

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bonilla at 7:30pm. Those present were: Commissioner Hugg, Commissioner Whitaker, Commissioner Massey, Vice-Chair Drechsler, Chair Bonilla.

June 10, 2014 Minutes: Whitaker, Public Comment Period – first sentence “were any photos submitted prior to the removal of the large trees on the northeast corner showing the view from the neighbor’s property” Motion by Massey 2nd by Commissioner Whitaker Vote: 5-0

June 19, 2014 Minutes: Motion by Vice-Chair Drechsler to accept the minutes as revised; 2nd by Commissioner Massey. Vote: 4-0-1 Commissioner Hugg abstained having been absent.

The Chair opened the public comment period: Bertha Sanchez wished to speak.

- Housing affordability, rent stabilization, rent control, people trying to find suitable and affordable places to live. We have 10% Below-Market-Rate (BMR) housing units. South San Francisco has 20% BMR. I would like to have our Planning Commission and City Council to consider 20% BMR. Developers will come to San Mateo (SM) because we are a great place to build and live. I believe we can demand a 20% BMR. I do not want to see SM in a rent control situation but we have low-income people that need places to live. These people do not have 6-figure incomes. Perhaps some of the tech start-ups can contribute towards a fund for this purpose. *The Chair explained that the Planning Commission doesn’t speak to items that are brought forth in the public comment period.*

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

Item 1

Study Session

PA14-045 Century Centre parking Garage

Tricia Schimpp, Contract Senior Planner, gave the staff presentation

Tom Wagner and Elliot Sun, Harvest Properties, gave the applicant presentation regarding the purpose of this application. John Purinton and Hung-Gi Jeong, Watry Design, Inc., discussed the design of the proposed garage.

The Planning Commission had no questions for staff, applicant or architect.

The Chair opened the public comment period. The following people spoke: William Gekakis, San Mateo; Bertha Sanchez, San Mateo; Janis Stoner, San Mateo; and Laura Peterhans, Belmont.

- How many of the parking spaces will be taken by employees of the building and how many by visitors to the businesses?
- Nice to build a structure, a garage, instead of taking more land. Consider some housing on top of the garage. Be innovative. Should you incorporate housing, move the building to the corner.

- Is there any potential widening of highway 92 at that location? The parking structure is proposed for close proximity to the freeway. Parking on Mariners Island Boulevard is very tight. Perhaps having more parking on the site will allow more parking on the street for those who need it.
- Good having the structure/garage away from the basic street.
- Is 1 elevator enough? Perhaps a 2nd elevator should be considered. Is there going to be any additional areas provided by bicycles and motorcycles?
- I am a tenant of the building but I was unable to attend the neighborhood meeting I have had problems with the operation and management of the valet service. At times I have had car damage and also difficulty in accessing my vehicle. My clients tell me that they cannot park. Construction could take at least 18 months and 1/3 of the parking lot will be taken away during construction. Please force the owners to mitigate the existing problems now. I believe that the tenants have not caused the current problem but the current owners have. The parking problem has gotten progressively worse. More space has been leased out in the recent months. I don't understand how additional square footage could be leased out with the current parking problem? I don't believe that 161 additional parking spaces is going to be enough. My employees have been blocked in by the valets, leave the building to visit clients but are unable to find parking spaces when they return to the office. We need the parking but as a tenant would like the Planning Commission to work with the owners for compensation while this garage is being addressed.

Questions to staff:

- Do we have any jurisdiction over the parking issues? *Staff: Parking is based upon the square footage of the building. We do not regulate the population of an office building. Construction parking has not been addressed yet, but the traffic study will address how parking and circulation will be impacted. We will look at accessibility requirements for whether 1 elevator is enough. We don't have the information designating use of the parking spaces, employees vs, visitors. Providing housing – one of the issues is that we are .62 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) already. In looking at the other 4 office buildings, the Mariner's Island Specific Plan addresses – parking was not calculated in the FAR for the buildings surrounding this one. City Attorney specified that compensation is identified in the leases between the two parties and is not governed by the Municipal Code.*
- Applicant: we are working on guest parking and bicycle parking onsite in the overall plan. I do not have specific numbers for you this evening.
- Any proposed widening of highway 92? *Public Works staff: Nothing is currently planned. Along that particular section there is wide shoulders. Nothing in the foreseeable future regarding widening.*

Question/Comments by Planning Commission

- Tree selection – was there an alternative other than the acacia tree? *Architect: we have not yet come up with an alternative along SR92.*
- Increase in office intensity – what is the threshold that has to be crossed before a Transportation Management Analysis (TMA) is looked at? Adding parking is not a solution. *Planning staff: the formations of TMA's are usually called for in policy planning document, such*

as the Downtown Plan or Rail Corridor Plan. This could be a consideration with an amendment to the Mariner's Island Specific Plan. In addition, staff will initiate a revision of the City's Circulation Element in 2015, the issue of TMA's could also be discussed at that time.

- Compact spaces, how much is being proposed? *Architect: 28% of the 304 spaces are compact parking spaces.*
- 60 trees are coming out, from where? *Applicant: Preliminarily along highway 92 and a few smaller trees that are within the footprint. We are going to build very close to the current line of trees; these trees are not in good condition. There will be an arborists report in the formal application.*
- Because this building is on site 3 and not on one of the others, we need to approve an amendment to the Mariners Island Specific Plan (MISP). Are there any other properties located on site 3? *Planning Staff: A change to the Mariners Island Specific Plan (MISP) for this site will not affect any other sites.*
- Please look at something other than acacia trees. Something larger and fewer of them. Please get creative with the trees. The soil and the trees are not in good shape. Please look at the parking structure at Hillsdale between 31st and Hillsdale for what Bohannon Development Co has done along the El Camino Real. Be more sustainable, larger at installation and farther apart.
- Could the form of the parking structure be made to look more like the buildings it will be near? Step backs on the different levels?
- TMA should cover the entire MISP. Exclude covered parking from the FAR for this building. The need for this project is clear.

Item 2

Study Session

PA14-055 Station Park Green

Lorraine Weiss, Contract Senior Planner, gave the staff presentation

Members of the SPG group gave the application presentation. These included Alan Talansky, Station Park Green; Dorin Schoolmeister, Robert Rauscher, and Megan Dobroth, MVE & Partners, Architect; Gary Strang, GLS, Landscape Architect; Aaron Welch, Raimi & Associates, Environmental Engineer; Grant McInnes, ARUP, Civil Engineer; Jared Eigerman, Dalton & Finegold, LLP, Attorney.

The Chair opened the public comment period. The following people spoke: Laura Peterhans, Belmont; John Ebnetter, San Mateo; Russ Horvath, San Mateo; Bertha Sanchez, San Mateo; Kara Cox, San Mateo; Jeff Hylton, San Mateo; Cheryl Hylton, San Mateo; Chris Eckert, San Mateo. The Chair called for a 4-minute time limit on comments.

- 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?

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

The Planning Commission addressed the following questions mentioned in the comments:

- How is this project going to be using water? *Applicant: Multiple aspects are being considered. LEED-ND Gold will be water-efficient. The light fixtures will be highly efficient. The development program fits within the Rail Corridor Plan and the Environmental Impact Report. The landscape has been designed to be highly water efficient. We have a focus on many trees. Less than 10% of the site area is lawn and the plant palette will include more water-efficient plants and more drought-tolerant trees.*
- Can you address grey-water facilities? *Public Works staff: there are none at the moment. The Water Quality Treatment Plant was producing some recycled water at one time that was used for the golf course. The infrastructure for grey-water facilities is not in place; it is being looked at, but appears to be in the future.*
- Is there value in pre-facilitizing? *Public Works staff: Pre-facilitizing recycled water should be done city-wide. At the time we do that, we would put in the codes, purple-pipe, etc., for that.*
- Do some projects in the city have the piping for recycled water? *Public Works staff: the project that was approved with that was not built. There are state codes for this purpose and roof water can be collected for certain uses. This is something that is available by meeting some C-3 stormwater requirements. The difficulty in this area is the size of the area for collection as well as the rain water patterns.*

- What about the possibility of the city providing reclaimed water? Are we requiring anyone to do this? *Public Works staff: We have not gotten that far yet. The only reason it was used at the golf course was due to proximity to the Water Quality Treatment Plant.*
- Will these be apartments or condominiums? *Applicant: These are apartments, no townhomes or condominiums are proposed. Some apartments will have townhome street entrances.*
- What are the limits for increasing the Below Market Rate dwelling unit requirement? *City Attorney: The development agreement is vested to existing city laws and it provided for 10% BMR.*
- What is the possibility of more train stops at Hayward Park Station in the future? *Public Works staff: This station was on the list to close and because of the Station Park Green development we were able to argue that it remain. This is constantly being reevaluated by Caltrain for ridership. At the present time, Caltrain does not feel they would get the ridership, but after Station Park Green is built and if counts change, they could redo the schedule. Applicant: Within 2-3 years after the project is built, we should see electrification as this allows trains to stop/start faster. With electric trains, smaller train sets are available, thereby allowing for more frequent stops. More usage should happen once Station Park Green and Hines have construction complete...*
- What is the building and setback along Delaware and what is the building height? *Applicant: We will go into more detail once we get to discussions on that particular aspect of the project. 35' height maximum with 40' depth off of Delaware is proposed*
- Parking was referred to as being too massive. *Applicant: Parking is completely enclosed within the building envelope. Each building has a level of parking for each level of residential use. Every resident parks at the same level as their apartment is located. From the outside street view, the garages will never be seen.*
- Will dogs be allowed on site and will there be amenities? *Applicant: Yes, dogs will be allowed. The restrictions regarding a dog park have not been decided upon yet. There will be dispensers for them. There will probably be a defined, enclosed area for off-leash dogs.*
- Is the swimming pool area located in Block ME-1 available for all residents? *Applicant: The swimming pool will be a common amenity for residents of Station Park Green only.*
- Will play structures be installed in the designated open space areas? *Applicant: We do not have specific structures planned, though, we do have various play areas proposed at ground level to encourage play.*
- There is an area of solid concrete wall. Every two years a homeless count is conducted. This area is perfect for the homeless. *Applicant: This is private property and people sleeping over in the park will not be allowed. The proposed lighting and security requirements should take care of this issue.*
- Are the pavers permeable? *Applicant: Soil conditions are not always suitable for the use of permeable pavers. There will be pavers, but the soil underneath is not completely permeable and we will be providing something in its place. There is an issue with the fact that this project is on bay mud. There won't be deep penetration because of this type of soil.*
- Park seating for seniors is important. Have you considered people being able to walk through this complex from Delaware to the train station? Walkability for seniors in this project is a concern. Single level living for seniors is good. *Applicant: Each of these buildings has at least*

two elevators. Parking for these units typically happens at the same level as the apartment. The entire building is entirely handicap accessible.

- Adding more benches and seating areas would benefit the project. There appears to be a bit of a disconnect between the plans and the renderings we received.
- Signage should be incorporated into the design to educate people regarding way-finding around the development. *Applicant: working on it.*
- Is there any way of incorporating a farmer's market into the park area? *Applicant: Yes, we have a pavillion area where a small farmer's market would work. Any farmer's market will be strictly for the residents of this complex. It would not be a large scale farmer's market such as at the College of San Mateo.*
- Is the proposed circulation system consistent with the City's Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan? *Planning Staff: The circulation proposed is conceptual and a more detailed design is necessary for submittal; however, the circulation is generally consistent with the City's Pedestrian/Bicycle Master Plan.*
- Is there bike-sharing proposed? *Applicant: We are working on it. We would make a facility available for bike sharing. A lot of bike parking is being incorporated but bike sharing is possible.*
- Specific type of retail types have been discussed and how to incentivize specific types. A mix of retail uses is acceptable to this area. *Applicant: Retail is unique and unless you have tenants who want to be there, you cannot really incentivize. We feel that a small deli, coffee shop, and small dry cleaners, are the type of businesses that would fit in this area. A comment letter indicated that a coffee shop located near the Hayward Park Station would benefit train commuters. Applicant: A stand-alone coffee shop closer to the train station would fail. In the retail area of this project, there are some coffee shops that have indicated a desire to be in our project. We want a strong mix of community-serving retail services.*
- Are there any safety concerns with the flush sidewalk surrounding The Park? *Applicant: Warning pavers would be installed that signify the area between the roadway and The Park. Bollards are proposed in areas where people might cut corners. None are proposed on the straighter flat areas where people want to walk around.*
- Number of trees: 305 new trees are proposed and shown in one document, though, 250 trees are noted in another document. Which figure is correct? *Applicant: 305 which includes the bamboo.*
- Do all buildings have parking on the roof? *Applicant: All buildings, except MU-1 which has a pool on the roof.*
- Five (5) parking spaces along Concar. *Applicant: The 5 spaces on Concar are included in the non-residential spaces.*
- Why do you need the through-block connection from Delaware, when only a few steps north you have the street/sidewalk entrance? *Applicant: The specific plan called for the through-block connection. This area gives people a place to meet. It has always been there.*
- There was a concern of whether this walk-through was covered or open. *Applicant: It is mostly open to the sky.*
- Please clarify the use of the club space. *Applicant: It is envisioned that the club space has a combination of functions: seating groups, TV's, fireplace, meeting areas, and an open kitchen to share. All of these uses would be open to the perimeter.*

- What is the half-moon shaped cut-out at the northwest corner of the property? *Applicant: This location is a cul-de-sac owned by the City and we are hoping the City will declare it abandoned so that we can add that into our project. Our attorney is putting together an offer to the City so that we can own that area.*
- Please be creative with the concept of bike sharing.
- Tree selection: Glad to hear that the landscape architect is aware of the soil conditions and tree selection for these soil types. I am concerned about the need for water-wise plantings. Not sure that a redwood tree is a good choice in this area. *Applicant: In the Specific Plan we have a very extensive plant selection. Two or three alternatives are listed in every area for the plants for that specific location. Options are provided throughout the landscape plan.*
- Have you considered engineered soils or root zones? *Applicant: Yes We are considering engineered soils.*
- Certain trees are not suitable for a location with people walking along the sidewalk and for maintenance crews cleaning up the area. *Applicant: We are happy to work with the City to find suitable trees.*
- Solar-ready rooftops would be nice and should be discussed. This is a concern. Anything and everything we can do, on-site, to be as sustainable as possible is good.
- How will the southern border work? It's an Emergency Vehicle Access (EVA), jogging path and walking path. *Applicant: It is a 20' wide area; jogging path on one side, engineered for fire trucks so that one wheel can be on concrete and one on the gravel, and plantings, and a 10' wide bike path and plantings, and a jogging path. This area is not meant for cars or any other vehicles; except for emergency vehicles, such as only fire engines and ambulances. The Fire Department has already given preliminary approval of the EVA.*
- The seating areas need benches with backs for people to rest. *Applicant: A combination of sloping and straight walls is proposed.*
- There are some things we can do to go farther than just LEED Gold: solar, electronic vehicle charging. Interested in having the applicant look at all technologies and implement them, if possible.
- There are only four (4) ZipCar stations. Can we get more? *Applicant: We will work on that.*
- There are only five 3-bedroom units right now. Can we increase the number of three (3) bedroom units? *Applicant: This will be challenging and would require some design change.*
- What is happening in the main access from Delaware through to the Joint Powers Board (JPB) site? *Applicant: The JPB has their site out for another development. We are in discussions with them. It makes sense to open it up.*
- Do we have any guidelines for hours of operation for the retail uses? *Staff: There are no guidelines for hours of operations. Only types of businesses are discussed. Applicant: I think the retail businesses need to work on that. It depends on the type(s) of retail that are there.*
- Shadow studies show that the plantings within the notched areas on the residential buildings are almost always in the shadows throughout the year. A type of tree that has been selected appears to demand a lot of sun. *Applicant: We will continue to look at that but have found that the tree indicated does well in that area.*

Planning Commission had the following comments:

- I am a fan of the project and feel that it has enormous potential for San Mateo. I understand the constraints that have forced the developer to propose the current plan. However, if you look 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? Am not a fan of the pavilion structure in the park.
- Am also 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.
- Am excited about the development of this project. Like the pavilion in the park area. Am 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.
- Am in full support of the project. Do agree that 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 station.
- Curves rather than the zig-zag paths would be better.

Communications and Announcements

1. Communications from Staff:
 - a. September 9th meeting is cancelled
 - b. September 23rd is still scheduled – annual review of Hines Development Agreement
 - c. Station Park Green may come back to you the first meeting in October 2014
 - d. Update Commission on projects that came before the Planning Commission earlier in the year
 - e. Chair Bonilla requested elevations around 9th and El Camino Real. Although presently an incomplete application we will provide the elevations.
 - f. January 2015, workshop on operations. Is this something the Commission is interested in? Explain development review process.
2. Communications from Commission:
 - a. Commissioner Massey not available for September 23
 - b. Friday October 24th, Housing Leadership Day
 - c. Station Park Green – the 3 books that Lorraine Weiss gave us earlier we are keeping but what about the plans? Building elevations can be given back to the planner.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:25pm

**City of San Mateo
Minutes of the Regular Meeting
Planning Commission**

APPROVED - October 14, 2014

Call to Order at 7:30pm
Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call

Chair Bonilla

Chair Bonilla
Vice-Chair Drechsler
Commissioner Hugg
Commissioner Massey
Commissioner Whitaker

Approval of Minutes, with amendments, for September 23, 2014

Approved: 4-0-1

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

The Chair then convened the meeting in Conference Room C at 7:40pm for the purpose of viewing renderings and videos of the project site.

The meeting was then reconvened in the Council Chambers at 8:00pm.

Written questions from Conference Room C regarding the Station Park Green project.

1. Are members of the public allowed in the park areas? *Yes, the parks are open to the public.*
2. Please explain EVA? *Emergency vehicle access; open to pedestrians and bicycles it is closed to vehicles. This goes around the perimeter of the property.*

Questions from the Commission regarding tonight's study session.

1. We are limiting our comments to MU1 and RE2? *Yes. The applicant and staff have presentations to show for this evening.*

ITEM 1

Study Session

PA14-055 Station Park Green

Planning Commission focus tonight on MU1 and RES2.

Lorraine Weiss, Contract Senior Planner, gave the staff presentation.

The Commission had no questions or comments for staff.

Darin Schoolmeester, Principal MVE & Partners Architects, gave the applicant's presentation.

The Commission had no questions for the applicant.

The chair opened the public comment period. The following people spoke: Cheryl Hilton, San Mateo; Russ Horvath, San Mateo; John Ebnetter, San Mateo; Rich Hedges, San Mateo; Kaye Sharma, San Mateo. They had the following comments:

- One member of the public described the design quality of 2090 Delaware and stated that the Station Park Green project looks much better. The speaker showed the Commissioner various pictures taken with an iPod to explain a dislike for the 2090 Delaware project.
- A resident of the 19th Avenue Park neighborhood stated that parking has been well addressed in the Station Park Green project. He asked several questions including: What level of earthquake proof would the building be built for? Are these apartments or condos? The speaker brought up a project in San Carlos, "Transit Village" on San Carlos Ave and El Camino Real. For the Station Park Green project, 598 units seem too much. Everything looks beautiful, but one thing that doesn't get focused on.
- Four (4) sustainable technology items addressed at the last meeting included: solar, electric vehicle charging stations, sewer heat recovery, and gray water. The speaker would like to know which features are provided in this project and suggested that recycling of food waste be considered.
- Ten (10) years is a long time. Let's get this project built.
- Where are the residential buildings placed? Are some residential units along the train tracks? If so, how would noise from the trains be handled? What commitment to building materials made in the USA is there for this project? With 598 residential units in this project, how many school children will enter the school system as the schools will be impacted?

Comments from staff:

- 2090 Delaware is more of an area of industrial looking buildings. There is a public storage area across the street; therefore the design treatment is within a different context.
- There are a number of sustainable measures in this project. This is planned as a LEED Gold neighborhood.
- Noise – The Building Code and the General Plan have sections relating to the noise issue that the project must comply with. The percent of the amount of materials that will be built in the USA is unknown at this time. *Applicant response: the specifications for a lot of the materials are still to be determined. There is certainly a consideration to use locally produced materials.*
- School district was consulted during development of the Rail Corridor Plan, and the San Mateo/Foster City school district indicated that schools were adequate for the total development within the Rail Corridor Plan area. In addition, a school fee is calculated when a building permit is issued and this money is paid directly to the school district.
- As for earthquake safety measures, the buildings are reviewed in compliance with the current building codes.
- This project is proposed to be apartments.

Questions from the Commission.

- Request to have Larry Cannon, Cannon Design Consultant, answer some questions regarding the project design *Larry Cannon: The rendered drawings shown tonight give a good idea of what is*

being proposed and a better idea of the interaction between the stoops and the sidewalks. Two items for the Commissions deliberation: the Design Guidelines were approved with one set of designs and which appear to be different than the proposed buildings in some regards. This proposal is a "heavy" design. The Hines building across the street seems "lighter" in appearance. The regularity and lack of variety in this project, especially along Concar is an issue the Commission should examine. Is the Commission comfortable with the direction that this project is going? It does not seem necessary to have such big signs to announce this development. The landscaping should be sufficient.

- How do the pedestrian experience and the ground floor treatments work within this transit oriented project? *Larry Cannon: For the area closer to Delaware near Concar, larger stoops and more space for the residents is apparent, but narrows as along Concar moving west towards the railroad tracks. The Mission Bay area in San Francisco has stoops close to the street and the blinds in the residential units on the ground floor are always closed. In addition to this area, in the vicinity of the park, the pedestrian areas seem quite narrow. What does the concept of urban mean? Larry Cannon: The plans show glass/aluminum on the storefronts, with minimal visual interest and lack variety. Only the storefront signs would differ and provide some variety. As a positive example, Santana Row in San Jose has variety so that each storefront is just a little different. What are the expectations Of the Planning Commission for the retail areas, are they viewed as serving only project residents/employees, or the surrounding areas as well?.*
- Staff – The signs are shown for illustrative purposes only since signs are ministerial, and no variances or exceptions are permitted. One thing not seen tonight, but discussed with the applicant will be a palette of storefront prototypes to present to the Commission. Future tenants will then be able to choose from a range of storefronts provided and be handled at staff level for review and approval.
- What species of trees are going to be used along Delaware? *Staff: 48-inch box Sycamore, which was later corrected by the landscape architect to 36-inch box Sycamore trees.*
- 3 large vertical signs are proposed. *Staff: The sign square footage has not been measured at this time. The sign code is very clear and there is no variation. Sign review is handled with the building permit.*
- The administrative report discusses the club room having telescoping walls. *Applicant: The door system would open to the plaza from this club space. We are still exploring the exact specifications.*

Parking: There is total of 788 parking spaces for residential and 135 parking spaces for non-residential. Of the 135, 5 are car-sharing, 12 loading spaces, 47 on the street are unassigned, and 51 at level 1 are unassigned. Is that in the MU1 building? *Applicant: The 51 spaces are located on both levels of Buildings MU-1 and RES-2,.* The amount of retail along Delaware has changed over the course of this project. At one point, the entire front along Delaware was residential. *Applicant: At one point we had planned to put retail on one corner along Delaware. We still plan to have a drug store and a coffee shop. There will also be residential facing the 19th Avenue Park neighborhood.*

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

- Overall, pleased with the direction the project is going. There are two places along Delaware that concern me: 1). Along Delaware facing the residential areas be sure to have building variety on the frontage. Make sure that the modern architectural style in the urban design

context has room for variety; 2). Can the design push back from Delaware? The amount of stucco is a bit concerning. The look as these buildings get older is not always good, as these buildings often do not age well. Could there be more embellishment? I like this project to be as useful to families as possible. I appreciate the addition of the 3-bedroom units and would like to see more.

- Project is moving forward well. I like the changes that have been made, however I do have a concern about the design. It still appears as four large apartment blocks. Is there a way to soften the look? Need to consider the pedestrian experience, especially along Concar which still needs some enhancement. Can we go back more towards the original designs? This project still has much heaviness. I would like to see the three large vertical signs eliminated. The retail is heavily concentrated at Concar and Delaware; not sure that the club room and vendor carts is a good thing and do enough to promote retail near the train station.
- Why are we using the trees that have been shown listed on the plans? *Applicant: Sycamore trees on Concar are trees that already exist and it is my understanding we are following City recommendations but will welcome any suggestions.*
- The trees along 3rd Avenue where the Metropolitan Apartments seem to have filled in there nicely. The European Hornbeams are a beautiful tree along 3rd Avenue.
- Can the applicant provide some answers regarding some green solutions? *Applicant: We have a LEED Consultant that we are working with but we have not made any final decisions relative to the LEED Gold Standard that we wish to attain. We are currently exceeding Title 24 requirements by about 15%-20%.*
- I am concerned about the club space. Not sure that a fitness center and retail vendors is enough. It needs to be more transit friendly.
- We now have eight different building façade palettes. Seems we now have too much. The residential buildings have multiple styles. *Applicant: The reason for the diversity is to create more of a traditional cityscape. We wanted to avoid having people see the same thing over and over again.*
- The two buildings fronting South Delaware, I feel they should reflect more of the residential neighborhood across the street, the 19th Avenue Park neighborhood.
- When I look at the Hines building I see 4-5 stories and lots of glass, so this project is compatible with the offices which will be located across Concar. Also, the homes in 19th Avenue Park were considered modern when they were built in the 1960's.
- As we look at the transit-oriented corridor within the Rail Corridor Plan area, we are going to see more density in housing such as the Station Park Green project.
- I want to see us get as much renewable energy as possible in this new construction, including solar and the planning for purple pipe for use of recycled water.
- We have less land, in fact, almost no land for projects. This project is a reuse of land for affordable projects. We need the housing, as dense as it is, we need the parks.
- Modern stucco is different from that of 10 years ago. Materials are more resistable/resistant than years ago.
- Some of the windows that are recessed will fare better than those that have more exposure to the elements.

- Sycamore trees are more a city standard. They provide leaf cover in the summer. As long as the signage works within the sign code, it is fine. Signage at the two main entrances would help people find the project.

Commissioner Massey moved to continue this study session/public hearing to October 28, 2014 Second by Vice-Chair Drechsler

Commissioner Massey updated the Commission on the Civic Arts Committee.

Communications and Announcements

1. From Staff
 - a. Public Works is working with CalTrans on improvements at El Camino and SR92
 - b. 10/28: Station Park Green Study Session; 3rd & Fremont Public Hearing
 - c. The November 11th meeting has been changed to November 10th due to Veteran's day holiday on the 11th.
 - d. Housing Element on November 25th.
2. From the Commission
 - a. Invitation to the Housing Leadership Day Conference on Friday, October 24, 2014.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:35pm

CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 28, 2014

Approved

The meeting convened at 7:30 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 Vice Chair Drechsler, seconded by Massey to approve the minutes as amended of the Regular meeting of October 14, 2014.

Vote – Pass unanimous 5-0

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Bonilla opened the public comment period.

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

ITEM 1

PUBLIC HEARING

PA14-075 Metropolitan Apartment Staging Area

Tricia Schimpp, Contract Planner, gave the staff presentation.

David Wright, Prometheus, was present for the applicant presentation, as well as Chris Brocco and Duff Broeker.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant or staff.

- Thanks to staff handling this matter appropriately when notified of this issue
- SPAR & Special Use Permit should go forward
- Can the City fine Prometheus for current actions? *Staff* – Fines are issued via statute. Initial staff response was that on-site storage was approved, but off site needed permit. The city can double fee for work done without an authorized permit.
- Movement of materials now going around the corner and obstructing other streets and public safety. Conditions of Approval should now include using flag men by trailers and limiting other movements. *Staff Counsel* – Yes, Changes to the Conditional Approval for health & welfare would be defensible.
- Need traffic controls especially as they affect downtown. Changes need to be made for safety.

- Can applicant define current process and make changes to trailers for Condition of Approval? *Staff* - Per presentation, materials can be moved via flatbed trucks and pick-up trucks. *Applicant* – Yes, we are moving around the corner to the west as most of the work is still on Third. Will be back on Fremont as work continues. Current policy is for everyone to cross at the guard post – it is in our application. Activities move with sections where construction is progressing.
- And at present how is material moved? *Applicant* - Company trucks and hand carts
- Can you use stacked trailers instead of smaller carts? This would cut down on crossing the street so often. *Applicant* - We could look into that, would need to have room for the larger trailer but can't reserve curb section for parking – private cars are there. Hand carts are now rolling up to patio areas where there is temporary storage. We spoke with Staff for staging and were referred to Public Works. PW said no debris boxes could be in this area. *Staff* - Correct no trailers, debris boxes, but for short periods of construction this would be allowable, for example just a couple days here and there - not storage or staging.
- Work supplies move with work progress? *Applicant*- Yes and we must leave room for our building residents; construction must be on one side at a time. Exterior perimeter work starts and interior perimeter work follows behind.
- How is parking handled now? *Applicant* - Carts minimize activity to keep walkways clear for residents and scaffolding clear to be OSHA compliant.
- 4th Avenue has "for sale" cars parked; put no parking signs could be out for mission critical days. *Applicant* - Duration for demo would be approx. 2-3 months.
- Can we get that section of curb clear for that section of time? *Staff* - This would be a floating area for needs of residents and contractor. If applicant has a plan for parking needs, including moving signs & barricades, that could be worked out.
- Condition of Approval should include curb access where needed to insure public safety. *Staff Counsel* - No additional changes needed to that sentence.
- Will Prometheus work on this plan? *Applicant* - Seems we only move materials twice a day now. Large truck would take backing and positioning into place. About 32 workers on-site currently.
- Greenworks is recycling – could they do it in one truck once a day to limit trips across the street? *Applicant* – Yes, but would that large obstruction impede residents? We can work on that plan if parking is provided. *Staff* – Temporary construction parking would have to be clearly part of the construction company, needs to be clearly marked. Must also look at driveways, timing, etc. *Staff Counsel* – Needs to be 30 days from date of Conditional Use Permit.
- Condition of Approval to include eliminating trips between yard & staging site and work with PW for parking permits that can be moved with work progression.
- Side streets would be better for construction parking, Eldorado, Fremont, Grant. *Staff* – Public Works will work with Prometheus regarding restrictions and staging for parking.

Planning Commission had the following questions/comments:

- This site has previously been used as a Christmas tree selling site for a charity, there needs to be signage to new location so they can continue and return when project is over. *Staff Counsel* – As long as they conform to sign ordinance and check maximum allowed.
- Unfortunately, the project has begun and it is tougher to come back and fix a problem that should not have occurred since we were assure they had quality designs, labor etc.
- Need to be sure downtown is not affected by material movements across the street.
- Maybe traffic controls should have been put in place for this construction site, crossing guard needs to be truly alert, be community minded.
- Disappointed in the way City process was overridden to secure this corner.
- Disturbed because applicant did not secure a permit for the staging area when project started, it is abuse, it is disrespectful to the city of San Mateo, and there is the construction material transport issues with this project as well.
- Other arrangements need to be made to consider the charity that uses that corner seasonally. In 2015 applicant should move to the corner at 2nd and Fremont.
- Code Enforcement cease order did not take effect, work continued
- Inconvenience to neighborhood, irresponsible for two years' worth of construction, to repair poorly executed original project only 10 years ago.

MOVED by Commissioner Massey 2nd Whitaker, Passed 5-0:

Adopt the Categorical Exemption Class 4 Section 15304(e) Minor temporary use of land having negligible or no permanent effects on the environment based upon the Findings for Approval in Exhibit A.

Approve the Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) for site plan and temporary structures for purposes of storage and construction staging and a Special Use Permit (SUP) for an off-site construction staging area based upon the Findings for Approval in Exhibit A, subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit B, with the addition of the following Conditions of Approval:

- **SEASONAL SIGNAGE** – The applicant shall display a significant sign at the corner of 3rd Avenue and S. Fremont Street during the period of time when Project 90 operates a Christmas Tree Sales lot located at the corner of 2nd Avenue and S. Fremont Street to notify the public that the Christmas Tree lot has moved to the corner of 2nd Avenue and S. Fremont Street. A permit shall be obtained from the Building Department and shall be in compliance with the City's Sign Ordinance, San Mateo Municipal Code, Chapter 25.
- **TEMPORARY PARKING PERMITS** – The applicant shall obtain temporary parking permits from Public Works for the purpose of parking trucks or trailers containing construction materials at the curb near the construction activity and shall renew the permits throughout the duration of the construction activity as specified by Public Works. The temporary

parking permits shall be valid during active construction hours only. The applicant shall maximize the use of the parking permits in an effort to reduce the number of pedestrian and hand cart trips back and forth from the staging and storage lot to the area of construction.

ITEM 2

STUDY SESSION

PA14-055 Station Park Green, continued from October 14, 2014.

Ron Munekawa, Chief of Planning, gave the staff presentation.

Applicant's presentation by Alan Talansky and Darin Schoolmeester, Principal MVE & Partners Architects

The Planning Commission had the following questions/comments:

- 20% indoor universally accessible throughout the project, including below market rate (BMR units)?, Applicant - will apply evenly to all units, additionally virtually all units will be accessible due to design and layout of the project.

Public Testimony

1. In favor of project. However, the City and applicant should further consider livability, think about what residents need, emphasize Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). Need services nearby, balance density, need retail. Increase accessibility with no cars.
2. San Mateo is an expensive place to live, wants affordable place to live, was raised here, wants to stay here and be able to rent livable place within the community. Please pay attention to cyclist travel lanes, need buffer lane between cars and cyclist. Plan for long term future including solar panels – need to save money on energy. Wastewater should be used and re-used. Edible landscapes should be considered.
3. Like the proposals presented tonight. Sustainability to address climate change is the right thing to do. Glad Planning Commission is aiming for high goals because we need to do this for the future.
4. Lots of development on Delaware – we need it. Keep low cost for requirements of many residents in mind. Many retail stores to supply this area are already in place. Vote of approval for this project.

Staff response to questions raised in public testimony

1. Rentals will be at a rate consistent with the City's Below Market Rate (BMR) program.
2. Sustainability measures are included as part of the project.
3. Retail & livability – the Commission will be reviewing this evening and making comments as deemed appropriate.

Planning Commission questions on Blocks RE-3 & RE-4

1. Will there be a dog run and what is the status of the cul-de-sac at the terminus of Garvey way? *Applicant:* We are going through process of appraisal now and would be executing an agreement with the City to utilize this area as part of the project.
2. Is there an area for laundry? *Applicant:* Laundry will be provided in each apartment unit.
3. Statement that this plan exceeds Title 24 by 20% - is that the current Title 24? *Applicant:* Yes.
4. Please explain photovoltaic reference in the presentation? *Applicant:* Pre-wired for panels to be built in to accommodate in the future.
5. In the area of increased setbacks on Concar, have entries moved to interiors? *Applicant:* Ground floor generally have 2 entrances/exits, however, the units in this area will not have stoops or entries facing the street.

Interested in the City's Design Review Consultant's response to the storefront alternatives. Larry Cannon, -drawings suggest a lot of variety, however, have not had the opportunity to do an extensive review since these were prepared close to the date of the meeting.

Planning Commission Comments on RE-3 and RE-4

1. Choice is important, San Mateo has about 50% renters, we need BMR units for them. San Mateo is running a deficit for lower income residents.
2. Glad to see RE-4 modified, still concerned about so much stucco. Looking for continuity between current buildings, but more variety of material within project.
3. Looking for more articulation for residents and pedestrians.
4. Like Concar elevations, which include stoops or room to be outdoors to meet neighbors.
5. Reduced parking is part of these developments.
6. Public comments were good, we need to think of this holistically; the project does carry out the goals of the Rail Corridor Plan.
7. Landscape of retail will change with the building of this project, will be an asset and benefit to the City.
8. Appreciate the changes made but needs to be reviewed and altered to be less "blocky", variety and visual richness. See Design Guidelines, need more visual interest.
9. Changes of materials are enhancements, but the buildings appear flat. Can applicant work with Mr. Larry Cannon, Consultant? Look at original specific plan and design guidelines, design consultant input, we are still not where we need to be.
10. See Design Guidelines which show more building modulation, angles, and curves. Would suggest using the heavy framing for building only at corner of Concar & Delaware. Use Consultant letter of suggestion - varied skyline silhouette, vary module widths, deep entryways, etc.
11. Impressed with project, there is enough dimension & articulation. Shapes of buildings are fine, they look modern will age well in the future urban environment of the site. look good for future, urban.

12. Entire area including Hines and large vacant lot for retail in future – appreciate applicants work. Revisions have been made to achieve consistency with the Design Guidelines
13. Need to reduce pollution, car plug in stations, energy, water, food waste, etc. Look forward to next iteration.
14. Like the project, happy to see progress, thank you for continuing and moving forward. Checked Specific Plan for Guiding principles – of the six guiding principles, this project currently surpasses three, possibly four principles. More work is needed on principles with regard to “consider the context” and “create a vital center” – this project has surpassed those points.
15. Project looks well connected to neighborhood.

Staff wrap up comments

1. Consensus is that it meets Rail Corridor goals – but 3 commissioners are looking for more vertical and horizontal articulation; two commissioners made a comment regarding visual richness while another expressed an interest in more variety in materials.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff

- a. Thursday evening, mandatory St. Matthews Bi-Annual Review
- b. Next meeting will be on MONDAY 11/10 due to the Veteran’s Day Holiday.
- c. November 18 – Neighborhood meeting for Three Corners in Council Chambers
- d. November 25 meeting – Housing Element, Classics at Tilton
- e. December 9 Study session on Three Corners at El Camino Real/Third Avenue.
- f. Development philosophy, future land use policy joint City council/Planning Commission study session as recommended by the Community Development Department audit with be scheduled for the beginning of 2015

2. Communications from the Commissioners

- a. Attended Housing Leadership Council’s Conference – can staff look into San Mateo County tobacco ordinance, Can we create smoke free environments in the City of San Mateo. Staff: Will research and forward information to Commission, However, the City Council would set policy in this area.
- b. Thank commissioners for attending the Housing Leadership Council Conference.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 28, 2014.