

COMMISSION MEMBERS  
Dianne Whitaker, Chair  
Mike Etheridge, Vice Chair  
John Ebnetter  
Ramiro Maldonado  
Ellen Mallory

**CITY OF SAN MATEO**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**Planning Commission**

City Hall  
330 W. 20th Avenue  
San Mateo CA 94403  
www.cityofsanmateo.org

**Tuesday, April 23, 2019**  
**Council Chambers 7:00 PM**

**Regular Meeting**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Public Announcement regarding Live Stream

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

**Present** 5 - Chairperson Dianne Whitaker, Vice Chair Mike Etheridge, Commissioner John Ebnetter, Commissioner Ramiro Maldonado Jr., and Commissioner Ellen Mallory

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. [Planning Commission - Meeting Minutes Approval of March 26, 2019](#)

Vice Chair Etheridge to motioned to approve the minutes of March 26, 2019.  
The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ebnetter and approved unanimously on a voice vote (4-0-1).  
(Commissioner Maldonado abstained).  
**Approved**

2. [Planning Commission - Meeting Minutes Approval of April 9, 2019](#)

Commissioner Maldonado motioned that the approval of the Minutes from the April 9, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting be held over until May 14, 2019. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Etheridge and approved unanimously on a voice vote (5-0).  
**Continued to a Date Specific**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Chair opened the public comment period. There being no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

3. [1 Carey School Lane, Zoning Reclassification, Zoning Code Amendment, Special Use Permit \(SUP\) Modification, and Site Plan and Architectural Review \(SPAR\) \(PA-2018-069\)](#)

Rendell Bustos, Associate Planner, presented the project with a PowerPoint presentation. The applicant, Duncan Lyon of the Carey School, provided a slideshow presentation.

**Commission Questions and Answers from Applicant:**

Question: Clarification on the school's solar design and other sustainability efforts?

Applicant: The school is working toward 100% solar energy to the extent feasible, which depends on the site and the building's arrangement.

Question: Details on the school's annual \$20,000 Caring at Carey donation and what portion of the donation goes toward schools within the City of San Mateo?

Applicant: The school's donation currently goes toward a Title 1 school in South San Francisco but has been working with a non-profit to direct the donation to a local San Mateo school.

Question: What is the floor area ratio in the Q8 overlay?

Applicant: The requested 0.39 floor area ratio in the Q8 overlay allows for the addition of storage containers and buildings. The school does not have plans to expand in the number of students.

Question: Location of the temporary portable classroom buildings?

Applicant: They are to be in the lower play yard.

**Public Speakers:** David Karp, San Mateo, Jennie Klenow, San Mateo.

**Public Comments:**

Carey School is a good neighbor and in support of the project. The school's expansion may affect traffic for neighboring residents.

**Commission Comments:**

The school's pick-up operations and other operations seems well managed and staffed. There are no visible changes from the Study Session review; difficulty in seeing the project's consistency with the applicable General Plan policies. The school relies on the offices at 1900-2000 Alameda de las Pulgas for off-site parking and suggests modifying Condition of Approval #10 to require a parking agreement that covers the school for the duration of construction and some period of time afterwards given the uncertainty of the offices. In discussing this Condition of Approval, the Commission agreed to modify the Condition to require a minimum length of two years from project approval. Suggest Condition of Approval #55 should be made more prescriptive and more similar to Junipero Serra High School's public notification requirements. Despite the traffic study's conclusion, the project may still contribute to an impact to traffic. In favor of the overall building and courtyard design; the school's Parking and Traffic Plan provided to the parents is confusing. Not in favor of the request for additional enrollment and floor area because of the lack of public benefit to the community and lack of changes from the Study Session review. Suggest increasing the boundary that the school must notify.

Commissioner Ebner motioned to recommend approval, by making the following motions:

Zoning Reclassification, Zoning Code Amendment, Site Plan and Architectural Review, and Special Use Permit Modification based on the Findings for Approval in Attachment 1 and subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment 2 with modifications to Conditions of Approval #10 and #55 as outlined by the City Attorney.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Maldonado and approved on a voice vote (4-1).

**Approved**

## STUDY SESSION

4. [480 E. 4th Ave & 400 E. 5th Ave Downtown Sites Affordable Housing Pre-Application \(city-owned former redevelopment sites\) \(PA-2018-077\)](#)

Roscoe Mata, Senior Planner, presented the project with a PowerPoint presentation. Mollie Naber of Mid-Pen Housing gave a PDF presentation.

**Commission Questions and Answers from Applicant/Staff:**

Question: What is the number of people permissible in the units?

Applicant: The number of people allowed by the financing.

Question: What percentage is being set aside for public employees?

Applicant: At minimum, approx. 1/6th of the units.

Question: What is the make-up of the garage (hourly, monthly, etc.)?

Staff: Assistant City Manager, provided information on the parking planned for the site.

Question: What is the dollar amount using for AMI?

Applicant: The California tax credit committee publishes annual rents for San Mateo County.

Question: Residential parking?

Staff: The residential units are assigned 1 parking space per unit.

**Public Speakers:** Jose Mares, San Mateo, Thomas Heiser, San Mateo, Carlos Chavez, San Mateo, Reyna Sandoval, San Mateo, Jordan Grimes, San Mateo, Adam Nugent, San Mateo, Drew, San Mateo, Laurie Watanuki, San Mateo

**Public Comment:**

In support of the Workers Resource Center; concerned about the comments made online about the Center; concerned that building can't be built higher than 55'; wishes for a better pedestrian experience; in support of affordable housing; an employee of the workers resource center provided her experience with staffing the workers. Concerned about the amount of parking being provided; disagrees with the parking garage being built first; desires expressed to have the garage be adaptable to other uses in the future; likes the submeters and bridge between parking garage and building; likes sidewalks along Railroad Avenue. Buildings should be designed to account for the tracks changing (grade separation); suggest treatment on wall on the substation side of parking garage (so that it is not blank); concerns about traffic; would like to see more compatibility with single family homes with stoops. Suggests wall of green plantings at garage to soften the structure's mass; concerned about loitering and safety of pedestrians.

**Commission Questions and Answers from Applicant/Staff:**

Question: What is the reason for many parking stalls?

Staff: The Council adopted a Parking Management Plan that identified reasonable occupancy rates and the amount of spaces needed to accommodate future demand.

Question: What are the mobile medical unit and impact fees?

Staff: The mobile medical unit is not associated with the workers resource center and the fees will be assessed similar to other affordable housing projects.

Question: Density allowed and configuration on the sites?

Staff: Staff explained the density limitations and the different options presented in response to the request for proposals.

Question: Are you bringing natural gas to the project and are you unbundling parking?

Applicant: The project is designed to 2020 code and tax credit financing equity doesn't make sense to unbundle.

Question: Clarification to the density transfer and historical information?

Staff: Explained the density transfer and gave examples of other projects that utilized the density transfer.

Question: Street Tree?

Staff: An arborist report will be required.

Question: Bridge and the public plaza?

Applicant: The applicant provided more information about a possible railcar that could be used and the reasoning behind the plaza location, and that the location is flexible.

**Commission Comments:**

Appreciates the design and the layout, likes the residential plaza close to the railroad, likes the plantings. Concerned about additional parking, prefers plaza location adjacent to railroad. Appreciates the sustainable design, would like to see the building transition between residential neighborhood to downtown with softer design features. Concerns about number of compact spaces and would like to accommodate more families. Likes the way the project plans were presented, likes the larger units with 2 and 3 bedrooms with broad range of affordability. Likes the building design, massing materials and colors. Likes the parking and the separation of the uses (parking and residential) site plan.

## **REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Ron Munekawa, Chief of Planning summarized future projects and upcoming meetings.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 p.m.