



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

Present 7 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Terrones, Bandrapalli, Sargent, and Gaul

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

Sandra Lang spoke on this item:

- > *Serves on a county commission on aging.*
- > *Has concerns with decisions being made regarding senior citizens, and effects planning could have.*

5. STUDY ITEMS

- a. Envision Burlingame (General Plan Update) – Led by Representatives of the General Plan Consultant Team from MIG

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)
[Emerging Land Use Workbook](#)
[Study Session Slide Presentation](#)

Planning Manager Gardiner introduced the item.

Laura Stetson and Dan Amsden of MIG consultants made a presentation, covering the following items:

- > *Project Schedule and Update*
- > *Community Involvement, including workshops and online survey*
- > *Regional Growth Trends*
- > *Emerging Land Use Concept*
- > *Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Feedback*

Commission questions:

- > *What engagement has there been with the school district on land use and population projections? (Stetson: There is a representative from the school district on the CAC. There needs to be follow-up, as we are aware of concerns with additional school children.)*
- > *Is the Emerging Land Use Concept a reflection of the survey primarily, or is it a reflection of the CAC*

recommendation? (Stetson: Combination of the workshops, CAC, intercept surveys, and stakeholder interviews. The consultant team synthesized the input, then presented it back to the CAC for specific comments.)

> Why was the CAC not in favor of mixed use at the corner of Adeline Drive and El Camino Real, and instead favored stand-alone residential use? (Stetson: It was not a vote, but various CAC members had concerns that commercial uses could create a nuisance. El Camino Real is primarily residential in Burlingame.)

> Why did CAC members suggest lowering the residential density south of Broadway? (Stetson: It's a nuance. The high-density category has a range from 20 to 50 units per acre. It is a large range. The areas south of Broadway are presently zoned for multifamily development up to 50 units per acre, but are probably not built to 50 units per acre. Concern may be that if the high-density designation is retained in the area, it may encourage consolidation of lots to build something bigger that would be out of character with what exists today. If the cap was 30 units per acre the current land use pattern would continue and remain stable. Could be implemented through an overlay.)

> Does the term "Emerging Land Use Concept" refer to future trends of what land use is heading towards? (Stetson: No, it refers to the land use plan not being settled yet. It could be considered a "draft." The term "emerging" because input is still being sought.)

> In the future when streets are discussed, will it have been vetted through traffic studies? (Stetson: Yes. Preliminary studies were done before any concepts were discussed.)

> How much land is within the anticipated "change" areas versus the areas that are considered stable and not anticipated to change? (Amsden: Has not done the calculation. The Downtown Specific Plan area is also not expected to change significantly, given the plan was adopted relatively recently.)

> Have the projects in the residential pipeline been projected on a map to see where they fall? (Stetson: Staff has mapped the locations of the various applications and approved projects. Currently residential development is allowed in a lot of areas.)(Gardiner: None of the current projects require General Plan amendments - they are all accommodated within existing zoning. The City has a lot of zoning capacity, in theory, however most of the land is already built on.)

Questions from the public (submitted on question cards):

> Given that schools are already at capacity, how would schools be factored into the discussion? (Stetson: It is a critical part of the discussion. Schools are required to accommodate the students that are generated by new development, but there needs to be balance to have a vibrant, healthy city. Some of the housing may not generate school children, such as senior housing. Schools need to be addressed in the planning.)

> Do general plans ever have a development "cap" in population or numbers of units, if the community decides on what would be the right number for future growth, even if there is more land zoned that could accommodate more growth? It could be based on capacity issues such as schools, infrastructure, etc. (Amsden: Yes, it can be a policy decision to limit growth based on capacity of facilities, or constraints. The environmental analysis would include the cap/threshold. There could be a later policy decision to go beyond the cap, but then there would need to be further environmental analysis on the potential impacts.)

> To what degree have FEMA flood zones and Sea Level Rise been a consideration or will be a consideration going forward? (Stetson: Sea Level Rise is a consideration in new projects submitted on the Bayfront, and FEMA regulations apply to new projects in the flood zones.)(Amsden: There may be specific overlays to address requirements such as raising of buildings.)

> What if any reduced parking requirements are being considered for mixed use projects? (Stetson: The plan can set a policy framework for parking regulations. The regulations themselves will be included in the zoning update, which will be done in conjunction or right after the General Plan.)

> What is the City's current jobs/housing balance? (Stetson: Approximately 33,000 jobs, and just over 12,000 housing units, for a ratio of approximately 2.75 jobs per housing unit.)

> Does the General Plan include parks and green spaces for future growth, particularly if there is an increase in population? Would there be provisions for more parkland? (Stetson: There could be a policy direction to have a parkland ratio per 1000 residents. There would be a need to find places for additional parks if that was the policy.)

> What is the thinking behind reducing density near Broadway if there is also a desire is to make

Broadway successful? (Stetson: It is a policy question reflecting comments from CAC members. The question is whether to keep the neighborhood at the intensity it is today, or allow additional intensity to create more activity on Broadway.)

> Have there been calculations to determine if there would be adequate infrastructure if all properties were developed to their maximum capacity under current zoning? How is the maximum potential determined if both residential and commercial are allowed? (Stetson: There will need to be a build-out analysis for all uses in the city. Some assumptions will need to be made including how many existing parcels would turn over, and the proportion of residential and commercial uses. Over a 25 year period not all parcels are going to turn over. However there would not be an exercise to see what would happen if every single parcel turned over because it is not a credible scenario to consider.)

Chair Loftis opened the public hearing. Public comments:

Mark Haberecht, 1505 Balboa Avenue, spoke on this item:

- > The Housing Element prepared two years ago expressed skepticism towards ABAG projections as they applied to Burlingame. Burlingame's population has remained flat over the past 40 years.*
- > Forecasts have been wrong in the past.*
- > Do we blindly approve transit-oriented development defined loosely around High Speed Rail and electrified Caltrain that are unfunded? They may no longer exist with autonomous driving technologies.*
- > Through regional pressures may have to decide how to absorb housing requirements and what to protect in existing quality of life.*
- > Bayfront is underutilized, whereas infill development west of Highway 101 and along the El Camino Real corridor is contentious. Bayfront housing in exchange for protecting areas that are already constrained.*
- > Hillsborough is exempt from ABAG requirements; Burlingame has agreed to accept all externalities and costs of high-density development, while Hillsborough is allowed to count nanny units as housing growth.*
- > Residential developers should contribute to schools, fire and police.*
- > Mixed-use development at Adeline Drive and El Camino Real beyond what exists now will create more controversy than the condominium proposed at 1509 El Camino Real. It should be zoned R-2 Residential.*

Michael Barber spoke on this item:

- > Was on the school board for 16 years. The schools have not been included in this process.*
- > If the concept plan was built out, there would need to be a place for another school.*
- > The schools are at maximum capacity. In 16 years grew from 2200 students to 3400 students now. Without a new school, the existing schools would have to become denser with larger class sizes.*
- > Countywide Sea Level Rise assessment will be completed in September. Should be careful about putting residents into a flood-prone area.*

Jennifer Pfaff spoke on this item:

- > If some areas are allowed to have residential development where they do not currently, need to consider trend of losing local control. Latest is the Governor's by-right housing proposal to fast-track housing that includes 10-20% attainable units.*
- > Local review is strong, which is why Burlingame looks the way it does now.*
- > Trend is towards regional rather than local.*
- > If rezone areas to allow multifamily residential, may lose control over how the City looks.*
- > Would advocate having a development cap.*
- > While current plan is from 1969 there have been updates including the Downtown Specific Plan. Plans can be altered over time.*

Chair Loftis closed the public hearing.

Laura Stetson and Dan Amsden facilitated the commission discussion, with the discussion organized by geographical area.

Bayfront:

- > *Have the flood zones been considered? (Stetson: Yes, they are discussed in the background reports, and have been factored into the consideration process.)*
- > *The distinction is allowing the possibility of something to happen, as compared to proposing it. There are many layers of regulation including FEMA that would apply to a project. Codes and regulations would need to be followed.*
- > *The Bayfront and Rollins Road areas have underutilized properties. It's almost like these areas have been "poisoned," whether by policy or economics.*
- > *Likes the proposals that have been put forward such as live/work, and that they are not the standard approach. Worthy of being studied further.*
- > *The area cannot be ignored just because it is within a flood zone, since there are already uses in place. The issue needs to be addressed regardless.*
- > *Would like to see something vigorous and vibrant, since that would not describe the area currently. Likes the direction of what is shown in the concept.*
- > *School issue is a "chicken and egg" situation, since a school won't be built until there is residential development, but there can't be residential development until it can be accommodated with schools. Would like to see residential development on the Bayfront but understands the challenges with the schools.*
- > *Live/work would not necessarily generate a lot of school children. They are more likely to attract young professionals and single people. They would be smaller units that would be less likely to accommodate families, not single family homes. (Stetson: Cannot dictate who could live in the units, but could limit the size of live/work units.)*
- > *The area is underutilized and there is a desire for the parking lots to be developed.*
- > *Concern over how to make the desired development happen, since zoning in itself won't necessarily bring the development. (Stetson: One tool is to create land use regulations that provide flexibility and attract the types of users desired. The other is going out and seeking the developers and letting them know where the opportunities are. One or two catalytic projects can start things.)*
- > *Likes the direction of the concept on the North Bayfront. However residential on the south end would be out of character with the rest of Burlingame. It's like Redwood City compared to Redwood Shores, they are so disconnected from each other. It would also be more car-centric than the rest of Burlingame.*
- > *There have been lots of developers wanting to build residential on the Bayfront, but since it is not allowed it is not clear what would be the next highest use. Typically it defaults to discussing hotels.*
- > *Would not expect development to have the character of Foster City or Redwood Shores. Instead it would be pioneering development that would cohabitate with what already exists, such as live/work or condo hotels. Should think about the form and character of development to inform the vision, and is worth studying further.*
- > *The Shoreline area will have a different impact compared to the Inner Bayshore industrial area. Anything east of Bayshore Highway and Airport Boulevard will have a different look and feel than anything west.*
- > *Should consider the preferences of millennials, such as telecommuting and ordering goods online. Is that being considered? (Stetson: It is always a challenge to predict how the next generation wants to live. If land uses are adaptable and flexible, and buildings are adaptable and flexible, different ways of living and working can be accommodated. The proposed concept creates that flexibility.)*
- > *Need to better understand population growth projections. (Stetson: The 5% historic growth represents the availability of land and what could be accommodated with the zoning. Meanwhile the regional economy has been booming, creating more demand for housing and therefore there have been more requests for residential development in Burlingame based on the region changing. The ABAG projections take in the regional factors.)*

North Burlingame/Rollins Road:

- > *More dense housing at the southern end of Rollins Road will be a problem in terms of traffic, the*

train, the traffic generated by Burlingame Point. Should not be placing more dense development that will bring more cars. If more residential development needs to be accommodated, the northern end of Rollins Road makes more sense since it is near the Millbrae station.

- > A design district with live/work seems to fit.
- > Concept is good. Makes more sense to have higher density at the north end, but there ought to be some at the south end too. Also likes the innovation district.
- > The north end of Burlingame is not active at night and is underdeveloped. Focusing on the northern end of Rollins Road is a good idea.
- > The approach in the concept to the North Burlingame area on El Camino Real is good.

Broadway:

- > The photo illustrating the development at the "nodes" or ends of Broadway is too intense, but having three gas stations out of the four corners doesn't seem right. At least one of the property owners has interest in doing something other than a gas station.
- > Would not want to intensify the El Camino end but the California Drive end could be intensified.
- > It doesn't need to be intensified, just needs to be different.
- > The gas stations are successful so not sure how likely they are to redevelop.
- > Conceptually the gateway development makes sense.
- > Understands interest in having less density in the blocks south of Broadway since there is competition in parking between the residential uses and the commercial uses on Broadway. There are other areas of emphasis in the city that can be the focus for increased density.

El Camino Real at Adeline Drive:

- > Having the market and small businesses there adds a lot to the neighborhood. Would be unfortunate to zone them out of existence.
- > Parking and traffic is a problem for the corner, given how busy it is.
- > If it changes to residential it will feel like all the other blocks on El Camino Real. The market is a great spot and should be developed as more of a commercial area.
- > Depends on intensity. Term "mixed use" evokes intensification with more traffic and impact, but if it is not intense can be a benefit for having local commercial uses and not always having to drive to a shopping center.
- > Accommodating parking on the corner lot will limit the potential for how intense the development can be. Not likely to be more than two stories.

The survey had many responses from Easton Addition residents, and the response was wanting services for nearby residences.

- > Commercial use would be good provided it is not intensive.

Downtown:

- > In agreement with the concept plan.

California Drive corridor:

- > Seems there is potential as a connector between Broadway and Burlingame Avenue. (Stetson: This is an instance where having a change to the road configuration together with a land use policy change will allow some transformation. Currently it is not friendly to pedestrians.
- > The roadway is odd, in that it is four lanes to sprint between two lanes at each end.
- > Makes sense to have some residential on the upper floors.
- > It is a long corridor. Some of the uses such as automotive are not things people would walk to.

Other considerations:

- > The chart showing growth trends for San Mateo County is not helpful. The chart should show Burlingame instead, since growth in Burlingame is flat.

- > There has been talk of having a ferry terminal on the Bayfront. That would change the discussion of whether to put development on the north or south side of Rollins Road.
- > The Bayfront is disconnected from the rest of the City. Need to discuss the above-ground grade separation on Broadway, which will separate the area even more.
- > There have been discussions with the school, including representation on the school district's master plan committee.
- > Needs to look at parking standards for transit-oriented development and other uses that would not have as much impact. Perhaps a subcommittee with the Traffic, Safety and Parking Commission.
- > Dichotomy between millenials prefering to walk or bike to work rather than drive, versus concerns with development at south of Rollins Road creating traffic. Needs to take a position. The Millbrae Avenue end may be just as busy.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

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.

THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE BURLINGAME PLANNING COMMISSION WILL BE HELD ON MONDAY, JULY 25, 2016.