STUDY AREA 1 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date **3/3/20** Station Name **SA #1**

A, B & C General

- Pop & jobs correlate more realistically/balanced
- a reach, but maybe not too much
- account for more future growth - @ least 1 more floor @ North

Relate transit options to land use (consider bike undercrossing @ 39th)

- Bldg scale transitions
- OK w/alts. as long as infrastructure is in place
- @ North, consider safety of street parking & driveway ingress/egress
- @ South, area btw EC & tracks is space limited
- Maple & Palm are more walkable (El camino unpleasant to walk on)
- San Mateo drive more walkable
- Site & Bldg design is important - not too tight on site.

Alternative A

- High density designs could be improved
- Vehicle maneuvering (@ North (parking, driveways)
- consider historic resources
- Bldg scale transitions fr. Commny to Res.
- max 3-4 stories @ Central
- need thoughtful Bldg design
- Need Streetscape to be attractive
- acct. for (E) + future historic Bldgs

- coord area btw El Cam. & tracks w/ Caltrain
- possibly too much - "wish list for developers"
- max 4 stories
- Alt. B is good
- more mixed-use (non-res @ ground)
- new Bldg heights should @ least match existing } central & South
- 1 more floor @ North
- likes B (but also C) - @ central

Alternative B

- updated (inventory) & re-use
- corridor is becoming claustrophobic
- need wider setbacks + sidewalks
- El camino wider sidewalk
- lanes are too tight
- @ south section expand saw to account for more transition away fr. El Camino (Buffer/zone transition)
- "missing middle"

- Coord w/ Caltrain plans (forethought)
- possibly too much - "wish list for developers"   - need jobs!
- max 4 stories
- more mixed-use
- comm. @ ground } @ Central
- match (E) Bldg heights } & South
- 1 more floor @ North
- preferred option - good to mix sfras & houses
- Same comment
- need more mixed-use w/ high rise

@ Central "maintain vision" @ surrounding neighborhood (central density could be higher but need details

Alternative C

- zoning will be oriented to vision

STUDY AREA 2 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date 3/3/20   Station Name   SA #

Make sure to keep a grocery store in the area. Don't create a food desert.
Mollie Stone needs to be replaced with other grocery store(s). Also applies to the other alternatives

If you are displacing Samaritan House/food bank, help them relocate to an appropriate location near public transportation.
Also applies to other alternatives

Keep commercial services/noisy next to El Camino + Cal Train + have restaurants further away

MOLLIE STONE SITE High Density - NEIGHBORHOOD Focus - ALT   A, B, & C
41st to 43rd - South S.M. Focus AREA - Higher DENSITIES ⟶ || SAME

Alternative A

Keep jobs near homes to reduce commute traffic. Applies to other alternatives

May need transportation improvement at 42nd & Pacific Blvd to accommodate more housing. Evening rush hour is
terrible between 4-7 from 42nd to Ralston & sometimes backed up onto Ralston. Applies to other alternatives

- Alternative B but w/a slightly higher density.

— redevelopment allowed to intensify worth the investment.

- should consider mixed use Medium in 7-11/gas station site
— Don't change zoning b/w ECR/Pacific Blvd, Caltrain 4-tracks future

Alternative B

- Want connection from east to west (overpass or skyway) over ECR just before Belmont
- consider medium residential near Vista Ave instead of low residential to maintain transition
  in intensity between medium residential (north) to mixed use Medium (south)

- have high density residential on east side of Pacific Blvd
— Don't change zoning b/w ECR/Pacific Blvd, Caltrain 4-tracks future.

Alternative C

STUDY AREA 3 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date 3/3/20   Station Name SA#3

- Alternative A or C should be different in the area immediately west of the Hayward Park Caltrain

General Comments

- One alternative should include Mixed-Use on Palm Ave (current alternatives are all commercial space)
- consider Bike + Ped circulation from colegrove across Hillsdale/DSW/The Counter Parcel
- More analysis of Historic Resources as part of alternatives
- Too much intensification of residential + commercial across all study areas
- consider impacts of density bonus
- Clearly define height limits of Mixed-Use high
- wants R1 - R2 Districts to be included

Alternative A

25th Ave = Neighborhood Commercial ← Study displacement of small business
Ped Xing of Caltrain @ Hayward Park - Stn Green residents

Alternative B

- Don't include mixed-use high
- All mixed-use high and medium
- Consider increased densities in Bay Meadows
- All High mixed-use around exist Hillsdale Caltrain

Alternative C

STUDY AREA 4 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date **3/3/20** Station Name **4**

＊ = applies to all alternatives

- Will there be enough parking? ＊
- Correctly mix w/ medium to residential south of 5th ave ＊
- Increase mix use density
- south of 5th Avenue should not have MU ＊
- △ Medium density to be 4-8 stories, high density to be 9+ stories (define max) ⇒match construction codes
- consider form-based zoning code for Downtown upon GP adoption ＊
- allow parking flexibility based on parking demand ＊ (look @ demand by use & scale accordingly) MU → parking demand needs to be proportionally separated. Consider shared parking after hours too
- designate the Historic District separately (separate zoning, ~~etc~~ on all maps, study area, policies) from Study Area 4 ＊
- encourage increased residential densities in Study Area 4 to ~~alleviate~~ alleviate burden of ADU development to meet housing needs in other neighborhoods ＊
- support for high mixed use development (Increase in Alt. A, potentially in Alt. B & C)
- Protect or replace neighborhood ~~serv~~ service shops ＊
- Ensure anti-displacement measures are in place when new sites are redeveloped ＊

Alternative A

- urban greening + street planning everywhere ＊
- will there be enough parking? ＊ need additional space
- relocate parking lot ~~too~~ to outskirts of downtown area ＊
- consider form-based code for more flexibility in development ＊
- ⇒ △ high MU → ~~as~~ residential south of 5th
- △ medium res ⇒ high res. along Caltrain tracks
- △ green roof on all buildings (cities alive) (see method) ＊
- △ affordable housing must be a priority (prevent housing displacement) ＊
- Increase mix-use density
- consider pedestrian- only streets ＊ (esp. on B St. & 34th & 3rd & 2nd)
- change ~~commercial~~ commercial building to mix use ＊
- add some parks ＊ + outdoor space/green space to compliment higher density mix use
- ~~goal~~ "OBJECTIVE DESIGN STANDARDS" that preserve the character & architectural integrity of the historic district while allowing evolution & new development over time
- B st should be MU-medium all from 9th to 5th ＊

Alternative B

- will there be enough parking? ＊ need additional space
- B st. should be MU-medium all from 9th to 5th
- like higher density near caltrain ＊
- define how high & stories can go; difficult to make 9-11 stories "pencil"
- △ low ~~re~~ residential to medium residential east of Eldorado Street ＊ (change office)
- hide building size
- △ ~~too~~ Keep buildings low. Not too high. High buildings give a sense of claustrophobia
- mix use buildings should have more residential units ＊
- △ study area too big
- ~~utilize~~ utilize ~~all~~ buildings efficiently
- △ ~~what~~ will there be anything done for the added traffic congestion?
- increase high density in downtown area
- increase residential low to residential medium
- will downtown area be able to handle more traffic, more buildings
- Preserve views
- 7+ stories too high
- if density increase make sure houses vary in size to accommodate ＊
- support high density
- Denser housing near downtown area - walkable distance
- change buildings East of El dorado to medium residential (walking distance of downtown)
- downtown needs to be "interesting" to attract people ＊

Alternative C

STUDY AREA 5 & 7 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date **3/3/20**   Station Name **5+7**

General Comments:
(1) distrust in the process
(2) increase ~~affordable~~ affordability housing near transit & make San Mateo residents a priority to obtain affordable housing.
(3) historical resources should be mapped on the alternatives. (districts/ind properties)
(4) it seems like we are not recognizing/honoring historical resources. We need to acknowledge historical resources in this process.
(5) we need more open spaces/green roofs, etc
(6) Shoreview is underutilized
(7) outside the study area, folks would like to see more multi-family housing
(8) preserve a good portion of existing commercial services on Amphlet.
(9) study 5: why not increase mixed use instead of residential?
(10) Shoreview shopping center needs to maintain services ok w/ mixed housing
(11) increasing mixed use can lessen car dependency
(12) must have convenient services in b/w neighborhoods. We can't remove services in replacement of housing

(13) Put parking spaces in ~~area~~ area 7 on Amphlet. Private developers would pay for this.
(14) ok development closer to highway should increase density
(15) medical offices should be maintained (all alternatives)

In support of lower density in study area 7 b/c there is already traffic and bringing in more housing will increase traffic

Alternative A

- having housing next to the freeway is not great b/c of noise pollution & traffic, & air pollution
- ~~Bla~~ Woodlake shopping center has potential for mixed use development (B & C)
- stands
- more supportive of ~~higher~~ more homes (in both ~~B & C~~ B & C); however, questioning how the density will impact the neighborhoods
- Shoreview is appropriate for mixed use, not sure about Woodlake (B & C)
- East side of area 7 would not prioritize growth (B & C)
- Study Area 7, Residential High is a good thing
- ~~preferred option~~
- Disappointed that there isn't enough mixed use (in all alternatives) Need to explore mixed use low/medium on San Mateo Dr.
- In all alternatives, increase mixed use high w/in the half mile radius of Caltrain
  - Doesn't support RH in Alt B because it would cause too much traffic

Alternative B

- the place types on this alt are too precise and too diverse in small sections. For ex Residential High is in b/w Residential Medium It should be zoned into 1 (either residential high or medium)
- Study area 7 → traffic will be a nightmare
  - maybe have mixed use here instead of just housing b/c we want to make sure services are close to homes
  - don't want to create food deserts when increasing residential
  - increase mixed use to include grocery stores/markets
  - high density near Shoreview isn't a good idea → it will increase traffic
- study area 7
  - ~~mixed residents~~ wondering also how the mixed use development would look next to single family housing
- Study area 5
  - supportive of residential high. There are parking lots that can be replaced w/ high/dense housing
  - commercial neighborhoods are good in this area.
  - ✱ Very supportive of dense areas in study area 5!
  - love to see services in Woodlake maintained & increased increase to mixed use medium (specifically to the Woodlake corner)
  - increase mixed use to medium @ Woodlake

Alternative C

STUDY AREA 6 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date 3/3/20   Station Name   6

Alternative A

[ALL ALT]
How accessible is this for EMS vehicles?

We need more housing

[ALL ALT]
· higher density residential w/ open space (community-serving)
· Also more height in commercial
· Robust TDM measures
  [ALL ALT] Need to enhance transit access

[ALL ALT]
Encourage green roofs

All alts would prefer a city park

very car reliant, so office might be better use

[ALL ALT]
· This is the area you would least want office / when it's a senior office
· med - to high residential

(address the noise)

Alternative B

Hard to envision residents mixed-use here b/c noise, these might be here an alt to higher density function

If you - going to add residential, keep jobs - jobs closer office

Should be mixed-use medium at least

More high-rise is important

This balanced approach is better

Office space builds commercial vibrancy

Area seems less desirable for high office use given its location

Add commercial/neighborhood to supply mixed with (residential)

the more we can have mixed-use dev, the better (more appropriate)

Commercial not built. Prefer less parking for this, but build "campus"

Alternative C

with more housing you'll build community social equity

How could this area be served by transit / connected to east/west?

Property too high is specified for residential

Build right to the commercial industrial use

what are the impacts of this alt?

Where do the jobs go?

Access to open space is good (only area)

STUDY AREA 8 & 9 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date 3/3/20   Station Name 8+9

Alternative A

8,9 - How Does this Corrolate with SB50 ABC

8,9 - Someone from City should Create more Awareness, Direct, Having a Plan (overall)
      and proposal - "initial proposal" in stead of public funding

8,9 - Too vague, unclear, feel manipulated (ABC)

8,9 - Focus is more on jobs than building - unbalanced

  - Protect community service commercial - Maintain Affordability
  - Traffic solutions (ABC)
9 - Is this developable - if not is suspect (A,B,C) Questionable

ABC - Too confusing - How are we to profit or Make money

  - Way too Many jobs   - Jobs Balancing - currently unbalanced
  - How do you Balance Jobs with current scenarios - (two Areas)
  - Do not implement methods until traffic control is proposed.
  - Be helpful to know whats existing

Alternative B

ABC - City will pick & choose to their liking after comments
  - What can be done to improve traffic that comes with scenarios
  - "Net new" should be "Max Possible" net new column should be "Max Net New" (point order)
  - Impact on neighboring schools, sewer and water
  - 8 & 9 Traffic choke points - maybe more bike lanes to transportation areas
  - Fumes and pollution to res areas because of highway proximity
  - More bike corridors,
  - Good landscaping is important
  - More mixed use specific because of location (9) preferentiable - liked
9 - More residential areas but keep shops - more mixed use
9 - Housing location should be priority
9 - Why not mixed use here? (B Area)
9 - Access from Grant St (closest) having to detour through Amphlett around would be too long to travel
  - Show baseline use on all scenarios
(B) 9 - Office Park to residential - then needs more access routes in and out for residents

Alternative C

  - Noise concerns with residential scenarios near hotel for example
  - Define legends bar
  - Is this job or housing focused (ABC)
9 - Likes open space
9 - Should keep services here local or surrounding res areas (Parkside Area)
9 - One scenario should have mixed use on both sides of Norfolk St (Parkside Plaza)
9 - Access from water front Parkside Area
9 - Waterfront boardwalk along (down) west side (Parkside)
9 - Keep library (Norfolk)

STUDY AREA 10 NOTES

Comments

Open House Date 3/3/20   Station Name 10

Alternative A

* Parcel north of 92, south of Fashion Island Blvd should be included in study area 10
* Ideal alternative - office uses next to FWY + residential along western portion near existing res. uses
  ↳ areas bordering 92 + filled should be office/commercial; all others - residential (low density near homes, higher near commercial)
* Taking away commercial regional may not work, where would they go?
* Keeping the ice rink
* Maintain regional commercial → vital taxes + services
* Residential near residential, commercial farther from res + closer to freeway

Alternative B

* Supports mixed use of commercial/residential, but not office
* Would like MU portion to be more dense, they need to self sustain (more people)
  ↳ lots of offices around, they need somewhere to go during day
* Need more equal job/house balance
* Kitchen gardens, community gardens
* mixed use medium would be better here so there is more diverse res. w/ cuter small shops → support a village feel
  ↳ lots of support for this MU medium
* GREEN ROOFS
* Mixed use high would be better here
* Supports more MU medium

Alternative C

* If you are looking @ so much res. where are the "support services (schools) going?
* The housing is needed → need to improve jobs/house balance, need more housing to catch up
* More balance in this one

CIRCULATION NOTES

Comments

Open House Date 3/3/20   Station Name Circulation

Alternative A

EXISTING PARKING ON EL CAMINO BETWEEN POPLAR AND PL MONTE DIABLO
+ (SAFETY FOR PRIVATE DRIVEWAYS AND PEDESTRIANS)

LIKES TWO-BLOCK PEDESTRIAN ONLY B STREET

Pedestrian improvements 3rd Ave / 101 (on-ramp/off-ramp to take bus)

◦ Would like to see an elevated Caltrain along
the entire corridor thru CSM (All alternatives)

◦ Excited about bike/ped path across overpass
at Hillsdale Station.

• label the historic district
and show the rotation in
the legend

Ensure that attends
to bring done @
North Shoreview.
(General Comment)

Alternative B

LOOK AT PARKING FOR CALTRAIN STATION, NEED MORE PARKING FOR CALTRAIN RIDERS
DOWNTOWN

INCREASING BUS FREQUENCY TO AND FROM SFO AIRPORT TO DOWNTOWN SM
- 24 hour bus timetables

Important to have east-west shuttle & connections!

Consider shuttle going for a loop from Hayward
Park to Study Area #10 to Hillsdale & back.

Alternative C

LIKES A WALKABLE DOWNTOWN, STUDYING SUPERBLOCK IS GREAT ✓✓
EXISTING
REMOVE PROPOSED BIKEWAY ON DELAWARE UNLESS A BUFFER IS PROPOSED
- IF NO BUFFER, CONSIDER ROUTE ON AN ALTERNATIVE STREET
- SPECIFICALLY ON DELAWARE BTWN MONTE DIABLO TO 1ST AVENUE

↳ As long as alternative parallel options are provided.
↳ Recommendation is no guide bike traffic on an alternate
Route from beyond bus/train car arrives.

SANTA MONICA 3RD STREET PROMENADE
IF TRAFFIC IS DIVERTED OUTSIDE CORE DOWNTOWN, PARKING FACILITIES SHOULD ALSO BE MOVED OUTSIDE CORE
- USE PARKING GARAGES OUTSIDE THE OTHER LINES

SUPERBLOCK ISN'T NECESSARY IF DENSITY ISN'T INCREASED DOWNTOWN

WOULD LIKE DEPENDABLE BUSES ON EL CAMINO REAL (MORE HEADWAYS)

$ FCX line, to align to Bridge Pont Area.

+ Resident support for RTC

Alternative A: Prioritizing a Walkable City

Alternative A: Circulation

This alternative aims to create walkable communities throughout San Mateo by prioritizing pedestrian corridors, pedestrian improvements to challenging intersections, and implementing traffic calming and safety improvements near highway onramps. This alternative envisions a two-block pedestrian-only street downtown. All the alternatives assume pedestrian and bicycle improvements consistent with existing City planning documents.

Crossing Improvements

- ○ Proposed Peninsula Interchange Project
- ● Proposed Pedestrian Crossing Improvements
- ● Current Caltrain At-Grade Crossings
- Study Area
- Sphere of Influence
- Caltrain Station

Line Improvements

- Transit Improvements
- El Camino Real Bikeway and Public Realm Improvements
- 2012 Proposed Pedestrian Priority Network
- Existing Bikeways
- Proposed Bikeways
- Existing Shared Bike and Ped Path
- Proposed Shared Bike and Ped Path
- Pedestrian-Only Space
- Missing Sidewalks

Source data: City of San Mateo, 2019; San Mateo County, 2018; Esri, 2019; PlaceWorks, 2019; Nelson Nygaard, 2020.

Map Legend

Alternative B: Prioritizing Regional Connections

Alternative B: Circulation

This alternative aims to increase and improve transit access to and from major connections in San Mateo by adding transit connections from Study Areas 3, 6, and 10 to the Hillsdale Caltrain station, prioritizing dedicated HOV and bus lanes, and adding BRT improvements to El Camino Real. All the alternatives assume pedestrian and bicycle improvements consistent with existing City planning documents.

Crossing Improvements

○ Proposed Peninsula Interchange Project

● Proposed Pedestrian Crossing Improvements

⬤ Current Caltrain At-Grade Crossings

▨ Study Area

▨ Sphere of Influence

🚉 Caltrain Station

Line Improvements

— Transit Improvements

— El Camino Real BRT Improvements

••••• 2012 Proposed Pedestrian Priority Network

— Existing Bikeways

••••• Proposed Bikeways

— Existing Shared Bike and Ped Path

••••• Proposed Shared Bike and Ped Path

— Missing Sidewalks

Source data:
City of San Mateo, 2019;
San Mateo County, 2018; Esri,
2019, PlaceWorks, 2019;
Nelson Nygaard, 2020.

Map Legend