



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, May 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Online

a. Zoning Code Update - Code Organization and Bayfront Commercial Zoning District

Attachments: [Memorandum - Zoning Code Update - BFC](#)

[Zoning Code Organization](#)

[Draft - BFC District Regulations](#)

The Study Session was called to order at 6:04 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

At the May 10, 2021 Planning Commission Study Session, the Commission reviewed the Draft Bayfront Commercial District Regulations, including the properties along Bayshore Highway within the I-I District. Following their discussion, the Commission provided the following comments and direction:

- > *Should there be a minimum number of community benefits required for Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects? As proposed, a minimum number is not specified like we have in other zoning districts.*
- > *Consider including a sea level rise mitigation as a community benefit.*
- > *If there is a project that the City is in need of, such as sea level rise mitigation or the Broadway Grade Separation project, is this something that the developer could contribute towards and have it considered as a community benefit?*
- > *Could consider adding priorities to the community benefits.*
- > *Consider adding more detailed requirements for the plaza as a community benefit (e.g., minimum size, providing Wifi access, providing furnishings, etc.).*
- > *Streetscape improvements will be an important element in this area and contribution towards implementing it should be considered as a community benefit.*

Public Comments:

- > *Sharon Lai, Director of Development, One Vassar Properties. Representing 620 Airport Boulevard which is proposed for redevelopment under the code update. We support and appreciate the draft code presented by staff and believe the new Bayfront Commercial zone in general would help the City realize the setup by last year's General Plan Update for this area. We want to thank staff for their hard work, and we are continuing to work with them to implement the General Plan vision and to test the viability of the proposed code including the right parking requirements, calculating commercial floor area and design standards for the ground floor transparency in order to ensure successful projects along the bayfront.*
- > *Marshall Dinowitz, Sequoia Audubon Society, Conservation Committee Chair, submitted via email: We gratefully commend you on behalf of all of us, including those of us concerned about preserving our environment so that we may live healthfully and sustainably. We commend you for including the very important provision in your draft plan for requiring bird-safe windows on buildings so that we may prevent bird deaths by collision into windows. Death by window strikes are responsible for the deaths of millions of birds annually. Birds are critical for the maintenance of a healthy environment for, among other things, insect and rodent control, pollination, and a broad range of natural areas to keep a balance in our ecosystem.*

The Study Session was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, May 24, 2021

6:00 PM

Online

a. Zoning Code Update - Review of CMU (California Mixed Use) and BRMU (Broadway Mixed Use) Districts

Attachments: [Memorandum - CMU and BRMU Districts](#)
[Draft CMU and BRMU Regulations](#)
[Draft Article 8 - Definitions](#)

The Study Session was called to order at 6:02 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

At the May 24, 2021 Planning Commission Study Session, the Commission reviewed the Draft CMU (California Mixed Use) and BRMU (Broadway Mixed Use) District Regulations. Following their discussion, the Commission provided the following comments and direction:

- > *Not sure why "Publicly Owned and Operated Drainage Facilities and Improvements" is listed as a permitted use in the CMU District, but not in any other districts. Would think that these facilities would be located along the east side of California Drive. Clarify or provide definition for "Publicly Owned and Operated Drainage Facilities and Improvements".*
- > *"Food Preparation (catering)" is listed as an accessory use in the BRMU District. Clarify or provide definition for "Food Preparation (catering)". Would not want to see this use become a primary use here, however we may want to consider it as a Minor Use Permit, but it would need to have a retail-facing component to it.*
- > *For consistency, should vehicle rental also be allowed as an accessory use in the BRMU District? For example, hotels are allowed with a CUP in the BRMU District; a hotel in this district may also want to have a rental car kiosk.*

Public Comments:

- > *Jennifer Pfaff: Was wondering if the zoning code update was going to look more closely at any of the more interesting structures in Broadway Commercial Area that potentially are significant? A lot has been remodeled on Broadway and also on California Drive, but there are a few little gems in there. Am concerned that there will be a lot of development here, so just want to make sure that somebody licensed looks at those structures who can study and fairly assess those areas. There are a couple of parcels just on the corners at El Camino Real and Broadway, I'm pretty sure during the General Plan discussions we were talking about offering those corners as potential being as just residential properties, so not necessarily forcing people to do retail on the ground floor. El Camino Real is mainly residential. Does the entire street need to have retail all the way up to that corner? If we are doing density bonuses in all areas of the City, doesn't that mean that these buildings can actually have four or five floors?*

Commission Discussion:

- > *Currently, the land use table notes that multi-unit dwellings are not permitted on the ground floor on Broadway or California Drive. However, one option could be to allow, but not require, multi-unit dwellings on the ground floor. Should review what the General Plan policy is for corner lots along El Camino Real.*

- > *Would like to see office uses as a conditional use, not as a permitted use in the CMU and BRMU Districts. Concerned about seeing too many retail spaces converted to office uses; prefer to see retail uses to maintain pedestrian activity. However, it still gives us the opportunity to be flexible.*
- > *Would like to see office uses as a permitted use on the ground in order to activate different types of uses Broadway; this would streamline the process.*
- > *Can we limit the number of office spaces or square footage of office spaces on the ground floor in order to manage the amount of applications submitted? This can be difficult to monitor over time.*
- > *Have a hard time seeing side setbacks for buildings on Broadway; it's a zero lot line urban condition.*
- > *Makes sense to have side setback requirements for buildings along California Drive, except perhaps for lots that adjoin Broadway.*
- > *In CMU District, if there is an existing residential use on an adjacent lot, would not want to see a building built with no side setbacks. Zero lot line building could be acceptable if building next to an existing commercial, mixed use, or multi-unit building.*
- > *Perhaps we could consider using the declining height envelope as a way to require side setbacks.*

Public Comments:

- > *Jennifer Pfaff: Required setbacks on El Camino Real must be maintained. Think the language in the code should be clarified to say any building with "frontage" on El Camino Real. It doesn't matter which the building is oriented. With regard to the set back, the 20 feet which is typical. I also would like to make sure that what has been common and used throughout decades as far as the garages or any dig outs that are done that they also are the 20 feet. So, not only the top of the building, but that it continues through and through so we don't have situations with flooding basements. Regarding the side setback requirements on California Drive, we did that on I think some parts of the Downtown Specific Plan after there were conflicting development issues and I don't know how that all worked out; a lot of those projects never got built, but I do think it's important to have some hard and fast standards.*

The Study Session was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, June 14, 2021

6:00 PM

Online

a. Zoning Code Update - Review of Parking Regulations and Historic Resources Chapters

Attachments: [Staff Memo](#)

[Draft - Parking Regulations Chapter](#)

[Draft - Historic Resources Chapter](#)

The Study Session was called to order at 6:01 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

At the June 14, 2021 Planning Commission Study Session, the Commission reviewed the Draft Parking Regulations and Draft Historic Resources Chapters. Following their discussion, the Commission provided the following direction:

Draft Parking Regulations Chapter

- > *There is a demand is for faster vehicle chargers. Code Section 25.39.070 (B) addresses electric vehicle charging equipment. Would like to see language in Code Section 25.39.070(A) used in this section in order to accommodate faster charging equipment and exceed what the CalGreen Building Standards Code would require.*
- > *In favor of reducing the minimum required covered parking space length from 20 feet to 18 feet for single-unit dwellings.*
- > *Concerned about the requirement for live/work spaces. Should consider requiring additional guest parking spaces or an area for a delivery vehicle. Could be a shared space or loading zone in the street.*

Public Comments:

- > *Russ Cohen: My first comment is in regards to the 20-foot garage parking space length verses the 18-foot length. The trend is actually that vehicles are getting larger, not smaller. For example, Ford has decided not to sell cars. They only sell SUVs and trucks. With that said, you would think you would want to make the garage bigger, not smaller. Secondly, if you're going to encourage people to pull their car into the garage and still have some storage, again, you'd want the garage to be bigger, not smaller. Thirdly, one of the trends I see is gigantic house, tiny garage. So the proportions are off. So, if you make the garage a little bit bigger, the proportion of the large house to the small garage gets a little less of a cattywampus effect, not that a couple of feet is going to make much of a difference. All three of those comments for me would suggest you would want to make the garage bigger, not smaller. Regarding tandem parking, I'm not sure why the City would not encourage tandem parking if someone wanted to build a garage that would accommodate two cars. That gets two cars off of the street. So, if they wanted to do that, why not let them do that? I'm not sure why there would be a discouragement of doing if that's what they wanted to do rather than force them to have a side-by-side garage.*

Draft Historic Resources Chapter

- > *Under Code Section 25.35.090, F, 2, it appears that you would be allowed to build a structure to the same floor area or lot coverage of the historic structure, but that it would not be required to be the same*

structure. Would like to see added language to clarify this. (Ruben: I'm not sure this is what this code section allows – check with Kevin).

> Under Code Section 25.35.040, Criteria for Including Resources in the Register, subsection C, 5, include "event" in addition to "person".

> Under Code Section 25.35.050, Powers and Duties of the Historic Preservation Commission, subsection C, consider including language clarifying that the Director or staff provides guidance to the Commission.

> Need more detail in Code Section 25.35.090, Enforcement and Penalties; am concerned with projects that had elements of the project that were contributing to the historical status that were discarded and nobody asked for guidance. We need to somehow address those situations, perhaps some penalty can be enforced. Not sure how that gets crafted.

> Perhaps we should consider requiring that the property owner and contractor sign a document stating that they understand the historic elements of the project and the consequences for demolishing these elements.

Public Comments:

> Jennifer Pfaff: I am confused with some portions of the this code section. If a historic building is demolished, would it be required too be rebuilt entirely the way it was? It irritates me that somebody, and let's not just focus on one particular project on Bernal Avenue, that a Variance could be granted, for example for a much narrower driveway than is required, for the promise of working on this historic building. But then when this didn't happen, even though they don't avail themselves or can no longer avail themselves of Mills Act benefits, they continue to have the benefit of something extra that someone else would not have gotten under normal circumstances. So my thought is that part of the project should be restored. We should invest in a Broadway Specific Plan that looks at the affected properties in the Broadway Commercial Area. If we're hoping these properties are redeveloped, what is the default mechanism? Is there some kind of a trigger, like CEQA review? How many properties would need to be felled or destroyed to get to any kind of CEQA review and would that include a historic element?

> Cathy Baylock: I've been advocating for this since 1997 to have some sort of designation and incentive for historic properties, so I'm glad to see we're moving forward with the Mills Act. From what I'm reading, it says there would only be a penalty for a designated resource which makes me believe that for example, a house that was found to be historic in Burlingame Park through the design process, it's not a designated resource according to this definition. So if the person with the historic resource does something, they haven't asked to be a resource, they won't be subject to any of those requirements. And what happens in the cases of demolition by neglect where a historic property has been identified and then the homeowner just let it's fall into disrepair? Normally ordinances have some qualification for people that just let their properties deteriorate. A Commissioner asked how does the general public know when they're buying a house that it's historic, and that's the benefit of having a historic resource survey as we did with the downtown plan. I'd like to point out, and I understand it won't be happening, is that not only does it identify which buildings are historic, it also identifies which are not. And it's a good roadmap to navigate because we have the Eichler's that are over 50 years old and other parts of the City that aren't as obvious that we need to think about. So what this does is it reacts to things, so I understand we're not doing that. The question of powers of duties of the Historic Preservation Commission, I envision this being a subcommittee of the Planning Commission that would meet separately and can go more into depth to study the individual applications for historic designation and Mills Act. Regarding the Broadway historic resource inventory, I wanted to make the point that since we've changed the zoning on Broadway to include residential, we are in fact inviting redevelopment and it would make sense to have a historic inventory -- because in essence, we know things are going to be changed and it's not as obvious that someone might demolish the property.

> Russ Cohen: I too, along with Jennifer and Cathy have been advocating for preservation ordinances for at least 25 years. I think we do have to remember the community education component. The best way to educate the community is to have a historic inventory of the entire City. I believe a majority of the cities along the peninsula do have those inventories in place today and they were put in place many years ago. Burlingame has always resisted the notion of doing a list, and I'm hoping that this Planning Commission,

acting as the Historic Preservation Commission as well, will be forward-thinking enough in considering an idea like this, not by simply doing historic inventories of the business district like we have in downtown and perhaps now considering Broadway, but do it of the entire City. Quite frankly, the majority of houses that have been built in Burlingame are over 50 years, so there's a likelihood that there's some aspect of some houses that are historic, but as Cathy mentioned, I would think a historic survey would reveal that more houses are not historic than are. It's the easiest way to determine whether you're purchasing a home that is potentially historic at the very least. I would ask you to consider that. I know that's a heavy lift. I know that other commissions and other councils have resisted doing it, but maybe the time has come to at least consider it and start that conversation.

The Study Session was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, June 28, 2021

6:00 PM

Online

a. Zoning Code Update - Review of Residential Zoning District Regulations and Rules of Measurement Chapters

Attachments: [Memo - Residential District Regulations and Rules of Measurement Chapters](#)
[Draft - Residential Zoning Districts Chapter](#)
[Draft - Rules of Measurement Chapter](#)

The Study Session was called to order at 6:01 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

At the June 28, 2021 Planning Commission Study Session, the Commission reviewed the Draft Residential Zoning District Regulations and the Draft Rules of Measurement Chapter. Following their discussion, the Commission provided the following comments and direction:

Draft Residential Zoning District Regulations

- > For the maximum allowed front setback impervious surfaces in the R-1 through R-4 zoning districts, consider allowing some forms of pervious pavement to be considered pervious coverage. Could limit the area that can be pervious pavement.*
- > In support of allowing larger decks in the hillside area, not just so that they can take advantage of the views, but also because in many cases the lots have a steep slope and the deck may be the extent of their backyard. This is distinctly different than houses on the flats.*
- > In Code Section 25.10.035, should eliminate the requirement for a Special Permit for a basement; thought that it had already previously been eliminated.*
- > Would like to revisit the reason for having a 20-foot setback on properties located along El Camino Real. See buildings along El Camino Real in other neighboring cities located much closer to the street to encourage the street frontage. Don't know what the setback should be, but feel 20 feet is excessive.*
- > Should be firm on the 75 SF maximum second floor balcony size; should consider constraining them more.*
- > Consider requiring a Special Permit for any second floor balcony; through review of Special Permit could then require landscaping screening.*

Public Comments:

- > Jennifer Pfaff: I completely disagree about reducing the setback requirement on El Camino Real. The Downtown Specific Plan had two blocks near where there were shops facing El Camino Real, and the actual setback from El Camino Real varies, probably about five feet and so. For the remainder which is largely residential, there are many reasons why the required setback is 20 feet. Also wanted to note that there is a major landscape plan for El Camino Real going on right now, and so I would think it would be a very poor idea to do alterations to this long standing standard at this time because trees are going to be going on either side of meandering sidewalks, and the new trees are also going to be large. That's the point. We really want there to be ample room for tree roots, which by the way is about the same size of a canopy. If you have a 50-foot wide tree, you need about 25 feet for just roots or 20 at least of root material or you're starting to invade basements and garages. In addition, we have seven creeks going from*

El Camino Real and we've been told, even with improved drainage, the drainage is always going to be a problem on El Camino Real. Originally, the setback requirement was 25 feet. In the 1970s, it was reiterated because garages were flooding. There are emergency vehicles that need 20 or 25 feet of clearance to pull off the roadway. Delivery trucks also need a place to go and yes, it is a bummer that sometimes there's trucks in front of these buildings, but they've got to go somewhere. So I think the rule about the impervious or pervious surfaces kind of covers that, so I completely believe in the 20-foot setback for residential, plus you are creating more greenery that is supposed to help with this greenbelt visually, so it has more depth and more richness to it. The State also passed a bill regarding the maximum amount of shade that a tree can cover solar panels. We want this lovely tree canopy, but you're creating a problem for yourself if you are making the setback smaller.

Draft Rules of Measurement Chapter

- > On page 10, items (e) and (f) are duplicates of each other.*
- > Should not allow basements to extend into side setbacks. Should leave room for water drainage and landscaping; shoring for the basement and undermining of adjacent properties becomes an issue. Light wells in setbacks may be allowed.*

The Study Session was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, July 12, 2021

6:00 PM

Online

a. Zoning Code Update - Review of Permit Processing Procedures and Zoning Ordinance Administration

Attachments: [Memo - Permit Processing Procedures and Zoning Ordinance Administration](#)
[Draft - Article 6 - Permit Processing Procedures](#)
[Draft - Article 7 - Zoning Ordinance Administration](#)

The Study Session was called to order at 6:03 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

At the July 12 2021 Planning Commission Study Session, the Commission reviewed Draft Article 6 - Permit Processing Procedures and Draft Article 7 – Zoning Ordinance Administration. Following their discussion, the Commission provided the following comments and direction:

Draft Article 6 - Permit Processing Procedures

- > Would like to see the Community Development Director or designee have the ability to waive a requirement within an application based on project type. For example, a small scale residential addition may not require a landscape plan.*
- > Page 26 - Should we require that a written statement be submitted which addresses how the proposed project complies with the findings for design review. Planning Manager Hurin noted that staff could look into whether or not this requirement should be in the Zoning Code or as an application form.*
- > On page 2 of Article 6, Item B, Quasi-Judicial Actions, change "the Director my refer" to "the Director may refer".*
- > Table 6-1 should indicate that a Comprehensive Sign Program requires a Decision under Commission and an Appeal under Council.*
- > Should FYI applications be listed in Table 6-1? Planning Manager Hurin noted that it is discussed in the Zoning Update, perhaps using a different term. If applicable, it will be noted in Table 6-1.*
- > Under Pre-Application Conference, is there something more we can do beyond encouraging pre-application meetings, especially for new applicants that are unfamiliar with our process? Planning Manager Hurin noted that we need to be careful not to single out certain applicants, so alternatively staff could prepare an informational handout which would outline the design review process and include clear expectations for applicants.*
- > Under Code Section 25.68.020 (C) (1) (e), would like to see the allowed increase to the height of an existing plate line for single-unit or two-unit dwellings specified as up to nine feet above existing finished floor.*
- > Would like to see a requirement for installation of story poles at the beginning of the review process for properties subject to a Hillside Area Construction Permit if there is a potential for view blockage of long distant views. If not a requirement, then perhaps the story pole installation can be strongly encouraged. Planning Manager Hurin noted that this requirement may be in the Hillside Area Construction Permit Overlay Chapter. If not, staff will consider including it in one of these chapters.*
- > Consider establishing what constitutes a live/work space, should it be under the Home Occupation section or other section? Would like to see more clarity provided in the Zoning Code.*

Public Comments:

> Jennifer Pfaff: Would like some clarification regarding Minor Modifications; are these referring to FYIs? If it is, the items listed under Minor Modifications are definitely not all the reasons you have looked at FYIs. You look at them for window sizes and for many other things, so hopefully that was not the FYI section. My question had to do with cumulative changes. For example, if someone was granted several variances on a brand new house, and then during construction, there were other things that came along that were falling in this category of decreases in the side setback, etc. If someone did this to an existing house and every few years they came back and asked for up to two more exceptions, is there a way to flag these so that it is seen that this property had these minor modifications, that taken together, are pretty major over time? My concern is, that it is too much and we have a lot that we probably wouldn't have approved had it come in as a straight variance originally.

> Kirk Syme: Article 6 includes Section 25.78.050, titled "Additional Building Height in the C-1, BFC, and I-I Zoning Districts Requiring a Special Permit". We understand this section has not yet been updated to reflect the land use regulations already addressing Article 2 previously reviewed at study session on May 6th. We also understand from staff that Section 25.78.050 will be updated ahead of the zoning code being presented to the commission in the coming months. We concur this direction and it's important that the previously proposed Article 2 language prevail in the relevant sections in Article 6.

Draft Article 7 - Zoning Ordinance Administration

> For Code Section 25.96.020 (A), provide clarification if the entire Commission or a Commissioner may initiate an amendment to the Zoning Code, Zoning Map, or General Plan.

The Study Session was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME
RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTION AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF
BURLINGAME PROVIDING A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE OF TITLE 25 (ZONING) OF THE
BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE, ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME ZONING MAP,
AND REPEALING TITLE 21 (HISTORIC PRESERVATION) AND TITLE 22 (SIGNS)**

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME HEREBY FINDS:

WHEREAS, on January 7, 2019, the City Council adopted the Burlingame General Plan (hereinafter "General Plan") following the certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter "EIR") and adoption of findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Government Code Section 65356, the General Plan was adopted by resolution, and took effect on February 7, 2019; and

WHEREAS, to ensure consistency between the Zoning Ordinance (Title 25 of the Municipal Code) and the General Plan, the City is required to update the Zoning Ordinance to be consistent with the General Plan land use designations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has directed City staff to prepare a comprehensive update for City Council adoption in order to align with the guiding principles, goals, and policies of the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Ordinance is the primary tool used by the City to carry out the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, it is intended that all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance be consistent with the General Plan and that any development, land use, or subdivision approved in compliance with the regulations will also be consistent with the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, The City is divided into zoning districts to allow for orderly, planned development and to implement the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Ordinance identifies all zoning districts; and

WHEREAS, the boundaries, designations, and locations of the zoning districts established by the Zoning Ordinance shall be shown upon the map(s) entitled "City of Burlingame Zoning Map" and referred to in the Zoning Ordinance as the Zoning Map; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Ordinance, together with the zoning map, shall be in compliance with current State planning, zoning, and development laws; and

WHEREAS, the draft Zoning Ordinance (attached as Exhibit A) and Zoning Map were presented to the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on October 12, 2021, at which time the commission reviewed and considered the staff report and all other written materials and testimony presented at said hearing:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council that it adopt an Ordinance of the City of Burlingame Providing a Comprehensive Update of Title 25 (Zoning) of the Burlingame Municipal Code and adoption of the City of Burlingame Zoning Map

Chairperson

I, _____, Secretary of the Burlingame Planning Commission, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 12th day of October, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:
NOES: COMMISSIONERS:
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Burlingame Municipal Code Title 21 (Historic Resource Preservation), Title 22 (Signs) and Title 25 (Zoning) are repealed in their entirety and replaced with the following:

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME FINDING THAT ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME PROVIDING A COMPREHENSIVE UPDATE OF TITLE 25 (ZONING) OF THE BURLINGAME MUNICIPAL CODE, ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME ZONING MAP, AND REPEALING TITLE 21 (HISTORIC PRESERVATION) AND TITLE 22 (SIGNS) IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BURLINGAME HEREBY FINDS:

WHEREAS, An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared and certified on January 7, 2019, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Update to the Burlingame General Plan; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 15019 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Burlingame City Council determined that any subsequent actions or approvals to implement the proposed Update to the Burlingame General Plan shall be based on and subject to the findings, conclusions, mitigation measures, and statements set forth in the in Table 2-1 of the Draft EIR (DEIR); and

WHEREAS, the comprehensive update of Title 25 (Zoning) of the Burlingame Municipal Code and City of Burlingame Zoning Map are an implementation of the Update to the Burlingame General Plan; and

WHEREAS, it is intended that all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map be consistent with the General Plan and that any development, land use, or subdivision approved in compliance with the regulations will also be consistent with the General Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council finds that an Ordinance of the City of Burlingame Providing a Comprehensive Update of Title 25 (Zoning) of the Burlingame Municipal Code and adoption of the City of Burlingame Zoning Map were adequately evaluated pursuant to CEQA in the General Plan EIR since the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map do not materially alter the mix of land-uses policies evaluated in the EIR, and that no further environmental analysis is required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Chairperson

I, _____, Secretary of the Burlingame Planning Commission, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 12th day of October, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS:

Secretary

City of Burlingame Map of Future Conditions

City Council Resolution XXXX adopted this Map to provide community resilience to sea level rise (SLR) and storms. It establishes the following requirements for projects within both Burlingame's Commercial and Industrial Zoning Districts (C-1, BFC, I-I) and the SLR Area shaded in yellow:

- The lowest building finished floor elevation shall be at least 3 feet above the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) elevation at the building's location on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map in place at the time the project application is deemed complete.
- For properties with frontage on San Francisco Bay, Anza Lagoon, and Bay Front Channel, new construction must include shoreline infrastructure consistent with a Regional Project of the San Mateo County Flood and Sea Level Rise Resiliency District and cities of Burlingame and Millbrae to protect against current and future risks. The top of this shoreline infrastructure shall be at the SFHA Bay water surface elevation at that location plus 6 feet, the total of which is indicated in green. Other shoreline infrastructure requirements are outlined in Zoning Ordinance Chapter 25.12.050.

San Francisco Bay



Note: All elevations are relative to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88)