

CITY OF BURLINGAME Community Development Department M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 8, 2020

Director's Report

TO: Planning Commission

Meeting Date: September 14, 2020

FROM: Ruben Hurin, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: FYI – REVIEW OF INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AT 1 & 45 ADRIAN COUT, ZONED RRMU.

Summary: An application for Design Review, Density Bonus, Approval of Community Benefit Bonuses, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map for construction of a new 265-unit mixed use development at 1 & 45 Adrian Court was approved by the Planning Commission on September 23, 2019 (see attached September 23, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes). The applicant recently submitted for a building permit, however a permit has not yet been issued.

During discussion of the project, the Commission asked the applicant to provide a solution for the blank curved concrete wall enclosing the parking garage, which faces the dog park at the rear of the site. At that time, the applicant provided sample murals and graphics that served as examples of the types of art that they would propose on the wall, but noted that they would like to develop and finalize the design of the graphics "concurrently with the project's exterior signage and interiors design in order to provide additional continuity and optimize creativity". Therefore, the Planning Commission approved the project with the following condition of approval:

 that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI for Planning Commission review of the graphics to be applied to the curved concrete wall enclosing the garage.

Please refer to the attached letter and plans submitted by the project applicant, dated September 4, 2020, for a detailed explanation of the proposed graphics. The proposed wall art will contain poppies constructed from offsetting layers (1-inch offset) of colored metal panels. The applicant notes that "oversize scale of the poppies is intended to help promote a sense of place as well as add a colorful and lively pop of the park".

If the Commission feels there is a need for more study or discussion, this item may be placed on an action calendar for a second review and/or public hearing with direction to the applicant.

c. Elaine Breeze, SummerHill Apartment Communities, applicant

Attachments:

Planning Application Explanation Letter from Applicant, dated September 4, 2020 September 23, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes Proposed Plans, date stamped September 4, 2020

	PLANNING APPLICATION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT—PLANNING DIVISION 501 PRIMROSE ROAD, 2ND FLOOR, BURLINGAME, CA 94010-3997 TEL: 650.558.7250 FAX: 650.696.3790 E-MAIL: PLANNINGDEPT@BURLINGAME.ORG			
PROJECT INFORMATION	1 and 45 Adrian Court 025-169-350 (1 Adrian Court) &025-169-999 (45 Adrian Court) ASSESSOR'S PARCEL # (APN) RRMU Interim Zoning ZONING PROJECT ADDRESS ASSESSOR'S PARCEL # (APN) ZONING PROJECT DESCRIPTION Please see attached letter. Image: Content of the second			
PROJE				
	PROPERTY OWNER NAME APPLICANT? ADDRESS			
APPLICANT INFORMATION	SHAC Adrian Court Apartments LLC			
	ARCHITECT/DESIGNER APPLICANT? ADDRESS			
	BURLINGAME BUSINESS LICENSE # *FOR PROJECT REFUNDS* - Please provide an address to which to all refund checks will be mailed to:			
	<u>NAME</u> <u>ADDRESS</u>			
OWNERSHIP	I HEREBY CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE INFORMATION GIVEN HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF.			
	APPLICANT'S SIGNATURE (IF DIFFERENT FROM PROPERTY OWNER)			
AFFIDAVIT OF OWNER	I AM AWARE OF THE PROPOSED APPLICATION AND HEREBY AUTHORIZE THE ABOVE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT THIS APPLICATION TO THE PLANMER COMPANY OF THE ADDRESS APPLICATION.			
AFFIC	PROPERTY OWNER'S SIGNATURE 9/4/2020			
	AUTHORIZATION TO REPRODUCE PLANS			
	I HEREBY GRANT THE CITY OF BURLINGAME THE AUTHORITY TO REPRODUCE UPON REQUEST AND/OR POST PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE AS PART OF THE PLANNING APPROVAL PROCESS AND WAIVE ANY CLAIMS AGAINST THE CITY ARISING OUT OF OR RELATED TO SUCH ACTION			
ONLY	APPLICATION TYPE			
	ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU)			
USE C	CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP) WIRELESS DESIGN REVIEW (DSR) FENCE EXCEPTION			
STAFF (
ST/				

SPECIAL PERMIT (SP)

DATE RECEIVED:

STAFF USE ONLY



September 4, 2020

Ruben Hurin Planning Manager City of Burlingame 501 Primrose Road Burlingame, CA 94010

RE: Adrian Court Mixed-Use Project Art Wall FYI To Planning Commission Submittal

Dear Ruben:

On behalf of SummerHill Apartment Communities (SummerHill), please find 10 copies of 12"x18" plans for the Adrian Court Mixed-Use Project's Art Wall enclosed. These are intended for use in an FYI to the Planning Commission per Condition of Approval #2 of the project's approval.

Description of Art Wall

In creating the wall art, we looked to provide a feature that would add to the natural elements of the park, but also create some interest and conversation. The oversize scale of the poppies is intended to help promote a sense of place as well as add a colorful and lively pop to the park. The poppies will be constructed from offsetting layers of colored metal panels, creating an impactful 3-dimensional work by separating each layer of petals approximately 1" from the layer beneath it.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require additional information as you review the attached plans.

Thank you,

Elaine Breeze Senior Vice President of Development

Enclosures

CC: Richard Norris, SummerHill Apartment Communities



Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, September 23, 2019	7:00 PM	Council Chambers

d. 1 & 45 Adrian Court, zoned RRMU - Application for Design Review, Density Bonus, Approval of Community Benefit Bonuses, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map for lot combination for a new seven-story, 265-unit mixed-use 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). (SummerHill Apartment Communities, applicant; Seidel Architects, architect; Helf Investments and Nicolet Family Partners, property owners) (73 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

 Attachments:
 1 & 45 Adrian Ct - Staff Report

 1 & 45 Adrian Ct - Attachments

 1 & 45 Adrian Ct - CEQA Class 32 Infill Exemption

 1 & 45 Adrian Ct - Plans

 1 & 45 Adrian Ct - Plans

 1 & 45 Adrian Ct - Public Works - Engineering Memo

 Vesting Tentative Parcel Map

All Commissioners had visited the property. Commissioner Sargent noted that he had met with the applicant. Commissioners Loftis, Terrones and Tse noted that they each had a brief email exchange with the applicant.

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

> Who is responsible for maintaining the public amenities and maintaining their accessibility in the future? As long as the project exists, they have to remain public, but what stops them from ten years down the road saying we're going to actually incorporate this into part of our building? Are there protections in place for that? (Hurin: There will be an agreement between the applicant and the City that would address those issues and concerns.)

> Are there hours of operation restrictions to the public park? (Hurin: I don't think we've gotten to that level of detail yet; we'll probably look at our City hours for parks as a consideration.) (Kane: The park also has to be available to the residents of the project, and would probably be available to them for longer hours than to the general members of the public. We want to be sensitive to the location in terms of security issues, so we're looking at that as part of the agreement that would cover it.)

Acting Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Elaine Breeze and Alex Seidel, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Are the 38 affordable units distributed throughout the project? (Breeze: Yes, they will be. We'll enter into an affordable housing agreement with the City. They will be equally distributed by unit type.)

> The affordable units are designated at the beginning and will remain designated affordable units throughout their life, is that correct? (Breeze: Yes, we have recently worked with other cities where once the program is established, there is some flexibility, but the goal is that you always have those 38 units that comprised the same unit mix we agreed upon. They are equally distributed.)

> Is there any update on what the potential uses are or potential tenants are for the commercial space or is that still to be decided? (Breeze: That is still to be decided.)

> Where is the plaster smooth finish verses the plaster sand float finish going to be used? (Seidel: The white rectangles that surrounds the wood would be the smooth finish, and then the sand float finish would be used on everything else.)

> On the pool deck level, is there just one barbecue area that serves that pool deck? (Breeze: There are barbecues areas in the eastern and western courtyards, as well as on the far left side off the club room.)

> On your renderings you show the trees along Adrian Court are lit. Is that the plan to light the trees along the sidewalk? (Breeze: That might be a little architectural license. That is within the public right-of-way and I don't think the City will allow that. There will be street lights above and lighting on the building that will need to comply with downcast requirements; there will be lighting on the building side of the sidewalk.)

> You mentioned transitioning from one type of window along the Adrian Road and Adrian Court elevations to another window type on the remaining elevations. How would you transition the windows along those elevations? (Breeze: We would wrap the windows around the unit so that nobody has two different window types; we've identified where we would want to wrap so it's properly breaking.)

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Acting Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> This is an exciting project. It has to be really satisfying for the community based on how much work went into the General Plan. Changing the zoning of this area was a leap of faith and to see it realized so quickly, I think it's really exciting. The community benefits are a great addition to this area, project is approvable.

> Agree, it is a really exciting project, astounding that it happened quickly while work was continuing on the General Plan. The project is extremely well articulated and the benefits are pretty remarkable.

> The one concern I had was to make sure the affordable units were not shoved up against Highway 101, happy to hear they're distributed through the project. I'm in full support of the project as well.

> Agree with my fellow Commissioners and am excited about the project. I think there's been so much thought put into every aspect of the design of this project, there are so many elements where you have exceeded requirements.

> Adrian Court is going to be a special place to go and visit and use, like the paseo entrance to the park. Thank you for all the care that you have taken to articulate the design of this project, can support the project.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the application for Design Review, Density Bonus, and Community Benefit Bonuses and recommend approval of the Vesting Tentative Parcel map to City Council.

Discussion of Motion:

> When we were working on what would would like to see in the new zoning for this area, we identified public amenities as being an important element; think that this project has set a good standard for future projects; in support of project.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Loftis

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Gaul