

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 10, 2015**

APPROVED

The meeting was called to order at 7:35pm by Chair Drechsler, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call: Commissioner Whitaker, Commissioner Massey, Vice-Chair Hugg, and Chair Drechsler

Minutes of February 10, 2015. Motion by Commissioner Whitaker, 2nd by Commissioner Massey to defer approval of 2/10/15 minutes until the next meeting – 3/24/15. Commissioner Whitaker feels that the minutes are incomplete, is willing to submit her comments for the minutes. *Staff: Another set of draft minutes will be sent out.* Vote: 4-0, motion carries.

Minutes of February 24, 2015. Question regarding the maker of the motions on the item. Motion by Commissioner Massey to approve minutes as amended by the discussion; 2nd by Vice-Chair Hugg. Vote: 4-0, motion carries.

ITEM 1 CEREMONIAL ITEM

Resolution for Rick Bonilla, read by Chair Drechsler and presented to Rick Bonilla by Chair Drechsler and Chief of Planning Ron Munekawa

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Drechsler opened the Public Comment Period. The following individuals spoke: Greg St. Claire, San Mateo; Rich Hedges, San Mateo.

- Thank Rick Bonilla for his hard work. Representative for Fiesta Gardens Homeowners Association. Extra traffic in our neighborhood is making travel too difficult. Need to get people to stop traveling through our neighborhood. The nightmare traffic on 92 is becoming dangerous.
- The traffic on State Route 92 eastbound is so heavy at night that it is forcing non-local residents to city streets and we need to try to keep the traffic out of Fiesta Gardens.

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

The Chair indicated that the issues raised in the public comments will be referred to the Public Works Department.

ITEM 2 PUBLIC HEARING

Climate Action Plan (CAP)

Staff presentation by Kathy Kleinbaum Senior Management Analyst, City Manager's Office and Eli Krispi, PMC

Questions:

- With respect for the Housing Element: what happens if we make changes, does the State approve it again? *Staff: Conversations with the State of California Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department have indicated that the changes will not affect the approval by the State. We will submit the amendments and get confirmation from HCD that the City's Housing Element remains in compliance with State law.*
- In the Circulation Element, there are several places referencing the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans. Were those two documents folded into the Sustainable Streets Plan (SSP)? *Staff: the SSP incorporates many aspects of both the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans., however, these Plans still exist.*

Public Comment on this item:

John Ebnetter, San Mateo.

- I am on the Sustainability Commission. Kathy Kleinbaum's description on what occurred re: solar on 20+ units or more is correct. Asked by the City Council if it would impact development and cost of units. Negative impact on renters a concern. A letter submitted by Paul Stuart from Government Affairs Director of San Mateo County Association of Realtors (SAMCAR), doesn't validate City Council's concern, price being a factor. SAMCAR comment supports the measure as long as it does not apply to resales and remodels. The Sustainability Commission did approve as revised but did not have access to SAMCAR letter. This is indicative of what we want to see in development in our city. If it is not done through the CAP it will be more difficult to get it done through other means.

Address public comments:

- Kathy Kleinbaum looked at how common mandatory solar requirements in various jurisdictions. The initial recommendation was aggressive and would have gone beyond other jurisdictions. Solar requirements on resales and remodels, what action should the Planning Commission take into account? *Staff: SAMCAR has not endorsed any measure that would be triggered by resale of a property. They have been pretty consistent on this issue.*
- In the proposed amendments for the Circulation Element, Sustainability Transportation actions, iii-28, modal share single occupancy vehicles, specific reduction measures have

been removed? What is the intent? *Staff: removed by staff as these are hard metrics to track success, especially pedestrian and bicycle.*

Land Use Element, section page ii-40, at bottom “reduction measures from 5 primary sources” have been reduced to 4 as one being removed, wording should be changed. “Long term reduction targets” indicates the year 2015. That should be changed? *Staff: yes the 2015 listed should be changed to possibly 2018 as an estimate.*

Planning Commission Comments:

- Appreciate the redline documents. These are easy to read and helped to understand the changes that we need to focus on.
- Support the CAP as prepared. Adding specifics, although difficult, is important. Lays out what we are going to try to do and how we are going to try.
- 50% renewals on multi-family development, I’m happy that we are still able to meet our goals without it.
- I believe we should challenge the developers a little more than we are.
- Continue to be amazed at the quantity of work put into this by Sustainability Commission and staff.
- Change regarding RE3/RE5; prior language for new construction of 20+ units would have required 50% of their energy through on-site renewable sources. New language is across the board, all new construction. Solar readiness is more cost effective when you put in conduit and allow space on a roof at construction. How are the solar panels to be mounted on the roof? You do not want to compromise the waterproof membrane. By the time some solar panels are put on it could be 5-10 years later. Technology changing so fast that prep work put on at time of construction is out of date by the time the solar panels are actually purchased and constructed.
- Impressed by document and how it was done. This document will always be a work in progress.
- We need to push the limits of what is possible.
- Having things in place to accept solar is something we should be working towards. I would like to see solar on every roof. We should serve as a model, if possible.
- California Solar Initiative is important. I think we should continue to move towards the 50%. I think a 10% requirement is doable which is 20% of the 50% requirement.
- We have had questions about the CAP not addressing water. I would like to see the bigger picture and our participation in the issue of water resources addressed by the Sustainability Commission.
- The original version of RE3 required new multi-family developments of at least 20+ units to have 50% of on-site renewable energy, we are proposing replacing the 50% requirement with 10%.

- New requirement to RE5 be maintained or taken out? Leave RE5 alone and put RE3 back to 10%.
- Are we going to leave in the requirement in RE3 that single-family homes be solar ready? Yes.
- As proposed, we are not touching remodels? *Staff: correct.*
- There are a lot of parcels in San Mateo where putting on solar is not possible, due to trees or homes facing the wrong direction. *Staff: the draft policy will include exceptions to this requirement where it does not make sense due to tree canopy and/or orientation.*
- Should the 10% requirement be added to commercial buildings as well as single-family homes?
- The requirements are for multi-family as there is more development in that area than in the commercial. There is less commercial building.
- I am reluctant going beyond the recommendations of the Sustainability Commission. I don't think we should impose restrictions that go beyond what they decided. I am not supportive of changing RE5 beyond solar-ready.

Motion by: Commissioner Massey

The Planning Commission recommend to the City Council:

- A. Adoption of the Climate Action Plan with the following changes to section RE3:
 - a. Restoring the 2nd to last bullet point reading "require new multi-family developments of 20+ units or more obtain at least 10% of their on-site renewable energy systems".
- B. Amendment to the General Plan Land Use, Circulation, Housing, and Urban Design Elements as necessary to reflect the CAP and as attached as Exhibit 1.
- C. Addendum to the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- D. Adoption of the Resolution is recommended.

2nd by Vice-Chair Hugg.

Vote: 4-0, Motion carries.

This item is a recommendation and will go before the City Council on Monday, April 6, 2015.

Communications, Announcements, Adjournment

Communication from Staff

1. Monday, March 16, 2015, the Century Centre Parking Structure will be heard before the City Council.

2. Tuesday, March 24, the Planning Commission will hear the Central Park Master Plan Study Session presented by Parks & Recreation along with the Planning Application process, Building Permit process, etc.
 - a. Request made by Vice-Chair Hugg to “push out” information on the application process. *Staff: Ron Munekawa will talk with Rebecca Zito, City Manager’s office regarding this item.*
3. April 6, 2014 the City Council will hear the Climate Action Plan.
4. April 14, 2015, the Commission will hear the Bay Meadows Annual Development Agreement and a study session for the Norfolk Street Hotel proposal. The developers want to demo the current motel and rebuild a new one. The issue surrounds a general plan rezoning from C1 to C2 as C1 does not allow for hotels, but C2 does.
5. April 28, 2015, Central Park South and San Mateo Executive Park requesting to add an additional level of parking to the parking garage.
6. City Council has extended the interview period to March 31st for the vacancy on the Planning Commission.
7. There are issues with the City Council Chambers and the City Clerk’s is spearheading an effort to review the acoustics, sound system, video. During June and July the Planning Commission will need to meet off-site
8. Planning Commission Field Trip: scheduled for April 18, 2015 .

Communications from the Planning Commission

1. Thanks for supporting the League of California Cities recent training.
2. SR82 (El Camino Real)/SR92 interchange needs improvement. Support participation.
3. Vice-Chair Hugg attended a discussion on SB743. Great discussion took place.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:05PM on Tuesday, March 10, 2015.