

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, May 28, 2019**  
**Council Chambers 7:00 PM**

**Regular Meeting**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

**Present** 4 - Chairperson Dianne Whitaker, Vice Chair Mike Etheridge, Commissioner John Ebnetter, and Commissioner Ellen Mallory  
**Excused** 1 - Commissioner Ramiro Maldonado Jr.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. [Planning Commission - Meeting Minutes Approval of April 23, 2019](#)

Vice Chair Etheridge motioned to hold over the Minutes of the April 23, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting to the next Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ebnetter and approved unanimously on a voice vote (4-0).

**Continued to a Date Uncertain**

2. [Planning Commission - Meeting Minutes Approval of May 14, 2019](#)

Vice Chair Etheridge motioned to approve the Minutes of May 14, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mallory and approved unanimously on a voice vote (4-0).

**Approved**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

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

**PUBLIC HEARING**

3. [Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement Annual Review \(Year 13\), 2600 S. Delaware Street \(PA-2019-019\)](#)

Brittni Barron, Project Manager II, presented the project with a PowerPoint presentation. Whitney Welsch of Wilson Meany made a brief statement.

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

Question: What is the percentage of retail space occupied?

Applicant: 35%.

Question: Franklin Templeton easement?

Staff: We are currently working with Public Works and Bay Meadows on this.

Question: Restaurant usage in Town Square?

Applicant: It may be two smaller restaurants opposed to one large restaurant.

**Commission Comments:** In support of Fieldwork Brewing Company.

**Public Speakers:** The Chair opened the public comment period. There being no speakers, the public comment period was closed.

Vice Chair Etheridge motioned to recommend approval, by making the following motions:

Adopt Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-1 Finding that Bay Meadows Main Track Investors LLC has complied in good faith with the terms of the Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement for the review period of December 21, 2017 to December 20, 2018.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ebnetter and approved unanimously on a voice vote (4-0).

**Adopted**

4. [406 E. 3rd Ave. Mixed-Use SPAR + SDPA + Tentative Parcel Map \(PA-2018-043\) and 405 E. 4th Ave. SPAR Modification \(PA-2019-015\)](#)

Rendell Bustos, Associate Planner presented the project with a PowerPoint presentation. Mike Field of Windy Hill Property Ventures gave a PDF presentation.

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

Question: The parking structure is available until 8pm. Is that a Public Works decision or the applicant's decision?

Staff: The time shown in the TDM plan is a suggested time. Staff will work with the applicant to agree on the hours.

Question: Clarify the number of housing units?

Staff: There are 25 units total.

Question: Do the tandem spaces count as one or two spaces? What is the cost per space for CPID in-lieu fees?

Staff: They count as two. The cost is just over \$25,000 per parking space.

Question: Is the Mitigated Negative Declaration a draft?

Staff: The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is a draft until the Planning Commission approves it.

**Public Speakers:** Laurie Wishord, San Mateo, Dino Antoniazzi, San Mateo, Carla Woodworth, San Mateo, David Karp, San Mateo, Adam Nugent, San Mateo, Jordan Grimes, San Mateo.

**Public Comments:** Concerned with parking circulation and the street closure at Claremont Street, how long will Claremont be closed? Concerned with the noise and vibration that would disrupt local businesses. Disagree with the amount of reserved parking. In favor of project; do not agree with the garage location on 3rd Avenue. Concerned with pedestrian safety on 3rd Avenue. Would like to preserve existing retail during construction and request to add a Condition of Approval to assure parking will be

available that won't interfere with business. Suggest permitted parking.

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

Question: Relative to the Study Session, has the BMR percentage always been 11%?

Applicant: Yes, but there were only 2 units devoted to BMR at that time.

Question: The Planning Commission had preference for more residential and retail at the Study Session, was this considered in the decision making? \_

Applicant: Traditional retail is not sustainable at this location. But we've tried to mimic a retail feel at the project.

Question: The design modification saves \$110,000, is there any benefit to the community or the design due to the savings?

Applicant: A flat wall helps with maintenance and waterproofing. In terms of cost, we are contributing to Public Works improvements and fees to the City.

Question: Why isn't the Commercial Linkage Fee assessed on the entire square footage? Why doesn't the Parking In-Lieu Fee have more spaces accounted for? \_

Applicant: The Commercial Linkage Fee is based on net increase of commercial square footage. We will work with staff to ensure the correct Parking In-Lieu Fee is collected.

Question: How are the BMR units sized?

Applicant: The City reviews the size and location.

Question: Would there be a difference if you had more leeway in height and density as it pertains to housing?

Applicant: More housing could only be achieved with more height and density.

Question: Will you be including three different trash shoots?

Applicant: We have two, one for recycling and one for garbage. We do not have a third shoot because compost is not appropriate for a shoot. The garbage company will provide an individual bin.

Question: Could you talk about the screen on the corner of 3rd and Railroad?

Applicant: Currently it's a concept for public art. We would work with local artists to further develop it.

Question: Is the parking for the residential bundled or unbundled? Are the tandem spaces office spaces?

Applicant: It is unbundled. The tandem spaces are office spaces.

Question: Why isn't there more consistency with the unit sizes?

Applicant: We tried to fit in as much residential units as possible.

Staff: The designation of the BMR units occurs after the approval, if approved. Sometimes the sizes vary. The agreement is executed with the City's Housing Division.

Question: Are you amenable to not having leaf blowers on the property?

Applicant: We are willing to not use electric or gas-powered leaf blowers on the exterior of the building.

Question: Would you be willing to add one more affordable unit to the project, or add one or more two-bedroom low cost unit?

Applicant: We have tried to maximize the number of units, so this unit mix is set. We are not willing to commit to more affordable units under this project.

**Commission Comments:**

Great addition to the area. The parking seems appropriate for the amount of commercial and residential. Appreciate the low-income units going from 2 to 3. Appreciate the changes in design from the Study Session, including the glass art piece. The TDM plan and trip reduction is great. Appreciates extending the permitted parking to the neighborhood. The Findings for Approval are agreeable but would like to see a few Conditions of Approval implemented around ground floor commercial windows and around monitored protection for small businesses on 3rd Ave pertaining to parking impact to construction activity. Would like to see the 3rd Avenue façade be more compatible with the historic district. Concerned with the back up of traffic toward the railroad. Uncertain if putting the public space on the corner near the railroad tracks is a positive or negative. Concerned with the garage being so close to the train tracks as this needs to be monitored. Appreciate the architectural changes. Retail would give the public reason to engage with the building. The earlier elevations are cleaner than the ones presented tonight. The window mullions appear heavy. The two buildings side by side are too similar and will read as one building.

The Planning Commission made a motion for each recommendation by making the following motions:

- A. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration as adequate to assess the environmental impacts of the project, based on the Findings for Approval in Attachment 1;  
**Commissioner Mallory motioned to recommend approval, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Ebnetter and approved unanimously on a voice vote (4-0).**
- B. Approve the Site Plan and Architectural Review for the construction of a new mixed-use building, Site Development Planning Application for tree removal, and Tentative Parcel Map to merge four parcels into one parcel based on the Findings for Approval in Attachment 1 and subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment 2;  
**Commissioner Ebnetter motioned to recommend approval, the motion was seconded by Vice Chair Etheridge and approved on a voice vote (3-1), Whitaker opposed.**
- C. C. Approve the Site Plan and Architectural Review Modification for a modified exterior wall design based on the Findings for Approval in Attachment 3 and subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment 4.  
**Vice Chair Etheridge motioned to recommend approval, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Mallory and approved unanimously on a voice vote (4-0).**

Approved

**REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:31 p.m.