



Item No: 1
Meeting Date: 10/14/2014

To: Planning Commission

Date: 10/6/2014

Authorized By: Ron Munekawa
Chief of Planning

By: Lorraine Weiss, Contract Senior Planner
(650) 522-7205 / Fax: (650) 522-7201
lweiss@cityofsanmateo.org

Subject: PA 14-055 STATION PARK GREEN FORMAL SPAR APPLICATION;
1700 and 1790 S. Delaware Street, San Mateo, CA; APN: 035-200-60,
035-200-180

RECOMMENDATION

That the Planning Commission review and provide input to the applicant and staff on the proposed Station Park Green formal application for Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR), Site Development Planning Application, and Tentative Subdivision Map, and revisions to the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The project site is located within the San Mateo Rail Corridor Plan's Hayward Park Station TOD (Transit-Oriented Development) Overlay Zone and consists of an approximately 12 acre parcel located at the northwest corner of South Delaware Street and Concar Drive (refer to Location Map, Attachment 1). The project site is the current location of the K-Mart/office building and the Michael's Arts and Crafts retail building. These buildings have a substantial amount of adjacent surface parking and minimal landscaping. The Shell Service Station located at the corner of Delaware Street and Concar Drive is also included in the project site. The subject property is adjacent to a variety of uses including commercial and office uses directly to the north; multi-family and single-family uses to the north and east; retail uses to the south and southeast adjacent to State Route 92 (also, the sites of the approved Hines 92 and Delaware Office Buildings); and the Hayward Park Caltrain Station and rail line directly to the west.

The property has a land use designation and zoning classification of Transit Oriented Development (TOD).

BACKGROUND

The original Station Park Green project including the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines were approved by the City Council on January 28, 2011 in addition to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration which was adopted on the same date. On February 24, 2011, the City Council and the applicant entered into a Development Agreement for the Station Park Green project including the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines.

On May 13, 2014, the Planning Commission reviewed the pre-application submittal at a Study Session for Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR), Site Development Planning Application, and Tentative Subdivision Map, and revisions to the Specific Plan and Design Guidelines.

Study Session #1

The Station Park Green SPAR Planning Applications were submitted in June 2014. The Specific Plan and Design Guidelines were amended to reflect changes to the original project (refer to Attachments 2 and 3, respectively). A number of Planning Commission Study Sessions are being held to review these applications. The first Study Session was held on August 26, 2014. The applicant gave a presentation that provided an overview of the design approach to the site plans, public realm including open space, parks, roads, paths, walkways, emergency vehicle access, and landscape, and general overall proposed architectural style for the four blocks included in the SPARs.

Eight (8) members of the public provided testimony. General comments expressed by the public included:

- Four (4) technologies were suggested for Station Park Green including: 1) solar; 2) grey water infrastructure; 3) EV charging stations; and 4) sewer recovery heat exchangers. Going green with all of these technologies is cost effective and the rate of return is good.
- I was originally opposed to this project but now I'm sold on it. All the questions I had have been answered.
- Are there issues regarding building of apartments and the drought/water shortages?
- Why is it taking so long to build this project?
- Are apartments or condos proposed? No townhouses proposed? Is there a community center proposed? May I have a copy of the project application packet, if possible?
- The original approval showed retail along Concar; There is more retail on the northerly portion of Delaware at the project site. How is the light going across Delaware going to affect the homes in 19th Avenue Park neighborhood? Can the retail be set back a little

bit more? Has the concept of stackable parking been considered to lessen the massing of the buildings?

- The project has more open space between housing which is good.
- The project should strive for 20% Below-Market-Rate housing. There are a very small number of 3-bedroom homes in this proposal. San Mateo has a lot of families and we could use more 3-bedroom units. What will increase the activity near and at Hayward Park Station? More housing.
- This is a great property in terms of location to make sure that transit oriented development (TOD) is built. This project still isn't oriented enough towards the TOD goal. It can be made even better to ensure that this will happen.
- The buildings should be recessed so that the buildings are not so imposing to the 19th Avenue Park neighborhood.
- A coffee shop would be a nice inviting place in this development on the west side of the project.
- What's proposed is greatly improved and getting better. How is this project adding value to the surrounding neighborhoods? It would be helpful to see renderings showing Delaware across from the 19th Avenue Park neighborhood in the future. Some ownership possibilities would be nice for the quality of life aspect for some people. The height and the lighting is an intrusion on the neighborhoods. Instead of lots of little entrances, why not one big one along Delaware?

The Planning Commission asked questions of staff and the applicant, answered questions from the public and made the following general comments:

- Supportive of the project and feel that it has enormous potential for San Mateo. There are constraints that have forced the developer to propose the current plan. However, when looking at an overhead view of this area, what we have are four (4) large apartment blocks. They are massive and that is a challenge. What is going to help make these four (4) buildings look more appealing?
- Not a fan of the pavilion structure in the park.
- Concerned with the building massing. The building in the southwest corner which borders Concar, going towards the Caltrain Station, is a long walk with nothing to look at except the apartment windows. There is a parade of stoops, perhaps, but it is boring. If it is too prominent, it becomes another object for the pedestrian to not take an interest in.
- Excited about the development of this project and like the pavilion in the park area. Concerned that the apartment entrances are not sufficiently recessed to provide an engaging public realm.
- An issue is putting all of the retail in Block MU1. Traffic along Concar and Delaware may not be as predominant if the retail is spread around a bit more. This really is an apartment project. Does adding a satellite coffee shop and club room really create a more attractive area? The club and fitness rooms are for residents only.
- The large blocks will need sufficient articulation to provide more interest.

- A lot of retail is proposed along Delaware facing 19th Avenue Park.
- Concerned about entryway from southern end of development into the train station.
- Curves rather than the zig-zag paths would be better.

The minutes of the August 26, 2014 Planning Commission Study Session meeting for this project are provided in Attachment 4.

STUDY SESSION #2

The applicant previously provided a document which includes an overview of the project and design approach that was distributed to the Planning Commission for the August 26, 2014 Study Session (Attachment 5). This project summary still applies to the current project. On September 19, 2014, the applicant submitted modifications to the plans based on feedback from the Planning Commission at the previous Study Session. See Attachment 6 for these modified plans; a description of the modifications is provided in Attachment 7.

Current Proposal

The purpose of the October 14, 2014 and October 28, 2014 Study Sessions are to review Blocks MU-1 and RES-2, and RES-3 and RES-4, respectively.

Table 1 below compares the originally approved project with the current proposal.

Table 1: Original Versus Current Proposed Station Park Green Project

Standard	Original Project – Approved February 24, 2011	Proposed Project - Submitted September 18, 2014
<i>Block Pattern</i>	12 blocks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 developed • 4 open space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 blocks • 8 open space areas
<i>Floor Plates</i>	Floor plates vary based on the block size. Footprints range from 4,000 to 78,000 square feet per building.	Larger floor plates as a result of change to block pattern. Footprints range in size - approximately 49,300 to 71,400 square feet per building
<i>Parking</i>	Underground	Enclosed above-ground/wrap around parking
<i>Retail use</i>	6 ground floor locations within site	Within a single block on ground floor at northeast corner at intersection of S. Delaware Street & Concar Drive
<i>Dwelling Units</i>	599 units maximum	598 units maximum
<i>Retail (retail, services,</i>	25,000 – 60,000 gsf	25,000 gsf – 30,000 gsf maximum

<i>restaurant uses) sq. ft.</i>		(27,693 sf shown on plans)
<i>Commercial Office sq. ft.</i>	10,000 – 45,000 gsf	10,000 gsf – 15,000 gsf maximum (10,426 sf shown on plans)
<i>Public Open Space</i>	2 acres	Approximately 2.3 acres
<i>The Park</i>	Approximately 1 acre	Approximately 1.1 acres
<i>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (all uses)</i>	3.0	2.3
<i>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (Retail)</i>	0.3	< 0.1 gsf
<i>Maximum Building Height</i>	55 feet (35 feet along S. Delaware Street)	55 feet (35 feet along S. Delaware Street)
<i>Minimum Setbacks</i>	Consistent with the Corridor Plan, buildings are not required to be setback from every street. Various based on Station Park Green Specific Plan and Design Guidelines	Various based on Station Park Green Specific Plan and Design Guidelines
<i>LEED Certification</i>	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) – New Development (ND)	LEED-Gold ND

Building Program: The project consists of four (4) individual buildings on an approximate 12 acre site. The four buildings contain a total of 1,254,276 square feet of area. Building MU-1 contains mixed use retail and office space at the ground level along S. Delaware Street and Concar Avenue, and residential units on levels 2 through 5 with parking provided on the interior of the building for all levels 1 through 5. A total of 27,693 square feet is proposed for retail services and 10,426 square feet of office in Building MU-1. The remaining three buildings, Buildings RE-2, RE-3, and RE-4, each include five (5) levels of residential units with five levels of concealed parking (“wrapped parking”) garage on the building interior. The roof top terrace of Building MU-1 includes outdoor amenities including a pool, spa, cabanas, dining tables, and barbeque for the residents of the development.

The residential component of the project consists of the following:

Studio units:	115
1 bedroom units:	323
2 bedroom units:	155
<u>3 bedroom units:</u>	<u>5</u>
Total Residential Units:	598

Parking: Parking is stipulated in the approved Specific Plan and confirmed in the approved Development Agreement. The proposed parking ratios and numbers comply with the approved

Specific Plan and consist of the following:

Specific Plan Residential Parking Requirement

- 1.0 parking spaces per studio unit
- 1.3 parking spaces per 1-bedroom unit
- 1.5 parking spaces per 2-bedroom unit
- 1.8 parking spaces per 3-bedroom unit

Visitor parking spaces are included in these residential parking standards.

Given the proposed mix of studios, one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom dwelling units, the proposed project requires 776 parking spaces, whereas 788 parking spaces is proposed, which is 12 spaces more than the parking requirement.

Non-Residential Commercial Parking

The Specific Plan includes commercial parking standards that are based on the total amount of commercial uses included in the proposed project as shown in Table 2 below.

Table - : Required Non-Residential Parking Requirement by Use

Use	Area	Parking Ratio	Required Parking
Community/Recreation Room	1,771 sf	.32/1000	1 space
Office	9,015 sf	.32/1000	3 spaces
Retail	25,316 sf	2.06/1000	52 spaces
<i>Total</i>	<i>36,102 sf</i>		<i>56 spaces</i>

The non-residential parking requires 56 parking spaces to satisfy the parking requirement. The proposed project provides 135 non-residential parking spaces, which is 79 more than the required number of parking spaces. Of these 135 parking spaces, 20 will be reserved for the proposed office space, 98 will be shared by the remaining non-residential spaces, 12 will be reserved for loading spaces, and 5 will be reserved for public car-sharing services.

The proposed project exceeds the parking requirement and fulfills the visitor parking requirement.

Shared Parking Program

The 130 of the non-residential parking spaces will also be used by the residential tenants during non-business hours and will be made available for guest parking for residential visitors. The five (5) parking spaces reserved for public car-sharing services will not be included in the shared parking program and will remain as such 24 hours a day all week.

As discussed at the previous Study Session, open space and parks are provided throughout the project site. Open space and parks remains largely the same with some revisions as noted in 'Current Project Modifications' section below.

Proposed Project Modifications

In response to the Planning Commission's and public comments at the August 26, 2014 Study Session, the applicant has made a number of modifications to the project. The following is a list of the changes proposed and is further detailed in their letter dated, September 16, 2014, and provided as Attachment 7.

1. **Massing and Lobby at Midpoint of Block RE-2 along Concar Drive:** A stack of three units was removed from the south side of Block RE-2. This provides a break in the massing between the eastern and western portions of the building. This gap offers a location for a more enhanced entry lobby with a full-height curtain wall on the ground floor, in addition to an enlarged landscaped exterior plaza.
2. **Block MU-1 and Plaza at Corner of South Delaware Street and Concar Drive:** The building massing at the corner of South Delaware Street and Concar Drive has been modified. There are no private balconies or decks on the residential units west of the plaza. This results in a tall glass element that highlights this corner site and its relationship to the adjacent public streets and surrounding neighborhood. The sign element has been adjusted in location and moved further away from the South Delaware Street façade. The landscape plan for the plaza has been changed to enhance this space and tie-in with the project's overall landscape design concept. The species of the large specimen tree in the plaza planter has changed from redwood to a deodar cedar with the possibility of no tree and a sculpture in its place.
3. **Block MU-1 Retail Storefronts:** The plans have been modified to show more variety in the storefront designs. In addition, the applicant will provide the Planning Commission a palette of materials, colors, trims, mullions, glazing, canopy designs, and sign examples to be used by retail tenants in order to provide variety at the ground floor level.
4. **Building RE-4 Massing along South Delaware Street:** The building at this corner of the building has been modified to be articulated with a more residential architectural feel.
5. **Planting Palette:** Tree species and plantings have been changed in the landscape plan. The revised plantings include the following:
 - Redwoods were deleted and replaced with Deodar Cedar.
 - Brisbane Box is still shown as the tree on C Street; however on sheet L-3.1 other optional species, Chinese Drake Elm and Peppermint Gum, have been added.
 - Cherries are still shown in the courtyards; however, optional species of Eastern Redbud for areas with more shade has been added and shown on sheet L3.1.

- While Cottonwood is shown in the rain garden, an added option species, Empire Ash, has been shown on sheet L3.1.
- A note on sheet L3.0 stating that species can be substituted with “encouraged species” as listed on Sheet L3.1 based on soil and groundwater conditions and that GLS would work with an arborist to make final selections.

The changes above are provided on sheets L-3.0 and L-3.1.

6. **Site Furnishings:** A new plan sheet, L-4.3, has been provided with the plan submittal to show the location of seat walls, general design of seating with backs and arms, and respective heights.
7. **Retail near the Train Station and Station Corridor Vendors:** In an effort to provide retail space near the train station, the ‘Club Room’ has been proposed in the lower northwestern corner of building RE-2 with utility services that could accommodate a future retail tenant. The Club Room has telescoping walls that open up to the landscape area in front of the building. Also, the applicant is proposing to place vending carts in the designated space in the Station Corridor Area adjacent to Building RE-2. The proposed vending cart location is shown on sheets A2-1.0 and L-1.6.
8. **Increased Car Sharing:** One additional car sharing parking stall is designated as part of the unassigned surface parking adjacent to Block RE-2 for a total of five (5) car sharing spaces. This is shown on sheet A0-2.0.

Material and color boards will be presented at the Planning Commission meeting.

ISSUES

Design Guidelines: The Station Park Green Design Guidelines contain recommendations for each of the developable blocks including the design intent, form, streetwall and setback, height, circulation and access, building entrances, building expression, and articulation and modulation. The essential purpose of the Design Guidelines is to provide direction to ensure spatial and architectural quality that creates a strong sense of place and enjoyable pedestrian experience within the development that connects to the train station at the Station Park Green project site.

The City’s Design Review Consultant and staff completed a review of the SPAR plans for consistency with the Station Park Green Design Guidelines. The City’s Design Review Consultant comments are provided in Attachment 8. The following specific Design Guidelines issues affect the overall building and site design:

Architectural Form and Building Style: The Design Guidelines indicate that building heights should be modulated as contextually appropriate to break-up building mass, create variety and visual interest and allow of penetration of sunlight and air. Facades should have modulation

and articulation to create visual interest and architectural diversity in the neighborhood. The facades of higher buildings should generally adopt a defined base, middle, and top as a primary modulation. Along Concar Drive the building articulation should provide variety, visual interest, and points of reference. Façade step backs, recesses, and projections should continue above the ground floor to create visual interest and rhythm. The Design Guidelines emphasize substantial architectural detailing, wall plane changes, recessed windows with articulated patterns, top floor building setback with a varied sky silhouette, and height variations and roof shapes to create attractive rooflines.

The project plans show eight (8) separate building styles proposed with varied forms, some have a vertical emphasis while other have a strong horizontal presence. While the proposed design offers some variation of smaller scale vertical building forms with the large horizontal blocks which could break the four large buildings into what appear to be several smaller buildings, the example illustrations and diagrams in the Design Guidelines show a different style and scale of architecture with more visual variety and façade depth than shown in the proposed building designs.

Ground floor Interface with the Public Realm: The Planning Commission provided feedback to the applicant in the previous Study Session that focused on the length and scale of the structures as related to the pedestrian experience in walking to and from the Caltrain Station. The pedestrian experience is relevant to the residents and tenants of this project and to all nearby neighborhood residents and commercial tenants. Ground floor uses, architectural interest and landscaping are important to the TOD pedestrian experience. The retail spaces are heavily oriented to the street with limited impact on activating The Park. The Specific Plan states that the project should provide retail and services for commuters using the train station and nearby residents. Some revisions have been made to provide additional retail by locating food kiosks adjacent to Building RE-2 on the Transit Station Plaza and a 'Club Room' at the northwestern corner of Building RE-2 which could convert to a retail tenant should one be found.

The setbacks along the residential building facing South Delaware Street and Concar Drive are variable. One generally accepted precept of transit-oriented design is that the ground floor uses, building design and landscaping should enhance the pedestrian experience by making the walking experience between one's living unit or work location and a transit station as pleasant and enjoyable as possible. Also important in the ground floor interface is the quality of the living environment for residential units adjacent to major pedestrian walkways (e.g., privacy and usable outdoor living space). The ground floor areas are the most important in reinforcing the pedestrian experience for transit users. The Planning Commission should discuss whether the proposed ground floor throughout the development achieves a pedestrian environment supportive of transit-oriented design.

The applicant has made some improvements to break-up the mass along Concar Drive, enhance the lobby entrance at Building RE-2 along Concar Drive and align it with the crosswalk, provide a landscaped exterior plaza in front of the lobby, and modify the architectural design of the

building on either side of the lobby. The ground floor conditions are variable for the proposed design. The area that seems most problematic is the Concar Drive ground floor setbacks and façade articulation. While, the indented façade section on RE-2 is an improvement and there is enough room for a good buffer between the sidewalk and private living space, there is little façade depth the building facing Concar Drive between Greenway and the Greenway (EVAE). There is also very little room at the southern portion of Building RE-2 facing Concar Drive for an adequate buffer between the sidewalk and private living space. The limited setbacks and façade depth could be addressed by some combination of increasing setbacks, reducing the landscape buffer between the street and the sidewalk, and/or modifying the unit plans to increase the façade depth and visual interest.

Retail Storefronts: The Design Guidelines encourages varied and visually interesting storefronts. Detail and materials should address pedestrian scale. The applicant has responded to previous comments made by the Planning Commission for some changes to the retail storefronts. While these modifications are an improvement, the proposed storefronts appear uniform in design. The applicant has indicated that they will present to the Planning Commission a range of varied materials, colors, trims, mullions, glazing, and sign locations to satisfy this criterion such that potential tenants can select and be consistent with the Design Guidelines and, if approved, not have to return to the Commission with an amendment each time a tenant improvement is requested.

Signage: Signs must comply with the City of San Mateo's Sign Ordinance, Chapter 25.06, of the Municipal Code. The Design Guidelines emphasize that storefront signage should help create architectural variety from establishment to establishment. In multi-tenant buildings, signage should be used create interest and variety. Business signs, including face signs, projecting signs and window signs, are encouraged to be oriented primarily to pedestrians. The signage shown on the project plans are meant to show where signs could be placed. However; the commercial and retail storefront signs will be reviewed by staff as each tenant submits for tenant improvements.

Staff is seeking Planning Commission input on the architectural form and building style, ground floor interface with public realm, and retail storefronts topics noted above. Specifically, the Commission should examine the following issues:

- Proposed building designs.
- The heavy surrounding frame shown on several of the buildings.
- The adequacy of visual interest within the bounding frame of the box.
- The provision of visual variety and architectural details on all the structures.
- The project's strong urban architectural form and character.

The Planning Commission should provide input on the major issues where the plans affect the overall design of the buildings, their form and scale. The Planning Commission has the ability through the SPAR process to use discretion in implementation of the Design Guidelines. The

Commission must evaluate whether the major issues noted above are consistent with the approved Specific Plan and Design Guidelines. The purpose of this feedback is for the applicant and staff to gain an understanding of the Commissions' primary interests in order to move forward with processing the application. A project may be approved even if one or more specified items or conditions are not satisfied, as long as the Planning Commission finds that the proposed design is found to be consistent with the overall design intent and goals of the Design Guidelines and the Specific Plan Amendment.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION:

In accordance with Government Code section 65090, notice of this hearing was published in the Examiner newspaper 10 days before this Study Session. In accordance with Government Code section 65091 and the City's Municipal Code noticing requirements, this hearing was noticed to the following parties ten days in advance of the October 14, 2014 Study Session:

- Property owners, residential tenants and business tenants within 1,000 feet of the project site;
- The City's "900 List" which contains nearly 100 Homeowner Associations, Neighborhood Associations, local utilities, media, and other organizations interested in citywide planning projects;
- The City's E-Notify Email list; and,
- The interested parties list which includes interested individuals who contacted the City and requested to be added to the project notification list.

At the time this Administrative Report was published no written comment was received on the project.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A Mitigated Negative Declaration was certified by the City Council on January 28, 2011 which tiered off of the San Mateo Rail Corridor Transit-Oriented Development Plan (Corridor Plan) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (August 23, 2010). Planning Staff and the City Attorney's Office are conducting the necessary background to determine the appropriate environmental analysis for the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). At this time, it has not been determined what type of environmental document will be prepared. No project conditions have changed since the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared.

NEXT STEPS

Following this study session, depending on the nature of comments provided, the applicant will incorporate comments into a revised set of plans and materials, and return to the Planning

Commission with a draft set of conditions of approval and findings for Planning Commission review and subsequent recommendation to the City Council.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Location Map
2. Station Park Green Specific Plan – dated July 31, 2014 (*provided under separate cover for previous Study Session*)
3. Station Park Green Design Guidelines – dated July 31, 2014 (*provided under separate cover for previous Study Session*)
4. Planning Commission Study Session Meeting Minutes – dated August 26, 2014
5. Applicant's Statement Station Park Green - dated July 31, 2014 (*provided under separate cover*)
6. Station Park Green Plans (revised) prepared by MVE + Partners Architects – dated received on September 19, 2014 (*provided under separate cover for previous Study Session*)
7. Applicant's Description of Modifications – dated September 16, 2014
8. Larry Cannon, Cannon Design Group, Design Review Comments – dated September 30, 2014

(Attachments 3, 5, 6, and 8 were previously distributed to the Planning Commission. They may be found electronically on the City's What's Happening page at <http://www.cityofsanmateo.org/index.aspx?nid=2808>)

CC (AR and attachments (hardcopy) via USPS First Class Mail)

Alan Talansky, EBL&S Development LLC, Property Owner & Applicant
Jared Eigerman, Dalton & Finegold, LLP
Gabrielle Whelan, Assistant City Attorney
Matt Bronson, Assistant City Manager/Interim Community Development Director
Ronald Munekawa, Chief of Planning
Gary Heap, Public Works Department Engineering Manager
DRB members

CC (Website link to AR and attachments via Email)

Interested Parties (if email address was provided)
Dennis Frank, Landscape Architect, Park and Recreation Department