

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
JULY 10, 2012**

Approved

The meeting convened at 7:30 p.m. in the City of San Mateo Council Chambers and was called to order by Chair Whitaker, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Those present were Commissioner Moran, Commissioner Hugg, Vice-Chair Massey, and Chair Whitaker. Commissioner Bonilla was absent and excused.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Massey seconded by Commissioner Hugg to approve the minutes of the Regular meeting of June 26, 2012. Commissioner Kelly abstained as she was absent.

Vote – Passed 3-0-1-1

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Whitaker opened the public comment period.

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

ITEM 1

*** PUBLIC HEARING**

PA 12-039 BAY MEADOWS PHASE II DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ANNUAL REVIEW #6, Annual review of the Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement. The project site is located at 2600 S. Delaware St. (APNs: 040-030-250, -260, -270, -280, -290, -310, -320, -330, -340 & -350).

The Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement Annual Review is an annual review by the Planning Commission of the compliance of the property owner with the terms and conditions of the Development Agreement.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: None required (Not considered a project subject to CEQA)

The project site is approximately 83 acres. The project site is located at the southern terminus of South Delaware Street and is bounded by Saratoga Drive and the Franklin Resources campus on the east, San Mateo County Exposition Center on the north, Caltrain rail corridor on the west, and the McLellan Avenue single family residential area on the south. The project site is zoned BMSP (Bay Meadows Specific Plan).

PROJECT PLANNER:

Darcy Forsell, AICP, Associate Planner
dforsell@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT:

Genelle Ball, Wilson Meany Sullivan

4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111
GBall@wilsonmeany.com
(415) 905-5300

PROPERTY OWNER: Bay Meadows Main Track Investors LLC
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3300
San Francisco, CA 94111

Darcy Forsell, Project Planner, gave the staff presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for staff:

- This review is generally done earlier in the year; staff replied that the delay was to allow for a complete Commission.

Chair Whitaker opened the public comment period for this item.
(No persons wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.)

Move by Commissioner Moran to approve the Resolution / 2nd by Commissioner Massey.

Vote Passed 4-0

Commissioner Hugg recused himself prior to Item 2.

ITEM 2

* PUBLIC HEARING

PA 11-087 2090 S. DELAWARE STREET APARTMENTS; development of 111 residential housing units; 2090 S. Delaware St., (APN: 035-320-120).

Required Approvals:

- A. Addendum to previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration to Assess Environmental Impacts
- B. Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) for demolition of the existing commercial structure and construction of 111 apartment units
- C. Site Development Permit for grading and removal of major vegetation removal
- D. Vesting Tentative Map for the delineation of 111 residential condominium units and associated common space

The project site is 2.37 acres located on the northwest corner of Delaware Street and Pacific Blvd., zoned TOD (Transit Oriented Development).

PROJECT PLANNER: Lisa Ring, AICP, Senior Planner
lring@cityofsanmateo.org

APPLICANT: Tim Ramm
Newport Equities, LLC
1601 Dove St, #250
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Ph: 949-553-4800
TRamm@provinvegroup.com

PROPERTY OWNER: Lithographix
12250 South Crenshaw Blvd.
Hawthorne, CA 92050
Ph: 323-770-1000

Lisa Ring, Senior Planner, gave the staff presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for staff:

- Explain revisions to Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. Staff response: Revisions clarified language terms of the actual number of projected trips and how the project's future trip generation will be monitored.
- Note two changes to the conditions of approval relating to Pedestrian Improvements:
 - Why was timing moved to occupancy? Staff response: The applicant requested to build improvements at time of occupancy since that is when the demand for these improvements would occur, would also better coordinate with the project's construction schedule.
 - Does the plan for a sidewalk connection to Hayward Park Station include lighting? Staff response: Based on a site visit by staff, it was determined that adequate lighting already exists in the area, so no additional lighting was deemed necessary.
- What are construction hours? Staff response: As specified in the Municipal Code, 7-7 Mon-Fri; 9-5 Saturdays; 12-4 on Sundays.

Tim Ramm and Christiani Johnson Associates Architects gave the applicant presentation.

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant:

- Please show how emergency vehicles will access site. Applicant Response: Emergency vehicle access (EVA) is through the main entrance of visitor parking; adequate distance exists around the site and buildings for hose runs without going onto Ironwood property; no perimeter road is necessary.
- Why are there breaks in the line of street trees at corner of Delaware and Pacific? Applicant response: To maintain an adequate line of sight at corner and to accommodate an existing utility box.
- Describe the changes in the building along South Delaware. Applicant response: The project has been revised to provide additional setback and buffer for the adjacent

Ironwood Project. To accomplish this, the units at this corner, were modified. The six 2-bedroom units have been converted to 1-bedroom units and the building height and bulk reduced accordingly.

- Are the windows flush or recessed? Applicant Response: Water infiltration and the resultant damage is a concern with recessed windows. As a result, we are proposing a type of window that is not recessed, although the window frame has some recess in it.
- What is the anticipated length of construction time? Applicant response: We estimate 24 months, the work will not be phased. There could be some weekend (Saturday) work.
- Are there provisions for dust control and other construction impact measures? Staff response: Noise and air quality control is written into the conditions of approval.

Chair Whitaker opened the public comment period for this item.

William Nack, Foster City; Maya Togashi, San Mateo; Ryan VandenBreck, San Mateo; Pernille Gutschick, San Mateo spoke

- Consider the economic effects of the project on members of the Building Trades Council; encourage the applicant to use union labor.
- Consider noise, traffic and air quality impacts.
- Concerned about the negative impact on resale of Ironwood properties.
- Would appreciate having all the windows washed at Ironwood after construction at 2090 S. Delaware.
- Want to limit negative lighting on Ironwood – construction lighting shining into properties at Ironwood.
- Traffic exiting from Ironwood has difficulty turning left onto Delaware. During the commute times, the traffic is much worse. There are no standards for exits without signal lights; residents from Ironwood often have to wait several minutes before they can exit. Is it possible to establish a “Keep Clear” zone at the driveways? Expo Center traffic also adds to the problems at the corner.
- Am not happy regarding the shade and shadow studies, but am appreciative of developer’s efforts to address Ironwood residents concerns.
- The 3 story building element along Delaware is a concern. However, acknowledges that the developer has increased distance between Ironwood and 2090 S. Delaware buildings.
- Potential construction hours are giving some Ironwood residents concerns.
- Some of the documents and graphs on the staff report were difficult to read.
- Construction trucks exiting onto Delaware a problem; can’t they use Pacific & 19th?
- Architectural sound barriers are good.

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

The Planning Commission requested clarification on the following:

- Regarding light intrusion, are there lamp-posts proposed in the area adjacent to Ironwood? Staff response: No, only foot path lighting is being proposed along the pathway by Ironwood and also in the courtyards.
- Has the City looked at establishing a “keep clear” zone for driveways along Delaware? Gary Black, Hexagon Transportation Consultants: Did not look at this option as there would be secondary traffic impacts if such zones were established at all private driveways, particularly along arterial streets. For this reason, no City routinely puts these zones to facilitate access to and from private driveways.
- Can the conditions of Approval be modified to allow Pacific Blvd as an approved truck route? Staff Response: Yes.

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

- Thank you to the developer/applicant and the neighbors for working together to improve the project. Recognizes problems with shading, however, would look strange to cut the buildings back any farther from Ironwood than they are.
- Recommend that the conditions of approval be modified to allow construction traffic along Pacific Blvd: Pacific to 19th Avenue to SR92 and from SR92 to Concar to Pacific Blvd.
- Authorize planning staff and city attorney to work with applicant to revise the condition language regarding Pedestrian Improvement along Pacific to make the wording more specific. Can lighting be considered or a monetary contribution towards improvement? Add condition language for the \$25,000 to be used towards improvement of lighting, since the applicant has agreed to voluntarily make this contribution. . Give city attorney authority/ability to tighten up language.
- Am concerned with the 2-level bike racks, they are difficult to work with and it is sometimes hard to get to the upper rack.
- Design is good regarding street frontages, however, the north face is uninteresting. In addition, the front stoops and railings are not particularly attractive, nor hospitable. The stairways are too big, the solution suggested by design review consultant is a better approach. Base looks like slab of concrete.
- Add a Condition of Approval to redesign the stoop. This includes a change of materials. The design should be better integrated into the building: individual entries with a sense of arrival, a front door feel. This condition should be subject to review and approval by the Zoning Administrator. The pedestrian related improvements are consistent with the Pedestrian Master Plan and the Rail Corridor Plan.

The following Conditions of Approval have been modified and/or included as part of the project:

E3.3 PACIFIC BOULEVARD PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS – The applicant shall design and construct sidewalk, curb and gutter improvements on the east side of Pacific Boulevard from

Project site to the corner of 19th Avenue and then through newly constructed curb ramps and thermoplastic crosswalk, continue sidewalk improvements on the west side of Pacific Boulevard connecting to the existing sidewalk adjacent to the Hayward Park Caltrain station. The applicant shall also give the City a one-time payment of \$25,000 for the installation of lighting along Pacific Blvd to improve the lighting along this roadway. The City will secure easements for all sidewalk construction off of the project site. The applicant shall complete the sidewalk improvements prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy or enter into an Improvement Agreement with the City for them. (PUBLIC WORKS)

A1.6-ENTRY STOOPS-The design of the entry stoops shall be modified to include varied materials and a design that is more integrated with the proposed buildings. The stoops shall retain an individualized look that provides for an emphasis on pedestrian entryways. The design of the stoops shall be subject to the review and approval of the Zoning Administrator. (PLANNING)

F3.7 MATERIAL HAULING AND CONSTRUCTION WORKER PARKING - For material delivery vehicles equal to, or larger than two-axle, six-tire single unit truck (SU) size or larger as defined by FHWA Standards, the applicant shall submit a truck hauling route that conforms to City of San Mateo Municipal Code Section 11.28.040 to the approval of the City Engineer. The haul routes for this project shall be: **To: Highway 92 to Concar Drive to South Delaware Street or Pacific Boulevard to Site. From: Site to Pacific Boulevard to South Delaware Street/Concar Drive/19th Avenue to Highway 92.** A letter from the applicant confirming the intention to use this hauling route shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works, and approved, prior to the issuance of any City permits. All material hauling activities including but not limited to, adherence to the approved route, hours of operation, staging of materials, dust control and street maintenance shall be the responsibility of the applicant. All storage and office trailers will be kept off the public right-of-way. Tracking of dirt onto City streets and walks will not be allowed. The applicant must provide an approved method of cleaning tires and trimming loads on-site. Any job related dirt and/or debris that impact the public right-of-way shall be removed immediately. No wash down of dirt into storm drains will be allowed. All material hauling activities shall be done in accordance with applicable City ordinances and conditions of approval. Violation of such may be cause for suspension of work.

The applicant shall provide a construction-parking plan that minimizes the effect of construction worker parking in the neighborhood and shall include an estimate of the number of workers that will be present on the site during the various phases of construction and indicate where sufficient off-street parking will be utilized and identify any locations for off-site material deliveries. Said plan shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of City permits and shall be enforced during construction. Failure to enforce the parking plan may result in suspension of the City permits. (PUBLIC WORKS)

Motion by Commissioner Moran to approve the project; Second by Commissioner Massey.
Motion passes 3-0. Commissioner Hugg recused.

ITEM 3

+ STUDY SESSION

PA 11-072 SAN MATEO EXECUTIVE PARK PRE-APPLICATION, preliminary review of a proposal to demolish an existing 8,956 square foot building and to construct a 107,696 square foot office building. The pre-application also includes construction of a four-story parking garage. 3000-3155 Clearview Way, (APN 041-361-120, APN 041-361-130).

The project site is approximately 22 acres and is located adjacent to State Route 92 and College of San Mateo. The existing buildings and site improvements are clustered within the existing 12.5 acre developed area. The General Plan land use designation is Executive Office. The zoning district classification for the site is E1-1.0 (Executive Park, 1.0 FAR).

PROJECT PLANNER: Christy Usher, AICP Associate Planner
cusher@cityofsanmateo.org

**APPLICANT/
PROPERTY OWNER:** Hanns Lee, Senior Vice President
Lowe Enterprises Real Estate Group
3155 Clearview Way
San Mateo, CA, 94402
Ph: (650) 341-7730
hlee@loweenterprises.com

The Planning Commission had the following questions for staff:

- Is 270,000 square feet, the square footage of all existing buildings on site? Staff response: Yes.

Hanns Lee gave the applicant presentation.

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

- Is the interior core of the building floor plan intended for restrooms, elevators, etc? Applicant response: Yes.
- Will on site food service be provided? Applicant response: It is not currently planned for the new office building. Solar City has their own cafeteria for their employees, GoPro (another major tenant on site) has plans to bring in their own café/coffee shop. We have also arranged for Food Trucks at the site. To reduce trips in general a shuttle to Cal Train and Bart is provided.
- Was view blockage the reason for lowering the building height from 4 to 3 stories? Applicant response: Yes. The downsized project was a result of a combination of issues related to traffic, view, and massing.

- Have you considered any joint usage of facilities with College of San Mateo? Applicant response: Yes, the college allows the public to utilize their gym and cafeteria and employees of the office park do take advantage of those services.
- Doesn't the tree removal report need closer examination to ensure accuracy? Applicant Response: The Arborist survey is in the process of being updated.
- Will this proposed office building D complete build out? Applicant: Yes, there are no plans for additional office buildings at this location.
- Noticed garbage and debris not being contained on site during site visit. Please clean up as soon as possible.
- Would like to see facilities provided for electric cars and improved bicycle access off W. Hillsdale, as well as added bike storage and racks on site.

Chair Whitaker opened the Public Comment period.

No one wishing to speak, Chair Whitaker closed the Public Comment period.

The Planning Commission had the following comments regarding the specific request of Staff for comments on architectural style and materials, scale of proposed building, and parking garage visual impacts.

- Design is somewhat underwhelming but value the intention to match the recently renovated buildings. Overall, the appearance of the site is much improved from the original buildings. Would be open to experimenting with the design more. This site and building will be very prominent though out the City from both public and private vantage points. Keep consistent look throughout all the buildings.
- Do not find the stair enclosures for the parking garage to be in harmony with the building the way they protrude above the body of the garage.
- Consider a restaurant feature on site, if economical. Would be nice to have another destination restaurant, with a view, such as Charlie Brown's.
- Consider provisions to allow on site food service at a later time.
- It will be important that the new building footprint and related construction activity minimizes impacts to trees such as Bays and Buckeyes (just to name a few) especially as they relate to the watershed to the north.
- Drainage and stormwater treatment are also paramount.
- Protect the watershed in the area of the proposed office building and keep the watershed free of debris. Currently there is a lot of trash in the surrounding areas.
- Concerned about additional traffic and encourage a rigorous Transportation Demand Management plan.
- Prefer Scheme A; allows for more surface articulation on building.
- The parking garage set into hillside seems appropriate.
- Support the protruding glass elevators because they add visual interest to an otherwise linear form and because they help direct the user to the location of the elevators.

- Building materials are appropriate.
- Prior visual impacts have been addressed with the reduction in size of the proposed office building D.
- Support the decision to make it blend with existing buildings.
- Scale of the project feels appropriate. Visual impacts are much diminished with the revised project.
- Concerned about the air quality impacts during construction of the parking garage which will be in close proximity to an existing the daycare and play area.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff

- a. Build it Kidz, Sleep Train and Water Efficiency Ordinance on 7/24/12
- b. St. Matthews 8/14/12
- c. Commissioner Moran absent on 8/28/12; Retail Frontage Requirements
- d. A lot of email regarding Bridgepointe Ice Rink. Neighborhood meeting on 7/26. Will need to go to the Parks & Recreation Commission before coming before the Planning Commission.

2. Communications from the Commissioners

- a. Date for annual development tour? Agreed that possibly October would be a good time.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, Chair Whitaker adjourned at 11:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 10, 2012.