

Rendell Bustos

From: Ashley Snodgrass
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 10:17 AM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: FW: Parking

Hi Rendell,

Please see the comment below.

Ashley

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

From: Jerry Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 10:13 AM
To: Ashley Snodgrass <asnodgrass@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: Re: Parking

Yes, thank you for responding:

Tuesday 2/14/23- Planning Commission Meeting - 435 East 3rd Avenue - Office and 5 Residential Units - no on-site parking

Be wise in word and in deed

> On Feb 13, 2023, at 1:08 PM, Ashley Snodgrass <asnodgrass@cityofsanmateo.org> wrote:

>

> Hi Jerry,

>

> Are you referring to a specific project?

>

> Thank you,

> Ashley

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jerry Davis [REDACTED]

> Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 10:01 AM

> To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>

> Cc: [REDACTED]

> Subject: Parking

>

> Parking has become extremely difficult for our residence. Please consider, discuss, and explain.

> Jerry Davis

[REDACTED]

> Yours truly

> Your constituent

> Be wise in word and in deed

> * 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: Mary Escoto [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 11:57 AM
To: Rendell Bustos
Cc: Somer Smith; Jamie D'Alessandro
Subject: 435 E. 3rd Avenue Project
Attachments: 435 E 3rd Support Letter.pdf

Mr. Rendell Bustos
Senior Planner
Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave.
San Mateo, CA 94403

RE: 435 E. 3rd Avenue Project

Dear Mr. Bustos,

As a San Mateo resident of 10+ years, I am writing to you in support of this project and ask that you forward this letter (attached) to the Planning Commission as they consider this project. The project will be an asset to our community in that it promotes and supports the city of San Mateo's goals as they pertain to the provision of additional housing in our community to serve our local workforce. In addition, it proposes to locate office and housing in a key location near transit with robust transportation measures to reduce vehicle trips and promote healthy lifestyle choices, including walking and bicycling. This project will also replace an existing and underutilized auto service building surrounded by surface parking with an environmentally sustainable and attractive building that provides for a high-quality design at a very visible corner. The following project components serve the project area, but also the city as a whole.

- *Transit Proximity*-Office and Residential units that are proximate to transit (within a 1/2 mile distance of the San Mateo Downtown Caltrain station; direct access to multiple bus routes; as well as being within walking and bike riding distance to employers, retail entertainment and dining amenities.
- *New Residential Units*-The project includes five residential units in downtown San Mateo, which are needed in San Mateo. These units will work to fulfill the city's housing goals.
- *Streetscape Improvements* - including wider sidewalks, street trees, public art, street furniture, & pedestrian scale lighting. The improvements increase the walkability & connection from residential neighborhoods to Downtown San Mateo.
- *Sustainable, High-Quality Design* - sustainable and attractive building that provides for a high-quality design at a very visible block.
- *Robust TDM Plan*-A robust TDM plan that reduces vehicle trips by approximately 25% compared to a typical mixed-use project. A variety of measures TDM measures are included to maximize the use of adjacent transit amenities including an innovative sustainable Transportation Initiative, which will provide a monthly subsidy for transit use.

I encourage the Planning Commission to approve this project for San Mateo.

Sincerely,
Mary Escoto

Resident of Mariner's Island

Mary Escoto



February 14, 2023

Mr. Rendell Bustos
Senior Planner
Community Development Department
330 W. 20th Ave.
San Mateo, CA 94403

RE: 435 E. 3rd Avenue Project

Dear Mr. Bustos,

As a San Mateo resident of 10+ years, I am writing to you in support of this project and ask that you forward this letter to the Planning Commission as they consider this project. The project will be an asset to our community in that it promotes and supports the city of San Mateo's goals as they pertain to the provision of additional housing in our community to serve our local workforce. In addition, it proposes to locate office and housing in a key location near transit with robust transportation measures to reduce vehicle trips and promote healthy lifestyle choices, including walking and bicycling. This project will also replace an existing and underutilized auto service building surrounded by surface parking with an environmentally sustainable and attractive building that provides for a high-quality design at a very visible corner. The following project components serve the project area, but also the city as a whole.

- *Transit Proximity*-Office and Residential units that are proximate to transit (within a 1/2 mile distance of the San Mateo Downtown Caltrain station; direct access to multiple bus routes; as well as being within walking and bike riding distance to employers, retail entertainment and dining amenities.
- *New Residential Units*-The project includes five residential units in downtown San Mateo, which are needed in San Mateo. These units will work to fulfill the city's housing goals.
- *Streetscape Improvements* - including wider sidewalks, street trees, public art, street furniture, & pedestrian scale lighting. The improvements increase the walkability & connection from residential neighborhoods to Downtown San Mateo.
- *Sustainable, High-Quality Design* - sustainable and attractive building that provides for a high-quality design at a very visible block.
- *Robust TDM Plan*-A robust TDM plan that reduces vehicle trips by approximately 25% compared to a typical mixed-use project. A variety of measures TDM measures are

included to maximize the use of adjacent transit amenities including an innovative Sustainable Transportation Initiative, which will provide a monthly subsidy for transit use.

I encourage the Planning Commission to approve this project for San Mateo.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mary Escoto', written in a cursive style.

Mary Escoto

Resident of [REDACTED]

Rendell Bustos

From: Ashley Snodgrass
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 3:21 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: FW: Comments on the 435 E. 3rd Ave. IS/MND
Attachments: Comments on 435 E Third Ave IS-MND.pdf

Hi Rendell,

Please see the public comment below.

Ashley

From: Laurie Hietter [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 2:42 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Comments on the 435 E. 3rd Ave. IS/MND

Dear Planning Commissioners:

My comments on the Windy Hill project 435 E. 3rd and the IS/MND are attached. I support the comments from Laurie Watanuki and share her concerns.

My concerns remain regarding the cumulative effects on the downtown context, the loss of our oldest buildings, and the traffic and congestion that will result. The cumulative analyses in various studies grossly underestimate the environmental impacts because there is no realistic consideration of the 18 new highrise buildings proposed and approved for downtown. Using the office space numbers from the General Plan prepared many years ago is not appropriate for today's office use. The glare from the modern lighting will have an adverse effect on downtown.

Please consider additional analysis for traffic, parking, and hazardous emissions.

Thank you,

Laurie Hietter

----- Forwarded message -----

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

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

--
Laurie

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: Ashley Snodgrass
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 3:24 PM
To: Rendell Bustos
Subject: FW: 435 E. 3rd Avenue New Five Story Office/Residential Mixed Use Building(PA2021-081)

Hi Rendell,

Please see the public comment below.

Ashley

From: diana pettit [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 2:59 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@cityofsanmateo.org>
Subject: 435 E. 3rd Avenue New Five Story Office/Residential Mixed Use Building(PA2021-081)

This project consists of Mixed use of Office/Housing on 435 E.3rd Avenue in the City of San Mateo.

However, 5 units of housing is not enough housing for the future of our city families.

In fact, the office development will be a large building with a lighting around the middle edging of the two floors. The building lighting will illuminate the whole sidewalk. It will continue to glare into the Windy Hill property, which has residences on the top floor.

Currently, we already experience this illuminating lighting from the second floor office building at the Windy Hill property. The lighting can be seen east towards all the way to 3rd Avenue and South Fremont Streets.

I have commented and written many times to the City Council when the "Block 21" proposal was initiated and approved by the City Council regarding this illumination of lighting.

There are draperies that have been installed however now they look very inappropriate for an office building.

One other issue is the "permit parking" is not enough for this neighborhood.

Thank You.

Diana Pettit
[REDACTED]