

**CITY OF SAN MATEO
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 14, 2015**

APPROVED

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

Those present were Commissioner Whitaker, Commissioner Massey, Vice-Chair Hugg, Chair Drechsler.

A motion was made by Vice-Chair Hugg to defer approval of 3/24/15 minutes until the next meeting of the Planning Commission, seconded by Commissioner Massey.

Vote – Pass 4-0

***** PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Drechsler opened the public comment period.

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

ITEM 1

PUBLIC HEARING

PA15-023 BAY MEADOWS PHASE II DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ANNUAL REVIEW #9.

Brittni Barron, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation. There was no applicant presentation.

Chair Drechsler opened the public comment period for this item.

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

The Planning Commission had the following questions for the applicant or staff.

- The Conditions of Approval contained interrelationship of buildout, grade separation, traffic mitigation. Can you address that? *Staff: The Environmental Impact Report, 2005 Bay Meadows Specific Plan Amendment, Rail Corridor, Conditions of Approval, Trip Budget, sets PM Peak Hour traffic 1,562 vehicle trip cap. Until grade separation begins construction, staff is tracking permits relative to trip cap. We are under the trip cap with our current permit level. Monitoring of trips is done as occupancy occurs. With regards*

to grade separation: why is the trip cap at the start of construction and not at the end?

Staff: construction of office buildings is anticipated to be approximately 18 months.

- On page 2 of the matrix: below-market rate agreement units indicates 10% requirement block-by-block. Where are we now? *Staff: projects are phased. 10% distributed throughout a project and not clustered in one area. Approximately 200 currently occupied with 10% occupancy for below-market-rate.* The Field House: green building project. What measures have been implemented to invite public to experience a demonstration? *Staff: no information at this time.*

Motion by Vice-Chair Hugg to adopt Resolution 2015-2, Finding that Bay Meadows Main Track Investors LLC has complied in good faith with the terms of the Bay Meadows Phase II Development Agreement for the review period of December 21, 2013 to December 20, 2014.

Motion was 2nd by: Commissioner Massey. Vote: 4-0 Motion carries

ITEM 2

STUDY SESSION

PA15-002 – 2940 So Norfolk Hotel Planning Pre-Application

Tricia Schimpp, Contract Senior Planner, gave the staff presentation. There was no applicant presentation.

Chair Drechsler opened the public comment period. The following people spoke: Rich Hedges, San Mateo and Judy Arcuri, San Mateo. Their comments included:

- Entrance into the shopping center needs changing and it was proposed to the owners a long while back, but something about the planning process prevented it from happening.
- Owner is a very conscientious property owner.
- Having the new hotel will create new walk-in's for the shopping center, which will be good.
- Building with 5 floors facing the highway will hide the shopping center. No one will know that Marina Shopping center is there.
- I am sorry to see that 15 trees will be removed.
- Traffic will increase.
- Neighborhood is already getting busier.
- All about replacing the infrastructure, new tax bill for infrastructure.
- Increase in sales taxes, transit occupancy tax will increase.
- This project and others can help renew infrastructures.
- Public transportation nearby & serves Caltrain.
- Footing of pedestrian overcrossing is an issue to be resolved.
- Circulation & traffic are a challenge.
- With new hotel, the dollars stay here.

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

The Planning Commission had the following questions/comments:

- *Staff: Ken Pacini, Public Works addressed the pedestrian footbridge that has been proposed.*
- Zoning Variance required for hotels to engage in shared parking, why is this necessary if an agreement is already in place? *Staff: Both buildings must conform to the parking needed on their own. The hotel would be deficient, shared parking would be a necessity. The existing shared parking arrangement is proposed to be increased. The variance is to recognize that the hotel has too few spaces and needs the office parking to meet the requirement.*
- Findings for the variance. How is it applied in finding #2 in this situation. The right of the applicant, is there justification for the property right? *There are other situations in the city where this situation is applied. The variance is necessary to allow shared parking due to non-conflicting hours of operation.*
- There are 5 findings that would have to be made by the City Council, with respect to building height, correct? *Staff: yes. According to the building height chart, non-residential buildings that are neighborhood commercial can go from 25'-55'. The current height designation here is 25'. It will have to be increased in order to allow for this project.*
- There is no change in the access to the proposed hotel – it will continue to go through the current path to the building. *Applicant: unfortunately it will have to stay as is. We cannot change that since one of the entrances is located on another property. Improvements will need to be made to include better signage. Is there a recorded easement to allow for an entrance? Applicant: there is a reciprocal easement in place for us (hotel), Denny's Restaurant, for parking and ingress/egress to the parking.*

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

- Regarding the General Plan and Zoning: I am supportive of the project. It would be in the city's best interest to up-zone this project area. Hard to respond without seeing building materials board. Perfectly reasonable request of the applicant. There are 5 criteria for the building height. Design of the building is fine, the basic/standard look.
- Traffic and circulation, shared parking issues: need to see reports. Have visited traffic in this area before. Shared parking with the office building should work. Overall supportive. Benefits to the city/hotel to attract more hotels to the city.
- Building design is the standard model. Fencing along one side appears to be in close proximity to the building (AS-1, lower right corner). *Staff: project is currently under review by staff.*
- Would like to see some water conservation efforts made, such as cisterns to collect water for landscaping, electric car chargers. Circulation and parking are a concern.

Trying to go through the parking lot a challenge. What about parking for employees of the hotel?

- Consider changing the colors that are used add some that would provide zing! Use colors that will stand out. Consider more variation in design. Access to the hotel will not change so signage is important.
- General Plan and Zoning Code improvements are welcomed. Anxious to see this evolve. Points of access are required for hotels will add to the shopping center. Is the parking agreement tied to the expected life of the proposed hotel? *City Attorney: I will have to research that.*
- Differently weighted need for Marina Plaza Shopping center that would affect shared parking should be addressed now. Implement sustainability –solar panels should be considered. Recycled water, electric vehicle charging stations. Is the area at the back of the hotel that faces the back of the shopping center going to be impacted by garbage trucks early in the morning. How do the hotel lot lines interact with other parcels nearby? Nice to see lots of trees.

COMMUNICATIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Communications from Staff

- a. Field Trip Agenda at your places this evening.
- b. Meeting for April 28, 2015 has been cancelled.
- c. Commissioner Whitaker will be absent on 4/28.
- d. Climate Action Plan was adopted by the City Council on April 6. They did not implement the 10% that the Commission had proposed.
- e. Joint City Council/Parks & Recreation Commission meeting on Central Park Master Plan scheduled.
- f. May 12, Commission meeting has Central Park South and San Mateo Executive Park scheduled. The Executive Park wants to add 6th level of parking.
- g. 5/13 there is a Downtown Forum scheduled.
- h. 5/15 is the Boards & Commissions dinner.

2. Communications from the Commissioners

- a. Where is the Council in terms of finding another Commissioner? *Staff: interviews are being scheduled. I would look towards mid-May or the end of May before a new Commissioner is selected.*
- b. Commissioner Massey is termed out in June 2015 so a 2nd Commissioner will need to be chosen as well.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further items before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m. on Tuesday, April 14, 2015.