

## Lorraine Weiss

---

**From:** Toni Dicapua  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 24, 2014 3:59 PM  
**To:** Lorraine Weiss  
**Subject:** FW: Station Park Green

---

**From:** Bev Kalinin [<mailto:bbkalinin@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 24, 2014 3:37 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission; Robert Ross; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; David Lim; John "Jack" Matthews; Neighborhood Asso.  
**Subject:** Station Park Green

To: Planning Commissioners, City Council Members, 19th Ave. Park Neighbors

Thank you, Lorraine Weiss, Senior Planner, for being at the recent Marriott meeting to discuss Station Park Green.

I write this letter as a forty-five-year resident of 19th Avenue Park, the community located directly across the street from the proposed new construction. We here are the backbone of our city: hard-working, tax-paying, parents. We are voters who choose our leaders with trust that they will fairly serve us by knowing and acting upon our needs.

I am not against housing and development. We all here live together on a precious strip of land between our wonderful bay and a great ocean. Time passing brings change. And change will continue. For this reason all of us here in San Mateo need be cautious and wary of these changes as they affect the future. Trendy phrases like "transportation corridor" require thorough examination. Also, considering the limited land space available for development, the matters of traffic, parking, and density require increased study. We residents rely on you to give our needs first priority on these issues.

Station Park Green, along with the Bay Meadows project and the future Hines development will create a negative impact on the traffic flow in the already over-crowded roads that feed Highways 101, 92, and 280. What is more, though many savvy residents use public transport, and will continue to do so, suburbanites have cars, no matter where they work. Further residents will continue to drive their automobiles as well, even while using the trains. And this will exacerbate parking congestion. Lofty terms like "pedestrian-centric future" and "stewards of the twenty-first century," were spoken by Ben Toy, Homeowner Association president who at one time resided in 19th Ave. Park, And though these comments were well meant when he discussed SPG, they sounded to me as if they belonged in "The Cloud," along with all stored computer files.

Consider density and height. SPG will have three, four, and five story buildings in it. Four is too much and five is out of the question. Any new construction within the past twenty years **which is adjacent to homes is no more than three stories.** The Marriott, as close to 19th Ave. Park as the proposed SPG, was originally designed to be taller; we negotiated and the City deemed it to be too tall. As a result the Marriott is three stories all around with one small middle tower four stories. The new complex on the old police station on Delaware is three stories in front. All the office buildings near the freeway are taller but not near homes. SPG will have office buildings and it is near homes. When I asked Alan Talansky, representative of EBL&S, the developer, about height he answered, "Maybe three or four stories on Delaware and five in the middle." Maybe.

Turning to "gifts" offered by Mr. Talansky to the 19th Ave. Park community. He would like to give us trees. Our well-established homes (track built 1955) do not need trees. If the EBL&S corporation would like to give a gift I suggest an appropriate one would be a guaranteed reduction of building heights from three to five stories to two to three, at most. We don't need 600 new living units in KMart's lot and probably not as many planned offices either. This would be a worthy gift to all the neighborhoods in the area.

There are other issues in regard to SPG that our city officials, especially you, Ms. Weiss, are considering. I trust that the May 13 meeting will reflect the serious, fair, intelligent, and conscientious work on this project that is being done by all our City representatives.

Sincerely yours,

Beverly Kalinin  
692 Edna Way  
San Mateo, Ca. 94402  
650 341 4491

## Lorraine Weiss

---

**From:** Joint <hyltonjc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2014 10:08 AM  
**To:** Lorraine Weiss  
**Subject:** Fwd: Here are many legitimate concerns our HOA expressed in 2009 document - they still seem quite relevant & important

<hyltonjc@gmail.com>

**Subject: Here are many legitimate concerns our HOA expressed in 2009 document - they still seem quite relevant & important**

### Station Park Green Project – EBL&S Developer

#### Delaware Corridor Neighborhood Coalition for Responsible Development

#### Question Quick Reference Section

While the contextual details provided in the complete text of this document provide essential background and substantiation for these questions, we provide them here as a quick reference to facilitate a timely response.

#### 1) Development Agreements – Questions related to both SPG and Hines

1.1) Please provide the terms for the development agreements for SPG and Hines developments when available including: a) dollar amount rendered by these two developers; b) timeframe allowed before building; c) City's determined use for the funds; and d) other relevant commitments made.

1.2) a) Do other peninsula cities offer development agreements? b) if so, how do they determine the length, dollar amount, and terms; and c) if they don't, why not?

1.3) What safeguards will the City implement to assure that the three to six yet-to-be-identified co-developers will deliver the promised product, attendant amenities, and the cohesiveness of design to the letter of what is agreed upon in the development agreement between EBL&S and City officials?

1.4) While Hines is the sole developer of the Dennys/Telecenter sites, what safeguards will the City put in place to assure that their completed buildings are in accord with the currently agreed-upon specifications?

#### 2) EBL&S Background & Experience

2.1) Could the City obtain written confirmation of what EBL&S specifically plans to do with the Kmart site after entitlement, including: a) how many developers do they currently project being part of SPG; b) is EBL&S going to be the “master developer” that they refer to throughout their August 5, 2009 documents; c) what are the specific short and long-term responsibilities of a “master developer” in completing SPG?

2.2) As the City enters a long-term development agreement with EBL&S, a) what is the structure and relationship between all of its subsidiary companies and their business(es) and b) how does the City plan to hold accountable such a multi-faceted ownership conglomerate and corporate structure?

### 3) Questions from SPG Specific Plan & Guidelines Documents 8/5/09

3.1) The 599 units may well include a few hundred children, the SPG plan includes no playground space. Is the City is concerned about this lack of child-friendly planning? If so, what will be done to correct it? If the City is not concerned, why not?

3.2) When and how will the city ensure the implementation of SPG’s LEED-related measures?

3.3) If SPG units are to be apartments, and such tenants do not make payments into an HOA, who will pay the association fees needed to maintain public spaces and provide the costly amenities promised by EBL&S and how will the payment of such fees be monitored?

3.4) How will the City prevent SPG/Hines residents, employees, etc. from parking in nearby neighborhoods?

3.5) On page 122, the SPG plan states that the City will allow the owner of the land to apply for subdivision maps creating separate parcels that may be further subdivided. How will the city monitor these levels of ownership and ensure that it does not create complications for the City or the coalition members?

3.6) Page 28 SPG Design Guidelines document describes six discrete gardens covering .7 of an acre. Does this plan seem realistic and practical to City planners? If so, please explain.

3.7) How will the City assure residents that both the Shell and Michael’s site (a former auto service center) do not need environmental remediation? If not, why not?

### 4) Questions from San Mateo Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented Development Plan (SMRCTODP)

4.1) What are the City’s plans to fulfill the detailed SMRCTODP specifications to narrow Delaware and calm traffic and to prevent it from becoming “El Camino East”?

4.2) What are the City’s plans to provide a theme intersection treatment at Delaware and Concar, and how will the Hines and EBL&S developers be asked to participate in achieving this goal?

4.3) What are the City’s plans for a continuous, safe cycle/ped route, since the SMRCTDP mandates a connection and direct cycle link between Bay Meadows and Hayward Park along Delaware?

4.4) What are the City’s plans to extend Garvey Way (a SMRCTODP specification), as the SPG plan does not stipulate this important link?

4.5) What is the city's position on allowing the Michael's store to remain on the SPG site when it is predominantly a destination (not neighborhood-serving) retail chain that will worsen traffic, parking, and requires 21,000 feet of valuable retail space?

4.6) How will the City ensure the SPG Specific Plan includes the SMRCTODP-stipulated 12 to 16 foot wide sidewalks along Concar?

4.7) Yearly trip counts are inadequate and easily manipulated and accurate technology is readily available. Will the City mandate: a) this accurate automated monitoring method; b) what TMA enforcement will be required to assure promised trip reduction; c) what are the specific consequences of non-compliance?

4.8) How will the City monitor TDM at SPG? Who will specifically be responsible for compliance created by its complicated structure (eg. multiple developers, apartment then conversion to condo, master developer, etc.)

Lastly, and in summary, the Delaware Corridor Neighborhood Coalition for Responsible Development respectfully requests that San Mateo's Planning and Public Works Departments, Planning Commission, and City Council require specific and substantive answers from EBL&S to these four (of a total of eight) Rail Corridor Plan goals:

- How will SPG be compatible with & add value to our three neighborhoods?
- How will SPG protect & improve our three neighborhoods' quality of life?
- How will SPG improve the traffic conditions in our three neighborhoods?
- How will SPG be balanced with the traffic circulation system?

## Lorraine Weiss

---

**From:** John & Kim DeWitt <jdwkdw@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 8:06 PM  
**To:** Lorraine Weiss  
**Subject:** PA14-020 Station Green Park Application

Ms. Weiss,

I attended the 4/15/14 community meeting re: the Station Green Park Project, PA 14-020. I live on Carlisle Drive in Sunnybrae. Two key points came to my mind that I wasn't clear how they are being addressed:

(1) Caltrain only stops at Hayward Park station only once per hour, both during commute and non-commute times, making the train very impractical for significant numbers of riders. The project proponent assured the crowd that the Caltrain electrification will happen and that then every train will be 15-20 minutes, and all trains will stop at all stops. From Caltrain's web site, electrification is planned for 2019. Is it clear that this project is funded and happening? The viability of this project using the Hayward Park station seems to depend on the electrification of Caltrain. The proponent made it sound like it was a done deal that electrification is happening.

(2) Traffic in the vicinity of the project has become thick, especially at the Delaware/92/ECR interchange. Looking at the 2010 Traffic study on the City's project website, I read the text to state that the traffic study included only 5 intersections, and not the Delaware/92/ECR. The text stated that this interchange was part of a larger study. I do think if another 100 cars are entering that interchange at peak traffic times, there will be further impacts. I found the proponent's statement misleading that the current business done by Michaels and Kmart generates more than the increased project trip count because the time of trips is not taken into account in that statement. While I agree that the number of trip counts could be well more under current situation that after project implementation, the timing of project cars leaving for work in the morning rush appears to add significantly to the current load on the Delaware/92/ECR interchange. Additionally, the traffic study was done in 2010, and used 2007 data because the economic conditions had decreased traffic in 2010. Has anyone checked to see if the current traffic calculations (4 or 7 years later) are matching estimated counts and projections? I understand projects get delayed, but the same economic forces that put development projects on hold and then restart are the same ones that affect traffic loads. And is the assumption that the Delaware/92/ECR is OK because it is out of the project area still a valid assumption? I see Caltrans has recently released a Draft IS for the 92/ECR interchange. However, Figure 5 of the Draft IS shows that the Concar on ramp is not included in the study area. My concern is that both projects are ignoring the other.

Please be sure these considerations are addressed as the project moves forward.

Thank you.

John DeWitt  
San Mateo