CITY OF SAN MATEO

APPROVED

PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 12, 2013

The meeting convened at 7:30 p.m. in the City of San Mateo Council Chambers and was called to order by Chair Whitaker, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Those present were Commissioner Bonilla, Commissioner Hugg and Commissioner Moran, Vice-Chair Massey and Chair Whitaker.

A motion was made by Commissioner Moran, seconded by Commissioner Hugg to approve the minutes of the Regular meeting of February 12, 2013 with additional minor corrections.

Vote: Motion passes 3-0-2. Vice-Chair Massey and Commissioner Bonilla both abstained having been absent from the meeting.

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Whitaker opened the public comment period.

No one wishing to speak, Chair Whitaker closed the public comment period.

ITEM 1
PUBLIC HEARING

* **PA 12-065 BOSWORTH RESIDENCE;** Demolition of two existing single family residential units and construction of a new single family home; 3 and 7 Greenfield Court (APNs: 042-251-250 & 042-251-260).

A. Mitigated Negative Declaration to Assess Environmental Impacts.
B. Special Use Permit for the demolition (substantial removal) of two existing single family residences.
C. Single Family Residential Design Review for the construction of a new single family residence.
D. Site Development Permit (for removal of 8 Heritage coast live oak and 2 pittosporum trees, site development on a slope of 15 percent or greater, and site grading on a hillside).
E. Tentative Parcel Map to merge two existing parcels into a single 1.194 acre parcel.

The project site is comprised of two parcels totaling 1.194 acres located on the northern side of Greenfield Court near its intersection with Greenfield Avenue. The project site is zoned R1B (One-Family Dwellings "B") and the General Plan land use designation is Single Family Residential.

Darcy Forsell, AICP, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for staff:

- How was the building height calculated considering this sloping lot? *Staff: Staff read the building height definition from the San Mateo Municipal Code- Zoning Code.*
- Regarding the swimming pool: when the pool is cleaned and drained, where does the water go? How is it drained off? *Staff: the pool will drain off into the sanitary sewer system in a manner that doesn't overflow the system. There are also more modern pool treatment methods that use less chlorine like UV filtration systems.*

Andrew Bosworth, applicant and Jim Miller, architect gave the Applicant Presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- I wanted to clarify the newly proposed trees around the hot tub. Are these new trees shows on the plans? *Architect: Intent is for the height of the trees to provide additional privacy between the hot tub and adjacent residence. The hot tub is 24 feet to maximum height so the trees would be in the 30' height range. Landscape Architect: The proposed redwood trees would complement existing oaks and cedar trees.*
- The redwood trees can grow very tall and block the views. Is there a way to limit the growth of these trees so they do not grow so tall as to block the uphill neighbor's views? *Landscape architect: Suggest we study views to ensure we are not blocking anyone's views. Goal is to have a dense evergreen tree that blocks the view of the hot tub. Want to work with the neighbors to achieve the best outcome.*
- *What size are the three new redwoods- will they be 48" box like the other proposed trees? Landscape architect: yes.*
- What type of trees are planted? Going with what exists, like oaks? *We are preserving the existing oaks which are quite large. Then we are adding an understory consisting of Buckeyes and Redbuds mixed in with the oaks to add some color and lighten up the area.*

The Planning Commission Chair opened the Public Comments Period.

The following individuals spoke: Drew Maran, Palo Alto: Carol Reed, Belmont.

- I support the project. This home will be barely visible from the street, doesn't obstruct the skyline, the home design hugs the hillside, has compelling architecture.
- Too many "McMansions" today but this is not one like that.
- The home has a sustainable roof. Also being built for sustainability.

- I have concerns regarding this project: out of character for this neighborhood, impact on the slope and erosion of the hillside, will create a lot of noise, dust, etc., during the construction phase.
- I was never sent a notice about the project.

No one else wishing to speak, the Chair closed the Public Comment Period.

The Planning Commission had the following questions:

- The Commission asked staff about the noticing. *Staff: everyone within a 500' foot radius from all sides to this property was noticed and this includes residential and business tenants* in San Mateo as well as Belmont. *A minimum 300' noticing radius is required by state law, however, the City of San Mateo requires 500', which was done in this case.*
- The Negative Declaration addressed many issues thoroughly. Will require mitigation measures to be followed through Construction.
- City mandated hauling: *Staff: the city mandated that hauling will be on San Mateo streets only, not through Belmont. Trucks are also not routed on steep streets. For this project it will be Greenfield Ct to 42nd Avenue to Alameda de las Pulgas. Will monitor this carefully.*
- The truck hauling route is going to include some narrower streets. What is the potential impact of trucks going to and from the site during the commute hours? See there is a prohibition for pm deliveries but not am. *Staff: There is a Public Works condition regarding the hours for earth-haul that has been changed over the years. There used to be a morning commute hour moratorium but staff found most projects came in requesting exceptions because they had deliveries they needed to accommodate in the morning. There is accommodation for the end of the day but not for the morning hours. The Commission could elect to change this requirement for this project. However, shorter hours for truck traffic could lead to a longer construction period overall because there would be fewer hours for actual construction.*
- Are we allowing compression brakes? *These are prohibited for this project per the conditions of approval.*
- What is the amount of truck-haul from the site? *Staff: we estimate approximately 100-125 yards of off-haul. Planning Commissioner replied that that is roughly 10 truckloads and this might last approximately a week.*
- How is site drainage on the hillside going to be addressed? *Jim Toby, Lea & Braze Engineering, Project Civil Engineer: We have addressed this by designing a site drainage system that is two-fold: it collects the water it collects the water that runs off the building, brings it around the house in a controlled manner and then releases it in a spread out area. There is a large pipe 36" wide and 40' long that provides for a metered release and prevents the water from rushing out too fast. There is also a separate level spreader area so that once the water goes downhill it flows in a nice even fashion rather than a concentrated manner.*
- What about exceptional storms that overwhelm runoff systems? *We design for two scenarios: typically design for a larger (10-25 year storm) and that can be contained in the*

system based on the size of the large pipe selected. The vast majority of storms will be contained in the designed system. If the designed system fails or there is a very large storm that inundates the system, there is a series of overflows that bypass the metered release and the water gets distributed down the hillside but still in a very controlled and spread out manner. It would not be released in a concentrated manner.

- Please explain the borings that were drilled. Boring 5 in the front yard could not advance more than 6". *Architect: The site is underlain by Franciscan chert. The top of the site where the pool is now is extremely shallow. The drill ran right into an outcrop and was refused. How is that going to affect the design? Look at the location of the new home and 3 Greenfield Ct. We are going to be utilizing the existing excavation of the home at 3 Greenfield Ct and expanding it in some zones. What is under the existing house has been excavated down to bedrock. Boring #5 is not where there is new construction. It is where the steps are to the front of the house; also not where the green roof is. Area where you walk into the front of the house. The outcrop will remain and is quite stunning.*

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

- Live near the site but beyond the 500 feet that would prohibit voting on the application. Extremely familiar with the project site and construction on the hillside.
- Appreciate that the property owner and architect were looking to value the views. Very sensitive to protecting the neighbors views. Did not realize where the redwood trees were located. Will be asking staff with project sponsor input to add a condition of approval that examines the species of trees around the hot tub relative to the views so they are perhaps shorter. Redwood trees get really tall. Have seen a number of issues in the neighborhood about redwood trees growing too tall and blocking views.
- Very excited about green building including green roof. Do not have in San Mateo. Reductions in reduced greenhouse gas emissions have also been addressed.
- Was concerned about the hot tub but based on additional information provided am feeling better about it especially given the distance between the building and hot tub. No longer concerned about hot tub design.
- Staff has clarified that for this project we anticipate a reduction in operating emissions for greenhouse gases. Although the Negative Declaration is worded that it needs to rely on the City's Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction program to mitigate cumulative emissions we do not actually need to rely on that for the Negative Declaration.
- Overall the project is sensitively designed.
- It is clear the owners have tried to minimize the impact of this home to the hillside and surrounding neighbors.
- The owners have worked to create a design that works well.
- Struggled with this project but I like the design and the sustainability features, and that the design works with the hillside topography. There is a definite improvement for the neighborhood at Greenfield Court. However, I am concerned for the neighbors below. Even with the change in materials from level to level, the lower level looks like a giant foundation wall. It would be nice to break up that huge concrete wall.

- I am concerned that the floor area is nearly maxed-out: proposal is only 12.6 square feet under the maximum allowed. I support a condition of approval for trees by the hot tub on the property line.
- General consensus that the house will have a small impact on its surroundings.

Motion by Commissioner Moran and 2nd by Vice-Chair Massey to approve:

A. Mitigated Negative Declaration to Assess Environmental Impacts.
B. Special Use Permit for the demolition (substantial removal) of two existing single family residences.
C. Single Family Residential Design Review for the construction of a new single family residence.
D. Site Development Permit (for removal of 8 Heritage coast live oak and 2 pittosporum trees, site development on a slope of 15 percent or greater, and site grading on a hillside).
E. Tentative Parcel Map to merge two existing parcels into a single 1.194 acre parcel.

Vote 5-0. Motion passed with the incorporation of one new Condition~~s~~ of Approval to address the final selection of the three trees to be planted near the hot tub as follows:

FINAL SELECTION OF TREE SPECIES NEAR HOT TUB – The tree species of the three trees to be planted near the hot tub shall be examined in more detail as part of the final building permit landscape plans. The trees shall be changed as required by the Zoning Administrator to ensure the trees do not create future issues with the blockage of views. The landscape changes shall be subject to the final review and approval by the Zoning Administrator before the issuance of the building permit plans for construction of the new single family home.

This decision is final with the Planning Commission unless appealed as outlined in the San Mateo Municipal Code.

ITEM 2
PUBLIC HEARING

* **PA 12-053 California Water Service Bayshore District Office Building:** Construction of an approximately 18,184 sq. ft. two-story office building to replace existing offices and storage buildings for California Water (Cal Water) located at 341 & 345 N. Delaware Street (APN 032-204-240).

A. Negative Declaration to assess potential environmental impacts.
B. Special Use Permit for physical alterations to an existing public utility land use in a residential zone district.
C. Site Plan & Architectural Review for demolition and construction of a new office building

for Cal Water Service Company.

D. Site Development Permit for the removal of 8 trees.
E. Fence Exception to allow a 7 ft. tall wood fence in a required side yard.

The project site is approximately 146,778 square feet (3.36 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) and the General Plan Land Use Designation is "Utilities". The existing SamTrans bus stop is proposed to be relocated approximately 100 ft. to the south on Delaware Street.

Christy Usher, AICP Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

John Kelterer, Representative for Cal Water, introduced himself. Project Architect, Robert Zirkle gave the applicant presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- Can there be an interior lighting control system for the building that can be set to turn off indoor lights in areas of the building not being used after dark to avoid impacts to residents living in the vicinity? *Applicant: Yes, Cal Water is in agreement with the concept that interior areas of the building not being used after hours should not be lit to avoid creating a nuisance to neighbors, as well as, for energy conservation.*
- How will the new bus stop location be lit? *Staff: Ken Pacini, Public Works - Conditions of project approval includes requirements for street lights.*

The Planning Commission Chair opened the public comment period.

The following people spoke: Bertha Sanchez, San Mateo; Jack Wong, San Mateo.

- The proposed project is anticipated to improve the aesthetics, safety, and cleanliness of the neighborhood in the project vicinity which has been subject to a lot of illegal dumping, graffiti, etc.
- The Home Association of North Central San Mateo (HANCSM) Board of Directors took a straw poll and approves this project. It will help to beautify the neighborhood.
- Relocating the bus stop will help to improve circulation at the intersection of Poplar and Delaware. The proposed fencing will also improve aesthetics.
- The existing Cal Water facility will continue to service the community and would be suitable as an emergency operations center, if needed. This building already serves as a polling center during elections.

No one else wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

- Appreciate all of the changes made by the applicant since the study session to address the Planning Commission's comments on the design and fencing.
- Recognize is a critical functioning public facility in our City and having conference room space available to the public would be a benefit for the neighborhood.
- Suggest incorporating new conditions of approval to ensure interior lights are shut off after hours when not in use to ensure the facility does not "glow" at night disturbing residential properties in the project vicinity and to prevent "up-lighting" from the exterior light fixtures which could result in unwanted reflection or glare toward residences across from the project.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Massey and 2nd by Commissioner Bonilla to adopt

A. Negative Declaration to assess potential environmental impacts.

Vote: 4-0-1 Commissioner Moran abstained. Motion passed.

Motion made by Vice-Chair Massey and 2nd by Commissioner Moran to adopt/approve:

A. Special Use Permit for physical alterations to an existing public utility land use in a residential zone district.
B. Site Plan & Architectural Review for demolition and construction of a new office building for Cal Water Service Company.
C. Site Development Permit for the removal of 8 trees.
D. Fence Exception to allow a 7 ft. tall wood fence in a required side yard.

Vote: 5-0. Motion passed with the incorporation of two new Conditions of Approval to control interior lighting after hours and to prevent up-lighting of the exterior light fixtures as follows:

> ON SITE EXTERIOR LIGHT FIXTURES – Final building permit plans shall include specifications and locations of all exterior lighting fixtures which shall be subject to the final review and approval by the Zoning Administrator before the issuance of the building permit plans for construction of the new office building. All exterior light fixtures shall be so designed as to prevent up-lighting and ensure the lighting of the building does not exceed public safety requirements.
>
> INTERIOR LIGHTING- The applicant shall examine use of a lighting system that will reduce interior lighting in areas not used in evening hours subject to requirements of the Security Ordinance and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles. The interior lighting system shall be subject to the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator.

This decision is final with the Planning Commission unless appealed as outlined in the San Mateo Municipal Code.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff.
   a. On March 26, 2013 there is an appeal of a Zoning Administrator Decision.
   b. April 9, 2013 there will be the annual review~~s~~ of Development Agreement~~s~~ for Bay Meadows. We may do the discussion on the Brown Act and some other items.
   c. Ken Pacini updated the Commissioners on the status of the review at the intersection of Clearview Way and W. Hillsdale Blvd.
2. Communications from the Commissioners.
   a. Vice-Chair Massey indicated that he would not be here on April 23rd.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, Chair Whitaker adjourned at 10:40 pm on Tuesday evening, March 12, 2013.