
- The church is agreeable to closing the gates between Capistrano and Notre Dame? PUBLIC WORKS: We would not support closing a pedestrian access way. This is against City policy of making San Mateo a more walk able community. A permanent closure would not be supported. For short periods of time, we'd take a look at it. APPLICANT: The idea from neighbors was closing it on a limited basis during peak periods. We understand that Public Works, Police and Fire might have concerns. We're happy to sit down with the City and explore the concept.
- Use of the gym and auditorium would be prohibited on Sundays until 1:30 pm? APPLICANT: 1:30 is correct.
- As to the recommendation to fence along Aragon, where that would go, what would it accomplish? Reference the Hexagon report page seven. APPLICANT: As to the ingress and egress, there are different thoughts whether it would work. St. Matthews is can go either way on this issue.
- The fence is so that people wouldn't park on Aragon? TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: Yes, to discourage parking on Aragon. The earlier plan had bollards that people could park and walk right through.

Chair Massey opened the public comment period for this item.

The following people spoke:

- John Hermann, Capistrano, San Mateo
- Richard Romero, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo
- Ann Ciganer, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo

- Mike Cunningham, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo
- Patricia Dwyer, Carmel Circle, San Mateo
- Deborah Miller, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo
- Seth Schalei, Maple, San Mateo
- Don Pheil, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo
- Cynthia Wilcox, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo
- Mark Wilcox, Aragon Blvd., San Mateo
- Florence Bulatovich, Capistrano Way, San Mateo
- Louise Levi, Castilian Way, San Mateo
- David McGruerty, Aragon, San Mateo
- Pat Hagerman, Mission Dr., San Mateo
- Michael Geller, Capistrano Way, San Mateo
- Kevin Cullinane, Fordham Rd. San Mateo
- Diane Honey, Valley View, Belmont
- Ann Olson, 26th Ave., San Mateo
- Gina Bartlewski, Aragon Blvd, San Mateo
- Phyllis Leonhardt, Sonora Dr., San Mateo
- Joanne Norris, East Capistrano, San Mateo
- Ellen Wallace, West Capistrano Way, San Mateo
- Miriam Chirko, Castilian Way, San Mateo
- Steve Ghiselli, Alhambra, San Mateo

Their comments included the following:

- I am opposed. The parking issue is still not being addressed. Changing the building to a gym and shrinking it by 7%, I don't see how it will work. We still have a significant parking deficit. I have concerns for parking, safety, access of emergency vehicles. Good intentions are not enforceable. My house is within 100 feet of St. Matthews. There are 200 signers of a petition against this proposal.
- I am next door to the church. There is inadequate parking even presently. Changing the name of the project has no effect, there is still inadequate parking.
- Following the April 2006 study session, as part of the Aragon mediation team we discussed special use permits. I am discouraged that the planning staff has not rejected the special use permit.
- I oppose the project. I have posted a sign in my front yard regarding parking. The project has been described as a gym and daycare center. Additional parking is needed. The Hexagon study reports that over 600 vehicle trips are generated every day during the school year. The two intersections are oversaturated. I came up with a plan for an entrance along the promenade and a drop-off area to solve the queuing problem. Staff said that we could not include this parking plan in the Hexagon report. There are 12 spaces on the City right of way. City code prohibits backing into a city thoroughfare. Those 12 spaces need to be deleted.

- I am disappointed. How many more meetings do we have to go to, our voices are not being heard. The majority of the neighbors oppose this. I called the bank across the street about a year ago and then six months ago. I don't know of any agreement. What if that lot is sold, that is not the precedent set. Serra built a parking garage. St. Matthews needs to build one. Because of the name change there is a parking requirement change? There will be more use. A parking structure should be built.
- I am disappointed in the recommendation to the Planning Commission to limit the hours to Monday through Saturday no earlier than 7 am to 6 pm. I want to enjoy my house in a quiet neighborhood. If the gym is school use only, then there is no need for evening use. I don't want to come home after work to sit on a committee to monitor parking.
- I was here last June. The original Hexagon study was done before a couple changes, the timing of stop lights and the conversion of Albertsons to 24 Hour Fitness. Since those changes, the traffic patterns on Maple have changed dramatically. If a study was done today, there is more increased use of Maple as opposed to El Camino as a thoroughfare through the area, including drop-off times at the school. It is not uncommon to have my driveway blocked on Maple. It really is about not wanting to pay for a parking structure. Please require a parking structure to allow for the proper parking utilization.
- At mediation sessions we asked for a definition of special events. Is there a definition at this time, and will it apply to anyone else?
- I am three houses away from St. Matthews. My driveway is regularly obstructed St. Matthews parents. I can no longer use my driveway or garage. My car was hit on the street by a St. Matthews parent. I complained to St. Matthews who said that I should complain to the police. The ongoing problems with illegal parking should not be my responsibility to report, nor should City dollars be spent to monitor this. Why are they allowed to repackage this? Last year it was determined that the project required 273 spaces. Now the plan needs no additional spaces. Don't let spillover traffic ruin our beautiful neighborhood.
- St. Matthews says they would scale back the project and work closely with the community. What you've heard from neighbors is that this project does not look scaled back and they are not listening to the neighbors. Their intent is not to have concurrent use or large events. They are asking us the neighbors to police this, who is going to report that? Are we going to have to call the police, this is unfair to the neighborhood. Ask that they add sufficient parking so neighbors don't have to enforce this.
- I am a representative for San Mateo United Homeowners Association. I have attended several meetings and am impressed with what people there have to say. This organization unanimously voted to ask that all City standards be upheld regarding the St. Matthews expansion project. This proposed increased building directly impacts the surrounding neighborhood and exacerbates current parking problems. This sets a bad precedent for future projects.
- I have lived there 24 for years. A couple of years ago my elderly mother very ill. I came home and while turning off El Camino I get one third up the block and traffic is completely stopped. I could not pass to get through to my home. There were mothers blocking the street to wait for school to get out. I was stuck there for 20 minutes. The

next day I called the school with the response, "It's out of our control, this is what parents do, and call the police." What if fire or paramedics need to get through? The church and school have not shown consideration for the neighborhood. This is not respectful. Let St. Matthews take care of their existing problems.

- 10 years ago it wasn't like this. We've been at this for several years now. No one has talked about the noise problems. I am concerned about new lighting shining in my windows at night.
- I am troubled by assumptions of liberal use of naming this as a K-8 gym so that they can have zero additional parking spaces, and just to be used during school hours. This campus does not fit that intent, nor the typical description of a K-8 school. There is adult basketball, and preparation for services, etc. Sometimes parents are coming in two cars. Require the 325 parking spaces that this multi use facility should have.
- My kids are no longer allowed to play in my front yard, it is dangerous. St. Matthews is a 4000 family parish. One Sunday I counted 400 cars parking on the property plus the surrounding streets. The burden of enforcement should not be placed on the neighbors and City. This is a dangerous precedent. The proposal is essentially same as the one you denied last year. We've tried to work with them, our ideas have been rejected. Hold the applicant accountable to the same laws as everybody else.
- I am in favor of the project. I have two daughters who currently attend, and another did before. I am a developer by trade. I am working with the owner at 9th and El Camino to work on the parking agreement. This is a kid's gymnasium. There will not be huge numbers of people coming to use it. The neighbors are concerned with current uses and parking problems. This process today provides the opportunity for everyone to sit down and comes together.
- St. Matthews is taking steps to improve parking. There are parents serving as parking monitors in the am and pm. Each family that has children at the school is required to serve six shifts per year, only 5% don't comply. There is a traffic committee to keep children safe. We make sure that all are aware of the school's policies and procedures, we send email reminders. There is no parking on Aragon at any time. In 2007 there was a reconfiguration of the kindergarten parking. Back to school nights were segmented to reduce parking.
- I have been a parent at St. Matthews for 6 years. At first I used to park on Aragon and Maple. I agree with the neighbors that cars were packed on both sides of the street. Later we were told that there is no parking on Aragon and 80% of parents complied. The parking system now in place works well, we like it, and it's easy and efficient. This past year every day I drove through and went out Aragon. That street has nobody parking on it any more from St. Matthews. Maybe there are 5 or 6 cars, mostly drop offs. That is something that is reasonable. I don't think we can expect 100% compliance. Closing off Aragon will not work. The El Camino light is 1-2 minutes; we will be backed up because the cars are coming so fast. You can't see around cars parked on El Camino. Don't close Aragon.
- I support the new gym. In the fall I will have 3 children at St. Matthews. El Camino as the only access point will be a dangerous situation, you can't see to the left of ongoing

traffic. It is difficult taking our children to outside gyms under the current conditions. I don't want that situation to clog the traffic flow and cause a bigger problem.

- I went to St. Matthews School myself and my children went there. My house backs to the alley on Notre Dame. Two weeks ago I went to the 5:30 mass, three cars were parking under a no parking sign, and one of them was an usher. People park wherever they want to park. There have been problems with ambulances and fire trucks. I agree with the statement, even if they build a garage, people will still park where they want. I hope they do not get to build this building at all. Whether there is parking or not there will still be problems.
- Thanks to parents for their efforts to correct the parking. However, if it was working, we wouldn't be here. The only comparison with Serra is that the applicant didn't want to accept a parking garage. Almost every week I am blocked in my driveway during church hours. I asked parishioners doing this if the church has informed them about parking, and they say they are not aware. Buildings are permanent. Once we get those buildings, what are the enforcement mechanisms?
- Is there any conflict of interest? Are any planning commissioners members of this parish? Will this be fair? Just because it's a church is it getting different treatment? If it was a supermarket, would we be sitting be here today? My concern is that this is done fairly. I have received several tickets for parking in front of my house where there is a no parking sign. I have had to call police several times because of cars parking in front of my driveway.
- When there is a funeral it is difficult to know how many are coming. It is not believable that they will cancel a game if a funeral attendance is unknown. Their intent is not enforceable. Neighbors will continue to suffer.
- I am a parishioner, my children go there. We saw what we were getting ourselves into when we moved into the neighborhood and that at times there is an overflow. This proposal is just for a school gym, nothing else, just for students of the school or school related. If you do the math there is only going to be ten kids per team. It's not that many people. If everybody drives you are talking about 40, probably a lot less than 300 onsite.

(No other persons wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.)

The Planning Commission requested clarification on the following issues:

- Address the public questions regarding conflict of interest and special treatment?
ATTORNEY: A commissioner can't live within 500 feet of the project applicant. None of the commissioners do. If a commissioner was employed or a consultant, also none. As to treating churches there is a federal law that requires us to treat churches the same as other applicants.
- Does the City have or can provide a fixed definition of a special event? ATTORNEY: There is no definition in our municipal code. We would define it in the special permit itself.
- The applicant has asked that we use the special use permit process for their special events. Staff recommends no, as this is very complex.

- As to the idea of a new entrance and routing for school traffic across from 9th Avenue, the City has rejected this? STAFF: We looked at it, and also the City's development review board. A new driveway would bisect the campus and remove buildings. There were issues with fire emergency access and turning movements. There would be quite a few complications and new signaling would require Caltrans approval. However, there are individual issues related to driveways that we can take a look at.
- The aftercare, is that only for St. Matthews students? APPLICANT: Yes, that's an existing use.
- As to parents who violate the parking plan, what are the consequences for blocking driveways? APPLICANT: Children can receive detentions. The principal calls parents.
- Notre dame Avenue being blocked, is that still an issue? APPLICANT: It is. At approximately 3:00, cars will line up before students are out. For 10-15 minutes you would not be able to go all the way down the street.
- How are you addressing that? APPLICANT: There was no suggestion from the traffic reviews that it should be changed.
- It was a suggestion from the Planning Commission. I have personally been caught there. Where is the current before and after school care done? APPLICANT: Outside unless it rains, then inside the auditorium.
- Regarding requests that the church look at measures to reduce traffic, with parents bringing multiple children to school? Has church done anything on that? APPLICANT: We are in the process of following up on that. David Parisi (applicant's traffic consultant) has been a leader in putting together these types of programs. As part of our application we will include traffic reduction measures.
- Also for the parish? APPLICANT: Our main focus has been on the school, although we could also look at parish operations.
- What's the applicant's response to the overall tone of the public comment? APPLICANT: we've tried very hard to collaborate with the community. The parking structure point came up. Serra has students that drive plus football games that bring in thousands. We're very different. We tried to focus on the findings of the traffic consultants; a garage is not needed. This application does meet the City municipal code parking requirements. We are adding over 100 spaces to be a good neighbor. We will add those spots with strict limitation on concurrent use of facilities and will add no new uses in order to improve the existing. We want to improve existing conditions, this plan does that.
- The report indicates that the school drop-off and pickup process appears to work reasonably well, but public comment disagrees. HEXAGON: It is an opinion whether it works well or not. Our observations are that a coordinated drop-off plan is in place and is being implemented every day. The monitors and cones seem to be working pretty well. Almost any school 15 minutes before and 10-15 minutes after it ends can be somewhat chaotic. My professional opinion based on schools in a variety of locations and environments, it that the drop-off and pick up is efficient. It used to be worse than it is and the school has worked to make it better. There could be more things done.

However, we would need to see how it would be managed with the new site plan as the parking would be completely reconfigured. Where the cars would be queued, how much queuing space, where students would be picked up. Since the site is the same size, adequate pickup and drop-off space could be provided.

- Sunday mass seems to be the critical point with existing parking not meeting the need. To what extent is 340 spaces is really enough? HEXAGON: We've made field observations on at least four Sundays or more to count the number of cars. It is not possible to be exactly accurate. We don't know why they are parked there such as those parked on the street. It's our best estimate of how many cars parking at the peak mass. There are at least three masses on Sunday. One has higher attendance than the other two. The highest is 340-350 cars. Clearly there are cars presently parked in the neighborhood. According to the church, they tell us there are between 1,000-1,200 attendees at that mass, with approximately four persons per car on average. Based on our observations and attendance figures we were given, that's the figure we came up with. A range of three to four people. Anecdotally, during that mass a number of people walked and rode bicycles. The reason we recommended bike parking because bikes were scattered everywhere.
- In calculating the parking, 198 currently, approximately 100 additional, 25 on Notre Dame, 40 in the lot across the street, 20 on El Camino. If nothing else is happening except mass, are 383 spaces adequate? HEXAGON: Yes, but while the physical numbers of spaces is adequate, the trick is to get them to park where you want them to. Recommend some program to somehow encourage people to park where spaces have been provided.

The Planning Commission had the following general comments:

- Staff provided a memo regarding findings that we would need to make. Specifically the Site Plan and Architectural Review. Can I make these findings or what I might need to change to get to yes. I found that I got stuck on the "not detrimental to harmonious and orderly growth of the city" and "not impair desirability of investment." Regarding the finding of a special use permit, this finding says that it "would not adversely affect the health safety or welfare of the community..." that is another place I got stuck in thinking about this project. This is an opportunity, it is an ongoing problem. There have been problems with other private schools to work with the school and community to find a solution.
- We want to end this conflict. What we saw tonight was a step towards that. The parish and school are offering more than a year ago. We consider feedback as two reasons Serra worked. They built a parking garage, and Serra wants to continue to add buildings so they need to continue to be good. Here St. Matthews is only looking for one building. The question for me is, are we going to require a parking garage? Can we require one and is a parking garage really the only solution? Maybe there is something here if we go for a master plan. Ask the applicant to show us how they can make it work, and then we'll let them build a building. The only tool to get there is probably the master plan.

- I have the same thought. St Matthews needs to prove to the community that they can do what they say they are going to do. This is not about the gym but a serious problem with parking, especially on Sundays. Once new parking is put in place, the 100-110 spaces might resolve some of the issues raised by the neighborhood this evening. We won't know for certain until the parking is in. Can we do that? ATTORNEY: To allow parking to go in first would need to be examined with respect to conformance with CEQA. We can examine that possibility.
- Can a broader approach to parking change before the building? STAFF: If that's a clear consensus on the part of the Planning Commission, we can figure out a way to accommodate the interest. Will it improve a tangible difference around the school? That's one alternative approach. We can talk to the applicant.
- I'm willing to see the City actually agree to a master plan contingent upon approving the building if the parking is situation is resolved.
- I'm not ready to let them build the building. The Serra plan was a phased process. There would be a discretionary action before the building was built. STAFF: There is concern that staff would have, what is that criteria to determine if the parking works. Staff would need to work out criteria to measure success.
- I like the idea of phased in.
- I agree with this approach conceptually. In order for St. Matthews to build this building, we have to approve an overlay zone. As we have been apprised by staff and counsel it is a legislative action. As part of that process we can and should insist that the parking problems be solved and an adequate amount of parking be provided regardless of code. Look at this in terms of a long standing parking problem that has to be solved. In departure from fellow commissioners, in other projects we use parking and traffic studies to determine what the requirements are going to be. That's a tool we should be using here, a more comprehensive study of the parking needs. A preliminary traffic study that in order to provide adequate parking for Sunday mass the church needs that external parking lot. I am concerned about availability of it for an indefinite future. There is the possibility that the site will be redeveloped. Is this external block really going to be available and if not available how will the parking needs be met? We need a better indication of what the parking requirement is. I agree with staff that if we put parking in first, how do we measure success? Look at this in terms of we're going to have to approve the overlay zone, which will require a master plan that includes that the parking will be resolved. Use same methodology used for other projects. STAFF: Hexagon says given the number of spaces including the off site spaces, that would probably handle the peak period now. It doesn't mean that people will use the spaces if there more convenient spaces are in the neighborhood. We can go ahead to work with the attorney to facilitate the parking improvements now. We want to make sure of no other residual impacts. We don't want to create another problem unintentionally. Look at refining the phasing program for the master plan and what stages each improvement has made. We will need to consider ensuring that the parking management plan and spaces are adequate. The master plan needs some kind of entitlement attached, we

need to work through this. We'd like to get some sense of the other issues. For example, non-concurrent use will help to manage parking.

- Show us you can do it without a garage, and then we'd be ready to do something without a garage. Otherwise we'll be having a conversation about a garage. I'm not sure a garage is the solution. The neighborhood is very unhappy.
- If they don't do this project, the 100 additional spaces would help but they will go away if the project is denied. The restrictions on concurrent uses are new from the previous application and are absolutely necessary.
- Regarding notes from the June 23 neighborhood meeting, the idea of exploring a residential parking permit program, has that been looked into? PUBLIC WORKS: We are not aware of it. A residential parking program is to be initiated by the neighborhood itself. There are a majority of signatures required. This is not initiated by an applicant.
- In areas that have a parking program has it been successful? PUBLIC WORKS: I am not sure it would help here. Usually they are sited in areas close to businesses with people parking for eight hours all day. This would not do anything about drop-offs or masses less than two hours long.
- The concern about Notre Dame needs to be addressed. Notre Dame Elementary had a similar problem. They stagger class times for getting out, keeping cars off the street. I believe that has been successful.
- I agree with my fellow commissioners. I really want to see this work. We ought to be able to get to a solution that will work. I'd like to see the gym that the school wants, and their need for it. The concerns of the neighbors are equally important. You can't meet one without the other. We need a more detailed traffic study, before St. Matthews changes configuration.
- How are the different facilities used? I would like to see a snapshot of the last year and what actually activities actually occur on site. That would help us in our decision making.
- How to fit in the cars or how to flow better or reduce cars. Give thought to all these things. Trip reduction methods and circulation alternatives, not just existing driveways. Is there anything else can be done? Can fencing or another tool cause people to not park in the neighborhood? Try to differentiate special events. The management program might include free tickets if you take shuttle bus during annual carnival. It is possible to solve the problem without a parking garage. I have heard how important the gym is.
- I see the sincerity of the school. I am sympathetic to the neighbors. There is a way to come together and resolve this. I am disappointed to hear so many neighbors speaking against it. There is still more work for the applicant to do.
- We want to be comfortable adding the gym without further impact to the neighborhood. What the neighborhood is asking for is that we have to be comfortable that the existing parking problems are solved first. STAFF: There is a broader discretion with an overlay zone. The Planning Commission has a little more discretion than with a SPAR.

- The proposal is to prohibit concurrent use of the church plus gym plus auditorium?
STAFF: I read it as, when the church is in use for masses, you can't use either the gym or auditorium. At other times you can use the gym and auditorium together. APPLICANT: Correct.
- We need an alternate to the Serra model. I still have concerns about the overlay zone. Where we might set the FAR if we implement an overlay zone. Set it based on coverage after the gym is built? The FAR couldn't exceed that in future? STAFF: Yes, you could do that.
- That seems to be what they are asking for in the master plan. STAFF: That's one of the reasons to suggest a master plan. It winds up being a FAR of .33. That is based on improvements designated in the Master Plan.
- What other input is staff looking for from us tonight? STAFF: Discuss the procedure for review of special events.
- I agree how cumbersome this process would be to require a Special Use Permit for every special event. However, given the present state of relations the City is going to have some kind of role. Maybe there's another process that could be used. When relations improve the City can back away.
- Special events at six, can you list some of them? Does this exclude items that are already established like the carnival? STAFF: The carnival would be one of the six. Any event that would have more than 275 vehicles would be a special event.
- Another option for parking could be valet parking for big weddings or funerals to get around the special use permit.
- There are more than six large events. "Special events" are to be something outside of what you normally do? APPLICANT: Masses are religious gatherings, not special events. We have no intention of having new ones, examples are the carnival. There are some very large masses that happen every year such as Ash Wednesday, when those events occur we are going to shut down the campus. Special events are not masses. Simultaneous events over 275 cars that would be a special event such as a large funeral or wedding. STAFF: We realize that we need to do some work to define that and what you do about those special events. We want to be more active with respect to traffic and parking management.
- We should also discuss the design of the building. The applicant would like some comments.
- I support the design consultant's recommendation that masses of east and west elevations to be reduced.
- I have never liked the design, I feel bad about that. I looked at the findings regarding "to be in scale or harmonious." The auditorium is beautiful with trees and landscaping, special for the community. The new building is simple and modern. I would be happier if it fit in better with the El Camino facades.
- I recall that from last time. Discussion to blend in with existing architecture, why has the proposed design not changed? STAFF: Compared to parking and traffic, there was not as

much attention paid to design at the last meeting. The decision was to try and resolve traffic and parking issues before addressing building design in any type of specifics.

- I'm not excited about the design. It's okay, not exciting. It doesn't fit in very well with the rest of the campus. That aspect needs more work.

The Planning Commission had the following closing comments:

- Thanks to everyone for working on this. Am optimistic that we can make this better.
- Hoping that people will keep an open mind to work together.
- Thanks everyone, staff, applicant, and the neighborhood. We think progress was made. We are hopeful a solution for all can be reached.

This being a study session, no action was taken.

ITEM 2 **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Motion to elect Moran Chair of the Planning Commission by Whitaker, seconded by Freschet. Passed 4-0.

Motion to elect Freschet Vice Chair of the Planning Commission by Moran, seconded by Whitaker. Passed 4 - 0

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff

- a. Welcome back to Chair Moran. We would like to express our gratitude to former Chair Massey for a great job. We are thankful for the work of the chair and the entire commission.
- b. Hines Office project was approved by the City Council yesterday.
- c. The next meeting is a study session on the General Plan and EIR. Then again at the second meeting in August for a formal recommendation.
- d. For August 10 there are no items yet but something may emerge.

2. Communications from the Commissioners

- a. As the new chair I am pleased to serve. I look forward to working with all of you.
- b. As the outgoing chair I thank everyone, you've all pulled together. Thanks to staff and my fellow commissioners for all your support and assistance. I couldn't have done this without you.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, Chair Massey adjourned at 11:25 p.m. on Tuesday, July 13, 2010.