

**CITY OF SAN MATEO**  
**Planning Commission**  
**September 10, 2019**  
**7:00 PM**



**COMMISSION MEMBERS**  
Mike Etheridge, Chair  
Ellen Mallory, Vice Chair  
John Ebner  
Ramiro Maldonado  
Margaret Williams

City Hall Council Chamber  
330 W. 20th Avenue  
San Mateo CA 94403

## MINUTES

### CALL TO ORDER

Pledge Allegiance

Roll Call

**Present** 5 – Commissioner John Ebner, Commissioner Ramiro Maldonado, Commissioner Margaret Williams  
Vice Chair Ellen Mallory and Chair Mike Etheridge

### CONSENT CALENDAR

1. [Planning Commission - Meeting Minutes Approval](#)

Approve the Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of August 27, 2019.

Commissioner Maldonado motioned to approve the minutes with the revised edits, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Ebner and approved on a voice vote (5-0).

### PUBLIC COMMENT

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

### STUDY SESSION

2. [Hayward Park Train Station Parking Lot Pre-Application - 401 Concar Drive \(PA-2019-005\)](#)

Phillip Brennan, Associate Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation on the project. Ken Busch of Sares Regis gave a PDF presentation of the project.

**Public Speakers:** Bob Planthold, San Francisco; Nicolas Nagle, San Francisco; Jonathan Erwin-Frank, East Palo Alto; Paul Krupka, San Mateo; Rich Hedges, San Mateo; Robert Whitehair, San Mateo; Ricki McGlashan, San Mateo; Jordan Grimes, San Mateo; Holly Hewitt; Drew, San Mateo; Adam Loraine, San Mateo; Nori Jabba.

**Public Comments:**

City needs more affordable housing; this is a convenient location for families and seniors because of the nearby supermarket, drug store, and post office within walking distance. Project promotes biking and walking. Commends the developer for adding additional low income and moderate units above what is required. Concerned San Mateo is not meeting the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) guidelines. Parking and traffic concerns; request slowing down the project until the other developments in the area are complete; concerned

that the renderings do not realistically show the surrounding areas. Supportive of transit orientated developments and extra density.

**Commission Questions:**

Emergency zone, loading zone, trash pick-up, and shipping delivery clarification; stormwater treatment requirements; parking alternative options; Caltrain station size and schedule; permeable driveways and or roof plantings; private and open space requirements; collaborative discussions with nearby developments on access to the train station; environmental conditions and lead procedures; excess parking; all electric building; prevailing wage and organized labor; mechanized parking solutions; reduced parking cost versus more affordable housing; Caltrain parking usage; underground connection between buildings; Caltrain lease hold; required setbacks; plaza area use?

**Commission Comments:**

Kudos to public for provided comments; park-and-ride parking is important; buildings are crowded on the site; concerned about shadows/shade impacts on plazas; likes the street side elevation along Concar Drive; building “B” could be better articulated. Good location for housing site; likes the provision of affordable units, especially the proposed 3 bedroom units. Not okay with eliminating Caltrain (park-and-ride) parking; concerned that the increased train service will increase park-and-ride demand; concerned with site circulation for residents; concerned with delivery services queuing on Concar Drive which may be problematic; LID treatment should try and use bioswales/biodomes. Removing all public parking doesn’t make sense, deferring park-and-ride users to Hillsdale (train station) isn’t feasible or realistic; recommends use of combination of surface and mechanized parking lifts to provide more parking with possible use of public parking. Commends the architect for design; suggests utilizing living walls for screening along the garage walls; believes modern residential style is overused; design does not provide much uniqueness; likes the open space/outdoor courtyards; concerned the project doesn’t get bogged down with legal issues, should seek to resolve any issues. Appreciates the provision of affordable housing; disagree with the “arrival plaza” being right next to the drive aisle/EVA; suggests looking into expanding hammerhead plaza area; suggests stone veneer; disagrees with parking only being under one building (i.e. site circulation) as it relates to safety and convenience. Removal of public parking can have impacts on nearby commercial development.

**REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.