

**Lorraine Weiss**

---

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

<hyltonjc@gmail.com>

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

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

**Delaware Corridor Neighborhood Coalition for Responsible Development**

**Question Quick Reference Section**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2) EBL&S Background & Experience**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Lorraine Weiss**

---

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

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

**Lorraine Weiss**

---

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

Ms. Weiss,

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

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

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

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

John DeWitt  
San Mateo

## Lorraine Weiss

---

**From:** Toni Dicapua  
**Sent:** Monday, May 12, 2014 8:21 AM  
**To:** Lorraine Weiss  
**Subject:** FW: [19thavenuepark] Station Park Green

---

**From:** Linda Tolosano [mailto:lindatolosano@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 10, 2014 12:36 PM  
**To:** 19thavenuepark@yahoogroups.com; Planning Commission; Robert Ross; Maureen Freschet; Joe Goethals; David Lim; John "Jack" Matthews  
**Cc:** bbkalinin@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** RE: [19thavenuepark] Station Park Green

To: Planning Commissioners, City Council Members

Thank you Bev for eloquently expressing the viewpoint of many homeowners in 19th Avenue Park.

I echo what Bev has expressed in her letter below. I would hope that the Planning Commission does its due diligence with regard to traffic congestion created by the many high density developments in this area...take into consideration the total impact of all new development in addition to the traffic from the fair grounds, existing office complexes, retail and residential neighborhoods in the area. The issue of building height is a matter that is very concerning. I would like to see a development that is appropriate to the neighborhoods in this area (19th Avenue Park, Sunnybrae, Fiesta Gardens) with a reasonable approach to accommodate both the developer and the neighborhood. I also believe that "shared" parking along with 1.2 parking spaces per unit is inadequate and will cause spillover into 19th Avenue Park.

As for "gifts to 19th Avenue Park", Bev is right, we don't need street trees. Besides a height scale that is appropriate to this area, consideration should be given to new sidewalks and street paving, both of which we need.

We will be attending the upcoming meeting next week and look forward to hearing about these issues.

Thank you,  
Linda Tolosano (homeowner in 19th Avenue Park for 38 years)  
603 Vanessa Drive  
San Mateo, CA 94402

---

To: [PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org); [ross@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:ross@cityofsanmateo.org); [mfreschet@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:mfreschet@cityofsanmateo.org); [jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:jgoethals@cityofsanmateo.org); [dlim@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:dlim@cityofsanmateo.org); [jmatthews@cityofsanmateo.org](mailto:jmatthews@cityofsanmateo.org); [19thavenuepark@yahoogroups.com](mailto:19thavenuepark@yahoogroups.com)  
From: [bbkalinin@yahoo.com](mailto:bbkalinin@yahoo.com)  
Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2014 15:36:59 -0700  
Subject: [19thavenuepark] Station Park Green

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

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

[Reply via web post](#) [Reply to sender](#) [Reply to group](#) [Start a New Topic](#) [Messages in this topic \(1\)](#)

**VISIT YOUR GROUP**  
**YAHOO! GROUPS**

[Privacy](#) [Unsubscribe](#) [Terms of Use](#)

Dear Planning Commission,

May 13, 2014

In preparation of this meeting, I reviewed the original plan for Station Park Green, which was submitted in February 2011. It fits with the description of transit oriented development, or TOD, and describes a community which does not prioritize the car and makes concessions for long term environmental sustainability.

The main downside to the plan is an almost total lack of enforcement. While the vision is rosy one, compliance, for the most part, is not required due to the liberally interspersed usage of words such as 'encouraged', 'should' and 'permitted'. To quote the Green Building Design section of the Sustainability Chapter of the Plan:

Construction waste should be recycled and reused when possible

Roofs should reduce heat-island effect through design and materials selection

I resubmit to you the full list, but to summarize, every sustainability action is entirely voluntary. When it comes to issues of sustainable land use and water consumption, the word 'encouraged' ought to become shall and 'should' must become required.

**A few points on the Plan Comparison:**

A 25K minimum of retail is inadequate. Walkable stores and restaurants keep a community local and vibrant both day and night. The new design is too heavily weighted towards residential, which will burden the neighborhood with more citizens but provide no additional services.

And how can TOD be considered the most important guiding principle if ground level parking figures so foremost in the new plan? People would be expected to drive into their courtyard, enter their houses and leave the surrounding streets empty and lifeless.

Also, if cars are allowed to drive around the central park, as they are permitted in the new plan, it will have a detrimental impact on the safety and enjoyment of park goers.

Referring to the Street Hierarchy Plan Comparison, in the original proposal the blue lines designate a woonerf. A woonerf is a street on which pedestrian and cyclists have priority over motorists and is designed for maximum livability by residents. This sounds great. However, on the new plan the blue line designates a woonerf/alley, a curious alternative as I do not know of any vibrant, livable alleys. An alley all along western facing side of the property would be a disaster, whereas a woonerf would be a delight.

There is another reason to be concerned about the design of the western side of the property. On the Bike Trail System Comparison the Class I Bike Path proposed all along the western side is marked '(contingency location)', meaning no real certainty of ever existing.

In terms of station engagement, the old plan has greater connectivity between the project and the train station. The new plan only has one passage way, creating distance and inaccessibility.

**What am I asking of the planning commission?**

Do not encourage TOD, demand it. Require at least 45K retail and eliminate above ground parking.

Please require the developer to use the western facing side of the property as a woonerf, not an alley.

Uphold the highest standards of sustainability. Decide today that tomorrow the buildings in our city will be better, cleaner and more efficient than what has been built before. Do not use the word should to describe the builders' obligation in this regard; substitute shall and must instead.

Insist on maximum station engagement. The view of this property from the train and station represent San Mateo. Ask that the design is aesthetic, safe, accessible and inviting for Caltrain riders.

**My Overall Assessment?**

Changes in the new plan inconsistent with TOD, which zoning requires, need addressing, however they should not distract from the parts of the plan which have not changed, the pages of visionary planning materials full of loopholes, should the developers, for example, change their minds about the importance of investing in resource conservation.

While it is nice to think all developers will commit to sustainable building principles voluntarily, I am of the opinion contractual agreements would be a more reliable means of ensuring Station Park Green achieves the promise of the initial planning application.

Kind regards,

Kara Cox

Rec'd at Re mtg 5/13/14

May 13, 2014

TO: San Mateo Planning Commissioners, Chief of Planning Munekawa, and Senior Planner Weiss

FROM: Cheryl Hylton, 19<sup>th</sup> Ave Park (27 yrs) and San Mateo (45 yrs) resident  
As the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue Park rep, I attended 37 meetings with the Committee that created the 2005 San Mateo Rail Corridor Plan. The relative project size and time pressures meant the Plan's Committee devoted much more time and attention to the Hillsdale area. Plan specifics like 50 dwelling units per acre and 3.0 FAR in the Hayward Park TOD were developed quickly, basically because it was near the Hayward station and with no serious regard for its awkward freeway on/off ramps and poor traffic circulation being bisected by 92. Our neighborhoods now depend upon you - our appointed Planning Commissioners, our elected City Council, and City staff - to assure Station Park Green is compatible with & adds value to surrounding neighborhoods, protects & improves neighborhood quality of life, improves local traffic conditions and traffic circulation system, four of the eight Corridor Plan goals.

### **Concerns, Discrepancies, Significant Changes Noted in A cursory Review of April 16, 2014 Document titled "Revised Project Description"**

1) The developer states "the look and feel of the Original Project as envisioned under the Design Guidelines *will not change (EBLS' italics)* and "SPG will continue to be a "compact network of small, walkable blocks". Deleting residential and replacing with retail on the entire Delaware frontage south from Charles all the way to Concar is a big change. EBLs proposing retail facing its 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue Park neighbors underscores **the look and feel is changed and** completely disregards EBLs-promised residential look and feel facing the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue Park neighborhood and also disregards the Corridor Plan's goal to enhance our existing neighborhoods in this area.

Note: SPG Design Guidelines June 2009 document on pages 80, 84, 90, and 96 says things including: "Along S. Delaware, these townhome-style units will face the 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue Park neighborhood to the east. Located in a 35-foot height zone, the S. Delaware frontage shall have reduced mass....express the finer grain of individual townhome-style units ...and should be accomplished with patterns of stepbacks, projections, and changes in roof forms at each townhome-style unit."

2) "The Revised Project proposes...no visitor (parking) spaces" on page 6 in Section B.6. In the 2011 SPG project approval document, 127 resident visitor spaces were stipulated. Our neighborhood will easily become the "go-to parking lot" w/o requiring visitor spaces. While it may seem like an easy fix to implement a residential parking permit system, we want our SMPD to spend time on more important things, especially since the parking problem can be avoided with careful and realistic evaluation of parking requirements.

3) The table on the bottom of page 5 twice states the maximum building height is "45 feet along S. Delaware". The prior SPG and the Corridor Plan both mandate 35 feet height for the first 45 feet in. This brings up the concern of what other inconsistencies/misstatements may exist?

**NAP Concerns from Corridor Plan Standards and Requirements Called Out at Past Council/Commission Meetings That Haven't Been Corrected or Addressed Yet**

1) "Sidewalks should be the widest near transit stations, (12 to 16 feet wide), where the highest volumes of pedestrians are likely to be. (SM Corridor Plan, page 6-4). A wider sidewalk on Concar still isn't specified.

2) "A theme intersection treatment should be provided at Delaware Street and Concar Drive. This intersection carries a very high level of traffic associated with SR92 and the offices and....is also in close proximity to Hayward Park Station where Concar Drive provides a direct auto and pedestrian connection." (SM Corridor Plan, Page 4-17). This stated Corridor Plan design is still not specified.

3) Page 26 of the SPG Design Guidelines document under "Soil" states: "The Michaels building was once an automobile service center (and) a Shell gas station (is) located at the corner of Concar Drive and South Delaware. What are the relevant actions and assurances the City will require of ELB&S regarding the Shell and Michaels sites?"

4) In addition, there is a PG&E high transmission gas line along Delaware between SPG and 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue Park sites very similar to the one that caused the tragic San Bruno explosion. With pile drivers and heavy construction, we are counting on City staff and representatives to assure the safety of this pipeline is not compromised either during construction or after site occupation through careful project planning and appropriate regulations.

Ms. Weiss noted in the summary of her 5/6/14 memo to you requests your comments and input on the revised plan – does it meet Corridor Plan goals, layout, parking, etc. The good news is we are still at the planning stage. Hopefully after hearing the concerns and conflicting details that my cursory review uncovered, you will be as vigilant as possible in your examination and evaluation of the proposed changes EBL&S is now requesting as well as the original plan. Many thanks,

