APPROVED

CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 10, 2014

The meeting convened at 7:32 p.m. in the City of San Mateo Council Chambers and was called to order by Chair Bonilla, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Massey, seconded by Commissioner Hugg to approve the minutes as amended of the Regular meeting of October 28, 2014, pass 5 – 0.

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

ITEM 1
PUBLIC HEARING
PA14-082 400 & 450 Concar (Hines) Off-Site Parking Agreement

Moved by Chair Bonilla, second by Commissioner Massey, pass 5-0, to continue this item to the November 25, 2014 Planning Commission meeting.

ITEM 2
STUDY SESSION
SUSTAINABLE STREETS PLAN

Kenneth Chin, Project Manager- Public Works, gave the staff presentation.

Public Comment
No one wishing to speak, Chair Bonilla closed the public comment period.

Planning Commission Questions

- What is the proposed Pedestrian & Bicycle Service Request Form? *Staff* –Public Works currently receives requests for bike racks, audible access for visually handicapped at intersections, or other pedestrian/bicycle improvements. There currently is a process to give these requests a priority, so Public Works would create a new service form.
- Fig D21 on page D25 covers Form-based design, screen designs, codes for land use? Can you explain further? *Staff* - Deferred to the Consultant to expand on the topic. *Consultant* - Form-based means looking at modes and designing specifically for the mode, designed for what the city determines is the priority use of that street.

- Address Street Zones, in particular Pedestrian Zone in relation to utilities – can we plan ahead to be functional and esthetically pleasing? Will sustainability and safety work together even though they are unique? *Staff* – Utility location above and below ground is a tough issue – there are rules about traffic signal box placement and we try to make sure it is not in pedestrian walkway. This is covered in Pedestrian Master Plan. Public Works has quarterly meetings with utilities and we proceed to the best of our abilities.
- Like the use of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) over Level of Service (LOS). Are there guidelines/triggers for VMT? *Staff* - Don't have those metrics yet, will develop, need comparable method.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) & Parking – This works in the Corridor Plan but extending TDM outside the Corridor Plan to downtown makes sense. May need to be throughout the entire City. Majority of city is not dense. What is the feasibility of extending TDM? How does the level of TDM affect City? *Staff - Tier 1 would be 25% reduction, Tier 2 would be 15% reduction and Tier 3 would be a 10% reduction. These reductions would be implemented in the form of both infrastructure and programs.*

Planning Commission Comments

- Thanks to staff for a comprehensive unifying for document, it was a monumental 2-year job and overall we are going in a good direction. Thanks to Citizens for contributions and participation leading to this document.
- Would like to see greater link with transportation and land use; Functional linkages, synchronization.
- Equity can be at risk with plans like these. Want investment without displacement. Improve land values, amenities so that all benefit.
- Great that this plan emphasizes VMT over LOS.
- Outcomes are better than outputs – schematics are great but need the overall achievement of permanent goals. Consider there may be a point where investment is not worth the impact it provides.
- Tiered zones – Example is Century Plaza that is a larger trend use of office space, recognize trend and consider this in infrastructure plans.
- Need to fund ongoing community engagement & communication.
- LOS & VMT – Very supportive of backing away from LOS, focus on real traffic. However, concerned about substituting VMT for LOS, danger is we end up with just a different one- dimensional approach. Can't look at projects with an eye to traffic and ignore what led us to LOS – traffic congestion and mobility. This is important to neighbors of new projects.
- Parking – Planning Commission always considers parking with projects and overflow to side streets. Unbundling is good, but negative response from public to reduced onsite parking. Support flexible approach.
- Need to provide for elderly & disabled – need more research in that area. Need to include longer crossing times. Consider more passenger loading zones.
- Street lighting, very important, many areas now inadequate.

- Mode shifts - where are figures coming from, how can they be achieved? Should put more focus on encouraging/incentivizing folks not to drive to work.
- Extended TDM - extending TDM to Tiers I and II is probably good, but given how much of the City's residential area is in the hills and the distance of many areas of the City from services concentrated in and near downtown, does it really make sense to extend TDM citywide?
- Road diet – Need research, would we create gridlock? Keep larger context in mind.
- Chapter 2 policy statements – ongoing periodic reviews good idea.
- LOS & VMT with TDM & Parking – right direction but have education burden regarding projects that propose change – public is concerned with traffic & parking.
- Applaud staff & citizens for participating. Looking at TDM regionally is great idea, especially how our community is evolving. Attract business, keep jobs here, and keep workers here.
- El Camino Real needs attention, needs to be attractive & vibrant. Want San Mateo to be a city others point to.
- Over time, transport may change, things are dynamic, need to revisit this document over the coming years, evolve with things that evolve.
- Vision Zero – great overall objective, good bold steps.
- 3 levels of TDM – Should apply to other City Committees and Plans; it will take realistic incremental plans to achieve. Goals are good to shoot for.
- Like reducing minimum parking requirements, even for downtown at least in a couple spots.
- Like increased opportunity for water treatment with green streets – encourage to use on more streets in the City.
- Ongoing community education is important to continue; the social component of the public Taste & Talk gatherings generated great thoughts.
- If we reduce parking in new developments it causes parking in neighborhoods. There are parking passes for overflow, but our ideal is to incentivize low car usage so everyone wins.
- Examples of parking oversupply mentioned in plan would be hard to find in San Mateo.
- Remember our quality staff is developing professional plans that are top shelf. See website to view past Taste & Talk meetings.

Staff wrap up comments

- Public comment window is open till Thanksgiving.
- Thanks to all commissioners for comments and input.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff
    a. Next meeting Tues. Nov 25 – Chair Bonilla excused, Commissioner Hugg recused – must have 3 remaining Commissioners in attendance for quorum.

b. Tues. Nov 18 at 7 pm - Combined Neighborhood Meeting at City Hall with Public Comments for all three projects at 3rd/El Camino Real.
c. Tues. Dec 9 meeting – all three at 3rd/El Camino Real projects will be on agenda.
d. January meeting agenda will have Station Park Green for formal action and tentatively Century Center Parking Garage formal public hearing.
e. Also in January expect the Grading Permit for Los Prado Park and a Joint Study Session with Sustainability Committee on the Climate Action Draft Plan.
f. February plan is to set Study Session on Central Park Master Plan. Staff will provide email updates to commissioners for all meetings.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m. on Monday, November 10, 2014.