



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, July 10, 2017

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- a. 920 Bayswater Avenue (includes 908 Bayswater Ave., 108 Myrtle Rd., 112 Myrtle Rd., 116 Myrtle Rd., 120 Myrtle Rd., 124 Myrtle Rd.) zoned MMU and R-3 - Application for Environmental Review, Lot Merger, Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for Multi Family Residential, Variance for Rooftop Projection and Density Bonus Incentive for a New 138-Unit Apartment Development with two levels of below-grade parking. (Fore Property Company, applicant; John C. and Donna W. Hower Trust, Julie Baird, Eric G. Ohlund Et Al, Doris J. Mortensen Tr. - property owners; Withee Malcolm Architects LLP, architects) (160 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

All Commissioners had visited the property. Commissioners Sargent, Comaroto and Chair Gum met with the applicant. Vice-Chair Gaul met with owner of Burlingame Garage.

Community Development Director Meeker provided an overview of the staff report. Purpose of the hearing is for environmental scoping and also design review study. Comments could lead to modifications to the project which could lead to a second opportunity for scoping and design review study. No action will be taken this evening. He read the names of individuals submitting written comments prior to the hearing into the record: Lynn Feeney, Stephanie Sciacero, Dennis Xifaras, Rae Martin, David Davenport, Michael Zygarzewicz, Ellen Florio, Anne Toschi, Lynn Ann Howe, Teri Arbues, Sonja Shevalyov, Kathy Pirone, Frank and Toni Vasquez, Jerry and Maryanne Hahn, Lina Parness, Jaime Smith, Marsha Jurasin, Tim Smith, Alexis O'Flaherty, Mary-Helen McMahon, Linda Field, Ashley Kline, Leno Bellomo, Monika and Ralph Froelich, Timothy Hooker, Gig Xifaras, Nicholas Shevelov, Pam Baker, Steve Barron, Michael Nafziger, and David Whiteside.

Questions of Staff:

> When were the parking standards last update? (Meeker: within the last five years as part of the implementation of the Downtown Specific Plan.)

Chair Gum opened the public hearing.

Mike Pilarczyk and Dirk Thelen represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Generally discourage vinyl windows; why and is there a particular style? (Pilarczyk: not yet decided.) Generally see aluminum-clad wood windows or more commercial-type windows; can't indicate a preferred manufacturer. Referred to the Design Guidelines.

> Are building 179 bedrooms; what is the comparison between that number and the number of bedrooms being removed? (Pilarczyk: unknown. Can get an analysis.)

> How does the architectural design fit with the fabric of the neighborhood? (Pilarczyk: feels it meets the design guidelines. Have softened the color pallet based upon neighbor reactions to blend better with Craftsman architecture.)

> Doesn't have a preference for a particular style of architecture. How is the Craftsman style of architecture represented in the abstract? (Thelen: have included board siding with application in areas

where there is articulation of the facade. Corner boards are also part of that type of architecture as is the stucco and fiberboard. Are looking at board and batten elements. Also looked at the color pallet in the neighborhood and carried that into the project. Have done what they can at this scale to mimic the adjacent design elements.)

> Requested clarification regarding the variance. (Pilarczyk: the air conditioning condensers themselves alone rise over the 5% coverage. The elevator tower and stair towers take it up to roughly 7.5%.)

> On a project of this scale, it is more difficult to approve with special considerations; has the developer looked at ways to eliminate the variance? (Pilarczyk: are looking at other methods for installing the condensers, but not sure what will exist at the time the project is built.)

> Regarding the tandem parking; will the spaces be assigned? (Pilarczyk: will have a parking assignment plan for the development. The tandem stalls are geared to the two and three bedroom units.)

> How is this project a buffer from the west side of the project to the residential area neighboring it? (Pilarczyk: is multi-family use against multi-family use, the rail line also acts as a buffer. Considered the transition from four to three stories along Bayswater.)

> Did the applicant look at other means of breaking up the height rather than a consistent four story profile. (Pilarczyk: have not due to the State Density Bonus provisions.)

> Requested clarification regarding access to the roof deck. Does it run fairly close to the neighboring properties? (Pilarczyk: explained and noted that it is possible that one could see into the neighboring properties.)

> Was any thought given to including a commercial use? (Pilarczyk: are more than two blocks off of the main Downtown area, there is not much need in this area.) The Specific Plan encourages commercial uses.

> Asked if infrastructure analyses are forthcoming? (Pilarczyk: yes.)

> What is the wood-like composite siding? Provide a sample.

> Seems that the trees on the property could be saved; concerned that nearly every tree on the site is being removed. Would be a nice nod to the neighborhood to save more trees.

> Why is the breakdown of one-bedroom and studio units important? (Pilarczyk: promotes greater affordability and reduced use of cars. Given the prevalence of car-share services, car ownership is not as important today to persons who may live in the development. The development is close to CalTrain which will likely be more heavily used by residents. Are still providing adequate parking.)

> Is there hard data to back up the claim that the studio and one bedroom units will result in less use of cars? (Pilarczyk: a number of parking demand studies exist to support this claim for Transit-Oriented Developments.) Should reference that this is a Transit-Oriented Development.

> Is guest parking provided; how many spaces? (Pilarczyk: have 190 parking spaces which includes the guest parking.)

> How many below market rate units are provided? (Pilarczyk: thirteen.)

> What are the qualifying incomes for the affordable units? (Pilarczyk: will research and provide.)

> Has any thought been given to provide art as a public benefit? (Pilarczyk: will review.)

> When performing the traffic analysis, take into consideration the other projects in the Downtown area that are currently in the pipeline and being constructed.

> Whatever ends up on this property needs to serve as a buffer between the Downtown area and the residential area.

Public Comments:

Jennifer Pfaff: presented a petition containing 215 signatures from the neighborhood and Burlingame in general in opposition to the project. Met with the developer very early with a very similar plan. Is concerned that all of the trees are being removed. There is another Redwood and a Pepper tree that could be saved. The applicant implies that since he's doing affordable units he gets four stories; this is not a guarantee of the Downtown Specific Plan. The design needs a redo.

Linda Field: attended the May community outreach meeting. Strongly opposes this project. The project is too massive for the neighborhood; it combines too many lots. Believes the number of vehicles that will be owned by tenants will exceed the supply. Parking is heavily impacted in the neighborhood. The design is a

cookie-cutter version of many other multi-family developments proposed throughout the Peninsula. Thanked the staff for its assistance.

Juergen Pfaff: the project is too massive for the neighborhood. It does not work with the neighborhood. Biggest concern is that the increased traffic will severely impact the neighborhood. The transit system in the area does not function well for serving a development of this sort. Concerned about where traffic will be directed through the neighborhood.

Laura Hesselgren: Agrees with others' comments regarding the project. Lack the infrastructure to serve the development. The parking provided is unacceptable. Disagrees that the tenants will use transit; they will need parking. Bike storage will not likely be used. Will impact the Lyon-Hoag neighborhood. Past decisions of the City of Burlingame have impacted the neighborhood. Make the project fit into the neighborhood.

Monica Freolich: represent fourth and fifth generations within the neighborhood. A large-scale rental development will not result in occupants that have a vested interest in the community, they are transient residents. Are not opposed to any type of development; just needs to be of a smaller scale that fits better into the neighborhood, perhaps a two-story design. Desire a concept that will result in long-term residents that will contribute to the community. Deny or redesign.

Lynn Feeney: referenced 888 San Mateo Drive with 150 units; this project is similar in scale. Should be brought down to two stories. Seems like development at all cost. Concerned about pass-through traffic in her neighborhood; pets and pedestrians have been hit.

Susan Houston: lives a block from the development. Too big, but the change in the design still doesn't fit with the neighborhood. Parking is always a struggle in the neighborhood. Will still not be enough parking provided with the proposed project.

Rebecca Haseleu: has lived in Burlingame since 1955. This project is too massive for the neighborhood. Something half the size would be better. Parking and traffic will be issues. Traffic from Burlingame Point will severely impact on Peninsula Avenue; this project will contribute to the problem.

David Harris: supports everything that's been said so far. With other development that will be built and currently exists in the area, will create a canyon along Bayswater. Not certain that a project of this size can be accepted by the neighborhood.

Betty Norton: was at the neighborhood meeting. Most concerns were about the number of units. Parking is severely impacted in the area. Studio and one-bedroom apartments will still have people doubling up at times. Occupants will still have cars. Design the project thoughtfully.

Alec Hui: the project will impact schools; don't know how many people will have children. Doesn't know where the kids will be put into schools. Parking is occupied by people that work at the dealerships.

Unnamed Speaker: people are very upset about the development. Will likely double or triple the number of vehicles in the area. Will severely impact the Lyon-Hoag neighborhood. The design would fit well in San Mateo from a design and scale; doesn't look like Burlingame.

Jimmy Chan: glad to hear all of the feedback. Moved to Burlingame because of the quality of life. There is a lot of development happening in the area; if he had known this he may not have moved to the area.

Chair Gum closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Commission has an obligation to consider any project before it. There will be an extensive environmental evaluation.
- > Has serious concerns. The neighborhood is a transitional neighborhood, but not a neighborhood in transition. The Downtown Specific Plan identifies the area as a transition between Lyon-Hoag and the Downtown district. The design is not consistent, nor compatible with the neighborhood, nor is it compatible in mass and scale. Feels that the applicant has misinterpreted the language of the Specific Plan; the design acts more like a barrier. Are looking for a "graceful" transition between the two areas of the town. Need to transition from the two and three story buildings within the neighborhood, not just a token setback of the portion of the structure on Bayswater. Referenced Summerhill's approach to the transition from the single-family area. Need to revisit the massing. The courtyards are a great addition, except they may be intrusive and impactful to the neighbors due to the sound; perhaps look at more of a courtyard type approach to the development with courtyards facing the street; there are only token breaks in the facade.
- > Doesn't see an argument for the variance; should reduce the height of the building to stay within the limits.
- > The courtyards should be redesigned and reconsidered in order to try to save some of the existing trees, particularly along the perimeter of the buildings.
- > Look at providing some community gardens within the courtyard areas.
- > The fire lane will be an odd vacancy along the street; caused by the massiveness of the buildings.
- > Project has some great merits. Agrees with the neighbors that there are tired, beaten up properties within the area. Likes the smaller units and the provision of affordable units. Likes the amenities being provided. Just thinks that the project needs redesign before proceeding with environmental analysis.
- > Wants the environmental analysis to compare the density to other developments in the area. What does medium-density mean?
- > Recent parking trends to not match the observations of many Commissioners; would be interested in seeing studies referenced by the developer.
- > The project feels more like an incursion of density into the neighborhood.
- > Was surprised when walking the neighborhood that there are some three story buildings. The Specific Plan encourages respecting the lower one and two story existing residences in the area.
- > The design feels like it is bursting at the seams; is maxed-out. Doesn't believe the variance findings can be made.
- > The rooftop deck needs to be oriented more toward the street and away from the adjacent residential area.
- > The project is too massive, not broken up well. Is too modern; could achieve this style in more traditional ways. Would like to see more landscaping and add more around the outside to make it more pedestrian-oriented.
- > The sheer number of units is too large; the parking is sufficient for the number of units though.
- > The design sets a new precedent that doesn't fit with the neighborhood. Needs to fit better with the neighborhood. Perhaps break it into smaller sizes. The variance request is because the project is too large. A lot of the trees on the site could be saved.
- > The units will still not be affordable.
- > This is a great area to do some development. However, the project is too massive. Feels that no more than three stories is appropriate; don't need to maximize the site development. Encouraged doing a shadow study to see how properties are being impacted.
- > Make a 3D rendering from all sides to show how it fits with adjacent properties.
- > Doesn't know for sure how this project would impact traffic and parking. Is certain that there is a housing shortage and things are changing in Burlingame. Need to solve the housing problem somehow. This project wouldn't solve the problem, but need to address it somehow. Doesn't hate the project; is agnostic to the style. What does Burlingame get if the project is built; the developer needs to outline the benefits very clearly.
- > There is an artificial articulation in the design that is intended to somehow fit with the surrounding area, but is not successful in doing so. Will need to break down the large blocks and the heights. Doesn't like the proposed vinyl windows and wood-like plastic cladding.
- > Lets design the project intelligently and thoughtfully. Is a matter of crafting the project in a way that will

fit with the existing neighborhood.

- > Could have perhaps fit into the community at another time; there is no desire in the community for a project of this scale.*
- > Concerned about school impacts; where will the students go that move into the new projects.*
- > A buffer is an incompatible thing that protects things from one another.*
- > Would be great to see some of the trees saved.*

No action was required at this time.



Fore Property Company

Los Gatos

20 S. Santa Cruz Avenue, #300
Los Gatos, California 95030
(408) 203-1892 Telephone

November 8, 2017

**920 Bayswater Avenue
Proposed 128-unit Apartment Development
Progress Letter for Changes to Plans on Application Re-submittal (10/10/17)**

Summary of Plan Changes Resulting from our July 10th Planning Commission Hearing:

Fore Property Company ("Fore") heard the following comments from the July 10th Planning Commission and Design Review Board Hearing:

- Architectural style does not blend with the neighborhood – work with the neighborhood on design and site plan.
- Try to incorporate existing perimeter trees into the site plan
- Height transition or step-down in the R3 Zone needs to be further enhanced
- Reduce the size of the rooftop deck and provide more privacy for adjacent neighbors
- Reduce the overall size of the project (unit and massing)
- City of Burlingame will not accept a variance for rooftop projections
- What does the City of Burlingame receive from this project?

Fore meet with five neighborhood representatives multiple times over a two month period to listen to their concerns and implement significant changes to the architecture and site plan. Attached you will find a letter from the neighborhood representatives indicating the hard work and multiple meetings together that resulted in a better project that fits within the neighborhood. Working with the neighborhood resulted in the following plan changes:

- Complete Architecture Overhaul
 - Revised the architecture completely going from a modern industrial feel to a craftsman, bungalow style that is seen in the neighborhood. The project architectural style now blends into the fabric of the neighborhood.
 - Revised architectural style completely hides the 4th floor into the attic/roof which is consistent with this architectural style. This design allows a four-story building to look and feel like a three-story building.
- Site Plan
 - Broke the building up along Myrtle Road (now feels like three separate buildings)
 - Increased the building set back along Myrtle by 2'-3' providing more landscape

- Faced the courtyard towards Myrtle to provide another building break, massing relief, and additional landscaping
- Eight (8) trees are being incorporated into the site plan while two (2) others are being replaced to match the street tree species per city request.
 - Designated outdoor amenity space honoring the Brazilian Pepper Tree and creating a unique outdoor side yard and pet park for the residents.
 - Garage had to be designed and reduced in the R3 Zone area to allow for the space needed to help keep seven (7) existing trees in that area.
- Removed the 4th floor entirely from the R3 Zone property allowing for a softer, more natural transition to the adjacent multifamily property.
- Rooftop deck has been reduced in size and positioned to the side fronting Myrtle Road providing privacy and distance to adjacent neighboring properties.
- Project massing was reduced by breaking the building up into three separate structures in addition to lowering the unit count from 138-units to the current 128-unit design.
- Fore is no longer looking for a rooftop projection variance for this project.
- The City of Burlingame receives the following from this project:
 - Beautification of an aging block
 - True pedestrian connectivity from Downtown to Lyon Hoag Neighborhood
 - Much needed new Class A, LEED Certified housing stock in a time of a housing crisis throughout California
 - Transit Oriented Development (TOD) adjacent to CalTrain station and walkable to downtown Burlingame Avenue.
 - On-site Below Market Rate (BMR) rental units
 - Permit and Impact fees over \$550,000+

We have appreciated the opportunity to work with staff, receive comments and direction from the Planning Commission, and the detailed work with the neighborhood to create a better project that truly blends into the fabric of the Lyon Hoag Neighborhood.

Sincerely,



Mark Pilarczyk, Vice President of Development and Regional Partner
Fore Green Development, LLC
Fore Property Company