

**City of San Mateo
Planning Commission
Minutes of the Regular Meeting
April 23, 2014**

Approved

The meeting was convened at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers and was called to order by Chair Massey.

Those present were: Commissioner Bonilla, Vice-Chair Hugg, Chair Massey, Commissioner Drechsler – late arrival at 7:35, Commissioner Whitaker absent and excused.

Motion made by Commissioner Bonilla and 2nd by Commissioner Hugg to approve the minutes of the April 8, 2014 meeting with changes as noted by Commissioner Bonilla: Page 2 second bullet on grade separation be funded and get started; Pg 3, 3rd bullet – This will be a model that other communities can look to as a project, the word that was omitted, insert the word “that”; and Item 2 Historical significance of the building has this been addressed?

Vote 3 - 0 Motion passes with changes noted

Chair Massey opened the Public Comment Period for items not on the agenda.

No interested parties wishing to speak, the Chair close the public comment period.

**Item 1
Public Hearing
PA 13-049 Espresso Lane Drive-thru Coffee Kiosk**

Cky Ready, Contract Planner gave the staff presentation.

The Commissioners had the following questions for Staff:

- What about parking for staff? *Staff: Applicant has met and exceeded Municipal Code for size of the site, number of employees for an highest traffic time with an additional loading zone area available 1-4 am for deliveries.*
- If employee parking is limited, do they designate some as employee-only? *Staff: No but since this location actually favors drive-thru or walk up customers we expect the parking to be used by employees. This is particularly true for prime AM hours when 3 employees may be working, but that number will decrease thru the day.*
- Can we review the pedestrian safety issues that Hexagon traffic analyst brought up at the January 2014 Planning Commission meeting - this included foot traffic from Serra High School students and other the safety issues. *Staff: Will let applicant speak to that issue. Applicant: Pedestrian safety has been addressed by installing bollards, using plantings to route foot traffic, installing bollards by walk up windows for safety, as well as colored pavement and markings to provide safe walking areas.*
- What is the material on the upper canopy that is a dark red? *Applicant: paint*

- How far in advance can utilities be moved? *Staff: Drawings for the City's intersection improvement project show the City will move utilities. The City now completing a response to comments from Caltrans.*
- Discussion of pre application meeting on topic of traffic control box. *Staff: These will be moved out of the sidewalk area so as not to interfere with the trellis but still have visual connection to the light. Sidewalk will be a full 10 feet in width on the El Camino Real side and narrower on 20th Avenue side. The boxes will be moved back and screened.*
- Concerns about the roof hanging over the sidewalk by 8', is that OK? *Staff: Yes, we discussed this with Public Works and it is rated for wind and at the proper height, Public Works views this structure as safe for this location. Fire department says the canopy meets their standards*
- Any consideration to retention of bathroom facilities, especially one that is Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant? *Staff: The existing bathrooms on site will remain and will not be changed to ADA compliant, but the one in the new building will be ADA compliant.*
- This is a good use of space. The seating area & tree maintenance is a question, is lighting adequate? *Staff: Yes, San Mateo Police Department has looked at this and the plan conforms to their requirements for lighting.*
- How does this applicant project coordinate with the City's project for adding the turn lane, widening the sidewalk, etc? Not clear about the documentation of land dedication and easements – do these fall under the agreements with the City or do we need conditions of approval? *Staff: we have been working with Caltrans, and the project designer; we have developed conditions of approval on land dedication. Counsel: Condition A.1 requires the applicant to grant the right-of-way to Caltrans within 60 days of planning application approval and condition A1.1 requires the dedication of the public access easement ~~and recorded with~~ to the City within 60 days. Have these 2 conditions been met? Counsel: yes*

Steve Patrick, Architect, gave the applicant presentation

- Plans have been modified to incorporate ideas from last planning session. Parking was added as well as handicapped ramps and a loading zone are now in excess of requirements so that we meet conditions for approval.
- A photometric study was done and we are now re-purposing the awning and retrofitting the canopy with LED lighting
- Bollards have been added, the curb has been raised with radius tapering on the corners
- The business sign design is curved like corner and it feels solid and substantial
- The small building in back will be kept and used as a trash, recycle and composting area
- ADA restroom for employees will be in the new building
- Although the City will be removing 4 trees on 20th new trees will be planted in keeping with site composition
- Pedestrian safety is addressed on this corner lot – due to the habit of people cutting thru this corner, we have created a diagonal swath thru the back of the property 4 feet wide for pedestrian use to avoid cars, etc.

- Different types of concrete, designed and with colors and cues will be used to increase safety
- Many accommodations have been made to account for widening of the street for the turn lane and sidewalk.
- We do want to work closely with the City on signal and utility boxes.

Commission had the following questions for Applicant:

- Plan looks nice now, be sure the bollard placement near the walk up window is set to protect people and not just the building. *Applicant: we saw the current placement as best for traffic but we can bring them further around for walk ups.*
- Are there also bollards on diagonal part of the pathway & near the planter? *Applicant: that is a raised curb area, so bollards are not usually used on raised curbs, we did not feel pedestrians were in danger there*
- SE elevation page 3 bench trellis & monument sign, is there an opening between the trellis walls? *Applicant, Yes, a pedestrian could jump out of the way if there was a vehicle concern. Safety is a concern we are always addressing*
- Will parking for employees & customers be sufficient? *Applicant: this is primarily a drive-thru and walk up, so we feel parking is addressed. During prime hours there may be 3 employees and that would decline later in the day. AM & PM trips per day and we would defer to defer to traffic consultant but we expect peak time usage at 150-170 cars, Sundays about 90 cars. Parking provided meets Zoning Code requirements.*
- What about the pervious paving? *Applicant: Maintenance and storm water on site will be handled, via inspection for silt buildup. Staff: This is a C3 project with storm drain inspection and all maintenance schedules that apply to such a project.*
- **Applicant comments on conditions of approval language and discussion by Commission, Staff and Counsel**
- Applicant – property owner contribution is not part of City’s consideration for Public Works Services. Transportation improvement – \$22,578 is new to applicant. We ask to strike 27.13.010A dedicating land for the improvement, should be part of compensation. Applicant wants full compensation *Counsel: this is exactly what gives the City the right to ask for the dedication is giving a credit for the Transportation Improvement Fee so that the value of the land is worth the value of the Transportation Improvement Fee.*
- Applicant: just to address 3.5 again, we want to be sure there is no overlap with Applicant’s project and the City’s Public Works project. *Staff: there is no intention for the City Project or Caltrans Project to be charged to the Applicant.*
- Can we add a sentence that the Applicant will not be responsible for any inspections associated with the road widening project mentioned in condition A1.0 Intersection Improvement project? *Staff: Counsel can work on drafting language while the commission looks at other issues.*
- Applicant: What happens if the value of improvements increases and as a result the 20% requirement goes way up? *Staff: Once the traffic mitigation is complete, the 20% dollar amount is a dedication fee required in exchange for the number of trips generated. The Applicant has credit toward a traffic fee for property that they are dedicating. 20% is*

part of the traffic mitigation fee program, it is an estimate done at the time of planning. It is a methodology only, developer pays on a per trip estimated cost.

- What happens if improvement fee is \$30,000 and they only have a credit of \$22,578. Can we say no matter what the fee is they get full credit? Just to be sure dedication is full compensation? *Counsel: we can take another look at Municipal Code.*
- Second concern is fire conditions sec 2.0 C2.1, is staff saying this will not require fire sprinklers? *Staff: Fire Department has reviewed for Fire Code interpretation on unit of this size, staff would not amend a Fire Department recommendation.*

The Chair opened the public hearing period on Item 1.

No one wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

- The awning is a concern with the size of vehicles, large Caltrans repair trucks etc. that travel El Camino, but the site is unique and this new business looks so much better esthetically than the gas station.
- Still concerned with pedestrian safety, having some bicycle spots; really like the seating spaces that are provided
- Be sure the backdoor where employees come out is safe and out of car traffic.
- Glad to see changes in the trees on this site
- Please label parking for employees
- In long run this lot is limiting in size & shape, this is an attractive business, well thought thru, hope it succeeds
- Applicant has met needs from the study session, it will be a nice addition to area, ties in well to intersection, applicant is contributing
- Condition C1.1 – as proposed by Assistant City Attorney:

C1.1 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT FEE – Municipal Code section 27.13.090(a) provides that an applicant may obtain a fee credit if an improvement is identified in the City's Transportation Improvement Fee Technical Report and the applicant dedicates land for the improvement. Here, the applicant's transportation improvement fee is estimated to be equivalent in value to the applicants agreed upon dedication of land for the addition of a turn lane on El Camino Real, which is an improvement identified in the City's Transportation Improvement Fee Technical Report. Accordingly, the applicant is entitled to a credit in the full amount of the City's Transportation Improvement Fee.

Motion made by Commissioner Bonilla, 2nd Hugg to approve.

Vote: 4 – 0 motion passes

Announcements/Communications

1. From Staff

- a. 4/24 Neighborhood meeting on Bridgepointe at the Marriott
 - b. 5/1 St. Matthew Bi-Annual Neighborhood meeting as required by conditions of approval
 - c. 5/5 City Council meeting for first reading of Reasonable Accommodation Amendments
 - d. 5/13 Pre App Planning Commission meeting for Station Park Green
 - e. 5/17 Saturday 9 a.m. until Noon – Field Trip tour of projects – Possible announcement for general public with tour of TODs
 - f. 5/19 City Council meeting for adoption of Reasonable Accommodation Amendments
 - g. 5/27 Planning Commission meeting 6:30 p.m. start time for pre application study session on Bridgepointe Master Plan
2. From Commissioners
- a. Can we address the trees at linear park in Bay Meadows? *Staff: the trees are specified in the conditions of approval, there is a difficulty in making a change, we are trying to work through this. Would have to bring that before the Planning Commission again. Assistant City Attorney: This is actually not on tonight's agenda, but to summarize - the applicant wants a change and this cannot be done without bringing conditions of approval back to the Planning Commission.*

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m. on Wednesday evening.