

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
FEBRUARY 23, 2010**

APPROVED

The meeting convened at 7:30p.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, Vice-Chair Knorr, Moran, and Su. Commissioner Freschet was absent and excused.

Stephen Scott, Principal Planner, introduced new Community Development Director, Lisa Grote.

A motion was made by Commissioner Moran, seconded by Commissioner Su to approve the minutes of the Regular meeting of February 9, 2010.

Vote – 4 – 0 Passed

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Massey opened the public comment period.

Their comments included the following:

Holly Dietz, Afton, San Mateo
John Lyons, Bermuda Drive, San Mateo
Mike Manely, Aberdeem Drive, San Mateo
Mark Rau, East Grant Place, San Mateo
Michele King, 10th Avenue, San Mateo
Margaret DeWood, Magnolia Drive, San Mateo

- I am with the Delaware Coalition, and have concerns about the process of the Rail Corridor Plan. We feel we are early enough in the process to have a teamwork approach to things happening in this area. There is a sense of urgency because there are more projects coming into this area. We are not anti-development or growth in our area. We want growth to be measured and thoughtful. We want to see a cumulative approach to the growth in this area and a common sense approach to the analysis.
- I read the 2009 Housing Element on the website. The proposed development, according to my calculations, would be considered at 60 units per acre when we have in the existing neighborhood a ratio of 8.71 per acre which would represent an increase close to 700% or 7 times the density. Some people will argue we need more low income housing. But this document does not support that.
- I am representing myself as a resident of Sunnybrae. High density, traffic, sewage are all problems we deal with and it is not good for the neighborhood. One suggestion I have is when Kmart development goes through perhaps they could pay for extending

Railroad Avenue all the way through the back of Kmart over the 16th Avenue drainage ditch and behind the post office. It would another corridor of traffic besides Delaware.

- Sunnybrae residents have been complaining about the speeding traffic up and down Delaware & Claremont. Traffic is moving towards 9th Avenue or 92. The area needs another cross between 9th & 92. With all the development coming into the area this should be considered. 16th Avenue comes to mind as it is a straight street that comes through. Developing the Concar area will create more congestion in an already congested area. 101/92 is a mess. Can there be money to develop the drainage ditch to be expanded and fixed? Take everything into consideration as whole is important. Adding this much development will be a nightmare when it comes to traffic.
- I am a lifelong resident of Sunnybrae. I agree that redevelopment is good but how much is too much? As currently proposed all the developers who want to build along the Railroad Corridor want to maximize or exceed the allowable density. Take a look at the overall picture being proposed. It is too much. It will generate too much traffic. We do not have the infrastructure. The city has no control of state highways like 92 and 101 or Caltrans activities. Traffic jam exists every day now around Sunnybrae School. Families with children need cars to do their errands and transport kids to schools. The Planning Commission is the one group who can control what is happening. Lessen the total square footage of office space and housing units.
- I live in Sunnybrae. It is almost impossible to get to my home via Delaware between 3pm – 4pm when traffic is backed up in both ways. I worry about the density. You are almost doubling the amount of homes currently using this corridor. There are hardly any entrance/exits on Delaware. Making left turns now is almost impossible. This is going to affect Delaware from beginning to the end.

ITEM 1 – PUBLIC HEARING

- * **PA 09-065 BAY MEADOWS PHASE II DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ANNUAL REVIEW #4**, Annual review of the Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement, 2600 S. Delaware St. (APNs: 040-030-190 & -240).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement Annual Review is an annual review by the Planning Commission of the compliance of the property owner with the terms and conditions of the Development Agreement.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: None required (Not considered a project subject to CEQA)

The project site is approximately 83 acres. The project site is located at the southern terminus of South Delaware Street and is bounded by Saratoga Drive and the Franklin Resources campus on the east, San Mateo County Exposition Center on the north, Cal Train rail corridor on the west, and the McLellan Avenue single family residential area on the south. The project site is zoned BMSP (Bay Meadows Specific Plan).

PROJECT PLANNER: Darcy Forsell, AICP, Associate Planner
dforsell@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT: Genelle Ball, Wilson Meany Sullivan
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111
GBall@wmspartners.com
(415) 905-5300

PROPERTY OWNER: Bay Meadows Main Track Investors LLC
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111

Ms. Forsell gave the staff presentation, which included a power point presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for staff:

- Have there been any updates on the 3 railroad undercrossings? **Staff:** I am the project planner for Hillside Station Area Plan which is being funded through a grant through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). We are looking at the underpasses and the area on the west side of the train station. This will be coming to the commission in the near future and we are looking at the underpasses in more detail. As for exact timeline for funding we are anticipating to be the next underpass project on the Peninsula after San Bruno possibly starting in 2014. These underpasses are key to the access of the relocated Hillside Station.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- How does this tie into starting in the construction of the homes?
Applicant: We are preparing the roads that serve the pads of land that will be sold to developers. We anticipate selling Res 1, 2, 3 in the first quarter 2011. Depending on when the buyers come on line will determine the timeframe for construction. Movement into the site would be mid 2011 into the townhomes. Townhomes are 6-8 months construction period.

Chair Massey opened the public comment period for this item.
No persons wishing to speak, he closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Knorr made motion to adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2010-2
Finding that Bay Meadows Main Track Investors LLC has complied in good faith with the terms

of the Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement for the review period of December 21, 2008 to December 20, 2009 and seconded by Commissioner Moran.

Vote: Motion passed 4 – 0

ITEM #2 – STUDY SESSION

+ **PA 09-067 2000 S. DELAWARE STREET HOUSING PRE-APPLICATION** preliminary review for the development of 114-120 residential housing units; 2000 S. Delaware St., (APN: 035-320-120).

1.

The project site is 2.1 acres located on the western side of Delaware Street between 19th Avenue and Pacific Blvd. The project site is zoned TOD (Transit Oriented Development).

PROJECT PLANNER: Darcy Forsell, AICP, Associate Planner
dforsell@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT: Market-Rate Units:
Mike Wiley
Palo Alto Partners
909 Alma Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Ph: 650-470-4700
mikew@rossconstruction.com

Affordable Units:
Nevada Merriman
Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition
303 Vintage Park Dr #250
Foster City, CA 94404
Ph: 650-356-2915
nmerriman@midpen-housing.org

PROPERTY OWNER: City of San Mateo Redevelopment Agency
330 W. 20th Ave
San Mateo, CA 94403

Ms. Forsell gave the staff presentation, which included a power point presentation.

Jan Lindenthal, Richard Christiani, and Nevada Merriman gave the applicant presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- Seems like a lot of driveway for a few cars? **Staff:** The two driveways on the north and south property lines are required fire lanes. This was a mitigation point with Fire

Department. The driveways also provide garbage/recycling pick up and access to the guest parking.

- Did the fire department look at one access to the garage? **Staff:** The fire truck will not be getting into the garage. They asked for 2 points of access on the building corners. This was a compromise.
- Have we done parking like this before; 3 tandem in one stall? **Staff:** Yes we have done it in the past. There are two tandem stalls and one open stall.
- Ordinarily wouldn't code prohibit tandem parking but isn't this tied into the State Density Bonus? **Staff:** The State Density Bonus Code has provision for tandem parking as well as the Corridor Plan will require a parking study for this project. Most projects in the Corridor Plan do provide tandem parking. These are actively managed apartments and the tandem will be assigned to 2 or 3 bedroom units.
- Are these 2 buildings going to share a common stairway for fire exit? **Applicant:** Yes
- Why do you need 2 leasing offices if this is an affordable project? **Applicant:** The buildings will be financed separately with different requirements. The north building will be owned/managed by Mid Peninsula Housing Coalition and the south building will be Palo Alto Partners and will serve moderate income rate clientele. Historically in a 100% affordable below 60% affordability project there is minimal turnover, so there is not true leasing activity on the development, there will be waiting lists and we expect to have a fulltime leasing office dealing with the moderate housing. We are planning to have one management company for the development. But the leasing will be very different for each building.
- What will be the typical rent for a very low or moderate unit? **Applicant:** Building on the north will have 1, 2, 3 bedroom units. Average affordability now is at 45% of the area median income.
- Why is that the rent for a 2 bedroom unit much higher than a 3 bedroom? **Applicant:** For the tax credit financed portion of the project the maximum income is 60% of the area median income whereas for the workforce housing the moderate income component is 120% of area median income. At this time we do not have any 3 bedroom units in the moderate rate building.
- Do you have an idea of how many extra parking spaces with the new design? **Applicant:** We have moved the building forward into the setback on Delaware in order to get another row of tandem parking in the rear. We were able to increase the ratio from 191 to 220 so the new ratio is 1.75 per unit in parking. There will be 18 one bedroom units. Residents will get stickers and assigned spaces which we are doing for many of our garages.
- Was underground parking considered? **Applicant:** We are not dropping the podium to any level due to water issues and financial feasibility.
- There was another Mid Peninsula project reviewed with underground parking nearby. Can you explain why the parking is all above ground? **Applicant:** The water table is only 5 feet down so hydrostatic pressure will be on at all times and there is not an option of continued dewatering. It would be difficult to do with a low building. The environment

right now for affordable housing is extremely resource constrained. To fund the cost to go underground is more than what a project of this size can bear. There has been about a 35% decline in the amount of equity available in these projects. We have to prioritize where we will make this money available.

- It was the City's intent for this area to not have parking above ground.
- This driveway design strikes me as unusual and not comfortable from the pedestrian viewpoint. **Staff:** There is no on street parking for this site. This was part of the issue for the fire department to be able to pull the engine off the street and to have a specific designated lane for emergency response. The other issue is the trash/recycling pick up which cannot be done inside a parking garage. We can take a look at the driveways again.
- Guest parking on both sides seems inefficient.
- I want to understand what is going on street frontage on Delaware. Security issues have been raised for this area. How much glazing is there and how active would this area be in the evening? What kind of eyes do we have on the street? Will the street be visible from the units? **Applicant:** Commercial store glazing will be in the bottom area where the activity rooms are. It will be an active living environment to pedestrians walking along based on what rooms are on the bottom level. There will be a well lit grand stairway going into the courtyard. We are trying to break down the scale of the building with architectural elements.
- From the units above will you be able to see the street? **Applicant:** Yes, if on the balcony.
- Will you have to leave the building when leaving the fitness area? **Applicant:** No. The fitness room will have an interior corridor.
- Steps to the podium, is that an entrance to the building? **Applicant:** We pulled the building into the easement which will help activate pedestrian activity.
- Are these stairs open or secured? **Applicant:** This will be gated and secured. We will review this to be sure it is not inviting loitering. The way people tend to use this type of area is in a good way for neighbors to engage with one another.
- What is the level of security especially the pathway near the gas station? **Applicant:** At this time we are not showing this as gated. We would like to hear your reaction to this. It is the one way for pedestrians to get to the Hayward station. It is dangerous to get from the Arco station area over to Hayward train station. Ideally this would be a well lit place with public art so it can be used by residents and community at large.
- We should give you input on security? **Applicant:** Yes.
- Due to the flood plain is there an issue with the building base height being higher on the Delaware side? **Applicant:** Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is working on the new flood map. We have been having discussions with applicant and civil engineer already addressing this.
- Would the public spaces be required to be above the flood plain? **Applicant:** Yes. We need to have a better understanding of how it will look.

- Affordable housing can have a bad impression. What kind of people will be living here?
Applicant: There is a rigorous screening process for all residents which include criminal back ground, landlord reference check and more. We go through a much more extensive review than market rate housing. We are held to a higher standard due to the public investment. Every resident must be able to pay their rent. Once you get someone out to see an affordable housing project it demystifies the concerns about the type of people who live there. Residents in these types of housing programs are still earning a decent income but can't afford housing elsewhere. By coming to affordable housing it allows families to begin to make life changes like saving money for college for example which is why we provide services along with housing for after-school programs for example.
We expect these residents will be people who live/work in San Mateo area already.
- We were impressed with Peninsula Station. You are talking about a joint management structure for the buildings or selecting a 3rd party. I need to better understand the direct role MidPen will play to manage this site. **Applicant:** It is our intent to manage the MidPen building. But it is in both our interest to not duplicate management efforts. We currently do not manage any moderate income housing so we will plan to manage our building and collaborate with the other agency that have more experience on the moderate housing.
- Can you clarify that you are committing that this will be a moderate income development and adhere to the ceiling of 120% of the median? **Applicant:** It will be required for a 55 year term restriction that the household income be limited to 120%.
- This is not a market rate project. **Applicant:** Not in the true sense. "Workforce housing" is the new terminology representing an in between category representing people can't afford the high rents in the area and can't qualify for low income housing.
- Affordable housing is meant to be interspersed within a project and not segregated into one area. Is there a way to change the policy to address that the affordable housing is segregated? **Staff:** Our basic inclusionary policy 15% affordable and normal desire is to scatter them throughout the complex. In this situation we will have 50% units affordable so we are meeting the spirit of the program. The very affordable housing will be clustered. We are working with the City's below market rate (BMR) guidelines. These guidelines were adopted by the Council so it could be changed. Another way to look at it is through the density bonus and perhaps this could be a documented exception. It would have cost the city more money in subsidy money to get less affordable units. By splitting them we can take full advantage of all the tax credits and resources on one side and the moderate side could be more similar to a stand alone market rate project.
- What is the city policy? **Staff:** The normal policy for rental is 15% low or developer option that 10% can be very low. This project is closer to 50% very low. There are income restrictions throughout the entire project.
- Moderate units will have laundry facilities inside the units where the other building will have community style facilities. Will there be other differences between buildings?
Applicant: Specs will be identical for both sides. The affordable housing may feel more

spacious because there are minimum unit sizes for the tax credit financing. The finishes will be very much the same between the 2 developments.

- The first plan seemed to support ride sharing and school carpooling. If you do away with this drop off loading zone it could impact that benefit so I view this feature as a plus.

Chair Massey opened the public comment period for this item.

The following people spoke:

- Joshua Hugg, S. Humboldt St., San Mateo
- Robert Nice, Carlisle Drive, San Mateo
- Cheryl Hylton, Edna Way, San Mateo
- John Lyons, Bermuda Drive, San Mateo
- Joyce Williams, Marina Court, San Mateo

Their comments included the following:

- I live in Humboldt Square. I appreciate the previous comments about the importance to make sure things work together when developing multiple projects. I have benefited from the redevelopment efforts of the city. I was an engineer at Intel and found it very difficult to afford housing here. I have colleagues who have PhD's who cannot afford to live here and have to leave the area. So it is the entire range of affordability we are talking about. My neighbors represent the diverse cross section that is important to maintain a sense of community. I live next to teachers, postal workers, and city employees all who probably could not afford to live in this town if it weren't for developments like the one I live in and this one being proposed. Developing a transit oriented zone is very important because we have often designed for cars and not public transportation so this is an important project for the whole community. The Bay Area is going to continue to grow and we need to accommodate that in a thoughtful, sustainable manner.
- I live in Sunnybrae and represent the Delaware Coalition. We met with these developers. They are a good group doing good projects. But the question goes back to the Rail Corridor Plan and to approve or disapprove any project on its own merit is wrong. These projects must be viewed cumulatively. Traffic is a big problem. Drivers coming up Bermuda are more than neighborhood drivers. The gas station is very popular and problematic to traffic. You cannot walk to Sunnybrae School from this project. Density is scaring people in the neighborhood. This density is way above what we consider acceptable in our neighborhood. I blame the city for telling the developers they can build the maximum. We support development that meets with us and compromises with the neighborhood. We don't like how Delaware looks. But we will not support any development in the Rail Corridor Plan that has the 'z scenario' which is the maximum. It seems like the 'z scenario' is the normal level. We have a sewer problem in our town. Why are we building in this town when the infrastructure is not working? You

are allowing new development before you fix what is under the ground. We made a suggestion that the City open the back road to the Pacific Blvd. at the corporation yard.

- The City owns the land behind this space yet the project is coming right out to the sidewalk. Children need to have a green space area and not hardscape on a podium. The City is doing things in a piecemeal way and this is very frustrating. What is happening at the corp yard? It is time to let the commission know that there are more than just a handful of people who are concerned which is why you saw the numbers of citizens tonight.
- I am not clear about the motivation to have low income housing that will have reduced tax revenue.
- A few weeks ago at this meeting there was 120 parking for 120 units. I understand there is suppose to be 2 per unit and tonight I heard 176 parking and not 240. Is there any reason why we have gone to the maximum of 120? If you go to 100 there would probably be enough parking on site. Are any of these apartments going to be handicap accessible with handicap parking? FEMA flood plan has a new map coming out and if this is going to be in the flood plain I understand you will have build up and I am not sure I heard anything about that.

No other persons wishing to speak, he closed the public comment period.

The Planning Commission requested clarification on the following issues:

- What is the staff understanding of the future of the corp yard? **Staff:** I understand there is potential that the Public Works component may be moved to the Water Quality Control Plant but there is not enough space there to also move the Park Yard. At this point there is no relocation timeline. We will continue to look at this. We see there could be demand for this property as development intensifies. Neighborhood meeting brought up the idea of access through the corp yard but we found corp yard wants 100% secure site and will not allow access and pedestrian vs vehicular it is not wide enough of a panhandle to provide both.
- Is the City saying there is not enough low income housing? Do we have a need for housing? **Staff:** The bulk of the Housing Element report discusses the need for housing in general to accommodate the growing population and it definitely discusses the needs for those who cannot afford house. We have demographic data that people are paying too much for housing. We also have a large list of people waiting for housing. We have a 5 year wait to get into the BMR units.
- Can you clarify what the rules are and what will this project have to do to comply with FEMA/flood plain issues? **Staff:** There is uncertainty since the new and revised FEMA map is not released yet. We believe a higher first floor area will be required. The new map will have changed area and elevation will be higher. Building Department administers that; it is not significantly higher than current requirement. I do not have specifics at this time.

- The first level of inhabitable space must be above the flood plain and that would be true for any development in this area? **Staff:** Yes, but parking garage can be 'flood proof' since they are not inhabitable space.
- If you want to build in the flood plain you simply have to buy insurance? **Staff:** No. To be able to get FEMA insurance the City has to have regulations that don't allow you to build within the flood plain below the flood level.
- This is close to the flood plain border. **Staff:** We are looking at this carefully because we don't know for certain if this will be in the flood plain.
- Since it is commercial and garage on the first floor they can flood protect the garage and go through the design guideline with FEMA to get designed out of the flood plain instead of actually raising the garage pad up to whatever the FEMA elevation is. **Staff:** Yes. That is an option.
- A question was raised about disabled parking and units. **Staff:** There is a generous amount of disable parking in the garage and a certain percentage of the units are required to be accessible and in compliance with the American Disability Act (ADA).
- Am I correct in understanding Public Works is actively pursuing a sewer rehab to address the sewage overflow in the city and along Delaware and this program would be complete before construction would commence here? **Staff:** There are actually 3 projects that will help the current situation. Los Prados is close to final design on the other side of the freeway and it must be completed prior to Bay Meadows project; south trunk line that goes up Delaware and down Sunnybrae and across 101 which will alleviate any additional load plus mediate the current issues. Los Prados is planned for this year and the south trunk next year if not sooner. There is an existing cease and desist which has a time line by which these projects must be completed by.
- Page 5-12 of Rail Corridor Plan. "... a new 0.3 or 0.5 public park or plaza must be developed in this area". This park does not include this. Is there a vision for where this new plaza or park will go in this area? **Staff:** When there is a park out there it would help serve this project. When that policy was developed it was uncertain how this overall area would be developed. We can't get the corp yard relocated yet so we are unable to have a larger piece of land to work with. When the corp yards and the ATT yard can be developed is when we would be able to get a park in the area.
- I don't understand how the code works when there appear so few stalls for ADA. **Staff:** It will be in full code compliance when the building permit is issued.
- I understand a parking study will be done. **Staff:** For any project in Rail Corridor Plan we do require traffic and parking study that is site specific. Applicant did come with parking lower than the requirement based on their experience in other projects similar in size. We will be reviewing the data provided on other MidPen projects.

The Planning Commission made the following comments:

Driveways and site access

- We need as few driveways as possible. Too many curb cuts are not good.

- Completely eliminating a drop off area is not a good idea. Loading area should be considered. Not necessary to go with a landscaped island.
- 2 buildings and 2 leasing offices seem to drive the need for extra driveways. Fewer driveway cuts would be preferred and perhaps combine the leasing area some how. Better to keep it in one area.
- Alternative parking plan has an entrance that is almost the whole depth of the lot but if you take it put it on the north side you and eliminate the Bermuda Entrance to keep the drop off area the project would have 2 drive ways for queuing within the site on the north and south side. But we have to align the main garage driveway with the Bermuda signal.
- We are going to need to have 2 entrances to the garage. Looking at the north side is it necessary to have such a deep paved portion?
- I don't believe you will be able to only have one trash pick up location. Look at the trash pick up needs.
- We have done garages with only one entryway and one trash site so I wouldn't immediately say we must have 2. I don't necessarily want to have 2 service driveways if it is not required.
- **Staff:** There seems to be consensus that you feel there are too many driveways / curb cuts and you prefer to see the pull out from traffic for drop-off/pick-up eliminated but possibly redesigned as a duck out.

Preliminary design and site plan

- Delaware going west seems to have a good open feeling. Massing with the alternate plan is yet to be determined. I like the step backed roof. It reads like mixed use. The fact you don't see parking worked out well. It has a very simplified strong design element. This sets the tone for Delaware Street. I like the contemporary style building.
- I think it would be helpful to reduce the bulk to address the scale of the building. Project would be better with an underground garage to reduce the bulk and scale of the building. I find some elements of the design are a little disproportionate- the huge roof and gables are awkward. I don't believe the elevation ties together very well. I assume it is an open air garage and it will be visible so there is some concern about that. Even though the garage is not in front it's obvious the building rests on the garage since you can see through the garage on three sides.
- The design is going be very important for community acceptance. It needs to be excellent in design. Based on MidPen's track record with the other projects I have seen I have confidence we can make this work. I challenge you to look for excellence in this design.
- I could not figure out where the lobbies are so I think this needs more thought. The stairs are of concern for security issues. We have been so insistent on individual unit entries on other projects and this deviates from what we have demanded in the past. I am open to this but the trade off is to have more 'eyes on the street'. This project needs to look like it is occupied.

- I found it hard to get very much out of what was presented tonight. Overall this appears to be very preliminary so it is hard to react strongly to the design at this time.
- Massing and height will be an issue – even if it meets requirement we still have to be concerned about the look.

Other issues

- We have heard a lot from people in this area about traffic. Hexagon made an excellent presentation to us. Common sense says if we build more there will be an impact. Let's get this traffic study done quickly so if it is an issue we can address it at the beginning. We are already discussing details when it may be for nothing if the traffic isn't going to work it is not going to support the building.
- We are still feeling uncomfortable about traffic issues even though we have had the studies explained. Redevelopment of this site was included in the Rail Corridor Plan Environmental Report. We hear about queuing cars as a problem. It will be important to proceed that this is connected to the other development and it is not a good idea to extract it from the bigger picture.
- Our Corridor Plan on the whole will not work if we don't have the pedestrian / bicycle circulation set up properly.
- I need a better understanding of the Rail Corridor Plan and how it interacts with all these projects. We are changing traffic patterns by building transit housing.
- We are developing the highest density in these projects in the most complex traffic area of the Rail Corridor Plan.
- So if the Rail Corridor Plan allocates units to these parcels I assume this was looked at. **Staff:** This was looked at in fair amount of detail and will be happy to go over this with anyone who needs more detail. This is also an area of town where there are 2 train stations where we are trying to get people out of cars and into trains and make it more walkable.
- Rail Corridor Plan traffic study was more general without specifics of where things will be. For example we said in the Plan there will be a park but we did not say specifically where it will be.
- Sidewalk width on Delaware is the standard size with no buffer and it is scary to be a pedestrian along this way with the cars going so fast. So we need to give more thought on how this affects the whole area. We have yet to drill down to this level of detail. I do want to consider some buffering for the pedestrians along this area. Wider sidewalk width and buffering landscape would be an appropriate way to address this in this whole area. I don't want to be stuck with the current sidewalk configuration.
- Rail Corridor Plan called for a new park in this area and it is important to consider how this is to be met. This is a burden on the city; not specifically this project.
- How do we reconcile the complaints of the neighborhood about the auto traffic against the traffic studies? Why is it that Hexagon says 'no problem' yet the neighborhood has lots of concerns?

- We have heard complaints about the Rail Corridor Plan allowing high density development in this area. The city has an obligation to coordinate these things like the park. The community seems to be upset with the Rail Corridor Plan and this commission may not be able to address this but the City Council should address it.
- This development has been pushed up to the max by the Council to have this many affordable units on this property. They made this policy decision.
- We need to understand the overall circulation in the Rail Corridor Plan area. We are looking to staff to develop this information and present it to us. To develop this area to high density needs to be considered by the Council. This commission cannot address this effectively.
- Cumulative is the word tonight and it is essential to this whole discussion and the adopted Rail Corridor Plan. I agree our hands are tied.
- I am concerned about security and want to be sure Police have reviewed this. The area behind the Arco station does not feel like a secure or safe area. It is completely invisible anywhere else. With future development I would encourage opening it up to make it more friendly.
- How this is managed by the future owners will be very important to the neighborhood. If graffiti creeps in or storage on balconies occurs we lose the trust of the neighborhood so I would like future appearance and maintenance to be addressed by development agreement.

ITEM 3 - STUDY SESSION

+ **PA 09-072 CAL WATER OFFICE**, construction of an approximately 16,535 sq. ft. office building to replace existing offices and storage buildings, 341 N. Delaware Street (APN 032-204-240).

The project site is approximately 145,600 square feet (3.34 acres) and located on the south side of E. Poplar Avenue, between N. Delaware and N. Claremont Streets. The site is zoned R3 (Multiple Family Dwellings – Medium Density).

PROJECT PLANNER: Stephen Scott, Principal Planner
sscott@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT: John Kelterer
RBF Consulting
14725 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-2027

PROPERTY OWNER: California Water Service Company
1720 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95112-4598

Mr. Scott gave the staff presentation, which included a power point presentation.

John Kelterer, Rob Zirkle (Steinberg Architects), and Kevin Conger (CMG Landscape Architects) gave the applicant presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- Which entryways will be for public, employees, and trucks? **Applicant:** Along Delaware and Poplar will be for employees and service vehicles.
- What is in the storage yard? **Applicant:** Gravel, boxes, clay pipe, meters, repair equipment.
- It can be in the open? **Applicant:** An enclosed structure is not required for materials storage; however we will be providing some semi-sheltered areas for the efficient stacking/organization of materials storage.
- Why is the permeable paving specific to this little area only? **Applicant:** I have not integrated this work with the civil engineer yet who will locate these catch basins. The idea is it will go into the permeable pavers before the catch basin.
- What is material on the side of the building? **Applicant:** Trespa, a compressed panel from recycled wood products. It is a composite sustainable product. It is almost graffiti proof and is non-porous product.
- Will the middle area all be storefront? **Applicant:** The facility now is being used by the community as a polling place. This space is a great place to display water efficiency programs for educational purposes since the community comes into this building.
- Will the glass storefront go all the way over to the other side? **Applicant:** Yes.
- I assume you are doing a LEED project? **Applicant:** We are going to meet the LEED standard silver but would like to be gold level.
- Why redevelop on this site and not other sites? **Applicant:** It was discussed and Cal Water did look at other options and it was found that this site works best. All land on the Peninsula is expensive and since Cal Water owns the property it made more sense to redevelop here rather than go through site acquisition and all the other associated processes for another site.
- Was there any thought about future redevelopment on this site? **Applicant:** There has not been a discussion about future uses of the site, either with expanded operations or divestment of a portion for other development.
- I remember a discussion about drilling a well in San Mateo. Is there a vision that there may be a well or some other use on the site rather than what is there today? **Applicant:** This is not a good site for a well. Water quality is not there on this site.
- Existing operations will continue during construction so how will that work? **Applicant:** We have lots of room on this site and we believe we can get construction traffic onto the site effectively and continue operations during construction. The use of all current buildings can continue during construction.

- This is a huge site for your operations. Are you planning to have more storage on this site? **Applicant:** We may pick up more use on this site. This photo was taken at a time of day when the trucks were off site so it doesn't display well how the site is used.
- It would be nice to be able to keep the existing trees along Poplar. **Applicant:** They currently are all fenced off. The big trees that need to be taken off are not especially healthy trees. We feel we are replacing those trees with ones that will be more interesting for the pedestrian population than what is currently along Poplar.

Chair Massey opened the public comment period for this item.

The following people spoke:

- Allan Kornfield, N. Claremont, San Mateo

Their comments included the following:

- It's a beautiful site and sometimes invisible. I notice minimal traffic as a result of this particular business. My concerns are with regards to the new Peninsula/101 access and the construction work. I like the design of the buildings. I agree that this is a dark and ominous corner. I think the existing curbcuts need to be relocated from where they currently are.

No other persons wishing to speak, he closed the public comment period.

The Planning Commission made the following comments:

- This building does make a great statement for Cal Water. You have a fantastic team on this project.
- The building is going into the right spot on the site plan. Storage and parking for clients works very well. I like the atrium and glass which lends to a good feel for the public and the company. I like the bio-swells.
- Taking the use from the single family side to the public use side makes sense. The circulation makes sense. Elimination of the Poplar curb cut may be the only thing to consider in alleviating traffic on Poplar. My concern would be that it not be a chain link fence rather a fence that will allow a visible barrier so you do not see into the storage yard. Do we know what the fence looks like yet? **Applicant:** No. We are still looking at designs, including different style fences within the site. It will not be a chain link fence.
- I think the building has good use of materials and the 2 structures are tied together nicely.
- Seems like we should have more of a buffer along the south side where the single family homes are, so perhaps more trees there would be good.
- I like the public right of way concepts. I appreciate that staff will take a look at what is going on across the street with the Stanbridge driveway in relation to this project.
- I think you are aware of the security issues so any methods that can be used to address the security would be appreciated.

- I like the project. I like the landscaping.
- I think it will be a good addition to the community.
- The sitting areas on the walls along the water retention area are a good idea.

Item 4:

Because Commissioner Freschet was not available to be here tonight Chair Massey proposed that the election of the new Vice Chair be moved to a later date.

Commissioner Moran made a motion to move this to a date uncertain when all commissioners can be in attendance. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Su. Vote 4-0

Chair Massey gave recognition for Commissioner Knorr for his service. A resolution was presented to him on his last night of service to this commission. Commissioner Knorr thanked his fellow commissioners and staff for being good to work with as it makes the commission's job easy.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff

- a. Upcoming we have a neighborhood meeting on the public benefit for Station Park Green on 2/25 at the Marriott Hotel.
- b. A 16 unit Monte Diablo Condominium project will be coming for Public Hearing on 3/9 meeting.
- c. On 3/24 a public workshop on Hillsdale Station Area Plan will be held. We have we have a MTC ABAG grant for this.
- d. We have a vacancy on the Civic Arts Committee and we need a commissioner to fill that space.

2. Communications from the Commissioners

- a. none

3. Other

- a. none

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, Chair Massey adjourned at 11:40 p.m. on Tuesday, February 23, 2010.