



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, September 26, 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 September 19, 2022 the City Council adopted Resolution Number 114-2022 stating that the City Council and Commissions will continue to meet remotely for at least thirty days for the following reasons:

- 1. There is still a declared state of emergency;*
- 2. The State recommends that 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 114-2022, the City Council Chambers will not be open to the public for the September 26, 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 September 26, 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: 826 6118 3096****Passcode: 934909****To access by phone:****Dial 1-346-248-7799****Meeting ID: 826 6118 3096****Passcode: 934909****1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

Present 6 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent 1 - Gaul

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent 1 - Gaul

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

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

- a. 1312 Montero Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for second floor deck for a first and 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)(1). (Dreiling Terrones Architecture Inc., applicant and architect; Kate and Joel Rosenquist, property owners) (120 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1312 Montero Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1312 Montero Ave - Attachments](#)
[1312 Montero Ave - Plans](#)

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

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Gaul

- b. 2836 Mariposa Drive, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review and Hillside Area Construction Permit for a first and 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)(1). (Audrey Tse, InSite Design Inc., applicant and architect; Vikram Rao and Sonam Prakash, property owners) (104 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [2836 Mariposa Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2836 Mariposa Dr - Attachments](#)
[2836 Mariposa Dr - Plans](#)

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, and Schmid

Absent: 1 - Gaul

Recused: 1 - Tse

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 1205 Burlingame Avenue, zoned BAC - Application for a Master Sign Program for a sign above the ground floor and to exceed allowable sign area on an existing commercial building. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15311(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (David Ford, applicant and designer; Ronald Karp, property owner) (66 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1205 Burlingame Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1205 Burlingame Ave - Attachments](#)
[1205 Burlingame Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Pfaff did speak to the applicant or somebody who worked for the sign firm and the owner of the building several months ago. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

David Ford, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I happened to know about the sign, so just for the public's interest, this is probably the fifth reuse or so of the original sign. It was originally the Burlingame Hotel. The word "Hotel" was running downward and then the word "Burlingame" being in script on the bottom part which still exist. The very first version was without the little bottom part and it was way at the top of the building, but a blade sign. Then it was moved down and there was the script part added. Each time the font changed a little bit, so it has been altered quite a bit. When Sephora opened up, it was nice. They reused the original metal work and left it on the corner. I thought it was quite lovely. A little disappointed that we can't have neon or something unusual. I understand that corporate likes everything to match, so I personally don't have a problem with this item and or this proposal.

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

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Gaul

- b. 1855-1881 Rollins Road, zoned RRMU - Application for Design Review, Density Bonus with Incentive and Waiver, and Community Benefit Bonuses for a new, 420-unit multi-unit residential development. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines (Infill Exemption). (Scott Youdall, The Hanover Company, applicant; Jon Ennis, BDE Architecture, architect; SJ Amoroso Properties Co, E and S Property LLC, and ANRM Holdings LLC, property owners) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)
[1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)
[1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Categorical Exemption](#)
[Title 25 - Density Bonus](#)
[Title 25 - RRMU Zoning](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Schmid had a preview with the Hanover Company of the drawings before this meeting. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

Scott Youdall, Ian Murphy and John, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> Public comment sent via email by Doug Bojack: I'm not satisfied with two of the community benefits proposed as a density bonus for the project. Although, I'm generally in favor of allowing greater housing density in Burlingame and permitting even higher density bonuses as this project could illustrate. The community benefit of the public plaza, Plaza A seems minimal. It appears more like street frontage that is advertising the leasing office rather than providing a meaningful community benefit. I also have concerns about the efficacy of the proposed TDM plan. The expectation is that the TDM measures create a 25 percent reduction in vehicle trips, but this seems at odds with the construction of a parking garage that exceeds the city's parking space requirements while proposing to construct the smallest allowed of bicycle parking allowed. This housing development is in a location with some of the highest walking and bicycling scores in the city. I would much rather see the developer satisfy the density bonus by saving money not constructing additional parking spaces. Each space for gone would likely save at least tens of thousands of dollars per unit. Millions of dollars for the overall project cost and instead spend those millions making offsite streetscape improvements to improve public safety around the site and its proximity to a major multi-modal hub. If Burlingame committed an even higher density bonus and held developers to a commensurate higher standard, we would be able to replace at least a portion of that parking garage building envelope with apartments, generating more economic activity and with safer streets for our new residents. Thank you.

> Scott, Local 467 Plumber: I'm with the San Mateo Building Trades as well as Plumbers Union. My question is for Mr. Youdall. We like the project. We would like to discuss possibly using the many members we have that work here in Burlingame. We would like Mr. Youdall to have a conversation with us. We have left e-mails and voice messages and maybe we have a bad contact. I'm hoping there's a commitment tonight that you might make some time to sit down and have a conversation with us. Is that a possibility?

> Joe Sostaric: I am with a company called The Conco Companies and we have been around since 1959. We're a concrete contractor and have done a lot of projects throughout the bay area. I just wanted to speak out briefly on behalf of Hanover Company. We have worked with them many times and one thing about us is that we're signatory with many of the trades and they have always treated us very well. With our group, we have carpenters, cement masons, iron workers and operating engineers and we found them to be a very fair company to do business with. They have treated us well and because of the work that they have done, they've been able to give us a lot of work for our union families. I just wanted to make a brief comment in support of this project and in support of the Hanover Company, thank you.

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I like the direction that the project is taking. I like the changes made to the corner architecture. I like the shadowing and the layering of the materials that they have chosen to do. It has made it a lot more interesting than it was back in March. The new parcel in the back has allowed them to achieve a little better result on the circle around the property, so it's functioning better. I like the addition of the coffee business on the ground floor, which will help boost a little bit along Rollins Road. Overall, the project is going in the right direction.

> It's a good looking project, though it looks like every other one that's going up. The public space is just a wide sidewalk from my perspective. I don't see it as a huge amenity to call it a plaza, it seems a bit overstated. I'm not sure architecturally in height whether they really are taking into account the future context of that street. With the Alexandria biotech campus going up right next door, it's going to be 120 to 150 feet tall, this building will be dwarfed by the neighborhood in the future. The last comment, coffee is great but there's a soccer practice facility right across the street, so I'm sure those kids would like acai bowls or smoothies as well, they might have customers.

> I don't mind the aesthetic, I think it's okay. I like the density of the building. I'm a little off put by the public benefit. I tend to agree that the plaza seems overstated, I don't see much benefit at all there. The coffee kiosk is nice, but you're talking about hundreds or thousands of people living here along with the other new buildings going up and there's almost no retail or restaurants in that area. You have In-N-Out, a gas station and a Mexican restaurant. There's not a lot there. I'm concerned, we're putting thousands of

folks right on top of each other without a supermarket or a retail spot.

> I hope the developer, now that our governor signed AB2097, will take a look at that parking structure and re-think it. Having 1.3 parking spaces per unit is not applicable anymore, given the proximity to one of the best transit hubs in the Bay Area. That needs to be rethought. There could be a lot better done with that parking section. The dog park is nice but that's kind of scratching the surface, in my opinion. I agree with my fellow commissioner that it's going in the right direction, but I don't think the community benefit here is bold enough.

> This project has come a long way. They've done some nice architectural details, but we are missing the element of community in this area. For me, a little coffee kiosk isn't going to do it for these folks. We need a laundromat, a grocery store, someplace where someone can get some milk, coffee, bread for the morning or some eggs and we're not creating that. We have the cute little market on the corner of Paloma Avenue and Broadway where they've got the smoothies. It's a market, a deli and you can get anything you kind of need. I grew up on Paloma Avenue and we would run to the grocery store to get milk and we don't have that here.

> I agree, let's look at this parking and see if we can get some more community benefit in this area, not just for this project but every project that will come before us. We need to look at what it's doing to the community in those particular areas because you're not going to take your car across El Camino Real to go to the grocery store. We need something over there and if we're looking at this as a master plan, it's really important to get this right.

> I think that the project has come along from the very first meeting, we thought it was in a really good position to move forward. I don't see as much improvement this time around as what is being presented. The whole gateway approach with this building at the northern most point of this area on Rollins Road really has a nice opportunity, not only with the public plaza on that northeast corner but also just as a statement with something architecturally, sculpturally beyond a little piece of sculpture on the ground, but something architecturally on that corner that shows you have arrived here in Burlingame.

> The applicant could have looked at something more creative on the corner at Broderick Road and Rollins Road. I don't agree with that corner being established as a larger living unit on that corner. It really makes more sense that it can be like the corner market that my fellow commissioner was stating. Some other type of support retail space that goes with the coffee kiosk whether it's a bakery or market, something to go with hand-in-hand with that coffee kiosk. There's plenty of opportunity for those two corners that could be further developed to improve that public community space that the developers are attempting to develop here.

> I agree that with all the extra parking, there are 50-something odd spaces that are beyond the required number of parking spaces that have been created. I would love to see more living units, widen the development and have some more units or at least a bigger bike storage room that's located in a more accessible location. I don't agree that a cyclist will want to go so far, almost the farther most point of the property, to park one's bike after a day's work or workout. Some more thought is needed in terms of how one would use the bike storage spaces and access to that be closer to the multi-modal transportation node. But some nice things are developing for sure. I'm not sold that we're there yet and would love a little bit more push on the creative side.

(Gardiner: I want to remind the commission that this is an action item, not a study item. So there does need to be a decision this evening. I know some of the comments are suggesting further changes, but this project is up for action.)

(Spansail: Just to add on that, there's the Housing Accountability Act, and I can push back to Director Gardiner and he can talk about the conforming plan but as mentioned earlier, this is up for action tonight and I want to make sure we're considering that.)

> I am reminded that with almost a thousand people in this building who might want to go to In-N-Out or the other restaurants there, I didn't notice any provisions for pedestrian crossing at Rollins Road. I know that road can be a bit tricky, people running across between blocks, so that is a concern.

> I agree with everything that has been said. Personally, as far as an action item, I don't think this one is right. For all the additional space they got to get one more low income unit, I don't know the term. I understand what they are doing, they've got 35 units instead of 34 units for the chunk of land they got. The dog park has not been thought out completely, it's rather boring. It looks better than it did before but as far as design review, it doesn't pass with me, personally. It could be a lot better. I would have liked to have

seen exploration of some height variability in the same style if that's what is preferred. That could have worked and gotten units out of it and have the green space back.

> We're creating a community out there and this is probably the most important parcel, at least that I can foresee, and it's just not there. It's just barely satisfying the requirements or in some cases are not. I would have rather seen that the back is a bit higher in some other areas where the building and the units could be accommodated, but give the community something back, whether it's retail or just something of a community benefit. It's almost like a little city on to itself. I don't see a lot of interactions happening in any way, so I don't really know how to handle this one. Personally, I would not be able to approve it as we are seeing this evening.

> (Spansail: Vice-chair Pfaff, if you would like to, it may be worth considering because this is a project for housing and there's strict laws that govern this. If you'd like to, we should ask the applicant whether or not they would like to have it continued or have action on the item tonight.)

Acting Chair Pfaff re-opened the public hearing.

> We need to be a little conscious here of the purpose. The purpose is building housing, which is what they are focused on and they are focused on delivering the affordable units. What makes the affordable units happen is having enough density of regular priced units and making that work. So, we need to be careful on how much we push on amenities and things in which there's a whole Rollins Road that people should be developing towards having those grocery stores, restaurants and things, plus there are other businesses on Rollins Road. Maybe a little different than our conversation out on Airport Boulevard or Bayshore Highway where some of our new office buildings are a lot more isolated. It's going to take time, but this area will eventually develop because people will see that there's housing there and there is a need to fill.

> It's difficult to say that we need to push the businesses on to the housing developers when their focus is housing, especially when you look at our retail streets, we've got a lot of empty retail spaces. So, it's hard from an economic development standpoint to say that we need to be sticking on that and force them to develop the whole neighborhood. This is a pretty good solid project that is delivering a lot of housing opportunity. The comments about parking, they are good ones. I was hoping to see a little bit more on our TDM surveys on how successful these TDM plans have been in reducing the need for cars. Just because you're close to the multi-modal station doesn't mean you don't want a car. I haven't seen data that says just because you're near the BART station means you don't need to provide any parking. Those are my concerns about some of the comments I have seen in us actually shutting down this project.

> I don't know that anyone here wants to shut the project down. Some comments were made and I don't know they went far enough with them. I don't think they would have lost units, personally.

> I wanted to say the same thing. There's no push to reject the project whatsoever. It's a wonderful project being proposed. Like we said, the first time around we were impressed with what we saw. I speak only for myself, I wanted to see some of the comments that we had brought up last time be pushed further for a project to be approved tonight. I don't know if the applicant can answer the question, whether they could reduce the amount of the parking? You have a parking overage, which is wonderful for those who have cars and want to park, but are you able to provide more housing with less parking?

> (Youdall: This is being built at the maximum density of 70 units/acre with a 20% density bonus. I heard a lot of comments about a trade-off between parking and units and I wanted to inform the commissioners, I don't think there's a trade-off that exist. As we've advanced through our design, we have looked at dropping parking spaces. I would like there to be a vote tonight candidly. But if there's a condition that we would study, I've talked about a slight parking reduction with city staff and make sure that's okay if we decided to remove spaces from the garage as long as it was above the Burlingame code requirement. Hearing your sentiments tonight, it sounds like there would be no objection if ultimately what's submitted for permit is below the amount. As we have had those conversations with lenders and equity partners, ultimately, those are the sources of capital that help build these projects. The path to no parking projects will be faster than some people want and not as rapid as others want. Unfortunately, in the financing world, when I float lower parking ratios in this location despite the proximity to the Caltrain, there's hesitance because of more work from home and Covid, there's questions about long-term transit ridership. We believe that will happen. Glad we have what is largely an electrified garage and to the extent

we can reduce spaces, we're going to, because frankly we don't want to spend money on concrete spaces that no one is going to use. But I do want to make it clear that if we do make that decision, if we made the building taller, I couldn't put more units there. We basically tried to respond to the design aesthetic comments that we heard were important and we thought we were coming forward tonight with what I felt was a comprehensive response to those comments. I don't recall much commentary on the community benefits that we're proposing in March, so accordingly, we didn't make any change to those, they were prescriptive under the code. We did agree to additional benefits that in conversation with staff, sounded like they could be community benefits; the flood wall and access easement. I do think there's language in the code that allows a custom benefit to be created. But candidly, we didn't go through the exercise to qualifying those as official community benefits just because it didn't seem needed at the time. We are in a period of time where we would like to get the project approved or at least heard and voted on and try to move the project forward. Many of these projects are a race against time to get it into the ground and get started while the economy and the financial markets are in a position to support new construction. Time is always the biggest enemy, so it's our desire to see the project heard. I hear the concerns and would tell you that we are receptive to parking and receptive to studying within the gut of the projects, if the bikes were removed that's not going to change the aesthetics of the overall building. We will work with staff to study those matters and approve the building, but we'd like to see the project decided on the merits this evening.)

> One thing that has come up as well from last time, I do recall and from the member of the public who spoke about what has been called a plaza, I'm not convinced of any of the three. For the size of the project, I find them rather unremarkable. The one that you are focusing on that is the gateway, what are you willing to do with that?

> (Youdall: The plaza size was very prescriptive in the code and defined as what constitute a public plaza. We're not counting the public right-of-way or land dedicated to the public right of away as part of the project. So there's the sidewalk as you see it today, there's a land the project is dedicating to the right-of-way in support of the Rollins Road 85 foot right-of-way and beyond that is the 3,800 square feet, 50% double the requirement of what a plaza needs to be and there are three of them. I don't agree with the notion that these are glorified sidewalks. These are public plazas that basically represent areas that the building is carved back to allow and the building is still achieving its maximum density under the code. I'm informing the commission that I would like to see the project voted on and approved tonight but I'm also letting you know, to those concerned about over parking, that I share those concerns. To the extent, I can reduce the parking in the garage, it's the kind of garage that you can reduce parking later on, it's not like I'm cutting off a part of a basement and structurally it's possible to optimize the parking amount. I'm getting approved an amount of parking that I believe I can get financed with lenders and overcome any hesitations about operational issues in the long-term.)

Acting Chair Pfaff re-closed the public hearing.

> (Gardiner: I know it has been a while since we discussed the Housing Accountability Act, so let me give a little reminder. The Housing Accountability Act is government code Section 65589.5, this establishes limitations to local government's ability to deny, reduce the density of or make infeasible housing development projects that are consistent with objective local development standards and contribute to meeting housing need. So the operative statement there is "objective local standards." As much as we do design review, when it comes down to the decision, does the project meet the objective standards? It's helpful to be reminded that there is a larger planning effort for this area. The North Rollins Specific Plan will be coming to the Planning Commission and the City Council in the next couple of months and that really is where the more neighborhood planning type issues can be discussed fully. It's a little harder for one single project to try to carry the burden of an entire neighborhood being developed, but the important thing is to be cognizant of the Housing Accountability Act in any decision that might happen.)

> Comments from both the commissioners and planning has helped me understand the housing act. The fact that this has been through design review, I would be supportive of a motion that would include some guidance for the developer, but a motion to vote on this tonight.

> I tend to agree with my fellow commissioner and understanding the backbone of why we're here is

incredibly important. I do think though, my fellow commissioner brought up a great point, regardless of the actual building, I respect Director Gardiner's comment, we can't hold one project accountable for one neighborhood. In effect, this building is creating a neighborhood, at least we got to look at the public safety of getting across the street and Rollins Road and all that stuff. So I would echo what my fellow commissioner said, we can make a motion of approval with some conditions of some other things.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. What we need to do is look at this project and have some items that we would like the developer to come back with. As my fellow commissioner said, this is the beginning of this neighborhood and we really need to get it right. If it's just a little small area of retail space, we need to make the developers all understand that it's not just one person, it's all of them that are going to help create this environment. And so, as much as I agree with my fellow commissioner saying that the whole area is going to look at different places and different owners are going to do grocery stores, that's not the case. We've got a lot of old time people that have lived here who have owned these properties for a really long time; some will sell, some will not, some will develop and some won't develop, so we can't depend on that. We have to depend on what we have in front of us and ask these developers to step up to the plate because this is the time that we have and we've got to get it right.

> I appreciate all these points being made. It is helpful in forming an opinion and a decision. I wanted to just ask the question or clarification on the developer, if we were to approve this project as presented tonight, how would the parking changes, if any, be presented or brought back to us? Probably not for review to us, it would be as an FYI or how is that reviewed further? I was wondering what the process is because it was mentioned that we look at the parking again possibly, so what does that mean?

> (Lewit: It largely depends on what is being proposed. But in general, something where there's a reduction of parking, but they still meet the required minimum parking which they would and this parking structure is at the very rear of the site. It's not visible from any public right-of-way. That would probably not even come back as an FYI, but we have to see what the proposed change look like. If the changed parking also included any other changes, retail, a crosswalk at the corner that would then increase the likelihood that they would come back to the commission as an FYI or amendment.)

> I like the idea of potentially reducing parking space down to an appropriate level and if that could in turn help create space for some of the things that we are looking for, if that could allow them to push more units further back in the site and be able to open up some of the ground floor space at the front that would be a great trade. It's hard for us to get that done tonight. As they deal with how they reduce their parking, then hopefully that will have an opportunity to come back to us for some guidance on how we can help with that space. But I would like to see the project go forward and if we can offer our conditions, then that's a good way to go. There is a crosswalk down the street closer to the Millbrae side, closer to all those things you're talking about. So, it's not like there's no way across. It's just that further up a block.

> In the future we would be interested in hearing back from the developer on opportunities for reduced parking, expanded retail and bike rack location, community benefit enhancements and pedestrian safety crossing Rollins Road.

> (Spansail: I really apologize for speaking. No one likes the lawyer talks and we do need to caution ourselves adding conditions as we're looking at the project because of the scrutiny that the Accountability Act has. You can certainly encourage, but adding restrictions could have implications. We can ask the applicant to explain what they have chosen to do, however, the project tonight would be the project that is approved and if no changes were made, if they communicated with staff they weren't changing anything, an approval tonight would be an approval that have project)

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Schmid, and Tse

Nay: 1 - Pfaff

Absent: 1 - Gaul

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 740 Paloma Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage and Minor Use Permit for plate height of new detached garage. (Dain Adamson, Thomas James Homes, applicant; Bassenian Lagoni, architect; SF21G, LLC, Thomas James Homes, property owner) (112 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [740 Paloma Ave - Staff Report](#)

[740 Paloma Ave - Attachments](#)

[740 Paloma Ave - Plans](#)

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

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

Ana Falver, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

- > *There were no public comments.*

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Concerned about the elongated windows on the right and left side elevations. Consider a lower header height.*
- > *The main door looks really narrow. Consider a wider door with one sidelite.*
- > *Suggests to use the same paint color on the wood siding and the corner trims.*
- > *Overall, it has good massing and scale. The windows are a little big and when the applicant eventually talks to both neighbors on the sides, they will find the windows a little big. The scale works pretty well.*
- > *On the driveway side, it's a big two-story elevation without a lot of help on it. It could use a little bit of design help to break up the mass there. Whether it is a belly band or some other kind of trim piece that will help break up that siding would be a good solution.*
- > *Not hearing a convincing reason why a minor use permit should be granted on the garage for the plate height. We don't really get garage plate height exception requests, so I don't think our rules are all that stringent. I am not sure I see a compelling reason to grant that variance.*
- > *Overall, it has a pretty good set of drawings and the design works for me. I appreciate that quite a bit of effort was put into the landscape and trying to make the whole property sync, which that particular piece of property could use quite a bit.*
- > *Concern with some of the window sizes. Also concerned about the side elevation. Overall, would like to see a little bit more articulation on the rear and the side elevations. The front looks okay other than the second floor windows looking a bit squashed because the second floor is being pushed back so far. I realize they are working on stock floor plans. There are other opportunities to change the location of the stairwell so the front can be improved but it is not a deal breaker. I don't really like how the elevations look with the overhang, unless that is the intent to provide a covered patio space. It feels flat, tall and heavy over the back patio doors.*
- > *Also don't see a very good explanation or reason to have the Minor Use Permit apply to this garage to increase plate height. If they wanted some additional height inside the garage they can certainly frame it so that they can have a volume ceiling. I can't really see any justification for the Minor Use Permit.*
- > *When we see the other two projects being proposed by the same applicant later in the meeting, my concern is these are cookie-cutter standard floor plans that they are making slight differences to. I just*

worry about that in Burlingame. If they are successful and have another 20 homes like these going up then suddenly we would look like a tract home community and not Burlingame where it is really custom homes designed for homeowners.

> I am a little bit nervous about approving the three projects they are presenting tonight without setting a precedent because they have several other homes in Burlingame that they are bringing into the table. I don't like the cookie cutter mentality. I don't necessarily dislike the design here, the Craftsman style is consistent with several homes we see, I just don't want to see twenty of them go up in Burlingame. I would like to see some differences there. There is a business model here predicated by homeowners buying their lots prior to the homes being built. But in Burlingame we don't see this happening as much. I'd rather challenge them more to give us some unique designs.

> When I looked at all three applications I was not happy. With the design on its own, if I ignore the other two, I feel that it sits in its own lot pretty well. I won't have the same sentiment going forward. My fellow commissioners' comments are good, but probably just on the next two projects that we need to help them guide.

> Some comments were made this evening to help them make it less track home-like. It would be really great if we can see those looked at; the windows, the belly band and just some detailing. It would be really nice to have some unique features for each home.

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

Aye: 5 - Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Gaul

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- b.** 2704 Hillside Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage and Minor Use Permit for plate height of new detached garage. (Dain Adamson, Thomas James Homes, applicant; Bassenian Lagoni, architect; SF21G, LLC, Thomas James Homes, property owner) (114 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [2704 Hillside Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2704 Hillside Dr - Attachments](#)
[2704 Hillside Dr - Plans](#)

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

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

Ana Falver, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> Sheryl Seitz, 2700 Hillside Drive: I have a concern about the height of the right rear wall and the light blockage. I'm trying to understand how I can get a better look at the plans and what's happening there. I did receive one letter from a building company, it had a hearing date and the letter arrived two weeks after the hearing so this is my first opportunity to actually find a way to come ask how I can understand a lot more things about what is going to go on next to my house and what the plans are.

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Grid in between the glass looks horrible, the grids fall apart inside the windows. That is not what our design guidelines allow for.
- > Consider adding some windows along the kitchen wall to bring in some more light into the kitchen and improve the right elevation.
- > The house was described as "traditional" but the roof pitch, especially in the front elevation, doesn't appear to look very traditional. Suggests to take a look at the roof pitch again.
- > The front rendering seems squished to me. Similar to the other project, they just seem like they are up high but there's a gap to the left of the door which might be the staircase, but it can use another small window. This seems like a long nothingness that a small window there can help improve.
- > Although it's the same shape and virtually the same design, it doesn't seem to fit the place the same. I don't really feel that the scale or anything about the design fits in this chunk of the neighborhood. Most of the rest of the houses in the neighborhood are stucco plaster and totally different shapes and it just doesn't feel like it fits. The brick doesn't do anything for me. That whole front portion looks worse being highlighted with the separate material whereas in the previous project, it blended better. The long front roof really plays with the shape of it, in particularly on the angled view of it. The sides are still tall, flat and boring.
- > I'm concerned about the windows having the dividers inside is not an appropriate solution.
- > The applicant needs to think about the commission's comments on the previous house, because these look like spec homes. I'm not feeling confident in this design for this location. There are differences in the renderings versus the drawings, and it appears this is half of one house and half of another put together. This one needs a lot of work.
- > This particular house for this neighborhood and for a sloping site would be a candidate for a design review consultant. There are too many elements on all four sides to run a long list of comments. I just don't see it fitting in this particular neighborhood. I don't think there was any attention paid to the fact that the property is on a sloping lot. That was pointed out in the presentation, but none of the graphics represent that sloping lot and the issues that lot would face with this house under construction.
- > The rendering looks nothing like the proposed house. The rendering is based on the original design which had the ten foot plate height on the ground floor and nine foot plate height on the second floor, which is why it looks taller and elongated. It doesn't carry the traditional details and elements that was stated in the presentation. I would not want to see this built.

Commissioner Tse made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schmid, to refer the application to a design review consultant. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Gaul

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- c. 132 Occidental Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage and Minor Use Permit for plate height of new detached garage. (Anna Felver, Thomas James Homes, applicant; Bassenian Lagoni, architect; SF21A, LLC, property owner) (129 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [132 Occidental Ave - Staff Report](#)
[132 Occidental Ave - Attachments](#)
[132 Occidental Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)
[132 Occidental Ave - Plans](#)

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

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

Ana Falver, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > The front elevation shows a wraparound roof and the rendering doesn't show it.*
- > Suggests to reach out to the left side neighbor. One of the things here in Burlingame that we're trying to be sensitive to is large windows over the stairwell facing a side neighbor. It didn't appear on the other two houses that you have presented this evening, but this one in particular is quite large. It might be something to point out to that neighbor. It's a one-story home next door. Consider looking at reducing the size of the window. That's what we prescribe applicants to do in more recent years, to be more sensitive to glowing light facing ones house at night.*
- > The rendering doesn't match. I actually like the front elevation without the wraparound roof but the stone doesn't really fit. This neighborhood is more plaster and stucco. You had to go through a historic review for the existing house, and this is not coming out looking historic. It looks like a regular tract home. I don't think that's adding value to this location.*
- > Windows are big. Large expanses on the side. There are some windows on the right side that are not too bad, but it's just not doing it for me for this location.*
- > When you do look at the rendering, that's not how that block looks at all. A lot of reconsideration on this one is due.*
- > I do not support the garage request.*
- > The single car garage looks comically small compared to the massive building. It's a 7,500 square feet house with this little funky shack of a garage needs to be rethought.*
- > The porch here is too small. If you slid the ADU to the side, you can have that porch and not the weird pillar on the side of the house, which is bothering me on the elevations. This house needs some more work.*
- > Somehow the proportionate lot in the rendering or in the elevation is wider than the reality. I don't know what is off here, but the house seems wider than a typical frontage which we would see on a 6,000 square foot lot.*
- > This is a neighborhood where old-world details work better; classic, true classic detailing and proportions for these types of arrangements on the front elevation.*
- > The low-slung, flat, low-profile roof that's in front of that first floor just doesn't do anything for me. Consider breaking it up somehow and add interest in the front, it's going to improve the window profiles as well on the different levels. There's a lot of opportunity for applying a traditionally designed home to this floor plan that would fit this neighborhood.*
- > There have been incidents where the exact same homes were done close to each other. It's a little awkward but the difference is they were very high-quality and a lot of attention to detail. That makes a lot of difference. In the early days, there were many homes that were similar out of the Sears catalog or whatever, but somehow the proportions were right. They had some kind of cohesion.*
- > This house is just not fitting into its environment. This one is going to need enough work over that a design review consultant would be advantageous for them to get this to go a little faster.*
- > I wanted the applicant to know the comments are not intended to pick on anybody and the reason we're suggesting a design review consultant is it's a built-in part of our process to assist applicants to get across the finish line. Our hope is to be able to approve a design that's befitting the neighborhood in its*

own space so our design review consultants are knowledgeable about the design criteria we look for. Hopefully, the use of or the application of a design review consultant to this project would help you to sooner cross that finish line and get an approval.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to refer the application to a design review consultant. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Gaul

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- d.** 1305 Rollins Road, zoned I/I - Application for Commercial Design Review for exterior facade improvements to an existing commercial building. (William Hagman, applicant and architect; Black Mountain Properties, LLC, property owner) (49 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1305 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)

[1305 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)

[1305 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

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

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

William Hagman, architect, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *Provide a detail on the transition of the different materials for the proposed and the existing facades to show how the corrugated metal will be closed off.*

> *This is a nice addition to an outdated building. The uses are good as long as they can find the tenants and the building functions well for this. I would like to see the reuse of it and the adaptation, it's going to be good. I can see the overhangs going over the entry doors because you might need four feet from the door to the overhang to fulfill the cover over an entry door. You may then have to consider using tiebacks to hold it up. Otherwise, it is a good project.*

> *To clarify what my fellow commissioner said, I believe the front doors with overhangs are sufficiently set back so that there is plenty of depth.*

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

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Gaul

- e. 620 Airport Boulevard, zoned BFC - Application for Environmental Review, Commercial Design Review, and Special Permits for Height and Development under Tier 3/Community Benefits for two, new 9-story office/R&D buildings. (Boca Lake Office, applicant and property owner; DGA, Inc, architect) (20 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [620 Airport Blvd - Staff Report](#)
[620 Airport Blvd - Attachments](#)
[620 Airport Blvd - Plans](#)

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

Acting Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.

Jeremy Lui, Gary Leivers and Justin Aff, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *Public comment sent via email by John Hutar, President and CEO of the San Francisco Peninsula: Dear Chair Gaul, Vice-Chair Pfaff and members of the Planning Commission, I'm writing you regarding the proposed office development at 620 Airport Boulevard in Burlingame. Airport Boulevard and the surrounding Anza area have far too many underutilized parking lots and need improvement. New office development that will bring over one thousand new jobs to Burlingame will serve the community and local businesses by encouraging tourism, conventions and regional commerce. It has the potential to elevate the stature of our city to be a hub for innovation companies. Several of our hotel general managers and I have met with representatives from Vassar Properties to learn more about the prospective development for which they are seeking approval. As presented, the project will reinvigorate the neighborhood through job creation and patrons for local businesses will create demand for hotel room nights and encourage conventions throughout the region. Further, the project's generous improvements to the shore line and creation of a 1-acre park will encourage local enjoyment of the beautiful nature that the side of Burlingame has to offer. In conclusion, this proposed development will help elevate the Burlingame Bayfront and support local businesses. We support this project and encourage the Planning Commission and Council to continue the discussions of Vassar Properties with the ultimate goal of constructing a high-quality office project for the community.*

> *Public comment sent via email by Athan Rebelos: Hi, I'm happy to see so much development along the Bayfront. I want to advocate for small businesses. Burlingame is remarkable because we have many community oriented businesses from insurance agents to financial services, transit providers, spas, cafes, restaurants, pubs, local markets and so on. I hope that we can receive some assurance that this beautiful large-scale developments will make their best efforts to encourage and accommodate small businesses. Small businesses are vital to our community and our quality-of-life.*

> *Public comment sent via email by Anthony Montes: Hello, I'm writing to share a comment on behalf of the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition regarding the proposed development at 620 Airport Boulevard. I'm a community organizer in the North San Mateo County area working with residents and employees to create safer and more just communities by making bicycling safe and accessible for everyone. Vassar's proposed development of two life science facilities will have a positive impact on the current condition of the bay trail and would welcome the proposed improvements the plan outlines to the trail. Bay trail is the most popular class 1 shared use trails in the area and our supporters in their communities would greatly benefit from its improvements. Our concern with the development is the estimated 860 vehicle parking spots the parking garage is slated to have. We hope all interested stakeholders find ways to reduce traffic in the area including working with the city to lower its parking minimum requirement or establishing a shuttle service to and from the nearest transportation hub to encourage employees to use active*

transportation and public transportation methods. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions.

> Public comment sent via email by Leslie Flint, Sequoia Audubon Society: To the Planning Commissioners and staff, I'm a member of the Conservation Committee of Sequoia Audubon Society which is the San Mateo County chapter of the National Audubon Society. We have approximately 1400 members in San Mateo County. It has been shown that over 100 million birds die annually from striking buildings with reflective transparent materials that cause collisions. Under the right conditions, even transparent glass on buildings can form a mirror that can reflect sky, clouds and nearby habitat. This project's renderings show hazardous elements where trees and landscaping are visible through glass at the ground floor. That area must include birds' safety treatment. The plans for this project show the use of 45% opaque glass. Other jurisdictions such as Mountain View's North Bayshore Precise Plan, Cupertino and San Jose look for 90% protection within 300 feet of water feature. We encourage the developers to consider upgrading your plans. Thank you for your consideration.

> (Leivers: I'll briefly go through the bird safety treatment. We've got eight things we're going to do to deal with that. First is bird safety glass coating, which is a coating that is visible to birds but not to humans so it doesn't affect the transparency. The sight lines through the corners of the building are minimized by the column placement and façade treatment. The reflectivity of the glass will be 25% at the elevations less than 60%. The exterior glazing is composed of 45% opaque glazing. The glazing is high performance. We work on a lot of curb walls and we work very hard to find a sweet spot between maximum transparencies but also good on efficiency and that's a tough one. A lot of the opaque areas are actually shadow boxes, they are recessed surfaces. So you create a lot of visual disparity. It doesn't appear like one large area. Also, the mullion expression even though I talked about it, somewhat about the idea of it being a visual thing, it also breaks up the elevation and gives orientation, the external lighting will be minimized, shield and the maintenance of the massing and level one are recessed. Even though it is predominantly glazed, there's an enormous amount of subtlety that creates variation in the exterior envelope.)

> (Lui: First of all, we very much appreciate the constructive feedback and positive support from members of the community. I wish to make a response to the comment regarding parking. We're providing 838 parking spaces which is at the very bottom end of code. The reason why we're doing that is because we believe in a future where there are fewer vehicle miles traveled. We're in a location that is accessible by the Bay Trail as well as a bike lane in front of our project. Our project includes several features to encourage not driving, including showers and lockers within the buildings for those to freshen up before work. We have a list of TDM measures that I won't go through all today. We also have or are in discussions with a car sharing company for two-car spaces for those who show up for public transportation but might need a car to go to a meeting or attend special events. Lastly, we have a synergetic situation here in that we're located adjacent to the hotel which was designed and built in the 70s. It's very much over parked. Though we didn't indicate it in our presentation, there's a way for folks to access the hotel parking lot, the surface parking lot from 620 Airport Boulevard. That allows us to reuse a resource that can help us be park sufficiently while providing the minimum number of parking spaces allowed by code.)

Acting Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> The use of that flexible space is important because if it becomes fitness and assembly, that's largely tenant driven and it's not going to be as supportive to the overall community, but if you get a fair amount of food and beverage in there, then you really will make that courtyard and bay trail work well.

> This is a nice project. It's well done. My first concern was about the birds but they went through that in great detail, so I appreciate that. The use of having the hotel nearby, accessing parking and maybe having a nice restaurant in the hotel will be a nice add-on to this site. All in all, it's a great project and it will be well incorporated with everything on one campus which I really appreciate.

> I hope that they keep some of this flexible space available for a restaurant, coffee shops and/or things for the public. So I ask that they keep at least that ten thousand square feet available with what they have.

> The flex space and how you use it will determine some success in this and how it interacts with the Bay Trail. One of my big concerns is traffic on the two-lane road between Anza Boulevard and Broadway. I'm concerned to see how traffic is going to impact there. You are doing a ton and I appreciate that. The trail improvement and the outdoor areas that you're offering is a great addition, but I would suggest to consider looking further the section that extends in front of the hotel and to the next node. Maybe as you're adding the light, there's a future extension but unless we ask, it's hard to get the bay trail upgrades any more than just the area where the project is. Again, you definitely are offering a lot of really great public amenities in this project. The design looks great. I like the bifurcated design, the fact that you have the ability to see through and it's not just a gigantic mass handled the site very well. It's going to be a good project. You did a great job on your presentation and all the information you provided for us, it's a thorough read.

> Thank you for that really nice presentation. I'm so excited about this project. You've done a beautiful job designing such light and airy, very delicate structures that really look so comfortable in how you have sited them on this property. They are relatable to the size of the Hilton hotel next door. I love the opening of the view corridor in the middle. I really appreciate the energy you have put into designing the site, the buildings, and the public amenities. Really excited to get to use this bay trail space once this is all fully developed. I also noticed and appreciate the thoughtfulness of the placement of where your bike storage racks are by making them very useable, functional and accessible for those cyclists, keeping some of the motorist off the road.

> I love the relationship between the three buildings, it's beautifully done and the court proportions are beautiful. The landscaping is gorgeous. Thank you for all the thoughtfulness.

There was no motion for this application, as it will return as an Action Item to allow evaluation of the environmental review.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Director Gardiner reported that in the last City Council meeting, a decision was made to extend the parklet program for 18 more months. That will allow further consideration of whether to do a longer-term program, and if so what kind of changes enforcement to include. For now, the parklets will be here until at least summer of 2024.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 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, September 26, 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 September 26, 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 October 6, 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 \$745.00, which includes noticing costs.