

## Cascade Consulting

240 Cascade Drive  
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Phone - 415 272 6897 / FAX - 415 276 1827  
Email - [Brian@CascadeCapitalLLC.com](mailto:Brian@CascadeCapitalLLC.com)

---

### Environmental Review

The following pages review the environmental impacts and benefits of the proposed Saint Matthews Master Plan project that follows the California Environmental Quality Act format.

<b>Project Name:</b>	Saint Matthew's – School Gymnasium
<b>Entitlement Requested:</b>	Design Review (SPAR), Master Plan/Overlay Zone, Special Use Permit & Site Development Permit.
<b>Lead agency:</b>	City of San Mateo, Planning Department
<b>Contact person:</b>	Brian Swartz, 415 272 6897
<b>Prepared This Report:</b>	Cascade Consulting
<b>Project Location:</b>	910 South El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA 94402
<b>General Plan Designation:</b>	Single Family Residential (Note: Allows church and private educational uses subject to a Special Use Permit)
<b>Land Area:</b>	7.12 acres
<b>Description of project:</b>	Master Plan with Use Limitations and Traffic & Parking Management Plan including the construction of a 11,683 square foot school gymnasium building with an approximately 900 square foot room for an existing day care program and an additional 108 surface parking spaces for a total of 306 parking spaces on site.
<b>Surrounding land uses:</b>	Single and multi-family residential to the north, south and west with El Camino Real and commercial uses to the east.
<b>Other public agencies:</b>	None

## ***I. AESTHETICS***

---

The aesthetics of the project have been carefully considered by Saint Matthews, its architect and are responsive to the input of the City's design review consultant, the Planning Commission and the community. The proposed new gymnasium's current design fits well in the context of the other parish buildings. To be complimentary to the existing structures similar colors and building materials are used throughout the proposed new gymnasium. The proposed building shape is similar to the existing Auditorium form, which is directly adjacent. The east and west ends of the new gymnasium are dropped by approximately ten feet to help reduce the overall mass of the building.

Images of the aesthetic elements are contained in the project's submitted plan set.

### **Would the project:**

#### **a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

There are no scenic vistas in area around Saint Matthews.

#### **b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

There are no designated scenic resources in the area around Saint Matthews.

#### **c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

The architecture is complementary to the existing buildings within the Saint Matthews campus. A six foot wall and a row of trees screen the building to the east along El Camino Real.

#### **d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

No new un-hooded or un-shaded exterior light sources are proposed. Any new path lighting will be low level, downward facing and hooded.

## ***II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES***

---

There are no agricultural land uses within five miles of the subject property.

**Would the project:**

**a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No.

**b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

No.

**c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?**

No.

### **III. AIR QUALITY**

---

Saint Matthews is not located near any sources of high levels of pollutants. There are no significant levels of air pollutants or odors generated by the existing or proposed use of the property. Accordingly, it is not anticipated that air quality will be adversely affected by the proposed project. Dust control measures will be observed, pursuant to Best Practices, during the removal of the existing improvements and during constructions. All BAAQMD requirements will be followed during demolition and removal of existing structures.

**Would the project, with proposed mitigation measures:**

**a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

No.

**b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?**

No.

**c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

No.

**d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

No manufacturing or polluting industry is proposed.

**e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

No land use that generates objectionable odors is proposed.

## ***IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES***

---

The removal of heritage trees is considered a significant impact. However, the impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures in accordance with the City's tree ordinance. The Arborist Report also includes several recommendations to protect specific trees during construction.

**Would the project, with the proposed mitigation measures:**

**a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No

**b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No

**c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

There are no federally protected wetlands on or near areas proposed for development.

**d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

None

**e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

The Saint Matthews Master Plan follows the City of San Mateo tree ordinance and all removed trees will be mitigated accordingly.

**f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No such plans exist for the subject property.

---

## ***V. CULTURAL RESOURCES***

---

There are no known cultural resources located at the lawn area where the proposed new building will be located.

**Would the project, with the proposed mitigation measures:**

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?**

No.

**b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource?**

No.

**c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

No such features exist on the property.

**d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

No such features exist on the property.

## **VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

---

Geoforensics Inc. has completed a geotechnical investigation for the proposed site of the School Gymnasium and they concluded that the improvements as proposed in 2006 can be safely constructed. The analysis is still relevant due to the locations of the borings being done in the area of the currently proposed building. The project site is flat and there are no known faults on the site but it is located in a seismically active region. Recommendations of the Geotechnical Engineer shall be incorporated in all plans and specifications in order to mitigate any potential hazards.

### **Would the project:**

#### **a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

**i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?**

No

**ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

The site is not traversed by a Special Studies Zone for potentially active faults.

**iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

The soils report concludes that the proposed development areas are not susceptible to liquefaction.

**iv) Landslides?**

There are no active landslides on the property.

**a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

No grading is proposed except as minimally needed under the proposed building.

**b) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

No

**c) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

No

**d) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

Sewers are available.

## **VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

---

The project site is not listed as a contaminated site on the state's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List and the project does not propose to generate any hazardous waste or interfere with emergency services.

**Would the project:**

**a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

No

**b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

No

**c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

No

**d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No.

**e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

Saint Matthews is not located within two miles of a public or private airport.

**f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

Saint Matthews is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No

**h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

The proposed structure would be fitted with interior fire sprinklers.

## **VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

---

The Drainage Plan and Report, included in this submittal are in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System as administered by the County. It is proposed to provide vegetated swales on the west, north and east sides of the new building. Some storm drain pipes will also be oversized to facilitate maintenance and provide some additional storage. There will also be a sump pump installed. During heavy rain, the system will flow by gravity. After the rain stops, the pump will empty the pipes of standing water, preparing them for the next storm.

**With the proposed mitigation measures, would the project:**

**a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

No

**b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

No

**b) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

The proposed plan follows current drainage patterns and there are no streams in or near the project area.

**c) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

No

**f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

No.

**g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No. All proposed improvements are outside the 100-year flood zone.

**h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

No

**i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

No

**j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

The elevation of the School Gymnasium floor is 32.69 feet above sea level. There are no long steep slopes directly above or around Saint Matthews that would lead to mud flows.

## ***IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING***

---

An Overlay Zoning designation for the property to establish the appropriate development standards for the site is being proposed. Such standards in conjunction with the Use Limitations give significant consideration to the surrounding land uses such that the project will not cause any significant environmental impacts. The City uses the Overlay Zone to set forth such standards for uses that are unique to a particular zoning district. The General Plan Land Use Plan designates the project site as single family residential which allows development of a church and private educational uses subject to a Special Use Permit. The site has single and multi-family uses to the north, south and west with El Camino Real and a range of commercial uses to the east.

**Would the project:**

**a) Physically divide an established community?**

No

**b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

No

**c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

There are no such plans that affect the subject property.

## ***X. MINERAL RESOURCES***

---

There are no mineral resources on the project site.

**Would the project:**

**a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No

**b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

No

## ***XI. NOISE***

---

A noise impact analysis was prepared by Charles M Salter Associates, dated May 2008, which included analysis of project impacts as well as short term construction impacts and recommendations to minimize noise impact. Construction vehicle noise will be mitigated via all equipment being muffled. Stationary equipment will be located as far from existing homes as possible with baffles erected around them as required. All City-mandated hours of construction activity will be followed. Once the School Gymnasium is in use the analysis recommends doors remaining closed during noise generating events and an acoustical consultant will be retained to assist in the selection of mechanical equipment to insure that it meets the City's Acoustical Criteria.

**With the proposed mitigation measures, would the project result in:**

**a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

No

**b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?**

No

**c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

No

**d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

While noise levels may rise for short periods during construction, the proposed mitigation measures will reduce these to below a significant level.

**e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

**f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

## ***XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING***

---

The Master Plan including the School Gymnasium will not result in the displacement of people nor housing and it will not increase the population of the project site.

**Would the project:**

**a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No

**b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No

### ***XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES***

---

The proposed project will not result in an increase in a demand for services in public safety due to the significant increase in available parking, the implementation of a Traffic and Parking Management Plan and Use Limitations.

**a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

**Fire protection?**

No. The School Gymnasium would have interior fire sprinklers and new fire hydrants will be installed as directed by the San Mateo Fire Department.

**Police protection?**

The subject property is in a very low crime area and the nature of the existing and proposed use generates few if any police calls.

**Schools?**

The current and proposed use is a school.

**Parks?**

No

**Other public facilities?**

No

## ***XIV. RECREATION***

---

The project will not have any impact on existing public parks or recreational facilities.

**a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

No

**b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No

## ***XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC***

---

A Parking and Traffic Analysis dated June 8, 2010 for the proposed project was prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants and it included four recommendations. All of these recommendations have been incorporated. An additional 108 parking spaces are being proposed as is the implementation of the Traffic and Parking Management Plan. All of this will provide for an improved existing condition in the area around the proposed project.

### **Would the project:**

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

No

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

No

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No new roads or changes to existing roads are proposed.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

No; there is more than one way to access this project.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

No, as documented in the Hexagon Parking and Traffic Analysis dated June 8, 2010.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

No

## ***XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS***

---

The project can be serviced by existing utilities and service systems.

**Would the project:**

**a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

No

**b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

No

**c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

No.

**d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

Sufficient water supplies are available.

**e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

Adequate capacity exists.

**f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

A landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs exists in San Mateo County.

**g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

Yes.

## ***XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE***

---

**a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

No.

**b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

No.

**c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

No.