



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, January 13, 2020

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- d. 1095 Rollins Road, zoned C-1 - Application for Mitigated Negative Declaration, General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for Height, Density Bonus, and Vesting Tentative Map for a lot merger for a new 6-story, 150-unit residential apartment building. (The Hanover Company, Scott Youdall, applicant; SA Properties Company L.P., property owner) (25 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1095 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Application](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Initial Study/Mitigated Neg Dec](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - MMRP](#)
[1095 Rollins Road - CEQA Errata Memo](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Response to Comments](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones reported that he had met with the applicant and architect to receive a preview. Commissioner Loftis also met with the applicant, and although he was not in attendance for the study meeting he watched the video.

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

- > Do apartments have an open space requirement, as condos do? (Keylon: No, just a landscape requirement.)
- > What findings would need to be made for changing the setbacks? (Keylon: It is a provision in the R-4 zoning regulations. When a map is being reviewed the Planning Commission and City Council, if circumstances warrant it, a map can be approved that deviates from the standards in order to allow a parcel to be developable.)

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Scott Youdall, The Hanover Company, represented the applicant, with John Ennis, BDE Architects.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > How will the 15 below-market units be distributed? (Youdall: Will provide an affordable housing plan.) Will they be equally distributed? (Youdall: That is our assumption.)
- > Even with the tandem and ADA spaces not included, will every unit have an independently-accessed space? (Youdall: Yes.)
- > How does the provision of 96 bicycle parking spaces compare to other Bay Area projects? Do spaces like this get used a lot? (Youdall: Depends on the location. 96 is in excess of most of the other projects)

Hanover has developed in the Bay Area.)

- > How are the electric vehicle spaces allocated, and how will the project accommodate increased demand in the future? (Youdall: Citylift provides for chargers within the stackers. Intention is to meet growing demand. System has the capacity to include chargers.)*
- > The rooftop open space facing the freeway has a single door and a wall. Why not more glass? (Youdall: It is a glass storefront wall. The plan makes it look like a solid wall but it is meant to be transparent.)*
- > How usable will the outdoor space be given it's facing an 8-lane highway? (Youdall: The occupied activity area is set back with landscaping, so is shielded.)*
- > Is there guest parking? (Youdall: The standard spaces can be available for guests. There is not a set number of spaces reserved for guests. Unlikely the stacker spaces would be available for guests.)*
- > Is the water table 7 feet below the site grade? (Youdall: 7 or 8 feet.) Helpful that the parking is modular so if one section goes out, the rest of the parking still works. (Ennis: Garage is like a boat, with water on the outside. Has built projects around the Bay Area at sea level, with one and two levels below grade and into the water table.)*

Environmental questions:

- > Has the Anson project been incorporated into the traffic models? (Keylon: Yes it was included in the cumulative estimates.)*
- > Number of trips from the restaurant seems overestimated. (Keylon: The traffic study utilized ITE figures based on potential use of the restaurant as a quality full-service restaurant. The study needs to account for the potential maximum use of the facility in the future.)*
- > Traffic is a mess in the area now, with the Audi dealer service area, and people using Cadillac Way to cut through to the freeway.*

Public Comments:

Mike Amaroli: Owns a property nearby. Concerned that with the narrowing of Carolan Avenue and new buildings going in, parking is becoming be more of an issue. There will not be enough parking for this size structure. Will there be permit parking? Drops off car at Audi in the morning, and there is traffic on Cadillac Way which makes it hard for Audi to do its business. Believes the Audi mechanics park on Carolan Avenue. Will the new residents be given permits to park in the neighborhood when they find out there is not enough parking in the building? (Kane: Residents or businesses would need to petition to create a permit parking area.)

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Had been generally supportive of the project previously, and wanted to see how the environmental review comes out. Environmental review has indicated that impacts can be mitigated.*
- > Project has been designed to provide relief at the ground level, as well as usable open spaces distributed through the project at different floors.*
- > Frontage on Rollins Road fronts onto the freeway. The rear setback fronts onto parking lots and carports. It is not looming over adjacent uses.*
- > Creative project to provide housing in an area that needs it, in a location that will provide life to this area.*
- > Needs to consider a day where the Broadway grade separation will be completed, and the traffic issues will be resolved.*
- > The site is likely to be housing one day, but seems like there is too much program fit onto the site. Is a good-looking building and feels like a big city project, but is next to the North Park apartments which are more airy and spread out. Lot coverage standards are intended to provide light and openness.*
- > If there is anywhere where there should be more density, it is next to the freeway. This site can accept*

this scale better than in other parts of town.

- > Skeptical over using ITE standards in the the traffic studies.*
- > Concerned with construction traffic. (Kane: Parking management is reviewed as part of the building permit.)*
- > While these residential projects the Planning Commission has reviewed look similar to each other, it is the nature of multifamily buildings.*
- > Project sets up potential future development at a greater scale alongside the freeway.*
- > Likes the design but the size and density does not seem to fit the city. While the previous zoning did not have a density limit, it had development standards that controlled the density. This project varies from those standards.*
- > The North Rollins Road area is providing greater public benefits than this project does.*
- > Project is fronting on a freeway, not a neighborhood.*
- > For the environmental review, needs to consider if there are impacts that rise to the level of significance. If we do not see something in the analysis that warrants that, it is hard to justify having issues with the environmental review.*
- > The Bayswater project will have greater impact on a neighborhood and has a more impactful location than this location. The freeway is not an impactful location.*
- > This is the right density at the right place.*
- > Likes the design and material choices. Wants to support the project but is concerned with the traffic. The area will be congested but will need to follow a path to address the traffic.*
- > Concern with the four-tall parking stackers and how it they will function on a day-to-day basis.*
- > Good location for the housing. Easier access to the freeway. But concern with parking for visitors. People will have friends over and they will need to find parking in the neighborhoods.*

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to accept findings in the staff report for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and recommend those findings go to the City Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Nay: 2 - Sargent, and Gaul

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to recommend to the City Council approval of the development application. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Nay: 2 - Sargent, and Gaul