

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 12, 2013**

APPROVED

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

Those present were Commissioner Bonilla, Commissioner Whitaker, Commissioner Drechsler and Chair Massey. Commissioner Hugg recused himself.

A motion was made by Commissioner Drechsler, seconded by Commissioner Bonilla to approve the minutes of the Regular meeting of October 28, 2013.

Vote – Passed 4-0.

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Massey opened the public comment period.

- I am sorry that the ice rink is closed and hope to see it reopen soon. There are petitions on-line.

No one else wishing to speak, Chair Massey closed the public comment period.

ITEM 1

STUDY SESSION

PA13-047 AVALON MOTEL REDEVELOPMENT PRE-APPLICATION preliminary review for demolition of the existing Avalon Motel and construction of 12 two-story and 30 three-story residential townhomes with attached garages totaling 92,910 square feet; 220 N. Bayshore Blvd. San Mateo; APN: 033-101-160. The project site is approximately 2.13 acres and located on the east side of Highway 101 in the Shoreview Planning Area. The project site is zoned R4 (Multiple Family Dwellings High Density).

Christy Usher, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Andrew Warner, City Ventures, gave the applicant presentation.

- Showed existing conditions.
- Described neighborhood context.
- Indicated neighbors supportive of redevelopment.
- Described proposed site plan, elevations, and unit plans.

Public Comment Period

Chair Massey opened the public comment period for this item.

The following people spoke: Eric Hipp, San Mateo.

- Adjacent neighbor Homeowners Association happy to have neighbors.
- Difficulties with existing motel.
- Concerned that sunlight will be lost.
- Appreciates that the project is less than maximum density.
- Would like to examine greater setbacks on north side of project.

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

The Planning Commission requested clarification on the following issues:

- Per the data sheet please explain what a combo 2- / 3- story building is.. *Staff: for a variable building height section there can be different setbacks at different portions of the building.*
- No requirements for open space? *Staff: Correct, open space is not required in the R4 zoning district.*
- Regarding pedestrian access along North Bayshore, would compliance with City –wide Pedestrian Master Plan be required? *Staff: Yes, the project would comply with the City-wide Pedestrian Master Plan.*
- Where is the long-term bicycle parking located? *Applicant: In each of the garages.*
- Where are the short-term bicycle parking spaces? *Applicant: At the entry across from the mailboxes, approximate 6-10 bike parking spaces are provided.*
- Landscape strip does not exist in other sidewalks in North Shoreview. Would the City consider a full 10’ width sidewalk without landscaping? *Staff: Staff will work with the applicant upon submittal of a formal application to ensure it meets the City’s Pedestrian Master Plan.*
- How will the flood area designation be dealt with? *Applicant: Residential living areas are required to be elevated out of the zone flood area which could be approximately plus or minus 4 feet.*
- Are there private yard areas with the two-story units? *Applicant: Yes.*
- Is there guest parking adjacent to the 3-story buildings in side setback? *Applicant: Will make any necessary adjustments to the formal application pursuant to the setback requirements, which do not allow parking to intrude.*
- Need to provide sidewalks according to the Pedestrian Master Plan, existing sidewalks have a lot of obstructions which make access difficult. I observed quite a bit of pedestrian activity in the area. *Applicant: We will work with staff on sidewalk design plan for underground utilities.*
- What are the provisions for assistance with individuals displaced as a result of the project? *Staff: City staff needs to conduct more research to determine the applicability of the tenant relocation assistance requirements to this project.*
- I want to see conformance with Street Tree Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan.

- Given the lack of open space, how will families be accommodated? *Applicant: Families would likely choose the two-story units that include yard space; these units are also larger.*
- I have concerns regarding light and air. *Applicant architect: Shade and shadow studies were prepared and included in the project plans. During the worst case scenario, December, there is some shadowing on adjacent properties. We will refine the design upon formal planning application submittal.*
- Plans note mechanical systems will be on the roof, can you explain? *Applicant architect: The roof forms will be designed to allow for storage of mechanical equipment on the roof with no visual impacts to the elevations. These details will be made more transparent with the formal submittal.*

The Planning Commission made the following comments:

- Site Plan
 - The site plan is straight-forward, I was hoping for a bit more interest.
 - Will need to relocate parking spaces in side yard setback.
 - Need to provide adequate space for vehicular access and emergency vehicle access. Vehicular access can be an issue with one singular entrance/exit.
 - Need to improve sidewalks, including trees and landscape strip.
 - Good site plan.
 - Agree with other commissioners; very efficient but “cookie-cutter.” Would have liked to see more open space although not required.
 - Side yard could be used for storm water treatment but want open space to be useable, not just for bio-swale or other storm water drainage facilities.
- Design
 - Do like the look of design including the colors, materials and variety of roof form. Concerned about appearance of a 3-story wall along the street frontage. Three story buildings walls along Bayshore need attention. Elevations along N. Bayshore need to be enhanced.
 - Entries need attention on three story townhomes.
 - Not favorable to 3-story walk-up townhouse units. Difficult to access for children and elderly. Three-story entries not as well detailed as those for 2-story. Would prefer more 2-story units.
 - Will windows be recessed? *Applicant architect: No, but will provide window trim.*
 - I am concerned about pedestrian scale at the street.
 - Need to provide housing for families. Units need to be suitable for families, look at including amenities on-site.
- Environmental Review Shadow study should include some considerations for the buildings to the north which are close to the property line. How taller buildings will affect the neighbors is an issue.
- Look at compatibility of building heights with adjacent neighborhood and privacy issues.

- The noise study should include consideration of roof design with mechanical proposed on the top of the buildings.
- The effects of the sound wall should be taken into account in the noise study.
- Air Quality impacts should be examined as well as mechanical ventilation for the units.
- General Comments
 - Consider repurposing of historical elements on site. Appreciate the lower density.
 - Have concerns expressed: hire local craftspeople to enhance economic impact/benefit to the community.
 - Sad to potentially lose an historic building in the community, but believe the project is needed in that area. Housing is also a community need.
 - Overall, I like the project. In this situation appreciate the lower density given adjacent single-family dwellings. Project is needed because we need more housing.
 - Appreciate the study session process; hope applicant will consider Commission comments.
 - Upon a site visit to another recently constructed multifamily project to the south (on the east side of 101) the project seemed to be too compact for cars to maneuver around the development and in and out of the single entrance/exit.
 - Ensure telephone poles are not in the pedestrian walkway.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff

- a. Please tell the Planning Secretary the preferred dates regarding the joint Planning Commission/Public Commission study session for Hillsdale Pedestrian Bridge project.
- b. November 13, Public Works Commission will discuss public outreach for the Hillsdale Pedestrian Bridge project.
- c. No meeting on November 26
- d. Meeting of December 10: potentially the Classics at San Mateo
- e. Neighborhood Meeting for Classics to be held on November 20th.

2

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, Chair Massey adjourned at 9:05pm on Tuesday, November 12, 2013.