



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, November 13, 2017

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

- d. 920 Bayswater Avenue (includes 908 Bayswater Ave., 108 Myrtle Rd., 112 Myrtle Rd., 116 Myrtle Rd., 120 Myrtle Rd., 124 Myrtle Rd.) zoned MMU and R-3 - Application for Environmental Review, Lot Merger, Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for Multi Family Residential, and Density Bonus Incentive for a New 128-Unit Apartment Development with two levels of below-grade parking. (Fore Property Company, applicant; John C. and Donna W. Hower Trust, Julie Baird, Eric G. Ohlund Et Al, Doris J. Mortensen Tr. - property owners; Withee Malcolm Architects LLP, architects) (160 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

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

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

*Questions of Staff:*

> *Can the commission request an increase in affordable units? (Keylon: The affordable units are based on the state density bonus regulations. While a request can be made, it cannot be a requirement beyond what is provided in the regulations.)*

*Chair Gum opened the public hearing.*

*Mark Pilarczyk, Fore Property Company, represented the applicant, with Derk Thelen, Withee Malcolm Architects.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

*There were no questions to the applicant.*

*Public Comments:*

*Jennifer Pfaff: Concern in the neighborhood with the density of the project, but the numbers of units has been reduced and the developer has been responsive to neighbor comments. The neighborhood needs traffic calming, not just from this project but from everything else coming forward, and there needs to be traffic studies for the project. Some of the gables look like they are hanging - needs posts on both sides of the gables, or the entire porch needs to wrap around the corners, or recess the extra post. Also the shed roofs under the small gables are off center or not terminating at the right places.*

*Susan Houston, 821 Bayswater Avenue: Looks a lot better than last time. Still too big. Parking in the area is a struggle, people from other apartment buildings park on the street. Not adequate parking for this many units.*

*Bobbi Benson: Would like head-in parking for guests. Would like to see the roof deck eliminated completely so there cannot be parties and noise on the roof at night. Suggests more setbacks on the side, and for peace and privacy would prefer solid balcony walls where the two buildings are close together*

facing each other.

*Monika Froehlich:* Applicant has done a great job in incorporating concerns of the neighbors. Traffic and parking will still be an issue, needs to have a traffic calming study done. Bayswater and Bloomfield are like highways, not like a neighborhood. Concern project will add more congestion, traffic problems, and parking problems.

*Mary, Bayswater Avenue:* This version is much better than the first one, but still concerned with the size of the project. Myrtle and Bayswater is not a commercial area like California Drive or Peninsula Avenue where there is a lot of traffic. This area is residential. Even half as big would be too large for this area. Merging properties together creates a massive building. Myrtle and Bayswater are walking streets.

*Laura Hesselgren:* Originally opposed to project. Still concerned with the scope and density, but developer worked with neighbor concerns and took suggestions into consideration. Doesn't want large apartment complex in the neighborhood but developer has taken the time to break it up and try to make it fit in the neighborhood. Still concerned with traffic and parking - lots of traffic at Dwight and Bayswater on busy mornings. Plus Peninsula overpass and downtown construction, needs traffic calming in the neighborhood.

*Tony:* Chose this part of Downtown because it is flat and can walk. Neighbors have young children. Concern with how to facilitate a building this size in the schools. Most people use Dwight Way to access Peninsula Avenue and the highway. Where will people go when they go onto the highway - across to California Drive and back around, or up Bayswater? Nothing in this area this size. 128 units is too many, by a few factors.

*Gilbert Cappellini:* Myrtle Road has parking problems. During the day auto mechanics and auto body businesses use spaces, traffic will be a problem. Concern with safety.

Chair Gum closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Vastly improved since first iteration.
- > Reduced in size and while not to extent neighborhood would like, some great concessions have been made.
- > Rooftop deck will be a valuable amenity for people living there, and noise issues after hours are a police matter. It is appropriate that it has been moved to the Myrtle side.
- > Would like more green space in the middle of the project if possible.
- > Would like more space on the Bayswater side so it is not so close to the adjacent property.
- > Architectural details in the roofline.
- > Agrees with suggestion of having solid walls on the balconies, especially those close to the other units on Bayswater.
- > Not sure about the windows.
- > Believes there is only one electric charging station. Would like more stations.
- > Wants tree protection measures for the existing trees to remain so they are not damaged.
- > Suggests permit parking for the area, with permits for residents. (Kane: Members of the neighborhood can bring a request to the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission. It requires the concurrence of a super-majority of people in the area.)
- > Outreach to the community has been very impressive.
- > Still does not think it is the right scale and scope for the location.
- > School enrollment concerns.
- > Four stories does not fit this neighborhood; there are only a handful of four-story buildings in the area. Most in neighborhood are two and three story.
- > Concerned there is not enough parking, would expect 200 spaces.
- > Concerned with the scale of the lot consolidation. Seven lots with space and air between them,

combined into one.

- > *Would be helpful to have the environmental review to bring some science and metrics.*
- > *Shares concerns with the size but also understands the need for housing in the city. The City is expensive, business owners can't find people to work here, and people have to drive from far away to get to jobs here.*
- > *Refreshing to hear that the applicant has reached out to neighbors as much as they have, and tried to incorporate their concerns.*
- > *There are quite a few three story buildings in the area, and designers have done a great job making the four-story building blend in with the three-story neighbors.*
- > *Concerned with the window style, they still look contemporary in a craftsman-styled building. Would like more information on the sound ratings next time.*
- > *Does not seem like craftsman or bungalow. First version was "over the top," but this is an overreaction. While it is good to obtain lots of input, still needs to be a coherent and compelling project. Acquiescing to a style but not holding to a strong vision.*
- > *Floating gables need to be addressed, as well as columns and wrap-around porches.*

*There was no action, as the environmental review requires the application to return on the Regular Action item.*