

Rendell Bustos

From: Ashley Snodgrass
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 2:03 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Cc: Manira Sandhir; Mary Way
Subject: FW: Windy Hill proposal

Hi Rendell,

Please see the public comment below.

Ashley

-----Original Message-----

From: Judith Paton [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 6, 2023 1:16 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Windy Hill proposal

Since the State of CA is going to get tougher about our providing more housing, I think you should insist that Windy Hill reduce office space to the first floor only and build the remaining four floors as apartments. A significant number of those should be for low income buyers.

If Windy Hill doesn't care to help out with our housing needs, the land should be offered to a different developer. I hope WH would accept, as their 3rd St buildings are more attractive and on keeping with our older downtown than the two along B St.

Thank you
Judith Paton
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Rendell Bustos

From: Rendell Bustos
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:52 PM
To: I watanuki
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 435 E. 3rd Avenue - Questions

Hi Laurie,

Based on codes in place currently, the project would be responsible for 17 spaces (including the residential spaces). The staff report will go into more detail on this topic. I can let you know when the full staff report is available.

Thanks,

Rendell Bustos
Senior Planner | Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403
650-522-7211 | rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org

-----Original Message-----

From: I watanuki <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 2:20 PM
To: Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 435 E. 3rd Avenue - Questions

Rendell,

How many in-lieu parking spaces is Windy Hill paying for the 39,893 sf? Did they differentiate the number of Office Parking Spaces and the number of residential parking spaces?

Laurie

> On Oct 20, 2022, at 3:45 PM, Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org> wrote:

>

> Hi Laurie,

>

> Thanks for your questions below. Here are my responses:

>

> 1. I am not recollecting other projects that requested a density bonus waiver or concession/incentive to waive on-site parking requirements. However, the projects at 180 E. 3rd Avenue (former Aaron Brothers building), 2 E. 3rd Avenue (corner of 3rd and El Camino), and 221 S. El Camino Real (corner of 3rd and El Camino) were approved and constructed without on-site parking and paid in lieu fees for all required parking.

>

> 2. No, the Main Street Garage is closed from 2 am to 5 pm.

>
> 3. The metric used for the initial study is one employee per 300 square-feet.
>
> Let me know if you have additional questions, thanks.
>
> Rendell Bustos
> Senior Planner | Community Development Department
> 330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403
> 650-522-7211 | rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: I watanuki <[REDACTED]>
> Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2022 10:36 AM
> To: Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org>
> Cc: [REDACTED]
> Subject: 435 E. 3rd Avenue - Questions
>
> Hi Rendell,
>
> 1. Has any other developer in San Mateo requested with a density bonus waiver the by-passing of on-site parking requirements with payment of all parking through in-lieu fees?
>
> 2. Is there parking available in the Main Street Garage for office space and residential parking 24/7?
>
> 3. What is the number being used for the square footage allotted for each office worker now. I have heard various numbers from 100 sf, 175 sf, and 200 sf at different meetings. Can you clarify this?
>
> Thanks.
> Laurie
>
>
> * PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments from your computer. Thank you.

Rendell Bustos

From: Laurie Hietter <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, October 28, 2022 10:17 AM
To: Rendell Bustos
Cc: Christina Horrisberger; Manira Sandhir
Subject: Re: Comments on the 435 E. 3rd Ave. IS/MND
Attachments: Comments on 435 E Third Ave IS-MND.pdf

Good morning,

I do have two questions for you:

Will you be extending the comment deadline?

Can I please get a copy of the comments that were submitted?

Thank you,

Laurie

On Oct 27, 2022, at 1:37 PM, Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Laurie,

Your comments are received, which I will review internally with staff and our environmental consultant. I will follow up in a week or so with a response after our internal review. Let me know if there are immediate questions, thanks.

-Rendell



Rendell Bustos

Senior Planner | Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403
650-522-7211 | rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org





From: Laurie Hietter <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 1:28 PM
To: Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: Christina Horrisberger <chorrisberger@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Comments on the 435 E. 3rd Ave. IS/MND

Dear Mr. Bustos:

My comments on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project at 435 E. 3rd Ave are attached for your consideration.

The IS/MND is in many areas a well-prepared document; however, it has a number of inadequate assessments due to faulty, best-case assumptions. These analyses should be redone and the IS/MND recirculated.

We look forward to reviewing a revised IS/MND with more accurate assumptions and analyses.

Sincerely,
Laurie Hietter

* PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments from your computer. Thank you.

COMMENTS ON 435 E. 3RD AVE. IS/MND

KEY POINTS

1. The IS/MND uses best-case or inappropriate assumptions for many analyses, making the IS/MND inadequate. These analyses should be redone and the IS/MND recirculated.
2. 20 days is not adequate for citizens to review and digest the over 500 pages of IS/MND and technical reports. Please extend the comment period.
3. There are many complicated mitigation measures. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan should be provided with the IS/MND to ensure there will be adequate monitoring and reporting.
4. The project's one affordable unit makes a mockery of the process.
5. The project is not needed. There is over 700,000 sq. ft. of office space approved or planned downtown and San Mateo has a jobs/housing imbalance.
6. The architecture is modern, utilitarian, and cheap. Boxes on top of a box. Does San Mateo not have a design review board?
7. The Logistics Plan and Traffic Control Plan should be analyzed as part of the project. The traffic management during construction is very important because of the traffic backups from the Caltrain at-grade crossing delays. The IS/MND is deficient due to this omission.
8. The number of employees is undercounted because 300 square feet per employee is used in impact analysis calculations. A more realistic and conservative number is 150 square feet per employee. This more realistic allocation would result in 224 employees, which is more than double what is analyzed in the IS/MND. The air quality, noise, traffic, and public services sections must be reanalyzed using the more realistic, or a worst-case scenario (100 square feet per employee). The IS/MND is deficient because it is based on an inaccurate assumption with no reference.
9. The proposed project would result in a cumulative significant impact on the nearby and downtown historic resources. An EIR should be prepared to address the significant cumulative impacts on the downtown context.
10. The proposed project will cause a significant cumulative impact on traffic, shade, and wind in the downtown area.
11. The project will exacerbate the jobs/housing imbalance and should not be approved.
12. The project will add to the cumulative lack of adequate parkland.
13. Please specify if the conditions of approval are considered mitigation measures that will mitigate impacts to less than significant levels.
14. The cumulative noise and vibration analysis did not consider all buildings that may be constructed at the same time, such as 180 E. 3rd Ave. and Draeger's, which could be under construction at the same time as the proposed project. The grade separations could also be constructed in a similar timeframe. The analysis should not be best case but should be redone.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

p. 9, 3.21 Parking and Access

The description of parking references the Kiku Crossing City garage. The parking for that building has already been committed to the projects at 3rd and El Camino Real (which have no parking) and Kiku Crossing (Kiku and the garage removed surface parking).

The in-lieu parking fee is essentially deferred mitigation because additional parking will need to be constructed. The IS/MND is inadequate.

AESTHETICS

The IS/MND authors have misinterpreted the requirement in SB 743 to consider the aesthetic effects of a project on **historic** resources. Aesthetic effects of a project are exempt **except** for the analysis of aesthetic effects related to historic resources. The IS/MND is deficient due to this omission.

The building will represent a new significant source of light at night and glare that will affect nearby residents. Please provide mitigation to protect adjacent residents.

AIR QUALITY

The air quality analysis is flawed because the number of office is undercounted. 300 square feet per employee results in an underestimate of the number of employees, and therefore trips and emission. According to Zippia, the North American average is 150 to 175 square feet and the technology industry uses 115 to 155 square feet. Please recalculate all impacts that use the 300 square feet per person number.

Condition of Approval AIR-3.1 (D) is inadequate because it is not objective and is left to the discretion of the City.

The effects on the Safari Kids pre-school at 521 E. Fifth should be analyzed.

BIOLOGY

Removal of 31 trees, including 4 protected trees, is a substantial loss of nesting habitat downtown.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

p. 50 para. 2: "Impacts to properties listed in the NRHP must be evaluated under CEQA."

CEQA requires analysis of impacts to historic resource beyond those listed in the NRHP. Please see **Historical Resources** (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)) for a more comprehensive definition of resources that must be addressed under CEQA.

(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historical resources (pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code), or identified in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resource Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j) or 5024.1.

p. 55, para. 3: The IS/MND even states “However, the setting of the buildings located at 273 South Railroad Avenue (the former St. James Hotel from the 1860s) and 415 South Claremont Street have already been significantly changed by the surrounding development of modern conventional construction shown on Figure 3.1-3.”

The St. James Hotel (273 South Railroad Avenue) from the 1860s is one of the few remaining structures downtown from the original center of San Mateo, focused around 1st Ave, 3rd Ave., Railroad, and Main Street. Surrounding this building with modern glass boxes that do not respect the heritage of San Mateo is a significant impact that needs to be addressed in a revised IS/MND and mitigated; or, and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared.

The City has approved five four to seven story buildings downtown near the proposed project, which will diminish the historic context of 273 South Railroad, 415 South Claremont Street, and the downtown historic district. This project may be individually not a significant effect but contributes to a cumulative significant impact. No mitigation is proposed so an EIR must be prepared.

p. 55

“As described under Section 4.5.1.2 Existing Conditions, while no prehistoric- or historic-era sites or resources have been documented within 1,000 feet of the project site, the project site is located within a medium sensitivity zone for archaeological resources.”

Please revise the statement to reflect the National Register of Historic Places-eligible building at 273 Railroad Avenue and the building of local significance at 415 South Claremont. Please address the effects on the context of the historic buildings.

NOISE AND VIBRATION

Will vibration from construction of the proposed project, combined with construction of Block 20 and 21, and 180 E. 3rd? have an adverse effect on the historic building?

The Public Services section states that the project would add 13 residents and 111 new employees in the office space. Footnote 99 states: “Office uses typically generate one employee per 300 square feet of office space. 33,529 square feet of office space divided by 300 square feet equals 111 employees.” The citation for the source is not provided.

The number of employees is substantially underestimated because 300 square feet per person is on the high end of the space per person, which ranges from 100 to 400 square feet per person.

According to Zippia, the North American average is 150 to 175 square feet and the technology industry uses 115 to 155 square feet. Please recalculate all impacts that use the 300 square feet per person number.

PUBLIC SERVICES

p. 149; Condition of Approval PS-4.1: The City is already in a park/open space deficit. Allowing an in-lieu fee will only exacerbate the problem, which is a cumulative significant effect in the City.

The acreage of parkland is currently below the goal established in the City's General Plan of 6.0 acres per 1,000 residents. This project is adding to a cumulative impact by adding residents without adding adequate park space.

p. 152: "The proposed project includes private amenities for future employees and residents of the proposed project." The private amenities are not addressed in Impact REC-1.

TRAFFIC

Where will the in-lieu fees create parking? The Main Parking Garage is committed to previous projects and cannot accommodate another project's parking.

The building does not have a loading zone, which may cause significant traffic delays during the train crossings multiple times per hour.

p. 154, Table 4.17-1: Summary of Existing and Project Trips: The table undercounts trips because the number of employees is undercounted. The authors use 300 square feet per person, which is on the high end of the range, which results in undercounting employees. At 150 square feet per person (more common now) the number of employees would be 224 employees. Please recalculate the effects to better reflect a more likely impact.

Rendell Bustos

From: I watanuki [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 6:17 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Cc: [REDACTED]; Michael Weinbauer; Manira Sandhir
Subject: Re: 435 E 3rd Avenue - Comments for IS/NMD

Rendell, thanks for your note. Laurie

On Oct 27, 2022, at 6:01 PM, Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org> wrote:

Hi Laurie,

Your comments are received. I will be reviewing this internally with other staff and our environmental consultant and expect to provide a response next week. Let me know if you have any immediate questions.

-Rendell

<[image002.png](#)> **Rendell Bustos**

Senior Planner | Community Development Department

330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403

650-522-7211 | rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org

<[image003.png](#)> <[image004.png](#)> <[image005.png](#)> <[image006.png](#)> <[image007.png](#)>

From: I watanuki [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 4:20 PM
To: Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: [REDACTED] Michael Weinbauer [REDACTED]
Subject: 435 E 3rd Avenue - Comments for IS/NMD

Dear Mr. Bustos,

These are comments for the 435 E 3rd Avenue IS/NMD:

1. We need an extension of time for the comments for the IS/NMD. 20 days is not adequate to review all this technical information.
2. The architecture is still very modern and the interior lighting at night from this office building may impact the surrounding residential developments. There is also an older single family home next door 50 feet away to the north. The building design needs to blend better with the historic building at 273 Railroad Avenue, and the Takahashi family home. The building could be stepped back at the second level and the mass can be reduced so it fits into the smaller footprint.

3. There is only 1 BMR within the 5 units and the major portion is more office space which further exacerbates the jobs/housing imbalance. We have maxed out on office space in the Downtown and we need to address the RHNA numbers.
4. The number of employees is undercounted since 300 sf per employee was used. This comes to 111 employees according to the IS/NMD. A more realistic number is 150 sf per employees which comes to 224 employees which is double the number. This impacts the analysis of the IS/NMD in various categories such as the number of trips, parking needs, park / open space need to be re-calculated.
5. We need a revised IS/NMD or an EIR to address the mitigation deficiencies in this report.

AESTHETICS:

1. The architecture is still very contemporary and the interior lighting at night from this office building may impact the surrounding residential developments if you look at the renderings. There is also an older single family home next door 50 feet away to the north. The building design needs to blend better with the historic building at 273 Railroad Avenue, the Takahashi family home, and the Downtown Historic District. The building could be stepped back at the second level and the mass can be reduced so it fits into the smaller footprint. The other surrounding glass buildings have had significant impacts on the few historic buildings we have left on the east side of San Mateo and our older neighborhoods. These aesthetic impacts need to be addressed since each new modern glass building design has a cumulative affect and diminishes the value of our Downtown Historic District and our older neighborhoods on the east and west side.

AIR QUALITY-

1. There are multiple projects: Block 21, Block 20, 222 Fremont Terrace, 200 Fremont, 441- 445 South B Street (Tomatina / Talbots), 222 E. 4TH (Draegers), 180 E 3rd (Aaron Bros) which may contribute to the toxic environment of the surrounding area. These projects along with 480 Kiku Crossing, 400 E 5th Kiku Crossing garage, 477- 9th Avenue need to be included depending where they are in construction.
2. There is a preschool Safari Kids - which was not included in the Figure 01 map. They have an outdoor recreation area.

HISTORIC RESOURCE-

NOISE AND VIBRATION ASSESSMENT-

1. The interior noise standard is 45 db, and the exterior noise standard is 60 db with 67 max. The interior noise is rated at 58 db and the exterior noise level is rated at 73 db. Both will exceed standards. Also HSR with the elevation of the tracks to 2 stories will bring more noise impacts. How will you address these noise issues?
2. Do the noise impacts include the differences in the calculation on the number of trips? Or the future noise impacts from traffic from 303 Baldwin (Trags), 480 E 4th (Kiku

Crossing), 450 E 5th (Kiku Crossing Garage - 700 cars), Block 21, 180 W. 3rd (Aaron Bros), 1 Hayward, 616 S B Street (Taps), 477 - 9th Avenue/Claremont, 222 - 4th Avenue (Draegers), 445 S B Street (Talbots), 500 - 4th Avenue Block 20, and 31-57 S B Street (Donut Delite), 222 Fremont, 200 Fremont.

3. Construction noise impacts - There will be temporary noise impacts from 74 to 85 db. This can exceed 90 db and can have significant impacts. We would like to see other construction noise impacts be included in this analysis if all this construction is going on concurrently in the Downtown?

4. Heat pump noise - There will be 5 heat pump on the roof which generate 69 db day and the night. The worse case is 75 db. The noise limit is 73 db. How do you plan to remediate this noise from a 3 ft distance?

TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT -

1. There is no loading zone in the project on S Claremont for the Office use or 3rd Avenue for residential use. How will you address this?

2. The traffic generated from this project will add to the railway crossings delays and this has not been calculated into the impacts for 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, S Claremont, S Delaware on the east side and B Street, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th in the Downtown. We would like these traffic delay impacts included in the analysis.

3. Will Windy Hill widen the sidewalks on S Claremont for pedestrian safety as recommended in the Pedestrian Master Plan? There is a conflict between the building standards and widening the sidewalk. Will Windy Hill address this conflict with modifications to the building so the sidewalk width can be safer for the pedestrians?

4. Will Windy Hill provide traffic calming on S Claremont and 5th Ave to reduce the cut-through traffic generated from this project to the Transit Center. We need to avoid more cut-through traffic on 5th Avenue since this is a Bike Boulevard. We need to make 5th Avenue safer for the bicyclists and pedestrians and avoid the 5th Avenue route. Trip numbers are underestimated in this project.

5. The trip numbers need to be re-adjusted since they are too conservative and underestimated.

PARKING DEMAND STUDY

1. There are parking concerns with this project because the trip calculation numbers have been underestimated. This parking number has to be recalculated. The Kiku Crossing Garage and the Main Street Garage has been mentioned for parking for this project. Both garages have been allocated for other projects and the Main Street Garage is closed from 2 am to 5 pm.

Laurie Watanuki

*** PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are

hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments from your computer. Thank you.

Rendell Bustos

From: Rendell Bustos
Sent: Monday, October 31, 2022 8:05 AM
To: Daniel Shefer
Cc: [REDACTED] Manira Sandhir
Subject: RE: Comments on PA21-081-435-East-3rd-Avenue-Mixed-Use-Project-IS-MND

Good morning Daniel,

Your comments and questions are received. I will review this internally with staff and our environmental consultant. I should be able to provide a response within a week.

Thanks,
Rendell



Rendell Bustos

Senior Planner | Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave., San Mateo, CA 94403
650-522-7211 | rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org



From: Daniel Shefer [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 10:37 PM
To: Rendell Bustos <rbustos@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments on PA21-081-435-East-3rd-Avenue-Mixed-Use-Project-IS-MND

Reddell,

I'm CC'ing Lisa Nash and Robert Newsom hoping that as future City Council members, they take note and address these issues with the Planning Division.

Before getting to my comments, I'd appreciate it if you could advise as to why I have not been provided notification re this project despite living downtown (217 8th Ave)?

Specifically re this project -

1. **Residential vs office space**

The City of San Mateo needs more residential units, not more office space.

2. **Aesthetics**

Why are we getting yet another building that looks like it came straight out of Minecraft? This is yet another cookie cutter glass and brick building. The design lacks any kind of imagination or design talent. Is this the best the architect can do? Really?

3. **Parking**

Why are we allowing the developer to rely on public parking? They're assuming that the parking lot on 360 Main has 70 extra, unoccupied parking spots just waiting for the employees and residents of this building. Why would the city allow them to "dump"

they're parking needs on the public in exchange for a ransom? No amount of money can create more parking spots out of thin air. These need to be built.

4. **Number of Employees**

The project assumes 111 employees (Table 4.8-1) based on 33,529 square feet of office space divided by 300 square per employee. A more realistic number is in the range of 150 - 200 square feet per employee. Assuming the more generous number, that gives 55 more employees. 55 employees that are unaccounted for with regards to resources in general and specifically parking. Does the main parking lot referenced in the report (see previous comment) really have that many unused spaces?

I appreciate that the City's lack of a planning code precludes it from forcing any kind of aesthetics on developments. Further, I don't know if there is any ratio of residential vs office space that can be enforced. However, please be advised that if the Planning Division does not address concerns 3 and 4 above, I reserve the right to take legal action against the City of San Mateo.

Sincerely,

Daniel Shefer

Rendell Bustos

From: William Tatomer [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 6:04 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: PA 2021-021

Hi
I'm distressed to so yet more building with no parking. So more will get into residential areas to park.
When will gridlock be a consideration?
This just seems wrong
Thanks
Bill Tatomer
Sent from my iPhone

Rendell Bustos

From: Jonathan Chun [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, October 2, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: Neighborhood Meeting PA 2021-021

Dear Planning Commission,

I've expressed this before but the ratio of housing to office space in San Mateo is too low. This project simply does not make sense with the current low demand relative to availability of office space compared to high demand and low availability of residences. Furthermore with no parking this building is sure to increase day time congestion and make parking even more difficult. I do not support this project as it is currently proposed. I propose it that they at least triple the number of housing units by building six stories with three devoted to housing and three to office space. I would also propose they have underground parking to support the office workers and people living there.

Jonathan Chun

Rendell Bustos

From: Kline Ashley [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 1:37 PM
To: Rendell Bustos; [REDACTED]
Subject: PA-2021-021 / 435 East 3rd Ave
Attachments: image001.wmz

Hi Rendell and Mike –

I received the notice about the above-referenced property at my place of business, which is within a couple of blocks of the proposed development. I am writing in my capacity as the GM of Dompe US, which is a biotech/pharmaceutical company located in downtown San Mateo, where we have about 8k sqft of commercial office space and about 20 employees, most of whom have been working from home since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. I am also a Burlingame resident and live about 10 minutes from the proposed site. I frequently shop and eat in downtown San Mateo.

Downtown San Mateo is a very desirable location for commercial offices. The large number of walkable coffee shops and restaurants add a lot to the employee experience, and the warmer weather helps with recruiting when spaces are compared to more traditional offices spaces, e.g. South San Francisco or the San Bruno office park where YouTube has offices. The proximity to the CalTrain express stop has also been helpful for us in our recruiting efforts.

I would like to ask the Developer to reconsider the lack of parking in the project, and the City to strongly consider rejecting the project unless it can be reworked to include underground parking. Parking downtown has become more challenging with the closure of B Street to provide a pedestrian arcade. Furthermore, employees do not want to come into the office because they have grown accustomed to working from home since the beginning of the pandemic. When they do come in, they want the commute and overall experience of getting to work on the 1-3 days/week that they come in to be as frictionless as possible. Taking public transit (CalTrain) makes an already undesirable commute completely untenable for many people. Personally at our office, we are finding that employees are opposed to working live from the office unless the company provides parking in our building garage, where we have access to a limited number of spaces that were allocated based on our square footage in the building.

I have also looked at numerous other commercial spaces in the area, and almost all of the space, even in older buildings, has on-site parking available for employees. While traffic is a nightmare, and I wish everyone could take public transit, we live in a reality where commuting from many Bay Area locations into downtown San Mateo is not efficient using CalTrain. Even from San Francisco, the trip via CalTrain is terrible from many neighborhoods.

Both for business reasons to add to the marketability of the space (commercial and residential), and for the health of the downtown San Mateo business district, this project should not be allowed to move forward unless it can provide a way for the people who live and work there to park their vehicles. Using existing street parking and garages for this new development would strain an already precious resource.

Apologies that I am unable to attend the Neighborhood Meeting later this week.

Ashley

Ashley Kline
General Manager, Country Head — Dompé U.S., Inc.
Head, Global Biotech Business Unit – Dompe Farmaceutici S.p.A.



www.dompe.com



Please consider the environment before printing

Confidentiality Notice: This message is private and confidential and may contain confidential, proprietary or legally privileged information. If you have received this message in error or you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately and delete and remove the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Any unauthorized use or disclosure of the contents of this message or any attachments is not permitted and may be unlawful.

Rendell Bustos

From: DA [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 11:09 AM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: Tonight's neighborhood meeting

Hi Rendell,

I'm hoping to join the meeting tonight but not sure with zoom how that works. I want to comment to you and you may pass it on at the meeting and show what I mean. As always please state that I'm not against the project but would like to see the design more in keeping with the standards reflecting San Mateo's history. My feeling has always been that all the new buildings have the same architecture especially in one location. Please see two examples that would lend itself better giving the cityscape the diversity we are looking for. Hope to see you tonight.

Thank you

Dino

815 HAMILTON ST



9:36 AM Thu Oct 7

Current Projects » Development Projects

601 MARSHALL ST



Rendell Bustos

From: George California [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 3:41 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: PA-2021-021, 435 E 3rd Ave .. pre-App

Any project within the Downtown/Central district that does not propose on-site parking should be a non-starter. Very much opposed to this plan.

George Derby
[REDACTED]

Rendell Bustos

From: George California [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 4:02 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: Re: PA-2021-021, 435 E 3rd Ave .. pre-App

Setback seems inadequate for a future very high pedestrian traffic area.

Need more benches on the sidewalk around the building.

Where are the architecturally compatible trash cans? Should be at least three (3) around the building.

In terms of sidewalk space, have you considered street lighting attached to the building instead of sidewalk posts?

George Derby
[REDACTED]

Rendell Bustos

From: George California [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 5:29 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: Re: PA-2021-021, 435 E 3rd Ave .. pre-App

Is this project just a scaled down version of the building that went up on 4th Avenue between Railroad and Claremont?

George Derby
[REDACTED]