

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 12, 2012**

Approved

The meeting convened at 7:30 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the Elks Club Lodge at 229 – 20th Avenue and was called to order by Chair Whitaker, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Those present were, Commissioner Hugg, Commissioner Bonilla, Vice Chair Massey, Commissioner Moran, Chair Whitaker,

A motion was made by Commissioner Bonilla, seconded by Vice Chair Massey to approve the minutes of the Regular meeting of May 22, 2012 as modified.

Vote – Passed - 5-0

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Whitaker opened the public comment period.

(No persons wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.)

ITEM 1

STUDY SESSION

PA 10-060, St Matthew Catholic Parish and School Master Plan, St. Matthew Catholic Parish and School, 1 Notre Dame Ave, (APN 034-232-340, -350, -370). The project includes the construction of an approximately 12, 000 sq. ft. school gymnasium and reconfiguration of the existing parking lot to add 108 new parking spaces.

- A. Mitigated Negative Declaration to assess potential environmental impacts of the project.
- B. Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) for the design and construction of the gymnasium building and parking areas;
- C. Reclassification of the site to add a Qualified (Q7) overlay zone designation over the existing R1-C zoning for the property to establish development standards for the campus, including the maximum allowed floor area ratio and parking to back out onto Notre Dame Avenue;
- D. Special Use Permit (SUP) for the approval of a master plan to regulate uses on the site;
- E. Site Development Permit (SDP) for the removal of major vegetation.

The property encompasses three parcels and is approximately 310,400 sq ft (7.12 acres). The site is located west of El Camino Real between Notre Dame Ave and Aragon Blvd. The property is zoned R1-C.

PROJECT PLANNER:

Stephen Scott, Principal Planner

(650) 522-7207
Email: scott@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE: Brian Swartz
Cascade Consulting
240 Cascade Drive
Mill Valley, CA 94941
Phone: (415) 272-6897
Email: brian@cascadecapitalllc.com

PROPERTY OWNER: Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco
C/O Father McGuire
1 Notre Dame Ave
San Mateo CA 94402

Staff presentation

The Planning Commission had the following questions/comments for staff:

- Please explain the potential changes to the Special Events Committee process mentioned in the staff Report. **Atty:** currently we're processing special event applications as temporary use permits ordinance and we would like to come up with a specialized ordinance for special events that would include insurance requirements, public safety requirements, etc., and so it would be a matter of formalizing that into an ordinance that would require introduction and adoption by the City Council.
- Please explain the effectiveness of the parking management company (PMC) the church hired to manage parking during the busy 8:45am Sunday Mass. **Hexagon:** PMC already being used. They are getting the most efficient use of their parking by having the cars park in an orderly fashion whereas they may park more haphazardly if there were not some parking attendants out there. To fit all of the cars on-site, they would have to do stack parking (some behind others) and so certain cars would have to be moved in a certain order in order for the parking lot to empty after the service. The applicant has a diagram about how the stacking would occur; only one car would have to be moved for a car to get out. Not practical to use parking attendants to move the cars; people getting blocked in would have to wait until the other car was moved. Since everyone would be leaving at the same time, it would be a minor wait.
- If we aren't looking at that approach to meeting the parking demands, then what we're saying is that the parking demand is being met, in part, through off-site parking. Is that your view at this time? **Hexagon:** Yes. There are about 40 spaces in the parking lot across the street that the church has a lease for. There are also a number of on-street parking spaces along El Camino Real and Notre Dame and if you add all of that together you can come up with enough parking spaces to equal what we estimate the demand for

the 8:45 mass. That will not prevent people from parking on neighborhood streets since in some cases the neighborhood streets are closer to the front door than the parking lot across the street.

- In the report it is stated that the off-site parking lot is being used for the Sundays where Hexagon observed the parking. **Hexagon confirmed**
- As part of restriping of the parking lot, introduction of compact parking spaces requires certain size vehicles; feasibility of a PMC to queue up cars in order to direct them to the correct sized space. **Hexagon:** Cars arrive over a period of time (as opposed to all at once) for the 8:45 Mass and it is possible for the PMC attendant to effectively direct cars to the spaces. Currently using 3 attendants, may have to use 4-5 attendants in the future.
- What is the long-term feasibility of maintaining the lease arrangement with the bank across the street and the alternative location mentioned in the staff report? **Staff:** There is no assurance. The bank parking across the street has been used informally for a long time and the lease has formalized to a degree that the property owners are comfortable. The lease can be terminated. If the bank wanted to redevelop soon and had the financing to do so, the lease would be terminated. We have to look at off-site parking as something that will help for the mid-to long-term situation and certainly for the short-term. If and when it goes away, there is an obligation under the SUP for them to do a legitimate search for something similar within walking distance.
- Does the proposed parking lot meet Zoning Code standards for space and aisle dimensions? **Staff:** Yes.
- Within the AR and presentation, staff indicated that church's and private education uses are allowed in R zones subject to SUP and conformance with applicable code requirements. Is there an existing SUP for this site on file at the city? **Staff:** No. The school use has existed at this site for many decades and probably pre-dated the city's requirements for an SUP. Since they are now asking for something new and we need formalize an SUP for this site.
- Q7 zone: Is this being proposed/requested because of the FAR and the 21 existing and the 12 new parking spaces on Notre Dame that required backing out? **Staff:** Correct.
- If this request is granted, would the applicant then be able at some future date to not be able to build a parking garage? **Staff:** Q7 only locks in the floor area for the site. Any modification that would include more floor area would require a modification of the Q7 zone related to the allowable floor area.

Applicant presentation

The Planning Commission had the following questions/comments for the applicant:

- This gym is somewhat larger, 11,000/12,000 sq ft, than a typical elementary school gym. Typical elementary school gyms do not have the extra width around the court, storage areas, etc. And elementary school gyms are typically only open during the days, occasionally evenings and for a special event; the proposed hours of operations and uses

here are broader than others. Please respond to both questions. **Applicant:** Hours – Demand for gym space (field space) is such that some practices go to 10pm which is why we've requested that in this case. High school's use college-sized floors; grade schools use high-schools requirements. Additional width on the sides is to allow for parents to sit on the side, other teams to gather on the side. Storage is typical.

- The traffic management plan indicates there are to be surveys of parishioners to determine the modes of transportation; has this data been developed? **Applicant:** Our traffic consultant is not here; we have no response tonight.
- Please provide more information regarding the proposed size and hours of operation for the gym. **Applicant:** This is a K – 8th grade school; each grade level has 2 classes. Besides regular physical education needs, there are approximately 300 children that participate on 30 basketball and 12 volleyball teams in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades. There are approximately 45 hours a week of practices.
- How will the master plan address the pick-up/drop-off problems that the Planning Commission receives complaints about?. **Applicant:** There are currently 615 students that are processed onto the campus each morning and afternoon. This is approximately 180-190 cars in a 35 minute period. 180 school days a year – 166,000 cars moving through efficiently and safely. We are aware of intermittent people who are not abiding by the designated drop-off procedure. The parish continues to impress upon parish parents that they are expected to respect neighbors on Aragon and to use the normal process for pick-up and drop-off.
- Master Plan has some specific actions that the church was committing to take. **Applicant:** 9 people are posted AM/PM. The assigned monitors do not regularly patrol Aragon, but on a spot check basis they saw no one using Aragon.
- Please clarify the SUP prohibition regarding private activities in that facility – does this extent to city uses as well? The campus has been used for public meetings in the past. Are those no longer available on this site? **Staff:** The SUP currently limits the use of the gymnasium to St. Matthew-sponsored athletic events and cannot be rented out or used by outside organizations. The church would have the ability to come before the special community events committee to request a special event through the Special Community Events Committee process.
- Please provide details as to how the wall along El Camino Real is being enhanced. City's architect made some recommendations. **Applicant:** We are committed to cleaning it and placing plants in front of it. We will also follow the design review recommendation I to hide the transformer. Landscaping will take place at the end of the building process.
- Are there to be pedestrian timers for both the east/west and north/south directions at the El Camino Real/Ninth Avenue crossing? **Hexagon:** The timer heads are already installed, but will need to confirm whether they are for the north/south crossings.
- The traffic report assumes 3 persons per vehicle for the Sunday services; please describe how that is derived. **Hexagon:** The parked cars were counted and the church provided the number of people who attended the Masses; it is an estimate that is consistent with other church parking demand that we have evaluated.

-
- Please clarify which roof design is now proposed; earlier drawings had a gable roof. **Staff:** The current proposal is a barrel-vaulted roof, which is required in order to meet the height standard for the R1 zone. The earlier pitched roof with gable end was the version in the earlier study session set of drawings, but did not meet the height requirement.
 - Please clarify the types of events listed in the Master Plan. **Staff:** There are 11 “minor” events, which would generate less than 275 vehicles; 11 “typical religious and school gatherings”, which *may* generate more than 275 vehicles; and a request for up to 6 “major” events (such as the annual carnival), which would also generate more than 275 vehicles. The SUP lists these and requires that the events that could generate more than 275 vehicles must implement the private parking management company to assist parking those events.

Chair Whitaker opened the public comment period for this item. The following individuals spoke: Bertha Sanchez, Ryan Tiru, Richard Romero, Cynthia Wilcox, Seth Schalt, Casey Watson, Yu Ru Chen, Phyllis Leonhardt, Michael Geller, Pat Hagerman, Mike Cunningham, Hilary Landry, John Hermann, Joanne Norris, Tom Schratte, David McGuerty, Patty Dwyer, and Diana Stork.

Their comments included:

- Dealing with parking every day, mostly Sunday. No one has addressed what is going to happen in the future; we talk about what Sunday means and we’re mitigating that issue, but no one has addressed how many sports events, seating capacity of the gym, traveling teams coming in/out, additional traffic.
- Parking atrocious at this time. People park in the crosswalk in front of my house. Many times the people attending the church don’t go to the parking lot, they just go and park on Aragon.
- Loud noise from the church events both on the church grounds & near the adjacent residences. Children are awakened by car noises, such as opening/closing the doors, chirping from the keyless entry systems, restriping doesn’t create any new spaces for SUV’s and minivans. Since the last hearing, numerous photographs have been submitted showing parents loading/unloading their children while blocking my driveway. We were assured it would stop and it has not. The parking problem has not been resolved. There is still insufficient parking for their events. Limit events to 8pm; why does this school have events as late as 10pm. Serra High School, Draegers, library all have underground garages – so should St. Matt’s. The neighborhood was there before the church was. I come home with my child at the same time as the St. Matthew parents are picking up their children, and I have never seen anyone monitoring the situation.
- The current application is not materially different from the ones that have been submitted over the past 4-5 years. The same violations exist. Perhaps they are technically under the number of parking spaces required by the zoning code, but just because they are doesn’t mean we should continue this into the future. We are actually setting a precedent for other businesses in San Mateo if this measure is approved. Do the right thing and build an underground garage. I would also like to submit a request for a new traffic study. The older traffic study was done when Albertsons’ was closed and the traffic patterns have

significantly changed. The signal light timing patterns on El Camino Real have also changed. Traffic on Maple St. will only increase. Please do not move forward with this proposal as is.

- Neighbor for 11 years. One broad statement from my experience as a neighbor is that parking is polarizing issue between church and neighborhood. The best solution is really underground parking. Look at the library.
- Suggest that the Commission vote “no” on this project. Worried about the zoning code, which requires less parking spaces and enables a method to avoid taking full responsibility for parking impacts. If the SM school proposal is approved, there will be other applicants to apply the same zoning techniques, which will result in the erosion of the zoning code of the city. The Commission should take a long, solid look at this proposal.
- The existing buildings on the property total 78,000 sq ft. The proposed addition of the gym (11,700 sq ft.) brings the total to 89,793 sq ft. The site is overbuilt with buildings and parking lots. Why has it never been brought up that the existing gym could be retrofitted and enlarged to accommodate the standard needs of a grammar school. How many grammar schools in SM or other community have 2 gyms? This is a grammar school not a high school. There are 3 variances on this project; overbuilding, removing 26 heritage trees, and inadequate parking.
- Adding 50% more parking; truly are adding 30 spaces and restriping the existing spaces. Adding spaces not capacity ; important to distinguish between the two. Summer months over 400 vehicles; double-parked, triple-parked. Would argue that restriping creates more chaos. St Matt’s is referring to a parish community center and not a gym. Why is this parking discrepancy grandfathered in?
- Tired of the noise from the school; would enjoy some peace and quiet. Why are parking studies always done in the summer when there is no traffic. Why was the traffic from 9th onto ECR not included in the parking study? Neighborhood built in late 20’s; predate the construction of the school and the church. More study needs to be done on the number of events and vehicles.
- Serra High School is referenced as having an overlay. Document fails to mention that Serra built additional parking as condition. Conformance to conditions is not maintained by the city. Ward Hall is an auditorium. We have two gyms not one. How, looking at that diagram, can you get 108 spaces? Can fire apparatus navigate the recommended parking? Suggesting that St. Matt’s build a garage. It’s never been about “you can’t have a gym” it’s all about the parking.
- The parking lot across the street does not prevent parking on the neighborhood streets. People are going to park where it is convenient. We want the parish children/parents to have what they need – we also want them to stay out of the neighborhoods. Build a parking structure. Do something permanent and good for the neighborhood and parish.
- Pretending to care for the neighbors. Wear the neighborhood down until they get what they want. Neighbors will have to police things. We’re cutting down 100-year old heritage tree to cram in another 10 parking spaces? Cutting down all of the heritage trees will not provide enough parking. What happens if we find out it doesn’t work? Who do

we talk to? It's overbuilt, overdone, we're tired of coming up here. The PC needs to "man" up and deny the project. Please deny this project with prejudice.

- The Planning Commission doesn't seem to understand: Planning Staff have worked on this over the years. We have not been heard. People should not be allowed to do things not to code or the plan. Buy the bank lot and build a parking garage.
- Have heard that the gym would be for "St. Matthews" sponsored events and "church" sponsored events; is there a distinction? There is noise pollution, beeping from cars and additional car noises. Install sound barrier walls that help the neighbors. There will be light pollution – additional lighting inevitable. How will this new building be lighted?
- Within my North Central neighborhood there are 14-15 churches in a mile radius. They have no parking or very little. I do not own the parking space in my neighborhood. If someone is blocking my driveway I call the police. Parents are more cautious about their kids walking to school – they drive them. , Can't control everyone. Project has been scaled back. The auditorium is not a gym – it has a stage. Draeger's was allowed to count spaces on the street as part of their count. Will parking on Notre Dame be counted for St. Matthew's? Yes, special events should be limited, but please be careful on how you identify them.

(No other person wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.)

Staff response to public comments:

- What happens in the future? Has that been analyzed? **Staff:** Yes, what we've found is the major parking impacts have to do with the church masses and the eleven religious and school events listed in the Master Plan. The conclusion of the traffic study is that there is enough on-site parking to accommodate the sporting events and regular daily events that occur. The commenter's implication is that there is going to be additional traffic because of those sporting events but the traffic study evaluated that and the conclusion is that there is no change in the level of service at the local intersections.
- Why does this proposal not involve remodeling the auditorium rather than constructing a new gym? **Applicant:** We hired an historical architect and there was an historical significance. We provided that analysis to Planning & Planning Commissioners.
- Why was parking shortage grandfathered in but need for SUP not? **Staff:** What is being proposed is a school gymnasium, and the parking requirement is based upon number of employees for school. Gym is not creating additional employment on the site, so under the Zoning Code, no new parking requirement is triggered by the project.
- Why can some things be "grandfathered", but not others? The applicant is requesting a SUP. **Staff:** The SUP relates to the use modification (the new gym and associated activities). The parking related to the use is not required to be modified because the modified use is not increasing employment, which is the standard in the code for that particular use. Given the findings that need to be made for each of the different permits requested, there is potentially some room for the Planning Commission to require more

parking than ZC requires. **Attorney:** The use predates the parking requirements – cannot retroactively require a greater number of parking spaces; but if they come in for a change of use, new parking standards can be applied.

- Was the traffic from El Camino and 9th addressed in study? **Hexagon:** If the question was whether we observed and considered the cars coming from 9th and making a left turn onto El Camino and dropping off children, it was observed and considered.
- There was a reference to a recent special Mass combining 2 Masses: how would that be covered under the proposed conditions for the SUP? **Staff:** Under the terms of the SUP conditions contained in Exhibit B, the church would have to confer with the city and we would have to make a determination of whether that would be an event that would trigger the private parking management function or whether it would need to go through a special community events committee process.
- Does the parking design meet city requirements for fire safety access? **Staff:** The Police and Fire Department representatives of Development Review Board have reviewed the plans and signed off as the project has met their criteria.
- What happens if the applicant does not abide by the conditions of approval? **Attorney:** The proposed conditions provide for revocation or modification of the SUP if any of the conditions are breached. It is an arduous process; if there are concerns over whether or not the conditions are feasible, this would be grounds for a denial. **Commissioner:** Could the City put a lock on the gym? Or fine them? **Attorney:** The process would be to notify the applicant and the neighborhood of a revocation or modification hearing, hold the hearing, take evidence, then modify or revoke the permit conditions. **Commissioner:** Has any city been able to take action? **Attorney:** A lot of cases on point: heavily litigated area; more difficult if applicants can demonstrate they have a vested right – if applicant has spent a lot of money they are more likely to show they have a vested right, which makes it more difficult for city to revoke the permit. **Commissioner:** Revocation of the permit seems unlikely; could the City shut down the gym for, say, a six-month period? **Attorney:** That's less onerous than revoking the permit altogether and would be easier to achieve, but it remains a high hurdle to meet.
- Is the Notre Dame street parking meeting the proposed additional parking count towards the parking totals? **Staff:** The parking off of Notre Dame that is on the proposed site has been counted within the new 108 on-site spaces. The off-site street parking referred to in the traffic report as part of the 45 street parking spaces and has not been included in the on-site total. **Commissioner:** 12 new spaces that could back out would be included in the parking total and the 21 existing spaces would count toward the off-site parking? **Staff / Hexagon:** 21 spaces existing today on Notre Dame counted as on-street (off-site) spaces and not part of the church's parking lot but the new spaces on ND counted as part of the 108 new spaces.
- Please clarify the confusion about use of the auditorium and the gym: several different descriptions of how it could be used. SUP conditions enumerate things allowed, but not things prohibited. **Staff:** Fundamental idea being put forth is that the gym and auditorium cannot be used for outside, non-St. Matthew-sponsored events of any kind.

The use of the new gym as a new facility would be open to catholic-league tournament play, regular basketball and volleyball practices and night-time adult league for parishioners, teachers, etc., associated with the school. **Commissioner:** There is no enumeration of what is not allowed. Nothing that prohibits wedding reception, school play, etc. or any kind of event? How broad is this? **Staff:** PC can explore and put prohibitions in there but it was not set forth in their application and staff has not assumed anything beyond what they have asked for at the moment. **Applicant:** Wedding receptions have been prohibited and your packet does contain other events that are prohibited.

- **Commissioner:** Please clarify the distinction between a denial with and without prejudice. **Attorney:** If the PC decided to deny the project with prejudice, the Zoning Code provides that an application cannot be resubmitted within one year of a denial. This application was submitted within one year of a denial. It was accepted because city staff made a determination that it had materially changed and the two changes were that the proposed new bldg was smaller and more parking was to be provided. That was the basis upon which the application was accepted. An application denied without prejudice may be re-submitted within one year of the denial. **Commissioner:** What is difference between denying with prejudice or not specified. **Attorney:** The Zoning Code does not use terms with/without prejudice, it simply provides that you cannot submit a planning application for the same project within a year of denial.

The Planning Commission requested clarification on the following issues:

- Landscape plan – there is no detail for that portion of the wall facing El Camino Real and the offer to include plantings. Currently denuded of vegetation, etc.
- Regarding the use of off-site parking and extrapolating what scenarios would be if parking not available. The SUP states that a good-faith effort must be put forward to find replacement parking if the lease for 40 spaces is terminated. We need to better understand what this means. Safety valve may go away and no way to ensure that mitigation provided again reliably.
- There were public comments regarding the question/issue of cutting down the trees to create parking. What of the 26 trees that are proposed to come down, how many are coming down to provide parking, and how many to make room for the building?
Applicant: We will need a few minutes to determine those counts.
- Appreciate Police Department efforts in the area. Could the Police Department staff please provide their view of the school pick-up and drop-off function. **Police Department:** Boulders have been put in on the right (north) side of Notre Dame; appears to have eliminated illegal parking. The real impact in day-to-day activities would be for the residents on the north side of Aragon. Impacts appear different for drop-off for kindergarten – moms tend to hang around and socialize – impact to Aragon. Conflicts on Aragon have been reduced but temporary conflicts remain in the first few homes along Aragon. Most behavior is lawful. Officers observed three separate Sundays and for the most part, any violations were on the church site. Mostly behavior was normal. It

appears that the traffic plan that the school uses with the parents/staff – the lion's share of them use the traffic management and a handful that still use Aragon – we've observed the same people each time. While parking in front of a red-zone is a citable offence, the parents dropping off children in front of the red zone were there so briefly that the Officer couldn't respond. **Commissioner:** Why do the socializing kindergarten parents socialize on the street? Parking lot appears to be full. **Police Department:** Sunday Mass: staff were out for several Sundays, regular Mass, no observance of large-scale events.

Commissioner: Did you observe violations of parking code requirements. **Police Department:** We photographed violations – most were on the school property And not enforceable unless it was a handicap space. **Commissioner:** Did you observe lots of cars parked in the neighborhood during Sunday Mass. **Police Department:** The Sunday Mass has impacts on Capistrano, Castillion, and Aragon. **Commissioner:** You just saw the Masses at that time, not the bigger ones. **Police Department:** Yes, just regular Masses, not a big event. **Commissioner:** Did presence of the police car change behaviors? **Police Department:** Perhaps.

- Regarding the issue of whether the school should build a parking structure, I heard that Serra High school built parking. Please provide some specific reasons why Serra needed to build parking. **Staff:** The fundamental reason was that Serra has high-school age students who drive. The Zoning Code parking requirement for high schools includes the student population, not just employees, and Serra was under-parked given the expansions that they wanted to do. Serra proposed a Master Plan with several construction phases. In that process, a SUP and Q zone were approved, followed by a SPAR for the first phase of work, which included a garage to bring the school into Zoning Code conformance.
- It has been mentioned that the same people are observed using Aragon as the drop-off site and standing to socialite. Can the church make an effort to reach that group of people that are chronically offending the neighborhoods? **Applicant:** We have AM/PM Kindergarten. There is open parking in the front parking lot, but not enough. We can move faculty to the back lot so that parents can park in the front area. **Commissioner:** Thank you.
- Regarding Serra High School, did they end up providing all of the code required parking? If so, all on-site or combo of on/off site? **Staff:** I will need to confirm, but I believe they provided the code required parking on site, but that does not necessarily mean that they have been able to accommodate on-site spaces for all the driving students that attend Serra. That is why they have leased additional space at the Elks Lodge.
- Hexagon referenced a peak parking number. What does the 346-space demand refer to? **Hexagon:** The 346 was the 8:45 Mass on a typical Sunday – not a special Sunday such as Easter. This was a consistent observation for the six Sundays that we observed within +/- 40 cars. They have not been there for any of the major events listed.
- Follow-up answer to prior question regarding trees: **Applicant:** The trees; 108 parking spaces being referenced are all on-site; nothing off-site. 26 total trees being removed: 12 are heritage, of them 6 are due to parking improvements and 6 are due to construction of the building. **Commissioner:** What about the remainder? **Applicant:** The remaining trees are for other areas where the parking is being changed are spread around the site.

Some might be classified as small trees or shrubs. Sheet L1.0 – any tree that has an X in the middle is a tree being removed.

The Planning Commission made the following comments:

- Thank everyone who came out tonight. Neighborhood has some concerns and has been working hard; really feeling as though they are not being heard and they are. A long & difficult path you've been on. I certainly hear everything you are saying and believe it's valid. I hear what the church is saying and I feel their need for improved and adequate gym facilities. I walked through the current building and I believe they need a bigger, better facility. I believe the church has gone a long way to redesign the parking and made every effort short of building a structure - no one is going to build a subterranean garage near that site at all anytime ever. If a ground-level garage were to be built it would be some time in coming at a much later date. No one wants that in their backyard. Let the school continue to try and make arrangements for off-site parking; there are other places where the school might be able to lease space.
- I heard your comments loud and clear. I don't have the history with this project. Unfortunate that dialogue has deteriorated between church and neighborhood. Still very concerned about some of the parking plan, particularly overflow. Look at 108 spaces as a bonus, good-faith effort to improve the situation even though they are not required to do so because of usage designation. Looking forward to hearing about overflow parking and how robust it is and seeing it reflected in SUP. Website – had to dig to find info on parking and parking procedures; seems an important topic I would expect it to see a separate button for parking on both church/school website. View website as a reference to be used by anyone. Looking forward to hearing more about a parking plan – in an environment of continued dialogue.
- Church has come a long way, still concerned about parking. Church asking for 2 regular-type permits: SPAR and SDP. The Zoning Code tells us what can/can't be required in the permits. The applicant/staff have said that there is no requirement to provide for additional parking. However, the applicant is also asking for a change in the Zoning Code to accommodate their building, without which they are prohibited from doing any additional building on the campus. In that context, the Planning Commission has both the right/duty to consider the overall situation and to take into account the broader set of circumstances; specifically the impacts of the church on the neighborhood in terms of parking and traffic. The church has to provide as an absolute minimum the parking spaces Hexagon has determined necessary; 346 spaces. An argument can be made that there should be more. 346 have to be provided; strong personal preference is that the spaces should be provided on-site and from what I've seen tonight, I don't think the plan, as submitted, realistically provides for 346 cars to be parked onsite. I see from the plans that it is physically possible, but it is not practically feasible. So relying on off-site parking – if the church is going to provide for 346 parking spaces, using off-site parking, then the church has got to have some reasonably permanent rights to the off-site parking and I don't see right now where you have it. We have to see something more robust in terms

of a parking plan. Because I think the absolute minimum, the 346 have to be provided. Hours of operation: requested operating hours are too long – 10pm is too late. Don't understand and haven't heard a compelling reason why the facility needs to be open until 10pm 365 days per year. Why 10pm at all? The neighborhood impact is significant. Public elementary schools do not operate that way. 10pm is excessive. Need to revisit the wording/restrictions in the conditions of approval, for both the SUP and the master plan to more closely define what the facility can/cannot be used for. Confusion around this because we've used broad terms instead of getting into the details. Parking is a threshold issue. If the parish cannot provide the 346 parking spaces in a robust way and serious way, and relying on a parking lot that you can lose on 90 days notice, in my view, doesn't count, I don't see how we go forward.

- Where do we go tonight? I think things are better. The relationships are better. People are tired after 6 years. Fundamental problem is still a lack of trust in the community and a lack of trust for the church in the city. Framework that is procedural. Lack of trust is a primary concern. The plan shows 14 trees between the church and ECR being removed to allow for just a few parking spaces, which totally changes the character of that part of the site – I'm not comfortable making that trade-off. This may not happen without a parking garage. I want a good gym for the school and the community. How to make it good for both sides? Bike parking goes where? Not enough bike parking for both church/school. Overall, that's a fundamental flaw. As the Q7 is proposed, unless it's a modified application, we can't proceed. Q7 doesn't include parking garage. **Staff:** The Commission could continue the item to allow them to amend it or deny it without prejudice to allow them to come back within a year with a changed project. **Commissioner:** Overall if the majority will is to work towards approval, a lot of work is needed on the SUP conditions; saw things that could be changed by the church without approval by anyone else – lack of clarity. Don't feel I have enough information to make SPAR findings - can provide a list to staff. Also looking for additional controls around large events that draw large crowds; don't support distinctions between non-religious and religious events. Need Police Department educational help at beginning of school year or larger events. Church has offered to fund some Police Department activities – generous offer should be explored. More work needed on parking and traffic management plan – garage size, etc., if we go that direction. More effort to reduce people driving – minimize the amount of parking. What colors my view I see the gym proposal as not like a normal gym. I don't think the city could control it as a normal gym. Concerned about precedent about the Q7. Make some adjustments in what's allowable. Pretend that old parking problem doesn't exist or just a little part of it exists and the rest doesn't – not at a good balance.
- Site issues: loss of the only sizable green space on this parcel – that the students have for outdoor enjoyment. Not happy removing 26 trees. From information in report, only about 66% of the landscape unit value is going to be replaced – the remaining 33% will be paid into the in-lieu fund for city tree planting. Garden wall – 500 linear foot eye-sore; not all the responsibility of the church property – it is on CalTrans r-o-w. Cluttered with utility

boxes, newspaper boxes, trash, bus stops, etc. Would rather remove the wall for views into the site and retain the trees. Who will maintain the shrubs put in that area on the outside of the wall? Parking: concerned about 21 existing spaces along Notre Dame one-way street, one-lane; those cars having to back-up to leave from their parking spaces; and the proposal is to add 12 new ones there. I've heard that staff and the traffic consultant believe it is okay, but I think there is still a safety issue. Existing and new parking; spread out over 3 lots on the site, 3 access points to these lots contributes to the traffic problem. Proposed parking committee should have neighborhood representation. Like design of the auditorium; don't like design of church. Design of new building is good, but as viewed from El Camino, there is not a lot of similarity between the three buildings.

- If 3 of us think that the proposal is substantially not what we're looking for, then staff needs to prepare findings for denial or identify changes we want and continue to a date uncertain, to address. If 3 of us think we're heading in the right direction and some portion approvable we'd be looking for those corrections in the documents to move forward. That's a different set of activities. We probably need to provide some indication of what we're looking for. If we're still on the fence, then the staff should give findings for denial/approval; although it's extra paper work.
- Are you suggesting a straw poll of the commissioners to see where we are?
- Yes, to identify where we are as a commission. I believe I'm moving more towards the camp of a parking garage – the need to save the trees and the need to have more parking than can be accommodated. Remove some of the Sunday and events parking. Parking is so fundamental as well as the trees. I cannot go forward with the Q zone at this time.
Applicant: Point of order. We were told there would be no action tonight. Our proposal doesn't include a garage for environmental reasons, traffic reasons, financing reasons, circulation reasons, and to bring in new elements to our project and to move to an action when no action was to be taken is unacceptable.
- We're talking about getting a sense of the commission to give direction to staff.
Applicant: It's clear to me that additional information is being requested and we should have the right to bring you the additional information that's been requested instead of creating a new project that is environmentally unfriendly and from planning standpoint against every principle; financially unfeasible. We were told we were going to have a public hearing tonight. But due to a noticing problem, it is essentially a study session, and now we're being subjected to project being redesigned and informally voted on in a straw poll. That's not right. **Attorney:** Nothing wrong with a consensus of what direction they are heading. That is not taking a vote. Public notice that was sent out indicated both a public hearing and study session were happening. No prohibition for seeking a consensus view of the Commission.
- Prepare a set of findings for denial of Q7 or consideration of a reconfiguration of a parking garage to protect trees and some other issues. Not comfortable with SUP conditions but fixable. Needs more information to approve with the SPAR.
- We're heading in the right direction with what we've been given to work with. The project won't happen if the applicant is to be expected to build a garage. I'm willing to

allow the applicant to take the information they've been given and see what they come up with. Make other arrangements on their site to meeting the 346. There is something that they could do.

- I think the project is salvageable and that a solution can be found. Not moving towards a parking garage. I want to see what the applicant has to offer first.
- Wants to see what the applicant can come back with based upon the information they have been given.
- What do we ask staff to do? SPAR, SDP – there's more information. How do we proceed? Same issues being raised since 2006. A revised proposal that doesn't take as many trees.
Attorney: Act on the proposal as submitted and if the trees are a stumbling block, then that is grounds for denial.
- Is staff asking us for an indication of this application such as are we in favor or not?
Attorney: No. I can't speak for planning staff, but I have a good sense of what the Commission is looking for but we can't ask the applicant to change the project at this meeting. We can either say yes or no. I've heard that we should tighten up conditions – staff will work on this. **Staff:** If you were able to move to a vote this evening and there was something not proposed but that you wanted and wasn't in the conditions, you could specify that in the conditions of approval if there was an appropriate nexus, such as remove that tree or add a tree here. Agreement with the attorney - you can't be redesigning the project tonight for the applicant.
- One piece of the parking plan between the church and El Camino - doesn't want to see the 14 trees removed just for a small number of parking spaces. In favor of a parking garage. A small number of parking spaces changes the character. Would prefer to see change in that area rather than deny the project. I don't see how you can keep enough trees on the site without building a garage.
- Clarify earlier comments: I believe the church has to provide, firmly, 346 parking spaces – strong preference for them on-site. Concern expressed about the number of trees that are being taken under the plan as proposed, but that is my view. I don't see where you've met the requirement to have 346 parking spaces available, because you're dependent on off-site parking that you can lose on 90 days notice with no firm replacement available. You're under obligation to use your best efforts and I'm sure you would. It's possible that if you lost the bank parking you would not be able to replace it and then you would not have the 346 parking spaces. We would not approve anyone else (I don't think) with a plan like that. That's where I'm coming from. I'm not saying you have to build a parking garage. If you can come up with another solution, that's fine. If you can acquire property or get a long-term lease on parking spaces, I'm open to another solution. The plan as you have proposed it falls short.
- The other tree issue is the proposal to plant trees in the stormwater treatment units – throughout the parking area, - those are notoriously unsuccessful and they interfere with the stormwater treatment function and the growth/success of the tree. More successful to plant on the side of the swale and that only works with certain trees. You have to have a wide enough swale. That plays into the feasibility with the C3 requirements.

Construction w/in tree drip lines; no arborist discussion of that. I am not comfortable with the design; not ready for SPAR on the building. If this does go forward, I'd like to see a phased approval process, with the parking first and then a subsequent Planning Commission review of the building. I don't have enough information to go forward with SPAR approvals for the building and landscape design.

- **Commission:** What are the next steps? **Staff:** We are gathering direction from the commission from which would discuss with applicant for what they need to present in answer to tonight's questions. The next hearing will determine whether or not the questions have been answered adequately. The next meeting will be a public hearing held with the same steps as tonight, but the Commission will still decide whether or not it's ready to take a vote or continue it. **Attorney:** All information heard tonight is a matter of public record. All comments heard tonight are in the record.

After discussion regarding noticing time lines and commissioner availability it was decided that the Planning Commission will hear this item again on Tuesday, August 14, 2012.

No vote was taken at this meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff
 - a.
2. Communications from the Commissioners
 - a.
3. Other

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, Chair Whitaker adjourned the meeting at 11:59 p.m. on Tuesday, June 12, 2012.