



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, March 28, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed into law AB 361, which allows a local agency to meet remotely when:

- 1. The local agency holds a meeting during a declared state of emergency;*
- 2. State or local health officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing; and*
- 3. Legislative bodies declare the need to meet remotely due to present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.*

On March 21, 2022 the City Council adopted Resolution Number 025-2022 stating that the City Council and Commissions will continue to meet remotely for at least thirty days for the following reasons:

- 1. The City is still under a local state of emergency;*
- 2. County Health Orders require that all individuals in public spaces maintain social distancing and wear masks; and*
- 3. The City can't maintain social distancing requirements for the public, staff, Councilmembers, and Commissioners in their meeting spaces.*

Pursuant to Resolution Number 025-2022, the City Council Chambers will not be open to the public for the March 28, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting.

Members of the public may view the meeting by logging on to the Zoom meeting listed below. Additionally, the meeting will be streamed live on YouTube and uploaded to the City's website after the meeting.

Members of the public may provide written comments by email to publiccomment@burlingame.org.

Emailed comments should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting, or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda or is on the consent agenda. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the three minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words. To ensure your comment is received and read to the Planning Commission for the appropriate agenda item, please submit your email no later than 5:00 p.m. on March 28, 2022. The City will make every effort to read emails received after that time, but cannot guarantee such emails will read into the record. Any emails received after the 5:00 p.m. deadline which are not read into the record will be provided to the Planning Commission after the meeting.

To Join the Zoom Meeting:**To access by computer:****Go to www.zoom.us/join****Meeting ID: 871 8430 8571****Passcode: 667924****To access by phone:****Dial 1-346-248-7799****Meeting ID: 871 8430 8571****Passcode: 667924****1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Senior Planner Erika Lewit, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent 2 - Tse, and Gaul

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**a. Draft February 28, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

Attachments: [Draft February 28, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Pfaff, to approve the meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no public comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Consent Items.

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 501 Bayswater Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new two-story, single-unit dwelling and detached garage. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a). (Bayswater Partners LLC, applicant and property owner; Geurse Conceptual Design, Jesse Geurse, designer) (116 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [501 Bayswater Ave - Staff Report](#)

[501 Bayswater Ave - Attachments](#)

[501 Bayswater Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, designer, represented the applicant.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *It is going to be a great project. Really appreciate the applicant tending to the neighbor's concern.*

> *Everything has been addressed.*

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

- b. 1561 Drake Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Side Setback Variance and Special Permit for Declining Height Envelope for a second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(e)(2). (Robert Medan, applicant and architect; Paul and Robin Edmondson, property owners) (90 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1561 Drake Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1561 Drake Ave - Attachments](#)

[1561 Drake Ave - Plans](#)

[1561 Drake Ave - Renderings](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones was absent during the March 14th meeting but was able to read the staff report in detail and watched the video. Senior Planner Lewit

provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Robert Medan, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *It looks really good. You did a great job at addressing all the concerns brought up from the last meeting.*

> *Thank you for the rendering because it makes the front look of the garage easier to see.*

Commissioner Pfaff made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

- c.** 1315 Sanchez Avenue, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a)). (Tim Peterson, applicant and architect; Claire and Joseph Benoit, property owners) (130 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [1315 Sanchez Ave.action.sr](#)

[1315 Sanchez Ave - Attachments](#)

[1315 Sanchez Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Tim Petersen, designer, represented the applicant.

Public Comments:

> *Waldo: I live right behind the subject property. Our kitchen window looks right into their backyard so we are one of the few people who are directly affected by the house. We have no complaints nor suggestions. The only thing I want to mention is that the landscaping affects us a little bit. So we would really like to talk to the landscaper before that happens, which I'm sure will be some time from now. Thank you.*

> *Public comment sent via email: I tried to get on the meeting tonight but didn't get on. Burlingame is nice the way it is. I feel a second story will destroy the view and also makes the street awful. It ruins the site for the neighbors on either side. I think it takes away the nice older neighborhood. It will also cause too much noise and take away parking for the residents in the neighborhood. If they need a bigger place, they should move or thought of that before they moved into the house. This house is probably 100 years*

old and a modern building ruins and will also probably raise our property taxes. Can't they add to the back and not go up? (Medan: The right side neighbor has a two story house. The neighborhood is a mixture of one story and two story houses.)

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I like the changes that have been made. The architect has done a great job in doing what we've asked. It is a charming home that will fit in the neighborhood. I can see approving this project as per the staff report.

> The changes were good changes.

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schmid, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

- d. 1509 El Camino Real, zoned R-3 - Application for Amendment to Condominium Permit to add common open space on the roof of the condominium building. (Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum) (Pat Fellowes, applicant; 1509 El Camino LLC, property owner) (110 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [1509 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)

[1509 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)

[1509 El Camino Real - Addendum](#)

[1509 El Camino Real - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Pat Fellowes and Charles Salter represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> Andreas Ryuta Stenzel: I live in the property next door across the creek. We have maybe about 150 feet of property separation. I think it is okay to have people on top of the roof, whether they live there or gathering for some event. My statement or concern about the noise would not be so much about how many people are there but what they are doing. If it is a gathering at night, or even just two people listening to music, I'm a little worried that it can be something that is loud whether it is music from two people sitting on top. If it is something that is occurring again and again, hopefully there is a way that doesn't involve calling the police because I hate that and I think the police hate it too. There is something that we can do by maybe using some technology like these Airbnb noise meters that you can put in or take a look at that would help automatically notify people that after a certain time of day or after a certain decibel level a light goes on, they get a text message or something that notifies them that a limit has been reached rather than upsetting the neighbors. We do have a couple of trees that separate us from the view of the rooftop so we are not so worried about the noise. I'm a landlord and an Airbnb host as well, so I know there are some technologies out there. I don't know how well they work outside. Generally, I support the idea of having a deck that people can use. I would want limit on the noise though, that is all.

> Public comment sent via email by Ann and Paul Wallach: Dear Commissioners, we have been

advised to review the Mitigated Negative Declaration for this property. Despite issues mitigated in the document, the applicant pulled the rooftop from his original application so that his project could then be approved. We ask the commissioners to once more give equal review and weigh two earlier remarks made by the commissioners themselves as well as public concerns. To wit, the rooftop spaces are really large and provides much more space than building occupants could require. Instead it provides room enough for events hosting multitudes. Eleven different entities in the building could host such events. Contrary to the original plans, the majority of air handlers were removed from where they were drawn in plans to closer to the rear of the building. The Neg Dec does not address the noise issues regarding relocating the air handlers. Inclusion of the kitchen and bathroom encourages overly lengthy occupation of the space on any one occasion. Amplified sound equipment was not addressed adequately in the Neg Dec. The applicant has assured the commissioners that they were to be protected from such nuances by HOA by laws. How many owner/occupants reside in the building? How many units in reality are rentals owned by the applicant and his partners? What constitutes a legitimate HOA document which could protect neighbors as the applicant has ascertained? Thank you for consideration of these comments.

> Public comment sent via email by Athen Rebellos: This is a beautiful building. I think that the outdoor rooftop gathering space is lovely and precisely fits the Burlingame lifestyle. I fully support the open space on the roof.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I followed this enough to appreciate what the applicant did for the whole project; retaining the trees, bringing the level down, I'm well aware of all that. I am sympathetic about the noise. This brings to mind the project being built up the street from my home. It is 53,000 square foot parcel of conglomerate pieces with 128 units and your property is 19,400 square feet. They had originally proposed a 6,000 square feet roof top, the Planning Commission had asked them to pare it down to 4,000 square feet and have located the roof deck quite far away from the existing homes on the rest of the block. To be consistent with what we do, I did a ratio to what was done with a much larger project. You were proposing a roof deck with about 2,900 square feet and my calculations using the same ratio came out to a much smaller roof deck which is 1,863 square feet, which is still quite large. Suggests to push it towards El Camino Real, it can be further away from the other residences. It's true, sometimes you have two people on the roof doing repairs which is a hundred feet away and it is loud. It can be horrible. I do understand it is a concern. I understand that this happens to projects where they keep changing over time. I believe the proposed deck is too big.

> I am torn with this issue for several reasons. On one hand, I want to see projects work to the best of their ability, to help craft and create projects that work well. The site is constrained. I believe the occupants, whether owners or tenants, have a right to expect access to some outdoor open space. In fact, that is one of our ordinances in terms of how we review projects and what we require to be included. I want to see projects like this work. It is generally beneficial to take advantage of rooftop spaces when we can. We've seen various different projects that have done so successfully, including this developers project further down El Camino Real close to Broadway, that appears to have been working rather well. My concerns were in terms of the entitlement process for this, how and when we have reviewed it, and taking into consideration the neighbors' concerns because of this property's proximity to single family residential neighborhood. We have to be sensitive to the issues that could arise from a rooftop area like this. What I don't want to see is a rooftop area approved and then have it create difficulties for the neighbors, then therefore, torpedo a process for looking at roof top developments elsewhere as we review projects and as they come forward. Moving forward, we asked for some additional sound analysis to be included with the environmental review. With that said, I cannot personally think of any greater authority or more renowned than Charles Salter himself looking at this project for us and for the developer. His firm has been around for decades. I have to defer to that professional expertise and I am leaning towards approving this.

> I understand what my fellow commissioner was saying regarding the ratio. The issue that I have with that is, you then have to look at open areas related to any given projects and not just rooftop areas. For this project, this would be it. I understand that this is immediately adjacent to another neighbor, but if that

area on the ground floor is not developed, it is just a patch of turf right now. They have to go back and fully develop that barbecue and bocce court area. This is a good opportunity to take advantage of that area up on the roof and pulling it away from the neighbors as it was designed. If this moves forward, I'd like to see this come back to us for review, maybe after a year or whatever the correct time frame is, so we can reassess the approval and see if there are any issues that have come up. It is difficult to just say let's make it happen and then have Code Enforcement or the police take care of it. We have to obligate ourselves to have this come back for review and see how it has been performing after a certain amount of time. We have done that on other project approvals, granted they are more for use permits.

> It was right for the neighbors to ask for some proof. I feel the same way about Mr. Salter's firm. It is important for everyone to understand that this is a scientific process and has been done the same way all the time. Reducing the size of the rooftop will not reduce the size of decibels at the rooftop. What is important is taking measures to attenuate, as best you can, the disturbance that might arise now and again for very sensitive people. I'm told that the levels at the property line are no higher than ambient sound and that sounds reasonable to me. The developer and the team has done their due diligence and it feels approvable to me. This has become a very common typology now, the multi-family residential with rooftop space. The fact that it backs up to residential neighborhood is a concern, but for me, those concerns have been addressed. I suspect that noise and traffic on El Camino Real is louder than the rooftop will be. This feels approvable to me and my concerns have been addressed. I absolutely agree with my fellow commissioner that we ought to have this come back to us for review so we can prove to ourselves that we have made the right decision and we know what to do in the future.

> When this came before us previously, it was just a blank slate roof with a bunch of space and no articulation for furniture and everything else. Then we asked the applicant to do a little bit more with that so we would have a better vision and use of space. The applicant has done it well and appreciate the effort being put into that. The extra efforts with the consultants need to be taken into consideration. I find this very approvable. We have several multi-family buildings up and down El Camino Real that are backing up single family residential neighborhoods and it is going to continue forever. We are doing more multi-family residential and that is the way it is going to be.

> Spansail: With regards to putting in a condition for some kind of review, it will be a difficult thing to do, to have a temporary use permit that is essentially granting a land use right and then having to review it. It might set a precedent and that is not something we want to do. However, adding an element that staff come back and report to the planning commission how it is going is something that we can certainly do. We can then use that as a way to ensure that we are understanding the ramifications of what has happened.

> Gardiner: I would also like to mention that Conditions of Approval #2 restricts the use of the space to 8am - 9pm and 70 decibels. Those are objective standards that can be confirmed and staff can monitor that. I know we don't always want to rely on code enforcement, but those are clear standards. That is easier to enforce than a temporary use permit.

> That is a good idea because it gives us, as a commission, feedback so we can make more intelligent decisions in the future on items that don't come before us very frequently.

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the application with the following condition:

> That one year after the rooftop common open space is built, Planning Division staff shall prepare an FYI memorandum to report the operational characteristics of the common open space and any other relevant feedback.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, and Schmid

Nay: 1 - Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

- e. 220 Park Road, zoned HMU - Application for Sign Variance for proposed signs on a previously approved office/retail development project. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15311 (a). (220 Park Road Owner, LLC, applicant and property owner; GNU Group, designer) (108 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [220 Park Rd - Staff Report](#)
[220 Park Rd - Attachments](#)
[220 Park Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Alex Livadas, Dickson Keyser and Mollie Ricker, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Would like to see a Kelvin scale as part of the signage program.*
- > *Thank you for hearing our concerns about the architecture. The changes we've seen do a lot to maintain the integrity of the architecture. We were all quite concerned about it for various reasons. For me, this addresses all of those concerns. Appreciate your work in moving this forward.*
- > *I agree. Thank you for going the extra mile and coming back to us with some options. I agree with my fellow commissioner regarding the light colors, please keep the signage illuminated the same colors for consistency.*
- > *The projection detail at the corner and how it ends is important. Encourages the designers to look into that as you develop the final portions of your signage program.*
- > *I agree with my fellow commissioner about the detail, maybe those ends can be rounder or something very fine that would look like it was on purpose. I really think you have done a great job.*
- > *To avoid precedent, can we have in writing that the only reason the signage was allowed to be placed on a higher level on the building is because this is a historical site and placing the signage on certain areas on the lower level may damage the integrity of the building? Something to make it clear that there is a reason why this was done and to not have every tall building come and say they want the same conditions applied too.*

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Pfaff, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1617 Ralston Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second

story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Mark and Linda Garcia, property owners; Robert Bryant, architect) (105 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [1617 Ralston Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1617 Ralston Ave - Attachments](#)

[1617 Ralston Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Chair Schmid was recused from this item because he lives within 500 feet of the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Acting Chair Loftis opened the public hearing.

Robert Bryant, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Acting Chair Loftis closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *On the façade, the quatrefoil together with the door in a narrow area looks squished in. Consider using a wider door and eliminate the side lights to make the area less crowded.*

> *Windows on the rear and side elevations do not match the proposed windows at the front of the house, they don't fit well together.*

> *This is an existing house that is nondescript which is being made better. I commend the applicant for working with the existing conditions. I like the fact that they are putting in additional charm and details with the divided light windows on the front facade, the simulated carriage doors, the wood shutters, the timber sills, etc. All in all, it is making for a well-crafted project. If it were from the ground up, we might be viewing it a little bit differently. It is a fairly nice project. Within the context of itself, it works well.*

> *Recommend adding some type of roof over the door along the left side of the house, not a deal breaker but it could be a nice little touch.*

> *I have a similar feeling about that door, it feels lonely in the middle of the wall.*

> *The front of the project is much improved over the existing facade. There is charm proposed where there is no charm right now and that is a nice thing. It feels like the other facades are left out a little bit. Suggest bringing in more details into the other elevations, like some sort of awning on that side door. But as my fellow commissioner said, we don't want to be the enemy of the good because it is a very plain building being made better. I think it is fair of us to ask since the work that is being done is limited and the house is not being degraded. In general, it is not a bad project.*

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Pfaff, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

Recused: 1 - Schmid

- b.** 309 Chapin Lane, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling and new detached garage. (Tim Raduenz, Form+One, applicant and designer; Kelly and Kent Kockos, property owners) (96

noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [309 Chapin Ln - Staff Report](#)
[309 Chapin Ln - Attachments](#)
[309 Chapin Ln - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)
[309 Chapin Ln - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Schmid was recused from this item. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Acting Chair Loftis opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, designer, and Kent and Kelly Kockos, property owners, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Acting Chair Loftis closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Coordinate and update 3-D rendering to match proposed elevations.*
- > *On the top right window, consider doing the same box window detail that is on the bottom window.*
- > *Chapin Lane has a very restrained use of materials, it's usually wood shingles or stucco. This project has about five or six different materials. It is very busy. It could work but there is something at the porch that is very distracting, it's keeping it from holding together. Consider eliminating one or two of the proposed materials. It's not a deal breaker but could be better by simplifying the materials.*
- > *I don't disagree with my fellow commissioner in terms of the use of varying materials. It could come down to color, whether it is monochromatic or not. There is a lot going on. It is a detailing issue that I suggest the applicants reconsider. Generally, I like what is happening on the project. The front elevation is scaled nicely. With the added details of corbels and porch columns, it does bring it in closer harmony with the rest of the neighborhood. The side elevation has some weird elements happening with the existing additions and alterations that were done, but the proposed is a much better form that is more appropriate with the overall mass. I like where the project is going, but the details and the palette of materials need to be revisited before it comes back to us.*
- > *This is a nice project. We all have different perspectives of what is calm and what is not. This seems to be a pretty sedate project. I don't feel the busyness that my fellow commissioners are commenting on. There were some projects that we have reviewed recently that are more glaring and have nothing going on. I am interested to see how it develops. There is nothing that I see here that I wouldn't be comfortable moving forward with.*
- > *I agree with my fellow commissioner. I actually really like the project. I like the detail and some of the differences. There is a house at Cortez Avenue that has a lot of the same old charm and different variations. It adds a lot of detail to that street.*

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

Recused: 1 - Schmid

- c. 1766 El Camino Real, zoned NBMU - Application for Environmental Review, Design Review, State Density Bonus and Tier 3/Community Benefits for a new 8-story, 311-unit residential apartment development. (Carmel Partners, applicant; Certosa Inc., property owner; TCA Architects) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1766 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Greg Pasquali, Teresa Ruiz and Tan Katsuura, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *Public comment sent via email: Hello, I am a neighbor invited to the meeting. Here are some questions: 1. Parking is already inadequate or restricted limited in the surrounding area. What do you plan to do to address this? 2. Privacy: What are you planning for the tower window placement to minimize intrusion to nearby homes? 3. Shadows: Have you considered to minimize casting darkness over nearby homes? 4. Traffic: The intersection of Trousdale Drive and California Drive is already hazardous for pedestrians and vehicles, are there plans for more structured traffic control? Also, the intersection of El Camino Real and Trousdale Drive is a well-traveled route already, the frontage slip road and the front of the building adds an additional danger at the interface with this intersection and is inadequately controlled. What are the plans to address this in anticipation of higher volume?*

> *Public comment sent via email by Manito: As you know there's a crosswalk there crossing Trousdale that is awfully long and dangerous to cross. That crosswalk is not controlled by the signals there so people crossing are at the mercy of drivers who meet them at the crosswalk. And they could be coming from any of Trousdale's four lanes, or really turning from 8 different directions. You have to have your head on a swivel to cross there. And even then you will still get hit. At the very least the developer should be compelled to bulb out their corner, to shorten the crossing, make peds more prominent and more visible and to slow turns. That simple act of widening the sidewalk at that corner, also improves pedestrian and driver mutual visibility. This is important for pedestrian safety for future users and indeed even for current Burlingame folks. The curb radius they show right now is actually negative ped space and encourages high speed turns. Thank you for any help you can provide.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *Thank you for the nice presentation. Please take into consideration the email we received regarding the bulb outs suggesting a change at the corner of Trousdale Drive and El Camino Real for easier pedestrian crossing because it is kind of dangerous in that area. It is a very valid suggestion.*

> *Based on the renderings, it is a very handsome building with a residential feel and got good use of materials. But I am missing the ground floor experience; sort of an 8' or 9' doors, awnings or horizontal elements that are at 10' to 11' height and then continuing up with some clerestory above that element before you work your way up the rest of the facade. The thought is, at ground level, it doesn't matter what happens above you because you have a good experience down at that ground level. Suggests to revisit*

the design for the ground level and the randomness of where the stone pillars come down relative to the strong horizontal element at the third floor to give the building some grounding and to bolster that experience down at the pedestrian level. It is one thing to have a monumental experience as a pedestrian, but the experience is better when it is down at a pedestrian scale.

> For the environmental study, there is nothing special about this relative to other projects we've seen. We have to keep doing what we have been doing to date regarding those.

> When I looked at this project, I became disoriented and confused until I saw the conceptual model shown earlier in the presentation and found it very compelling. One of the key requirements of large architecture like this, especially on an urban environment, is legibility. I find this project, as presented to us with elevations and rendering, to be highly illegible but suddenly became very legible with that conceptual model. The problem that I am having with this project is that it is trying so hard to do all the things that a large residential multi-family project tries to do that it has gone overboard. I find this project frenetic. It has way too much stuff going on. It feels like there is a lot of willful design maneuvers that are without substance and all with a view towards breaking down the mass of the building and to not be boring because it is a large building. It is more graphic than architectural as it stands right now. You have to find the line where it articulates what needs to be represented in a piece of urban architecture and still holds together as a whole. This building is not holding together as a whole. Conceptually it makes perfect sense. The general articulation of the massing and the holding of the corners and street facade are all good, it doesn't need to be fine-tuned in pedestrian scale. But it really needs to be ratcheted back with regards to its graphicness. It needs to be a piece of urban architecture as opposed to a three dimensional graphic. This is more important because of its location as it is a major gateway into our city. To have a frenetic piece of architecture as our gateway is a mistake. The designers need to take a step back and really think about how far they need to push this thing to keep it from being boring without going too far and breaking it down that it is an illegible building.

> When I first looked at this project, I asked staff to look at other projects going around our city to see how projects fit within each other, it was because I got confused. It became very clear tonight. There is too much going on with this particular building. I'm not against the structure itself but I would love to see the façade of this building be a little more simple and elegant. Maybe it is the variation of materials used, the colors are all over the place. I feel like it is trying too hard. I am not opposed to the project. I'm glad we discussed the safety and traffic. I am concerned for the neighbors living in the town homes, not sure if there was a shadow study done or at least look at how it will impact them. Other than that, I look forward to seeing this in the next round.

> The difficulties I was seeing vertically between the third floor and the second/first floor that were pointed out very well and are happening horizontally across the facade. Because you can create a good pedestrian experience at the ground floor, you can then create a larger building that can work well if the architecture holds together nicely. We as a commission, generally have gotten past being afraid of large buildings and we as a community have to not be afraid of large buildings. We can have a façade that can be this large. It has good scale already because it has things that tell us that it is a residential building. I agree one hundred percent with what my fellow commissioner has said. I'm glad he pointed that out for us, it will help with the economics of the project, quite frankly. If the applicant can revisit the ground level experience, simplify the façade and can hang together as all one project just by looking at it. In terms of the environmental, I agree that it is a standard fair of issues that need to be examined. I hope that the communications issues with the police department get sorted out and doesn't become an insurmountable hurdle. In regards to the entitlement and the projects, I can support the density bonuses the way they have been crafted and the development standard waivers. I really appreciate, commend and thank the developer committing to a greater level of affordability than it was required. I hope that can remain part of the project as it moves forward. Staff has done a good job of reviewing the community benefits and they are supportable. It is a good project. I'd like it revisited in terms of design review before it comes back to regular action.

> I agree with a lot of what has been said this evening. I see a lot of really big windows that are floor to ceiling and you only have the structural band in between them. I am a little concerned with that. Even more so on the ground level in the amenity space. As somebody who does retail projects all the time, I am aware that you will need room for utilities. You can't just have a foot and a half from the bottom of one floor to the top of the other. That means, it then has to be shown in the elevation too because you want to

cover them. There is not much hierarchy of levels that help translate upward. It is just very strong thin horizontals which can be done in an Eichler house because it is only spanning twenty feet. Structurally, it needs more especially at the bottom level. I also agree that there are a few too many materials and too much switching, but yet not enough depth. I find the elevations flat. That is a large area of wood and it is not doing anything on the corner. The materials chosen and lack of detail is not helping. Some texture might be useful to this project. I am not afraid of the mass, the courtyards are in the right spots in order to make the mass and layout work. I also appreciate the efforts that the developer is putting into the affordability. There is some work to be done and hopefully they got a lot of feedback from us that will help with the design.

The application is required to return on the Regular Action Calendar because it includes environmental review. No vote was taken.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Community Development Director Gardiner reported that the March 21st City Council meeting included a presentation by OneShoreline to talk about the regional project sea level rise and flood protection project that they've been working on that includes Burlingame, Millbrae and SFO. It was an interesting presentation if commissioners wanted to look at it.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m.

Notice: Any individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Ruben Hurin, Planning Manager, by 10:00 a.m. on Monday, March 28, 2022 at rhurin@burlingame.org or (650) 558-7256. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for inspection via www.burlingame.org/planningcommission/agenda or by emailing the Planning Manager at rhurin@burlingame.org. If you are unable to obtain information via the City's website or through email, contact the Planning Manager at 650-558-7256.

An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on March 28, 2022. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on April 7, 2022, the action becomes final. In order to be effective, appeals must be in writing to the City Clerk and must be accompanied by an appeal fee of \$708.00, which includes noticing costs.