

COMMISSION MEMBERS
Dianne Whitaker, Chair
Eric Rodriguez, Vice Chair
Charlie Drechsler
John Ebnetter
Pamela O'Leary

CITY OF SAN MATEO

Regular Meeting Minutes - Final

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

Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 8, 2017
Council Chambers 7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Present 5 - Commissioner John Ebnetter, Commissioner Pamela O'Leary, Chairperson Dianne Whitaker, Vice Chair Eric Rodriguez, and Commissioner Charlie Drechsler

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. [Approval of the Regular Meeting Minutes for July 25, 2017](#)

Commissioner Drechsler moved to approve the minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Commissioner Ebnetter and approved by unanimously by a voice vote.

Approved

PUBLIC COMMENT

Arnold Rodman, San Mateo: Considers San Mateo suburbia, downtown was described an "urban downtown area" at recent planning meeting, one report tonight refers to an "urban environment". When did San Mateo go from "suburban" to an "urban"?; asked if this is way we want to be classified and if this is density we want. Believes an explanation is needed. There were no other speakers. The Chair closed the Public Comment period.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. [4 West Santa Inez Condos - 4 West Santa Inez / 1 Engle Road \(PA15-104\)](#)

Lily Lim, Associate Planner, reviewed the application with a PowerPoint presentation. Commission had no questions of staff at this point. Applicant Jack Matthews, addressed the Commission with a presentation.

The Chair opened the comment period for this item. Speakers: Mary Diepenbrock, San Mateo, Michael Harrigan, San Mateo, Yolanda Crosby, San Mateo, Mary Cravalho, San Mateo, James Cravalho, San Mateo, Eileen McKague, San Mateo, Brian McKague, San Mateo, Jodie Penner, San Mateo, Mark Penner, San Mateo, Arnold Rodman, San Mateo, Patricia Bordin, San Mateo, Christopher Angelo, San Mateo, San Mateo, Virginia McLissac, San Mateo, Clara Weissmiller, San Mateo, Thomas Weissmiller, San Mateo, Gerry Wentworth, San Mateo, Peter Douglas, San Mateo, Craig Jory, San Mateo, Tom Thompson, San Mateo, Adam Loraine, San Mateo, Richard Hedges, San Mateo. Comments: A majority of speakers expressed opposition to the project. A petition was submitted on behalf of Meg Horrigan (Nextdoor) showing 85 residents oppose and 3 support this project. Speakers commented about: Mass, density, existing and expected street parking and traffic conditions, ingress and egress, driveway location/intersection, visibility, pedestrian and automobile safety; public safety (vehicle break-ins and fire trucks), CityLift automated parking system, tree removal, plans for construction site parking and storage, history of owner violations, history of rejected project proposals, concerns of adjacent neighbors, and other

broader issues.

Questions: Why doesn't the owner want to preserve some of these trees? I understand there are live streams running underneath. What is the depth of the water table? Will tree removal affect the stability of the ground, especially for the adjacent neighbors? How difficult will it be to maneuver in those restricted spaces (such as tandem, i.e., placing children in car seats)? What does that do for other people waiting to get into and out of the garage? What happens when there is a power failure? Is the lift still available and does it have a back-up system? Is it controlled by computers? Computers often have glitches. Since no management on site, how will people access/retrieve their vehicles? Who will respond to make the repairs? Are there technicians to respond? Will parts be available for maintenance or repair? How about a traffic signal at W. Santa Inez and El Camino Real? What if permission for tie-backs is not given? Where is the exhaust system for the lift structure? Where is the exhaust going to go? This is lot line to lot line development. Where is construction equipment going to be stored? How are the construction logistics going to effect our community? Both homes are old. Has there been discussion about the demolition of structures, including the abatement of asbestos and lead paint? What are the details?

Comments: Too massive for the neighborhood, traditional non-automated parking would only allow five units, many of us wouldn't be here if five units were proposed, 24" buckets of trees won't help with mass, out of scale with the homes from on Santa Inez and Engle, where there are smaller homes from the 1920's, reduce to 4-6 units max, seems to be what the neighborhood can absorb. Parking: Parking and traffic are already bad and a densely populated development will make it worse. San Mateo Park: (1) homes have single-car or no garages, on-street parking is needed for these residents and their guests, (2) is bordered by ECR, which has many R4 buildings along this transportation corridor. There is significant spillover parking from these R4 buildings, parking creeps up 1-2 blocks from every one of the R4 buildings; on-street parking also consumed by those going to work nearby or those leaving cars on street to fly out to the airport through rideshare applications, planning codes and guidelines do not take the reality of behaviors into consideration, those who choose not to use the lift system will park on W. Santa Inez and Engle Road, because there is no parking on ECR. Ingress, egress: Driveway location exacerbates existing difficult traffic conditions at intersection of West Santa Inez & ECR, will be absolute havoc, consider relocation of driveway to the less busy Engle Road. Traffic: Disagree with traffic report findings, for this reason asks Commission to reject the categorical exemption, traffic reports do not include accidents at West Santa Inez and ECR, significant delays for left turns onto ECR, traffic affects fire truck route, main route to ECR is down Santa Inez, check with the firefighters at the station and ask them if a fire truck will be able to get through.

CityLift automated parking system: We were not told of puzzle parking at original meetings at King Center earlier this year, city code states parking shall be "easily made without undue maneuvering to, into or out of a stall. All stalls shall be equally and independently accessible.", however considerable maneuvering is made by this automated machine, and therefore parking does not meet code and is a reason for denial; parking system needs on-going maintenance, repair and eventual replacement, approval with this of parking system should require the HOA to take responsibility for lift for the life of the building, no confidence in two year maintenance agreement with the owner's history of maintenance, unfair to put that onto the tenants, CityLift is better suited for high-density urban areas, not residential suburbs, SUVs don't fit, SUV sales increasing, not realistic that everyone is going to use the lift.

Tree removal: Cutting down 23 trees (staff note: 22 are being removed), six are heritage trees, heritage tree language on the city website does not seem to apply to this project, though new trees will be planted, 24" box trees will take many years to reach maturity to provide ample screening, trees proposed on ECR may be a safety issue due to visibility, tree selection under any mandate should be made by City Arborist; trees serve a variety of ecological functions-input from trained biologists and ecologist necessary to document particular ecological value that may not be obvious to the general public and/or the City Arborist.

Other comments: Concerned about street closures, cranes, construction trucks and equipment on the street; development is lot line to lot line, so trucks will be on the street during construction, neighbor's permission is needed for proposed tiebacks, not going to happen, CalTrans doesn't allow tiebacks on ECR; owner and architect ignored the density, traffic and planning concerns of the people expressed at the King Center meetings earlier this year, this is housing, but these are not affordable units; past decisions are part of the problem for Commission, obligation to residents and homeowners to first address the problems that we have now; once that is done, can consider larger developments/more units, other developments are coming, cumulative impact of approved and under-review projects, push to build high density residential without considering implications, larger concern for/should focus on infrastructure first, concern for the community; need to balance development and growth and grasp the impact on the people of San Mateo, loss of suburban environment. A number of concerns were raised by the adjacent neighbor, including size, privacy (window size), privacy barriers during construction, construction hours, excavation 20' deep 7' from their home, and concern that the project will cause unreasonable and irreparable damage to the structure.

Closing comments from speakers: Opposition is well founded, please preserve this neighborhood, consider the community, respectfully request you deny this project, asked to reduce size to the number of units that would be allowed with traditional underground parking and not the proposed mechanized process in a completely residential area; would like Planning Commission to look at some balance between R1 and R4--there is no buffer.

Three speakers spoke in favor of the project. Comments: Need for housing in the area, jobs outpacing housing, this is a creative solution to density and parking, walkable to downtown, this project, and more like it, are needed; proposed structure is not totally out of character with ECR, it is smaller than others.

The Chair closed the public comment for this item. Staff responded to some of the questions raised by the speakers. After some discussion, Commissioner Rodriguez moved to continue the public hearing on this item to a date uncertain, and that future public comment be limited to the conditions of approval. Second by Commissioner Drechsler. Motion approved 5-0 on a voice vote.

Continued to a Date Uncertain

Yes: 5 - Commissioner Ebnetter, Commissioner O'Leary, Chairperson Whitaker, Vice Chair Rodriguez, and Commissioner Drechsler

STUDY SESSION

3. [San Mateo Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade and Expansion Pre-Application - 2050 Detroit Drive \(PA17-034\)](#)

Brad Underwood, Public Works Director, addressed the Commission. David Hogan, Contract Planner, reviewed the item with a PowerPoint presentation. Deryk Daquigan, Deputy Program Manager, San Mateo Clean Water Program, had a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the project in relationship with the Clean Water Program.

Staff clarified Planning Commission's role pertaining to this item. Public Works and the Clean Water Program staff are on working within a timeline; this project will return for a vote when a formal application is made. A site-specific CEQA will be a part of the formal application.

The Chair opened the public comment period for this item. Speakers: Kelly Moran, San Mateo, Esther Conrad, San Mateo, Renjit Mathew, San Mateo, Joshua Hugg, San Mateo, Adam Loraine, San Mateo, Richard Hedges, San Mateo. Speaker questions and comments:

Questions: The focus has been on meeting requirements to upgrade our facilities in time for permit renewal in 2020. What's the long term design for the plant? Where are we headed in the long term? Will we be able to free up space at the site and, for example, move the corporation yard or other facilities to this location? Instead of building for a combined system, why don't we design for a fix of the sanitary system? If the City did have a lateral ordinance, would blending be allowed? If that is true, would a smaller plant be allowed? If so, how much money would that save? Why is this important? 1) Would like tax dollars to be spent well, and 2) don't want sewage leaking into the ground. Critically important to understand the link--if we have a lateral line ordinance, will it save us millions of dollars?

Comments - general: All speakers commented about: Plant design and size, sewer lateral repair ordinance, and cost. Additional comments about permit timing and building for climate change resilience. Detailed comments: Not clear how big the plant needs to be, largest capital expenditure undertaken, plant is oversized by designing it to deal with high levels of flow, if designed for less flow, it will be physically smaller, costing less and making way for other land uses, the design before you is fundamentally challenged, everything is in place except a sewer lateral repair ordinance for inflow reduction, don't understand why we don't, it's known that water is seeping in from sewer laterals and that the lagoon is polluted with bacteria. Some of that is coming from the sewer laterals; the EPA, state water board and other environmental organizations are seeking sewer lateral improvements because the leaks from laterals are a public health threat, cannot size holding tanks if we do not know inflow from sewer laterals, need to look at the big picture, this is a very costly program, taxpayers will be bearing the cost, extra time could be afforded to look into the matter of a sewer lateral ordinance, sewer lateral infiltration has an influence on the necessity to have a plant of a certain size and has implications for groundwater infiltration, if we address the sewer lateral inspection issue, it buys us time with the RWQCB permit, this time allows us to (1) look at an appropriately sized, less expensive alternative and (2) provide a much more comprehensive solution; the phasing flexibility allowed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) is not specified in the materials before the Planning Commission tonight (speaker asked City to follow up with RWQCB). Climate change resilience comments: Important to build beyond the minimum to protect this very critical piece of infrastructure. For public health and the functioning of the community, it is important to consider elevations, structures and design that protect the facility beyond 30 years, include designs elements such as horizontal levees. Speakers urged Commission to: ask these questions, encourage staff to support the matters articulated, and ask City Council to reconsider how to move forward on this; the design and future use of the site are affected.

Discussion was held between commissioners and staff about the formal application process and Commission's charge this evening. Commission comments and questions: Speakers have made significant comments, concerned about how FEMA flood protection ties in with this, concerned about sustainability of this project, saltwater intrusion into the wastewater process. When was the last time Council weighed in on the project before us tonight? Concerned that circumstances may have changed since then. Will the RWQCB allow us to slow our process down so that we can look at alternatives? Staff responded. Commission's comments followed.

Planning Commission Comments:

Want City Council and Public Works staff to consider information/benefit from advice from both Commission and citizenry, important information provided tonight is of concern, concerned things have changed since project was approved by Council, need cohesive information, facility is too large and should be scaled down to reduce cost, need to make sure taxpayers money is not needlessly spent, urges City Council and Public Works to consider/have conversation about sewer lateral repairs/ordinance, assume Public Works/City staff are looking into the 100 year flood and climate change aspect, we have a duty from a public safety standpoint, there are areas we can improve, there is pressure from a regulatory board, but for a project of this magnitude, if we know we can do better, consider options before moving forward.

Comments about project design: Most commissioners favored the building design, including screening and the pedestrian bridge. One stated the west elevation is the most interesting and would rather see it face Joinville instead of the parking lot. One commissioner did not find administration building and headworks aesthetically pleasing. Other comments: Concerned about the elevation of new and existing buildings; some of the existing facility is below sea level, reality of sea level rise is a consideration, the basement below the administration building will be rendered useless in time of flood, use highest quality materials to make the project last as long as possible, include reflection of the natural environment in design. Landscaping: No negative comments about landscaping. Consider horizontal wetlands; one commissioner preferred mixing plant materials for a less manicured look, another expressed concern about tree selection due to quality of the soil. Raised walkway is high maintenance, one commented that it did not need to be elevated. Educational component: All favorable comments; added that it should be interactive, use technology, and should be as engaging as possible. The idea of incorporating a public art piece as part of the education element/part of the design was stated.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Reports and announcements were not made due to the late hour.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 9th.

COMMISSION MEMBERS
John Ebnetter, Chair
Charlie Drechsler
Pamela O'Leary
Eric Rodriguez
Dianne Whitaker

CITY OF SAN MATEO

Regular Meeting Minutes - Final

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

Planning Commission

Tuesday, September 26, 2017
Council Chambers 7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Present 4 - Chairperson John Ebnetter, Commissioner Dianne Whitaker, Commissioner Eric Rodriguez, and Commissioner Charlie Drechsler
Excused 1 - Commissioner Pamela O'Leary

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. [Approve the Minutes of the September 12, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting](#)

Commissioner Rodriguez moved to approve the minutes with clarification that the August 22nd minutes were approved "as amended". Second by Commissioner Drechsler. Motion to approve as amended carries 4-0 by a voice vote.

Approved as Amended

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Chair opened the public comment period. There were no speakers. Public comment period closed.

PUBLIC HEARING

2. [4 West Santa Inez Condos - 4 West Santa Inez / 1 Engle Road \(PA15-104\)](#)

Lily Lim, Associate Planner, reviewed the project with a PowerPoint presentation. Jack Matthews, of John Matthews architects addressed the Planning Commission about the Conditions of Approval.

The Chair opened the public comment period for this item. Speakers: Mary Diepenbrock, San Mateo, James Cravalho, San Mateo, Mary Cravalho, San Mateo, Eileen McKague, San Mateo, Brian McKague, San Mateo, Arnie Rodman, San Mateo, Debbie Leizgold, San Mateo, Gerry Wentworth, San Mateo, Christopher Angelo, San Mateo, Craig Jory, San Mateo, Tom Thompson, San Mateo. Speakers commented about the conditions pertaining to: The automated mechanical parking system, zoning code conformity, shoring/scaffolding, site survey, soils report and possibility of monitoring by third party structural engineer, consistency with the General Plan, design review comment letter, proof of liability insurance, landscape improvements, site development permit for removal of trees and tree replacement/in lieu fees, heritage tree protection, verification of landscape installation, west elevation windows, building construction activities, temporary construction of privacy fence, material hauling and construction worker parking. Several documents were submitted by the speakers.

The Chair closed the public comment period for this item. Staff and City Attorney responded to questions raised during the public comment period.

Commission questions, comments and discussion: History of automated parking systems in San Mateo, study session requirements (established by City Council resolution in the 1990's - 20 units), appeal process, neighborhood parking permits, California Civil Code 832, parking system annual review condition, tree removal, need for housing, building height, building setbacks, previous project approval at this site, high quality design by a respected architect, however out of scale for the neighborhood, project needs to be smaller and more respectful of the 1-2 stories in the neighborhood, great design but wrong place, consider reducing the number or mix of units, traffic, parking, not in a transit corridor, addressing mechanized parking for future projects, thanked staff, neighborhood and applicant for trying to work with others on very important issues that came up, appreciate efforts to increase housing stock, however, biggest concern is how this will impact that neighborhood, project is not treating the neighbors with the respect that is needed.

Commissioner Drechsler moved that the project, as presented this evening, be denied, with direction to staff to draft findings for denial as a Consent Calendar item for the Planning Commission meeting of October 10, 2017. Motion seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez and approved 3-1, Commissioner Whitaker voting no, and Commissioner O'Leary excused (absent).

Denied

Yes: 3 - Chairperson Ebnetter, Commissioner Rodriguez, and Commissioner Drechsler

No: 1 - Commissioner Whitaker

Excused: 1 - Commissioner O'Leary

STUDY SESSION

3. [303 Baldwin Avenue Mixed-Use Pre-Application \(PA17-033\)](#)

Roscoe Mata, Associate Planner, reviewed the project with a PowerPoint presentation. Jonathan Moss, Executive Vice President & Founding Partner, Prometheus Real Estate, addressed the Planning Commission and answered Commission's questions. Bryan Shiles, FAIA, Founding Partner, WRNS Studio, addressed the Planning Commission with a PDF presentation.

Chair opened the public comment period for this item. Speakers: Susan Dahi, San Mateo, Michael Weinbauer, San Mateo, Maxine Turner, San Mateo, and Drew (last name not provided), San Mateo. Comments/concerns: Traffic, parking--274 spaces will not be enough, setbacks, too much hardscape, not enough greenspace or recreation area, important project because it will set a precedence for downtown San Mateo and it abuts the historical district, this is currently a Latino-heavy shopping center, North B Street Initiative seeks to prevent gentrification of the area (speaker submitted document), blend with the historical feel of downtown, assess with the myriad of projects coming to San Mateo in mind, doesn't address the need for housing, glass wall box inappropriate for downtown, jobs-housing balance, automated parking. The Chair closed the public comment period for this item.

Commission questions: Q: Intersection concerns? A: (staff) Will be examined as part of the traffic and pedestrian safety reports. The bulb-outs provide shorter and safer pedestrian crossing lanes.

Questions for the applicant:

Q: How did the neighborhood meetings change your proposal? A: Meetings were held very recently and the comments aren't reflected in these drawings. Concerns revolved around traffic, parking, and how architecture fits. This building is consistent with massing in downtown, there is a diversity of architecture, and feels design put forth is consistent with that. Only a few office buildings have been built in downtown over a very long period of time. The market for office tenants, including ourselves, is for glazing to be pronounced in a significant manner. The glass elements are broken up. There is a reason why there are a

lot of newer buildings with large, open glass spaces--the market absolutely demands it. It is needed to attract a tenant that will be paying a reasonable rent for the building. It is important to note some of the images were residential buildings with punched windows/small apertures, which differ from offices.

Q: Some of the buildings downtown resulted in the enactment of height limits, citizens may not want those as a benchmark for comparison. A: We are not close to the heights of those 80-110' buildings; we are immediately across the street from the train station; height limit is 55'; in our opinion, proposal is not excessive.

Q: Do you anticipate talking with someone about designing within a historical context of downtown? A: We have not considered that, but may very well consider an advising historic architect. WRNS has an incredibly long history in design both in this context and completely different contexts has considerable experience in this area.

Q: Housing mix - there is not much variety in the size of the units, think larger units are needed. Did you consider varying the size of the units? A: We would love to do larger units, I love to do two and three bedrooms units, however, the trade-off would be an increase bulk and mass. The unit count was important to make this project feasible. So yes, these units are smaller, even smaller than we want them to be.

Q: What version of mechanized parking will you have? How does this work? A: We have done a number of mechanized hydraulic lifts in Sunnyvale and Santa Clara; this will be a puzzle lift configuration. We are currently evaluating the details and manufacturers, including CityLift and Klaus, which is the world's largest to my knowledge. We are interested in a system with the shortest wait time; looked into elevator lifts, which had a slightly longer wait time. We will be occupying more than half the building, so we want to make sure the lift system operates in a manner that is successful for everybody.

Q: How many below market rate (BMR) units are proposed? A: Six, that's one more than required.

Q: What can you do to make the north wall more palatable for the residents who see that? A: (Bryan Stiles) Honestly, that hasn't been studied, and it will be.

Q: Will it be feasible to step back the units on North B? A: Though consistent with what code allows-it sounds like there is interest in further stepping that back. Financially, and frankly, it makes it that much more difficult to make this work. Prevailing wage pushes the cost up 30-35%, which is tens of millions of dollars. We are committed for the long-term because we want to be located here as an office, if we weren't committed to being here, we wouldn't have proceeded.

Q: Use of the public space beyond the lighter paver space? A: Absolutely, yes. That's why we pulled the building spaces back.

Q: Are you considering unbundling your parking? A: We are open to suggestions, but generally do not unbundle because our experience is that residents will want to save \$100/month and will park on the street, which creates problems.

Q: Shared parking off hours? When commercial offices are empty, are comfortable with that; have found there is a little rub in the morning around and again in the afternoon, but for 20 hours a day it is fine.

Q: Why are 274 parking spaces provided where 243 are required? A: We wanted to put together a set of drawings that showed we could achieve that if the market called for it.

Q: Any thought of providing a grocery store on the ground floor? A: Yes, we do have that option and would

love to have a market in there. In the end, the market will determine the uses that will work here. We have reached out to a local broker to engage with local businesses who may want to relocate here. Currently, the interest level has been cafés and restaurants. Mark and Mike (Tragoutsis) have concluded the grocery market is a tough row to hoe, given the competition that exists out there. We are hopeful, but the probability of a market is lower than preferred.

Q: What do you mean by “giving back to the community” A: We are taking 12% of the property and giving it back to the City.

Q: Will there be retail dining opportunities? A: Absolutely. With a much wider sidewalk around the entire property, the pedestrian experience will be significantly improved relative to what is there now.

Q: Will you sign a sidewalk maintenance agreement require insurance if it is used by your tenants? A: Yes, absolutely, whatever is required by the City.

Commission Comments:

Building Design: This could be a great building, work to see it fits with our historic downtown/would appreciate if you could talk to a third party about how to better integrate this building, consider how the building will change our downtown, less glass/glass is overbearing, mix materials, look into reducing bulk by stepping back on Baldwin and North B. Consider a more integrated building design within the building itself--too much contrast between top and bottom, dark brown brick doesn't exude the warmth of traditional brick, consider what the public is going to see from the outside. There will be a shade-study; will also take into consideration reflection, concerned about reflection and impact on neighboring residences and businesses (N. Ellsworth and N. B), a little bit of architecture for inspiration is okay, doesn't have to be completely historical, but feels too modern for this area, show some historic features, consider presentation of the building as one comes from the transit station, reflect the eclectic style of downtown, consider culture, businesses and vibe on North B. Consider North B Street facade elevation and how it interacts with adjacent buildings, Baldwin facade needs more work, north end will need more character than flat wall.

Parking: Appreciate that more parking is provided than is required; interested in the automated parking system that will be chosen and how that will play out in the two levels of parking garage; don't have enough information on the automated parking to comment; will evaluate parking when we look at the traffic demand management and other information, parking can be addressed with transportation demand management (TDM), they can work and are critical to the success of this project.

Ground Floor Residential Use and Site Plan/Site Access: On Ellsworth side you have ingress and egress, trash and loading, don't feel that is a good fit for that side of the building. How will garbage be handled, consider relocation of the three backflow prevention devices, they are near the walkway that leads to the units. Ground floor residential looks good, don't have a problem, would prefer you vary the unit size for variety, unit mix--would like if could add a few two-bedroom units.

Additional comments: Try to balance what the market will bring plus what will be right for downtown San Mateo; possibility of more units: May be able to take advantage of the state's density bonus to add additional BMR units--look into that, satisfy the land-use and urban design elements of the General Plan, at public hearing will ask again how you responded after meeting with residents and neighborhoods, like the idea of a the grocery space. Looking forward to hearing about: Sustainability measures, TDM. Thanked for below market rate units, likes the way the space is activated on ground floor--on Baldwin and B--it is exciting and will help anchor downtown. Thanked public who spoke this evening, and for the letters which came in, hopes applicant will consider the input. Wants to approve this project when it comes back to Commission, wants to get mixed uses in downtown, exciting to see this prospect. Would like to see units for growing population of seniors and a 50-50 office/residential square footage split. Building affects the lives of people

in the neighborhood; difficult to balance improvements when people living next to them, be cognizant of that as we move forward, hope for participation in 100% green energy. Chair closed this item.

NEW BUSINESS

4. [Election of Planning Commission Vice Chair](#)

Commissioner Drechsler moved to continue the election of the Vice Chair to a meeting when all five Planning Commissioners are present. Second by Commissioner Whitaker, motion passes 4-0 by a voice vote.

Continued to a Date Uncertain

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Upcoming meetings:

City Council:

October 2nd - Public Hearing to determine use of the Hillsdale Terraces required developer contribution of \$400,000.

October 16th - Recommendation for 10 year time extension of Public Storage site

Planning Commission:

October 10th - Findings for Denial for 4 West Santa Inez, Election of Vice Chair

October 24th - Planning Commission - Annual Review Station Park Green Development

October 30th - Planning Commission-City Council Study Session for the upcoming General Plan effort

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:17 p.m..

COMMISSION MEMBERS
John Ebnetter, Chair
Charlie Drechsler
Pamela O'Leary
Eric Rodriguez
Dianne Whitaker

CITY OF SAN MATEO

Regular Meeting Minutes - Final

Planning Commission

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

Tuesday, October 10, 2017
Council Chambers 7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Present 4 - Chairperson John Ebnetter, Commissioner Dianne Whitaker, Commissioner Eric Rodriguez, and Commissioner Charlie Drechsler
Excused 1 - Commissioner Pamela O'Leary

CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner Drechsler moved to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Motion failed for a lack of a second. Consent calendar items were reviewed individually.

1. [Approval of the Minutes of the September 26, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting](#)

Commissioner Whitaker moved to approve the minutes with amendments noted during the meeting. Second by Commissioner Rodriguez. Motion passes 4-0 on a voice vote.

Approved as Amended

2. [Adoption of Written Findings for Denial for 4 West Santa Inez Condos - 4 West Santa Inez Avenue / 1 Engle Road \(PA15-104\)](#)

Commissioner Rodriguez noted the applicant submitted a letter, received today, requesting Planning Commission deny the project without prejudice. The Chair asked if any members of the public want to comment on this request. Speakers: Arnold Rodman, San Mateo, James Cravahlo, San Mateo, Taso Zografos, San Mateo, Gerry Wentworth, San Mateo, Eileen McKague, San Mateo. Comments: This is another twist in the road, if this is to be redesigned, need to make sure: (1) the public has a chance to comment on redesign, (2) project goes through a new hearing process, (3) take into consideration everything that was discussed when it was reviewed. What does "denial without prejudice mean"? How is this different than a denial? If the applicant can come back with the same project, how can the concerns of public and commission be met? What criteria will be used to define the resubmitted project? When denied without prejudice, does that mean the neighborhood be involved, or just staff and applicant? Will the community be able to have a voice in what the resubmittal will look like? Public needs confidence that the project won't return with only slight modifications, don't have a good feeling about what denial with prejudice means, neighborhood is concerned about a number of factors, want a win-win, architect was asked if they would consider 7-8 units and the answer was no, fair to say the neighborhood didn't want anything more than 5-6 units, so 7-8 isn't going to work. If denied and applicant works with neighborhood satisfactorily, can the time be reduced?

Commission and staff responded to public comments and discussed: The manner in which items can come back to a public hearing in accordance with the municipal code, definitions and procedures, waivers of time limitations, neighborhood meetings and deliberated whether to deny with or without prejudice.

Commissioner Rodriguez moved the project be denied without prejudice, and that the wording be added to

the prepared resolution. Second by Commissioner Whitaker. The motion was considered "no action", following a 2-2 vote, with Commissioners Rodriguez and Whitaker voting yes and Commissioners Drechsler and Ebnetter voting no. Commissioner Drechsler motioned that Item 2 be adopted as written. Second by Commissioner Ebnetter, motion passes 3-1, with Commissioner Whitaker voting no (Commissioner O'Leary absent).

Chief of Planning noted that Planning Commission's decision is final unless appealed to the City Council in accordance with the Municipal Code.

Adopted

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Gerry Wentworth, San Mateo: Asked how the appeal process would work if one or both Planning Commissioners running for City Council were elected; also asked if a project denied by Planning Commission could be overturned by two new city council members. There being no further speakers, the Chair closed the Public Comment Period.

NEW BUSINESS

3. [Election of Planning Commission Vice Chair](#)

Staff and Commission comments: Not a full Commission at this time, when a full Commission is expected, and the upcoming Planning Commission schedule. Commissioner Drechsler moved to postpone election of the Planning Commission Vice Chair. Seconded by Commissioner Whitaker. Motion passes 4-0-1 on voice vote.

Continued to a Date Uncertain

Yes: 4 - Chairperson Ebnetter, Commissioner Whitaker, Commissioner Rodriguez, and Commissioner Drechsler

Excused: 1 - Commissioner O'Leary

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Thursday, October 12th - two evening meetings: (1) St. Matthews Catholic Church bi-annual neighborhood meeting, and (2) A public information meeting regarding automobile shop vehicle lifts - 6:00 p.m. in City Hall Council Chambers.

Tuesday, October 24th: Station Park Green Development Agreement Annual Review

Monday, October 30th: Joint City Council and Planning Commission Study Session, (upcoming General Plan update), 6:00 p.m. meeting time is preferred.

Chief of Planning has communicated to Commission, by e-mail, that there will not be a full commission until November, and due to a number of other events, Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center (PCRC) matters will be moved to November. There is nothing presently scheduled for November.

For the remainder of 2017, it does not look like we will have a major proposal coming forward, with the one exception of the affordable housing site at Bay Meadows.

Commissioner Drechsler asked that the meeting be closed with respect to the victims of the California wildfires.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS
Rick Bonilla, Mayor
Diane Papan, Deputy Mayor
Maureen Freschet
Joe Goethals
Eric Rodriguez

CITY OF SAN MATEO
Regular Meeting Minutes
City Council

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

Monday, February 5, 2018
City Hall Council Chambers 7:00 PM
Regular Meeting

OPENING

Pledge of Allegiance: Operation Eagle Visit - Homecoming 50 Years

Roll Call

Present: 5 - Mayor Bonilla, Deputy Mayor Papan, Council Member Freschet, Council Member Goethals, and Council Member Rodriguez

CONSENT CALENDAR – CITY COUNCIL

The following items were considered to be routine by the City Council. After the titles of the items were read by the City Clerk, the public was invited to comment and there were no speakers. Motion by Goethals, second by Rodriguez, to approve the CONSENT CALENDAR - CITY COUNCIL items 1 through 8. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Mayor Bonilla, Deputy Mayor Papan, Council Member Freschet, Council Member Goethals, and Council Member Rodriguez

1. City Council Meeting Minutes Approval

Approve the minutes of the City Council Special and Regular meetings of January 2, 2018.

2. Rail Shuttle Bus Service Administration Agreement - Amendments

Approve amendments to the Rail Shuttle Bus Service Administration Agreements with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for shuttle operations and authorize the City Manager to execute the amendments; accept \$164,800 in grant funds for the Campus Drive and Norfolk Area routes; adopt a Resolution to appropriate \$49,000 from the General Fund to the San Mateo Commuter Shuttle project.

Enactment No: RES No. 13 (2018)

3. Poplar Corridor Safety Improvement Project - Budget Appropriation

Adopt a Resolution to authorize a budget appropriation in the amount of \$105,000 for the Poplar Corridor Safety Improvement Project

Enactment No: RES No. 14 (2018)

4. Examination of Sales or Transactions and Use Tax Records

Adopt a Resolution to authorize MuniServices, LLC to examine sales or transactions and use tax records for Measure S-related revenues.

Enactment No: RES No. 15 (2018)

5. Citywide Private Sewer Lateral Cost Sharing Program - Budget Transfer

Adopt a Resolution to authorize a budget transfer of \$140,000 from the Citywide Annual Sewer Rehabilitation Project Account to the Citywide Private Sewer Lateral Cost Sharing Program.

Enactment No: RES No. 16 (2018)

6. Sustainable Solutions Turnkey Program - Amendment

Approve the Sustainable Solutions Turnkey program Service Agreement Amendment and Work Order with Pacific Gas and Electric Company to complete the Investment Grade Assessment for municipal energy efficiency retrofits and authorize the City Manager to execute the amendment.

7. City of San Mateo Annual Investment Policy - Approval

Adopt a Resolution to approve the City of San Mateo 2018 Investment Policy.

Enactment No: RES No. 17 (2018)

8. Refunding of Golf Revenue Bonds

Authorize staff to proceed with the refunding of the Golf Course Project Revenue Bonds, Refunding Series 2007B.

End of Consent Calendar**Removed from Consent Calendar****9. Measure S Oversight Committee Appointment - Subcommittee Recommendation**

Motion by Papan, second by Freschet, to approve the recommendation from the Measure S Appointment Subcommittee to appoint the following five individuals to serve as the establishing members of the Measure S Oversight Committee: Rich Hedges, Naomi Chin-Fuen Hsu, Thomas Morgan, Lisa Diaz Nash, and Travis Taylor. Following the vote Hedges, Hsu, Morgan and Nash were sworn into office. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Mayor Bonilla, Deputy Mayor Papan, Council Member Freschet, Council Member Goethals, and Council Member Rodriguez

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ronald Brey stated he is against development. Thomas Weissmiller commented on taxes and fees spoke against increasing bridge tolls and aggressive sales tax.

PUBLIC HEARING**10. 4 West Santa Inez Condos - Appeal of Planning Commission Decision**

Council Member Rodriguez recused himself from consideration of this item as he heard and voted on the project in his role as a Planning Commissioner. He left the meeting at 7:21 pm.

Associate Planner Lily Lim provided the staff presentation and outlined the process undertaken for this project. Council asked questions of staff about public outreach. The Applicant/Appellant presented information on the project. Council asked questions of staff and the applicant.

The Mayor opened the Public Hearing. Taso Zografos, group spokesperson, for Gramercy-Mounds, El Cerrito Neighborhood Association, asked for Council to consider denying the project with prejudice, and uphold the Planning Commission denial. Allow the applicant to file a waiver before the one year period.

In support of the project: Rafael Reyes - need housing; Mark Hassloop - conflict between zoning designation, apply rules fairly and consistently; Victoria Fierce - obligation to follow housing law; Karen Sarraf, property manager - pledges to ensure residents understand the rules; Grant Wendt - diversity of housing opportunity; Tom Thompson - project meets or exceeds all City requirements; Mike Haddock - we need more homes not lawsuits; Gina Zari, SAMCAR - much needed housing; Evelyn Stivers, Housing Leadership Council - consistent with General Plan and zoning, careful not to make a decision based on misinformation and fear; Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain - works in the transit corridor.

In opposition of the project: Ron Eicher - concern with tree impacts; Jodie Penner - too large for lot; Mary Diepenbrock - does not fit in 4 W. Inez; Eileen McKague - thanked planning commission for denying with prejudice; Brian McKague - massive with no setback; Gerry Wentworth - parking congestion; Deborah Leizgold - parking stalls; Arnold Rodman - concern with parking proposal in the building; Patricia DeMoulin - concern with automated parking impacting street parking; Michael Horrigan - concern with only one neighborhood meeting; Christopher Angelo - City Lift rebuttal to concerns raised about limiting cars that can use the lift; Craig Jory - building not appropriate will impede emergency response; Lorna Shea - directly adjacent to the site never contacted by applicant; Mary Cravalho - adjacent to the project detrimental to the quality of life; James Cravalho - explain what adding without prejudice means versus with prejudice; Jackie Wentworth - asked for compromise; Linda Bogue - there is no check on this project too massive; Thomas Weissmiller - parking and traffic are a problem; Nancy de Ita - parking and traffic impacts, look at safety factor; Clair Weissmiller - no parking in the neighborhood. Virginia McIsaac these are market rate housing.

There being no further speakers, the Mayor closed the public hearing. The Council recessed at 9:17 pm and reconvened at 9:26 pm.

Applicant rebuttal - Architect Jack Matthews provided a rebuttal to the public comment.

City Attorney Shawn Mason explained that denies with prejudice means an applicant can come back after one year. Without prejudice can come back sooner than one year. He commented on the Housing Accountability Act. The Planning Manager, Ron MuneKawa, explained the need for objective standards, not subjective and provided information on parking requirements. Council asked questions of staff and consultants.

Council deliberated stating their appreciation of the project, the applicant, the neighbors and the Planning Commission and encouraged the applicant to come back with a different project.

Motion by Papan, second by Freschet, to Adopt a Resolution to deny the appeal without prejudice and uphold the Planning Commission decision on Planning Application (4 West Santa Inez and 1 Engle Road), Site Plan and Architectural Review for the construction of a new 15,322 square foot

10-unit residential condominium project; Site Development Planning Application for the removal of 22 trees; and a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map based on the Findings for Denial. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Deputy Mayor Papan, Council Member Freschet, and Council Member Goethals

No: 1 - Mayor Bonilla

Recused: 1 - Council Member Rodriguez

Enactment No: RES No. 18 (2018)

NEW BUSINESS

11. Consideration of Extension of Measure P General Plan Policies

Commissioner Rodriguez rejoined the meeting at 10:07 pm.

City Manager Larry Patterson presented staff report and outlined the question that had been brought by residents to the Council to extend Measure P. The options up for discussion were:

Option 1. Take No Action

If sufficient signatures - Council places on November ballot

If approved - Council unable to modify policies without voter approval

If rejected - Council could modify policies upon Measure P expiration

Option 2. Initiate CEQA process to evaluate alternative Measure

Initial Study - significant impacts if approved: a) No - Negative Declaration; b) Yes - Environmental Impact Report

Council could elect to place alternative Measure on the ballot upon completion of environmental review.

Public Comment: Ken Abrey - don't do the ballot initiative, have it be part of the General Plan process; Michael Weinbauer - select the do nothing option so the initiative process can go forward; Lisa Taner - extending Measure P protects affordable housing; Justin Alley - in order to make positive improvements, we need to approach this carefully in a deliberative action and have an open, honest fact based dialogue; Rebecca Wysong - does not agree with extending Measure P; Nancy Schneider - need to be open to different options higher density and height limits in downtown makes the most sense; Jordan Grimes - Measure P has contributed to escalating housing prices; Adam Lorraine - please support option 1; Evelyn Stivers - leave options open. Adina Levin - don't short circuit Measure P process; Maxine Turner - concerns with Measure P expiring during the General Plan process; Victoria Fierce - choose the path that gives the most density; Keith Weber - Measure P will help create affordable housing. Karen Herrel - asked Council to choose the let us do it for you option; Thomas Weissmiller commented.

Council asked questions of staff and San Mateans for Responsive Government. Council deliberated and provided their comments:

Deputy Mayor Papan stated she is mindful of costs, states it is inelegant to mandate a second election to change process; extending to 2025 is a better alternative, and more methodical.

Council Member Goethals stated he is prepared to move forward with the General Plan and Downtown Planning process and felt Option 1 do nothing is preferred.

Council Member Rodriguez stated he is in favor of Option 1; and he would personally prefer and request that the ballot measure be moved to five years instead of ten. He is concerned with diverting staff time from other high priorities.

Council Member Freschet stated she is in support of Option 1; not because she wants to as she is very disappointed and does not understand how tying the hands of the City until 2030 makes sense and views the initiative as robbing the City of the opportunity to have the dialogue.

Mayor Bonilla stated he does not appreciate the feeling that the City is being pushed into a corner. He believes we can have a thoughtful, informed, considerate dialogue on the issue as part of the process. He has to go with Option 1 because we don't have time to go through the CEQA process. There is no reasonable choice.

12. Fiscal Year 2017-18 Mid-Year Financial Summary

Assistant City Manager/Finance Director Drew Corbett and Budget Analyst Grace Castenada provided an update on the financial position at the mid-year. Council asked questions of staff. Public comment was offered and there were no speakers.

OLD BUSINESS

13. City Council Draft Strategic Plan/City Council Priorities for Fiscal Year 2018-19

Deputy City Manager Kathy Kleinbaum provided an update on the City Council draft strategic plan. Council asked questions and provided direction.

Public Comment: Chris Sturken, One San Mateo - affordable housing should stay on the top of the priority list. Regina Islas - engagement with people of color communities is critical, use public lands for 100% affordable housing. Drew stated the list is solid and there are several priorities he is in agreement with on the plan.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The City Manager, City Attorney and Council Members reported on their various assignments and liaison roles.

ADJOURNMENT

Following a moment of silence for San Bruno City Clerk Carol Bonner who passed away peacefully on January 22, 2018 surrounded by her loved ones, the meeting adjourned at 11:56 pm in her honor.

APPROVED BY:


Rick Bonilla, Mayor

SUBMITTED BY:


Patrice M. Olds, City Clerk