



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, July 8, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Senior Planner Erika Lewit, and City Attorney Kathleen Kane.*

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 4 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

**Absent** 3 - Sargent, Kelly, and Terrones

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**A motion was made by Commissioner Loftis, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

**Absent:** 3 - Sargent, Kelly, and Terrones

#### a. Draft June 10, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft June 10, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

*Item 9a has been continued to a future Planning Commission meeting - date to be determined.*

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

*There were no Public Comments.*

### 6. STUDY ITEMS

- a. 300 Airport Boulevard, zoned APN – Update of a previously approved office/life science development ("Burlingame Point"). (Facebook, applicant; Burlingame Point LLC, property owner) (36 noticed) Staff Contact: Kevin Gardiner THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 24, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**Attachments:** [300 Airport Blvd - Staff Report](#)

[300 Airport Blvd - Attachments](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the property. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Mandy Spain and Janet Woo, represented the applicant.*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Comments/Direction:*

- > Will the surface parking lot be open to the public? (Spain: Yes, some of the spaces in the surface lot will be dedicated to the retail outlet.)*
- > Will there be fixed directional signage for the retail space? (Spain: There will be blade signage on building, as well as A-board signs on the site for wayfinding.)*
- > Will future 2,000 SF expansion space sit empty for now? (Spain: No, will be used as part of the dining area on the first floor, but can be converted in the future.)*
- > If you did get a lot of interest in using the expansion space for retail when the building is occupied, would you consider using it for retail? (Spain: Yes, if there was sufficient interest. However, right now the intent is to use it as dining space.)*
- > How did you come to choose this corner of the building? (Spain: There is a double-door that leads out onto the promenade and allows for visibility from the trail as well as from the parking area. Felt like it would be an active corner and that the proximity to the parking would make it attractive to a vendor.)*
- > This proposal represents itself better than what was proposed in the FYI application.*
- > Concerns were that it wasn't answering the call that we had given to this project initially.*
- > Original discussion was about not being a ghost town on weekends; idea was to get reasons for people to be out in this area.*
- > Would encourage 2,000 SF reserve space to be used now when the building opens, instead of waiting.*
- > This is much less than what I had hoped for when project was initially approved.*
- > Want to make sure space is visible, accessible and encouraging for the public to use, especially for people using the Bay Trail.*
- > Encourage uses on weekends, like pop-ups and food trucks, to get people out there.*
- > Would have expected to see a more complete package to be able to review more thoroughly.*
- > Is a nice location within the complex as it relates to views and proximity to the Bay Trail.*
- > Would like to see outdoor spaces used on weekends and in evenings with pop-up events and gatherings; is an ideal space that many residents can use and will want to use. Encourage coming up with ideas to extend uses out towards the water and engage the public.*
- > Feel this corner will be quiet with parking area; would have liked to see space located in interior of complex.*

*Since this was an informational item, which included providing "FYI" clarifications to the Planning Commission's direction and suggestions for a previously approved project, there was no action taken by the Planning Commission.*

- b.** 150 Park Road (Lot F), zoned HMU & R-4 – Update of a previously approved 132-unit affordable workforce and senior apartment development. (Chris Grant, The Pacific Companies, applicant; City of Burlingame, property owner; Pacific West Architecture, architect) (376 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [150 Park Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[160 Lorton Ave - Attachments](#)  
[150 Park Rd - Revised Plans](#)  
[150 Park Rd - Previously Approved Plans](#)

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Chris Grant, represented the applicant.*

*Public Comments:*

*Dennis Gayle: Live immediately adjacent and to the south of the project in a condominium community. Have great interest in what happens next door. Wondering if developer has a break ground date anticipated yet? Developer previously noted that May 2019 was the anticipated construction start date. Would appreciate it if developer could provide an update. Cost of construction has escalated, is this a factor that is slowing this project down?*

*Warren Gish, 110 Park Road: Have questions regarding the design, proposed construction methods and how the project will fit in with the community. Where is garbage and recycling to be collected within the building and gather by sanitation workers? Rendering shows that the proposed five-story building and adjacent six-story building are about the same height, wondering if rendering is presenting an accurate view. Would like to know how wide the passage way is between the two buildings, who will have access to it and if the gate will be locked or unlocked. Concerned about safety and activity in pathways. Will there be a reduced schedule for use of noisy construction equipment? Will pilings be installed; concerned about integrity of building at 110 Park Road. Proposed units facing north and east may be concerned with noise from the airport and train. Will roof be adequately built to accommodate any activities on the roof? Concerned about what is happening with the contaminated earth from the previous underground tank.*

*City Attorney Kane noted that contamination on the site is currently being remediated; anticipate being completed this season, its a seasonal work because it has to do with the groundwater table height and when rains come; can't work on remediation when it's raining and the groundwater has to drain to a certain point before remediation work can occur. It's a commingled plume from a number of different places and we are close to completing the work, however if it cannot be completed this season, there are other locations where we can move that processing so that it is off the construction area. Project is currently in negotiations with the City; City Council recently adopted an amendment to the disposition and development agreement, there will be additional technical updates completed in August. The anticipated break ground date for the housing development is Spring 2020; construction of the public parking garage is anticipated to start first since there is no subterranean grading.*

*Chris Grant provided the following responses to the questions raised:*

- > Garage pickup will occur in southeast portion, or right side of the building, and will be accessed through an opening in the building.*
- > Ambition is to maintain control of the pathway and that it not be an open sidewalk through the site; pathway is approximately four feet wide. Pathway will be retained and overseen by the property management team; the Fire Department will also have access.*
- > Fully endorse the notion of maintaining security on the site.*
- > Would be happy to meet with neighbors to discuss any questions they may have about the project.*
- > Perspective of rendering is causing proposed building to look as tall as the neighboring building, in reality the proposed building is slightly lower.*

*Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Comments/Direction:*

- > You stated that you thought the proposed window is more in keeping with this design, in what respect do you mean that? (Grant: The lack of muntins is more compatible with the modern design.)
- > The color of the window changed as well, correct? (Grant: Window color is on the color board that was submitted. Is more of a neutral color, not trying to highlight the windows.)
- > Where there darker green color options for the awnings that worked well with the palette? (Grant: Felt that a darker color would not be enough color, trying to present an aged copper color for the project.)
- > Will stucco be painted or will it be a color coat stucco? (Grant: Expectation is that it will be a color coat stucco, but paint may be applied depending on what the architect calls for in the specifications.)
- > Will the siding have integral color or will it be painted? (Grant: Will have integral color rather than repainting, so that it ages well over time.)
- > Will corner boards be same color as siding? (Grant: Yes.)
- > Think all of the changes have improved the project and are more sophisticated.
- > Would encourage you to continue to pursue placing a bench outside.

Since this was an informational item, which included providing "FYI" clarifications to the Planning Commission's direction and suggestions for a previously approved project, there was no action taken by the Planning Commission.

- c. 160 Lorton Avenue (Parking Lot N), zoned R-4 - Update of a previously approved five-level parking garage. (Chris Grant, The Pacific Companies, applicant; City of Burlingame, property owner; Watry Design, Inc., designer) (298 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [160 Lorton Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[160 Lorton Ave - Attachments](#)  
[160 Lorton Ave - Revised Plans](#)  
[160 Lorton Ave - Previously Approved Plans](#)

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Chris Grant, represented the applicant.

*Public Comments:*

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

*Commission Comments/Direction:*

- > Don't think architectural screen will be manufactured as a single piece, so will they be built as tall thin strips? (Grant: Will be part of the shop drawing process; cannot say how they will be configured, but assume there will be several sections installed so that if one is damaged it can be easily removed and repaired.)
- > Have some concerns because we don't know how the screen will be built. If screen is split into too many pieces, it may potentially not look so good.
- > Unable to assess this because of the nature of what is being proposed and the lack of information about how screening is being put together. It could go really well or really poorly.

- > Scale of screen is beautiful and elegant, however the 6x8 horizontal members are large and chunky, so there is a big scale difference between these components. Don't know what mediates between those two elements. Did see that there are details that show an L-bracket and a capture, so that it appears that the screen is hanging from the L-bracket at the top, but don't know what happens in between, unless it's captured in an edge capture strung between two L-brackets, and how it's kept tight.
- > Surprised at how malleable the screen is and how easily it can be reshaped, concerned that it can be easily damaged.
- > Concerned about wear and tear in the real world.
- > Would be helpful to see connection and finish details on the edges and how panels would join together.
- > Would be helpful to see photographs of this installation on other buildings.

Since this was an informational item, which included providing "FYI" clarifications to the Planning Commission's direction and suggestions for a previously approved project, there was no action taken by the Planning Commission. Additional details requested by the Planning Commission will return as an FYI item in the future.

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

*There were no Consent Calendar Items.*

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 16 Park Road, zoned BMU - Application for Variance for parking off-site at 12 Park Road for a personal training studio. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Philip Levi, applicant; Park Road Properties, LLC, property owner) (197 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [16 Park Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[16 Park Rd - Attachments](#)  
[16 Park Rd - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the property. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Philip and Liz Levi, represented the applicant.*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Comments/Direction:*

- > Unclear on how the parking area will be striped and how landscape areas will be delineated.
- > Will there be curbs within the parking area as shown on the plans? (Levi: No, curbs will not be installed. Intend to install raised planters or planter boxes.)
- > Do you intend to install a wheel stop at every parking space? (Levi: Yes.)

- > At the rear of the site beyond parking space #10, is that an additional parking space? (Levi: No, that area will be used as part of the turnaround space for vehicles exiting the site.)
- > How will the radius markings for the vehicle turnaround area end up on the site? (Levi: We tested applying paint to the ground, but that required more maintenance. Had more success using nylon strips spiked into the ground. They are bright green and are highly visible to drivers. Nylon strips would also be used to mark the parking stalls.)
- > Concerned with execution of what is shown on the plans.
- > Trying to think of a solution without having to pour concrete curbs that seem to be indicated on the plan.
- > Could use railroad ties, would clearly show where visitors should be parking. Could be helpful to have numbers on them.
- > Should add "No Parking" and "Turnaround Only" signs in back-up area at the rear of the site, otherwise someone will park in that area.
- > A landscape plan would be very helpful, like idea of planting along the front of the site to screen the parking area. Need to see more details for all planting areas on site, parking area now is stark.
- > Nylon strips don't seem to last very long with wheels turning on them, and don't think painting gravel will hold up very well.
- > Don't think lines need to be permanent, but parking spaces somehow need to be obvious to drivers.
- > Don't see nylon strips as ideal arrangement.
- > Like how workout areas are designed, feel industrial, rustic and organic. Could come up with creative way to designate parking spaces to tie in with the design of the workout areas. See an opportunity to aesthetically tie in the parking lot with the building and business.
- > Add plants to soften look and feel of the parking lot.
- > Can make findings for exceptional circumstances for the requested Parking Variance; functions as a single property, has been used like this for a long time, either property would have a difficult time operating without allowing this symbiotic relationship, and is beneficial to the public by taking cars off the street and providing on-site parking.
- > Uncomfortable approving what is before us because the details aren't clear. Would be simple enough for applicant to come back with a basic landscape plan and indicating railroad ties spiked into the ground to delineate parking stalls. Railroad ties will form triangle-shaped areas near the property line where plants could be installed; will help to soften stark parking lot and may provide privacy.

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

- > that the applicant shall submit revised plans or photos of installed features that accurately show the proposed markers for the parking stalls (including wheel stops and barriers such as railroad ties and a no parking sign in the turnaround area at the rear of 12 Park Road) and the landscaping details (such as plant species); the update shall be presented as an FYI item to the Planning Commission.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

**Absent:** 3 - Sargent, Kelly, and Terrones

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 812 Linden Avenue (vacant lot adjacent to 816 Linden Avenue), zoned R-1 - Application for a Conditional Use Permit for re-emerging lots, Design Review and Special Permit for one new, two-story single family dwelling and attached garage at 812 Linden Avenue (vacant parcel next to 816 Linden Ave). (Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, applicant and designer; 812 Linden LLC and 816 Linden LLC, property owners) (148 noticed) Staff

Contact: Erika Lewit THIS ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO A FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - DATE TO BE DETERMINED

*Item 9a was continued to a future Planning Commission meeting - date to be determined.*

## 10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

*There were no Commissioner's Reports.*

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- a. 920 Bayswater Avenue - FYI for proposed changes to elevations to a previously approved Design Review project for 128-unit apartment development.

Attachments: [920 Bayswater Ave - Memorandum and Attachments](#)  
[920 Bayswater Ave - Plans](#)

*Called up for review by the Planning Commission - plans are small and difficult to read/ floor plans not provided/concerned with changes to the elevator tower.*

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

*Note: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on July 8, 2019. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on July 18, 2019, 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 \$1,045, which includes noticing costs.*

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Community Development/Planning counter, City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.*