



North Fair Oaks Community Council

*A Municipal Advisory Council to the
San Mateo County Board of Supervisors*

2600 Middlefield Rd,
Redwood City, CA
650-363-1800
www.nfoforward.org

March 26, 2026

7:00pm

The North Fair Oaks Community Council provides recommendations on the issues of community health, safety, welfare, public works, and planning for the North Fair Oaks geographic area. It holds regular monthly meetings to address the needs of the community, act as a forum, and serve as an advisory body to the Board of Supervisors.

The North Fair Oaks Community Council was held in person at the Fair Oaks Community Center (2600 Middlefield Rd, Redwood City) and by teleconference using Zoom:
<https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/92771523402> It began at 7:00 PM and Spanish interpretation was available.

This meeting can be viewed in its entirety and shows each agenda item here: [YouTube Video](#)

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Council members: Chair Prado, Parisi, Whitney, Daly, Esser, Orozco, Saman, and Aponte

Absent:

0

2. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

In-Person Comments:

Oscar
Dale Miller
Lorraine Ramirez

Comments via Zoom:

0

3. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda.

Motion: Council member Esser / Second: Council member Saman

Yes: 8 – Chair Prado, Esser, Whitney, Daly, Parisi, Aponte, Saman, and Orozco

No: 0

Absent: 0

Agenda is approved.

4. Motion: Consideration of approval to conduct fully remote teleconference meetings by Councilmembers using two-way audio-visual web conference software that the public is authorized to access and attend the meeting via the same means, as via a public physical meeting location, as authorized under Senate Bill 707.

Speaker:

Chair Prado and County Attorney Brian Pettit

- **SB 707 Overview:**
 - Decide whether the council will authorize the option to hold fully remote teleconference meetings for council members, with public access online and at a physical location, under SB 707.
 - Key Legal Points (County Counsel)
 - SB 707 (effective Jan 1, 2024) changes the Brown Act to allow certain advisory bodies (like this council) to meet fully remotely.
 - The Board of Supervisors already authorized this council as an “eligible subsidiary body” in early 2024.
 - Existing teleconferencing for disability and “just cause” remains available regardless.
 - A physical meeting location for the public is still required.

Council member questions/comments:

- Some council members want strong in-person presence; worried about deciding “important” meetings with only 3 days’ notice of the agenda.
- Many council members have a busy work schedule which they can’t be in person most of the time.
- Some don’t want council members to abuse the remote option.

In-person Public Comments:

Manuel Ramirez

Public Comments via zoom:

Gabriella Valencia

Recommendation: Motion to approve conducting fully remote teleconference meetings by council members using two-way, audio-visual web conference that the public is authorized to access and attend the meeting as well as public physical meeting location as authorized under Senate Bill 707.

Motion: First: Council member Whitney / Second: Council member Saman

Yes: 6 – Chair Prado, Esser, Whitney, Saman, Orozco, Parisi, and Aponte

No: 1 - Daly

Absent: 0

Motion passes.

5. Presentation: Presentation: Multicultural Institute Program overview.

Speaker:

Mirna and Josue from Multicultural Institute

- **Who they served & where:**
 - Immigrant, largely monolingual Spanish-speaking day laborers, domestic workers, low-income adults, and 3rd–9th grade youth across Alameda, San Mateo (esp. North Fair Oaks/Redwood City/San Carlos), and Contra Costa counties.
- **Core program areas:**
- Four main strategies – economic development, vocational skill development, learning opportunities/education, and immigration & health support. Day laborer & domestic worker programs (North Fair Oaks focus):
- **Key emerging challenges and trends:**
 - Financial instability and reduced job opportunities for day laborers
 - Rising rents and overcrowding/unsafe housing, often without documentation needed for formal programs
 - Increased need for emergency funds and food
 - Heightened fear of ICE, immigration enforcement, and raids, with associated mental health needs
 - Insufficient immigration legal capacity (not enough attorneys for demands).
- **Community events & cultural programming:** Navidad/Christmas celebration with gifts and meals, Día de los Muertos altar, regular domestic worker group Mujeres en Acción, and community mental health/processing circles.
- **Partnership model:** Extensive collaboration with county departments, city officials, nonprofits, local businesses, community foundations, volunteers (e.g., Adopt a Corner), and resident employers to provide jobs, workshops, and safety monitoring (including ICE/raid alerts).

Council member questions/comments:

- How can a regular community member hire day laborers or domestic workers through MI?
- Some members have shared their experience with going to their food distributions and fundraisers, too.
- Council members expressed their gratitude to both Mirna and Josue about their great work and efforts.

In-Public Comments:

None

Public Comment via zoom:

Ever R.

Gabriella Valencia

6. Presentation: Overview and process of the SB 63 Local Investment Plan.

Speaker:

Jessica Epstien, Director of Government and Community Affairs for the San Mateo County Transit District

- **Purpose of presentation:**
 - Explain a **potential November ballot measure** (SB 63-related, “Connect Bay Area” act) that would:
 - Impose a **regional sales tax** to fund Bay Area transit.
 - Generate funding for **SamTrans, Caltrain, BART, Muni, AC Transit**, and other operators.
 - Gather input to shape a **Local Investment Plan** for how **San Mateo County’s share** (administered by SamTrans) should be spent.
- **Background on SamTrans:**
 - **Agency role:**
 - Provides **bus** and **paratransit** service in **San Mateo County**.
 - **Rider demographics:**
 - **94%** of riders are **low-income**.
 - **80%** do **not own or drive** a car.
 - Service is **essential** for trips to **work, school, home, medical appointments**.
- **Regional Transit Funding Crisis**
 - Many Bay Area transit agencies are facing **major operational deficits** post-COVID.
 - Causes include:
 - **Ridership shifts** (especially for rail/commuter services).
 - **Higher operating costs** (including for electrified systems).
- SB 63 (“Connect Bay Area”) creates a framework for a **regional revenue measure** to address these gaps.
- **Structure of the Potential Ballot Measure:**
 - Would appear on the **November ballot** as a **citizens’ initiative**.
- **Geographic “district”:**
 - Combines **San Mateo, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa** into **one voting district**.
- **Pass threshold:**
 - Needs **50% + 1 of votes** in the **combined 5-county district**, not county by county.
- **Tax rate:**
 - In **most counties: ½-cent sales tax**.

- In **San Francisco: 1-cent sales tax** (their choice to go higher)

Council member questions/comments:

- How would these funds for road repair interact with the county and state responsibilities for roads?
- Does it have to pass in every county or is it counted regionally?
- Why are we seeking \$980M/ year regionally in new tax revenue?
- What cost cutting measures agencies are taking.
- Why transit agencies seem to “always come back asking for more money?”
- How to get more local transit available to more people in areas like North Fair Oaks.

In-Public Comments:

None

Public Comment via zoom:

None

7. Motion: Consideration of a Minor Subdivision, pursuant to Section 9.04.030 of the County Subdivision Regulations to subdivide a 10,491sq. ft. parcel into four townhouse units located at 521 3rd. Avenue in the unincorporated North Fair Oaks area of San Mateo County.

Speaker:

Konoa Kelley, Planning and Building Department

- **Project Introduction**
 - Identified the item as a minor subdivision request.
 - Stated location: 521 3rd Avenue, between 2nd and 3rd Avenue in North Fair Oaks.
 - Noted the existing house on site is vacant (since May 2024) and proposed to be demolished.
- **Subdivision Proposal**
 - Subdivide a 10,491 sq ft lot into:
 - 4 townhouse units (air-space parcels).
 - 1 common interest parcel (shared space/drive).
- **Each townhouse to be:**
 - 2 stories tall.
 - With an attached 2 car garage.
- **Parking:**
 - Meets County requirement of 2 spaces per unit (in garages).
 - Adds 1 on-site guest parking space, even though only required for developments of 5+ units.

- **Zoning & Policy Framework**
 - Clarified current zoning: R 2 (Two-Family Residential), typically limited to two-family projects.
 - Explained:
 - The General Plan and North Fair Oaks Community Plan designate this corridor for higher-density residential.
 - The Community Plan targets 24–60 units/acre in the broader Edison/Middlefield corridor; this 4 unit proposal is lower than that maximum but aligned with the intent to increase density.
- **Highlighted SB 330 implications:**
 - Because the project is consistent with the General Plan, the County cannot require a rezoning as a condition for approval, even though the R 2 zone text is more restrictive.
- **Standards Compliance**
 - Required S 5 development standards vs. the proposed project:
 - Setbacks: all met.
 - Height: allowed up to 3 stories; project is 2 stories.
 - Lot size/configuration: compliant with subdivision requirements.
 - Parking: compliant; no reduction or waiver requested.
- **Emphasized:**
 - No variances or special exceptions were requested.
 - Project fully meets applicable zoning and subdivision standards.
- **Environmental Review (CEQA)**
 - Stated the project is exempt under CEQA as a minor subdivision.
 - Noted:
 - No unusual circumstances or requested variances that would trigger higher-level review.
- **Provide an advisory recommendation to the Zoning Hearing Officer to:**
 - Recommend approval of the minor subdivision as proposed, with staff’s recommended conditions of approval
 - or, alternatively, recommend denial, with reasons, if the Council so chose.

Council member questions/comments:

- Asked about the request for airspace above the units and whether approving this could allow future 3 story construction (since zoning allows 3 stories though only 2 are proposed now).
- Asked whether the council has any real discretion to oppose the project given it appears to comply with SB 330 / housing laws and existing zoning/plan.
- Asked if any exceptions or special accommodation was being made by the County for this project (staff answered no).
- Questioned whether the 2 car garages (19 ft wide) were practically large enough for two cars.
- Focused on parking and traffic impacts:
- Noted existing severe parking problems in North Fair Oaks.
- Worried a 3 bedroom, 4 unit project could realistically mean many more cars than the provided spaces.
- Argued it is hard to support more housing without first addressing parking and quality of life impacts

- Noted project is very close to SportsHouse/Synapse and other planned developments, raising concern about cumulative traffic and parking in an already impacted area.
- Motion to recommend denial (Daly) failed.
- Subsequent motion to recommend approval of the subdivision passed by majority vote.

In-Public Comments:

Emma Gonzalez
Lorena Gonzalez
Lorraine Ramirez
Manuel Ramirez

Public Comment via zoom:

Gabriela Valencia
Ever Rodriguez

Recommendation: Motion to recommend that the Zoning Hearing Officer deny the minor subdivision.

***Yes = recommend denial**

***No = do not recommend denial**

Motion: First: Council member Daly / Second: Council member Saman

Yes: 3 – Chair Prado, Daly, and Saman

No: 5 – Aponte, Esser, Whitney, Orozco, and Parisi

Absent: 0

Motion failed.

Recommendation: Motion to recommend that the Zoning Hearing Officer approve the minor subdivision as proposed, with staff's conditions.

Motion: First: Council member Daly / Second: Council member Saman

Yes: 5 – Aponte, Esser, Whitney, Saman, and Chair Prado

No: 3 – Daly, Parisi, and Orozco

Absent: 0

Motion passed.

8. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.