



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, March 11, 2024

7:00 PM

Council Chambers/Online

---

- b. 1200-1340 Old Bayshore Highway, zoned BFC - Recommendation to the City Council on an application for Commercial Design Review, Special Permits for Building Height and Development under Tier 3/Community Benefits, Vesting Tentative Map, Development Agreement, and the associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for a new Office/Research & Development Project consisting of three, 11-story office/research & development buildings and two, 10 and 10.5 story parking structures (DW Burlingame I Owner, LLC, DW Burlingame II Owner, LLC, DW Burlingame II Owner A, LLC, DW Burlingame II Owner B, LLC, DW Burlingame III Owner, LLC, applicant and property owners; WRNS Studio, architect) (92 noticed) Staff Contact: Kelly Beggs/Catherine Keylon

1. Recommendation on certification of the Environmental Impact Report and adoption of a Water Supply Assessment
2. Recommendation on Commercial Design Review, Special Permits for Building Heights and Development under Tier 3/Community Benefits and a Vesting Tentative Map
3. Recommendation on a Development Agreement

*All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioners Horan and Schmid had a video call with the developer a couple of weeks ago. Contract Planner Kelly Beggs provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing.*

*Virginia Calkins represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the application.*

*Public Comments:*

*> Constance Quirk, Burlingame resident: I would imagine that this is one of the largest development projects in Burlingame's history. Two 10-story parking structures, three 11-story office buildings that equal a million and a half square feet excluding the parking structures. I don't understand why they were excluded from the FAR when they are two large buildings. Most regular people like me cannot grasp the enormity of this project. It is one thing to look at a set of plans and quite another to visualize it. I want to focus on the two parking structures for 3,400 vehicles. The developers want us to come down there and are only providing 40 parking spaces. For the amenities that were listed, that number of public parking spaces is quite low. I think we probably need 100 public parking spaces. How many of these parking spaces will be guaranteed with no ability to rescind? One of the reasons I say this is because Windy Hill Developers and tenant Verkada in downtown San Mateo had an agreement with the city to provide 150 parking spaces on the weekends and evenings in their new building. They have rescinded due to "a security incident" that they refuse to discuss. If you provide access to the bay, you must also guarantee*

the public parking spaces with very good signage. Has there been a traffic study in the neighborhood? El Camino Real, California Drive, Rollins Road, Oak Grove Avenue, Peninsula Avenue, and side streets will be very heavily impacted to get to this site, not just the 101 north and south. The impacts of this development are huge. Are there additional plans to provide infrastructures such as schools, parks, roads and for the increase in population? As a Planning Commission, please think of the consequences and unintended consequences of this enormous project. More people equal more housing equals more needs that have yet to be addressed. Thank you.

> Jaime Vasquez, NorCal Carpenters Local 217: Good afternoon, Chair Pfaff, and Commissioners, I am a field representative of Local 217 that covers the City of Burlingame. Today, I stand before you to emphasize the importance of planning for the future of our beloved city, Burlingame. As we progress into the year ahead, it becomes increasingly vital to lay a solid foundation for this prosperity and well-being of our community. Our significant step in this direction is this project Peninsula Crossing located at 1200 Old Bayshore Highway by using Devcon Construction. Divco West is making a commitment to the community, not only does this project hold the promise to contribute to the growth and development of our city but also represents an opportunity for workers to make the livable wage to earn healthcare and for apprenticeships to evolve their career. Peninsula Crossing is not merely a development proposal, it represents an investment that resonates deeply with the people of our city. It is a project we feel generally invested in something we can take immense pride in. As we embark in this journey together, let us embrace the opportunity to shape our future with thoughtful consideration. I urge the Planning Commission tonight to pass this Peninsula Crossing project. With the value it brings to our community, let us seize this chance for the future that will make Burlingame an even better place to live, work and thrive. Thank you for your time and consideration. Together, let us pave the way for a brighter and more promising future for Burlingame.

> Oscar Mazariegos, NorCal Carpenters: Good Evening esteemed members of the Planning Commission, I am a field representative for the NorCal Carpenters Union, also representing Carpenters Local 217 that covers the area of Burlingame. As a union carpenter, I stand before you today with great pride and enthusiasm to express my unwavering support for the project proposed by Divco at 1200 Old Bayshore Highway in Burlingame. This project represents more than just another construction endeavor. It embodies the promise of progress, growth, and opportunity for our community. It signifies the creation of jobs that will not only sustain families but also uplift them, providing stable incomes and benefits that are essential for a thriving workforce. This project is a testament to the commitment of Divco to uphold to the highest standards of craftsmanship and quality. As union carpenters, we take immense pride in our work, knowing that our skills contribute to buildings that stand the test of time, buildings that become landmarks in our cities and sources of pride for generations to come. Furthermore, the development of 1200 Old Bayshore Highway will not only enhance the physical landscape of Burlingame but also contribute to its economic vitality. By attracting businesses and investments, it will stimulate growth and prosperity creating a ripple effect that benefits the entire community. Perhaps, most importantly, this project embodies the values of collaboration and partnership. The successful completion of such a venture requires the collective effort of developers, contractors, carpenters, and the community at large. Through this collaboration spirit we can overcome challenges, achieve milestones, and ultimately realize the shared vision of a better and brighter future. This project will give a chance to Burlingame residents to work in the city they live. In closing, I urge you to join me in supporting this project. Let us embrace this opportunity, not only to build structures but also build bridges that connect us, strengthen us, and pave the way for a brighter tomorrow. Thank you.

> Moniqua Brown: Good Evening Chair Pfaff, fellow commissioners, and staff. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. I am a field representative for the NorCal Carpenters Union out of Local 217 here in San Mateo County. I'm here this evening to speak about 1200 Old Bayshore Highway. This development will bring good paying jobs and benefits to our community. It will also help with training our apprentices and making sure that they get the hours needed to be successful, work in their own community and earn a livable wage, healthcare, and benefits. Divco West is making an investment in this community. By working with Devcon Construction, they will not only turn over a high-quality project but will also be making sure that the people of this community are taken care of. I have been a carpenter since 1999. I was able to raise two daughters, buy a home and continue my career in the construction industry because of projects like this. Plus, I always have support and training whenever I need it until the day I

retire. Please keep supporting responsible projects like this. Thank you.

> Russ Cohen, Burlingame resident: I have so many questions, let's start with the building mass and the design. Big can be beautiful, but it isn't, not yet. The current design is architecturally lackluster. That's not to say that the design doesn't have its interesting moments. If you look at the design overall, we can do better. I want to be very clear; I am not suggesting that we not build this project. I am suggesting that we can build it better. The community must live with this project for generations. An architecturally spectacular building could actually be considered a community benefit. I encourage those who are working on the design to simply survey projects of this magnitude from around the world to be inspired. There are many ways to design and build beyond the box. Now, I want to talk a little bit about the development and will start with the community benefits. According to the report, there are six community benefits listed in the plan. It looks to me that 5 out of the 6 benefits for the site are not necessarily for the community. Sea level rise for example, sea level rise improvements protect the investment first and the community second. The public plaza and access to the bay benefits the tenants first and the community second. The same for the cultural art and community space. The bay trail improvements as I understand, please correct me if I am wrong, are mandatory as a Condition of Approval for any project that comes along the bay front. Let's think about this as an example; the community needs more indoor event space, so why not provide an indoor auditorium for the community first and it will also benefit the tenants second. This can be accomplished if you re-evaluate all the outdoor spaces for gathering and perhaps re-imagining both outdoor and indoor spaces. Burlingame's daily winds can be ferocious inhibiting the pleasurable use of outdoor open spaces. I would also like to add that a lot of other projects are promising the same thing: open plazas and access to the bay. This is not the only one that will do that. All the community benefits, no matter what they are, should be included in Phase 1. Realistically, other phases are in jeopardy of never happening, especially if the time to complete these additional phases is 20 years. Thank you very much.

> Chris, Burlingame resident: I have some comments based on the design and some nearby structures, regarding the scale of the project in relation to others. I haven't paid a great amount of attention to this project; this is my first time attending the Planning Commission meeting. In terms of the context of the building size, the buildings are 10 to 11 stories high each. 1350 Bayshore Highway on the other side of the proposed development, the large block structure, is at least 9 stories. The Hyatt Regency, which is across the road, is also about 10 stories high. Again, it is not out of scale in its surrounding environments. The Crown Plaza, across the corner, is also about 10 stories as well. With its current surroundings, a 10-story office structure is not out of scale, given that we are trying to intensify the development in that area. Two other hotels nearby, to show that there are larger structures along the bay shore, are the Embassy Suites and the DoubleTree, which are 9-stories as far as I can tell. Keeping that in mind, objections and concerns about this project based on the scale don't seem to be warranted to me, given that we already have large structures nearby. There wouldn't be a significant impact overall based on the existing structures in the area. I have no real concerns. I look forward to seeing it come back. I just want to bring this up for your consideration. Thank you.

> Tom, North Shoreview San Mateo resident: When we are talking about environmental impacts and traffic studies, my neighborhood happens to be one of the areas where people take shortcuts. I must look at this in two ways, as a resident and as a builder. If this will take 10 years, that's half of my career that I can spend literally 8 minutes away from my house. I will then spend more time with my family, less time on the road, I love that aspect. On the other side, I must deal with this having a huge impact on my life where I live. Not so much when I hear the addition of the bay trail, you're adding spaces where my kids and I can ride our bikes from our house and go have lunch at a restaurant, lock our bikes up and enjoy the bay trail because that is one section that I have noticed has not been completed in this area. It will be nice to keep it going and maybe have that as a stopping point. With art, it is always nice to experience art with your children. Everything I have been hearing today, including the on/off ramp modifications, because if you increase the traffic flow to and from, we will get less traffic through our neighborhood impacting our daily lives. So, I was really glad to hear that, about the bay trail and all the amenities that will be available to the public. There are too many times that you have developments that block off the public. I love the fact that this opens a community space as well as a job site. I really like everything that I've heard tonight from both sides.

> Kevin Kretsch, General Manager, Hyatt Regency San Francisco Airport: Good Evening Madam Chair

and Planning Commissioners. Our hotel is very near to this project. We have been involved and partnered with Divco West teams on all the planning over the last two and a half years. One thing that they have done in addition to working with this Planning Commission and the City Council, as the applicant mentioned earlier, is they have listened. They listened to partners and other businesses, such as us, in looking to see how they can benefit the community beyond just what the ordinances are, and the development needs are. I have been the General Manager for Hyatt Regency San Francisco Airport since 2019 and I have also worked there for five years in an operations role. For 10 years, I've been associated with the City of Burlingame and the bay shore corridor. The two things that really stand out to me in listening to our guests who come and stay in our hotel is one, they want the beautification of the immediate area. They want to be able to walk outside, enjoy natural resources and enjoy the amenities that Burlingame can offer to them. Right now, what we see along the corridor and what we see along the bay shore trail is disconnection, lack of enhancement and an area that needs to be drastically improved. This development will take what is now and create a gold standard for what our future is for Burlingame. It will connect our residents to one of the most beautiful natural resources we have right across the street from our hotel, the bay. The bay trail, as was mentioned, is being built beyond the requirements of what the city is asking for the bay trail, again setting the gold standard for the entire trail along the bay shore. Our undoubted support is with Divco West and Woodstock. I submitted a formal letter as well. Thank you for your time.

> Susan Baker, President and CEO, Burlingame/SFO Chamber of Commerce: I appreciate what you are doing, your hard work into the city and everyone that is here is quite a wonderful vibe. We have already submitted our letter of recommendation in support of Peninsula Crossing on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce. What I'd like to reiterate, if I may, is the fact that not only does it bring economic growth to our community, but my personal charge is that we develop this entire community as one. We live together in it, work together in it and we support each other. It was my pleasure to get to know Divco West and all its constituents as all of them, and they still do today, are listening. They are listening to our needs; they are incorporating, and they are trying to do the best for our community. Make no mistake, we understand they are here to build an amazing structure and bring in more people into our community with jobs that support our economic growth. Again, I want to thank every one of you for allowing me to speak this evening. The Burlingame/SFO Chamber of Commerce is in full support of this project.

> Public comment sent via email by Glenn Cronweather: I strongly oppose this project. Office space vacancies are the highest ever from San Francisco down to the Peninsula as more people are working remotely and tech companies are experiencing layoffs. Let the companies behind this project utilize existing empty office space first and leave our visual interaction with the bay intact. Is tax revenue more important than setting the culture Burlingame is based on?

> Public comment sent via email by Gita Dev, Conservation Committee Chair, Sierra Club: I am also speaking for Sierra Club Bay Alive campaign which represents tens of thousands of Sierra Club members, supporters who share our commitment to protect the health of our bay, our shoreline communities, and our wildlife by promoting living shorelines, healthy waters, and just equitable solutions to sea level rise. We appreciate the attentiveness of the developers in reaching out to us early on and modifying their plans along the bay shoreline for better habitat value and resiliency. We appreciate the inclusion of bird-friendly design considerations, such as differing patterns of the glazed façade. Large developments on the bay edge can negatively impact the ecology and behavior of migratory and resident birds as well as fish and other wildlife species. While the exterior lighting of the project is focused downward and is respectful of the bay, we remain concerned with artificial light at nighttime emanating from inside the multi-story buildings and parking structure reflecting on the bay's water and mud flats. We suggest that the project proponents consider automatic shades that draw down at dusk to avoid the impacts of light pollution on the bay. We ask the bird-safe and dark sky considerations be codified into the entitlements to ensure the persistence of these project features into the future. Thank you for your consideration.

> Public comment sent via email by John Medina, UA Local 483, has been received and presented to all the Planning Commissioners.

Chair Pfaff closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion/Direction:*

- > The parking provided is 60% above what is required, am struggling to understand why a developer would spend all that money on parking. (Calkins: We have tried to reduce the parking on this site. It is based on market demands. The project is roughly at 2.3 parking spaces per 1,000 leasable square feet, that is as low as we think the market will allow for potentially being an office project. Frankly, our leasing team believes it can easily be leased with more parking, but we are comfortable with as low as the 2.3:1,000 ratio because we invested in a shuttle. We have the convenience of a shuttle that we think our tenants will take to get to work. We have two different Caltrain stations, a BART station and pedestrian infrastructures that are close by.)
- > What would be the projected population if this is used as 100% office? (Calkins: It could be 4,000-5,000. We have a robust Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan detailed in the CEQA document to reduce the number of people driving their own cars to get to work.)
- > Post pandemic, with people working from home, you are still seeing 4,500 people. (Calkins: Post pandemic, we are seeing less peak hour traffic, which reduces the overall traffic a garage of that size would otherwise create.)
- > You are only providing 40 public parking spaces which is 1.1% of the total, how did you come up with that number? (Calkins: I am not sure if it was driven by the BCDC. Ten percent of all our parking stalls are EV charging including the public stalls.)
- > There is an uncertainty of the Easton Creek phasing in the Development Agreement, it can either be a part of Phase 1 or Phase 2. Can you please explain. (Calkins: Currently, we fully anticipate Phase 1 to include the center building, the southern parking garage, and all of Easton Creek. In the Development Agreement there is a flexibility for us to start with a different phase, in which case we would do all of Easton Creek by the end of the second phase.)
- > Can you provide a rationale on the recommended parcel boundaries on the Vesting Map? (Calkins: There are three different owners related to the three phases that allow future options for the eventual sale of the buildings. It is related to why it took us so long to get here. We wanted to create a site that has enough density, that can be a meaningful cluster and destination. It took 12 acres and a lot of parcels to bring them together, but ultimately, we don't need all those parcels and it does not make sense to have the buildings crossing to, so we are simplifying down to the three ownership entities.)
- > How do you expect the lots to look during the extent of the phase? Obviously, you will have a construction zone in Phase 1, what will Phase 2 and Phase 3 look like over the course of ten years? (Calkins: We will have construction fencing around Phase 2 while Phase 1 is under construction. On that fencing, we will have opportunities for educational materials. For example, it is an interesting place to learn about sea level rise. In the very beginning of the phase, we will be piling dirt because the site involves so much raising of the grades and compaction. The site will be cleared, and dirt will be there in the process of becoming protective material. It will be a fun educational opportunity for people and there will be a functional 20' wide bay trail which is a multi-modal connection point.)
- > Do you see the entire project being scraped all at once and fencing going up? (Calkins: Yes.)
- > If the north parcel is going to be Phase 3, you will be scraping that at the same time to prepare for Phase 1? (Calkins: Exactly. Raising the grade of the site and getting it to a level that it can be protective and functional for sea level rise protection is a long game. We intend to scrape the entire site as soon as we are entitled and able to start getting the dirt settling until it is ready, that is a single option at the beginning.)
- > Did I understand it correctly that among the 40 designated public parking spaces, only 20 will be for the bay trail and 20 will be for a potential restaurant? (Calkins: There will be 40 available parking stalls for public use. It does not matter if they are buying coffee or walking the bay trail.)
- > I wanted to confirm that photovoltaic tiles are not part of this project. (Calkins: No.)
- > Regarding the planting strip along Bayshore Highway, there is very little space on the north end where the parking structures are proposed. The strip is about 10' wide between the sidewalk and the parking structure. I know there are issues about the utilities that you can't control, but if you are envisioning this nature walk how would you do that given this limited space? (Calkins: There are a lot of elements along that frontage. As much as possible, we are following the Old Bayshore Highway vision plan which lays out

the importance of a planter strip and a sidewalk. Where there are conflicting utilities, it is in our Conditions of Approval that we will plant street trees should the utilities relocation the city is taking on be successful. As much as possible, we are making it a good place to be pedestrians. Furthermore, we are orienting the exit of the parking garages towards the bay trail at the south. We imagine the pedestrians using that for circulation as well.)

> How many bike parking spaces are available for the public? (Keylon: There will be about 120 short term bike parking spaces.)

> To follow up on traffic, do you have updated information on the optional Level of Service counts provided in the CEQA document? (Calkins: Our Level of Service is reflective of the current design. We took the most conservative assumptions, both in terms of our project and the regional buildouts. If anything, it will be marginally getting better.)

> Among the 5.5 acres of open space, does that include the tidal and marsh land towards the south? (Calkins: Yes.)

> Regarding the plaza by the marsh land, how are you going to keep cars from going over? It seems very exposed to be called a plaza. (Calkins: In terms of actual barriers beyond a curb, that is something we could consider and talk to traffic engineers. One of the benefits of the site relative to existing conditions is, because of the new protected bike land and the grade of the plaza, the overall area will feel more populated and more urban, so motorists will be driving slower. It will feel less of a highway condition, whereas today you don't feel the presence of the bay. Based on experience, one will be driving like it's a highway coming around that corner. It will be mitigated by just the character of the place.)

> Based on the site plan, there are very narrow spaces between the buildings, about 50'-60' in between the parking buildings, about 300' of a corridor or a void with a street and some kind of sidewalk. It is a long valley. There was a wind and shadow study done which states "the spacing between the buildings is such that sunlight hits the ground for substantial area between buildings for much of the year." That is not actually accurate. In fact, for a large part of the year it is rather dark and very windy to the point where it is very uncomfortable and possibly hazardous. I'd love this to be beautiful and more scaled to the site. How do you propose to mitigate that concern? Those are several hundred feet in darkness which appears to go over the bay trail significantly, about 600' at certain times during the year towards the bay. (Calkins: On wind specifically, we are near the bay, it is a windy site there today. We are proposing to have 50% of the site become what is called a "comfortable condition". As it exists today, only 10% of the site is comfortable. Furthermore, we are concentrating on areas of recreational opportunities where we know they are largely wind protected. With the height issue, we are responding to the General Plan which is increasing the density of this area for economic development to 3.0 FAR. We began the project thinking about a 3.0 FAR massing but ended up having the same reactions you have that the site may feel too full at 3.0 FAR. So, we studied where we can pull back and how we could scale back strategically. It's prioritizing between the service drive where trucks will be coming in to deliver things to the building and the Easton Creek corridor. We concluded that we want to prioritize areas of nature that people will be coming to enjoy. So, we pulled the buildings back from the Easton Creek corridor, the southern tidal marsh and pulled the foot of the parking garages from the bay trail. The shrinking of the project has been very intentional and strategic to make this a welcoming place to the public. Overall, it is a 12-acre site with 5.5 acres of publicly available open space where today none of it exists. It is the height and the strategic placements of the buildings that enable that. This may not be a great place for a delivery truck driver, but that is a tradeoff that reflects the priorities of the community.)

> Where is the significant reduction in the footprint of the site, what changed? (Calkins: Since the project inception, we tried to fit 3.0 FAR in the site. We reduced it down to 2.7 FAR in a strategic way where we had the most impact on the public, the community, and the environment but making sure that the project is at a level that it remains feasible. We are investing significantly in sea level rise protection and in other community benefits and the project is at a scale to support that.)

> I want to revisit the 40 public spaces. Please help us understand where these parking spaces are located within the parking structures. (Calkins: The public parking stalls are in the southern garage. Very intentionally located where the restrooms, the bike mechanic station, the airplane viewing platform, the water bottle filling station are and is centrally located between the two public cafes designed for convenience. As someone also mentioned earlier, the importance of signage, making sure the public knows they are welcome here. It will be clearly indicated where the garage with numerous public facilities

is.)

> If you feel there is an increase in demand for off-hour times by the public, is the parking layout cohesive enough to extend that parking access to the next floor and add another 50 stalls for the public to use where there won't be any roadblocks? Is there flexibility in the available public parking spaces if about a hundred people show up during the weekend? (Calkins: Yes, I think it is a good idea. Certainly, there is flexibility. There are details that need to be worked out in terms of the security protocols, the gate arms, operations, and maintenance. But the idea that you are out there having an event on a weekend, and we are going to have people biking coming to the site for a cool bay trail event, and we need a hundred parking stalls, yes, they will be available.) My point is to not put concrete barriers past the 40 parking spaces, that there is no way to use available parking spaces beyond the designated 40 public parking. I understand the security part because we have that at the town hall parking facility where it is shared with office employees and the public during the week, but in off hours it is hardly being used. (Calkins: Yes, totally agree.)

> One of the public comments was about having some indoor public space. It is a good point to have something available when it is windy and there are a lot of shadows cast. Is there a possibility of having some space, even if it is indoor/outdoor, something that is going to be available to the public? (Calkins: Yes, we have two public cafes that we think will be popular and will have both indoor/outdoor spaces that will be publicly accessible and open.) That is a commercial amenity with a tenant in it. I was talking about a public benefit. (Calkins: It is an interesting idea. As we polled the public at the beginning of this project, their priority and interest in the community was recreational outdoor spaces, using the adjacent bay. What makes this site really unique is the habitat and the natural environment. So, we responded to those priorities and have invested in those in terms of where we think the public will feel most welcome and enjoy the site in addition to the two different cafes. The project began with a single café and people said we think this will be a popular place for the public to come and spend time, that is why we have provided two cafes. We've also added shelter trellis areas in the outdoor for people to have a shaded area.)

> To clarify, do you have a tenant for the two cafes? (Calkins: We have not identified an operator yet.) Is this a space that could only become a café/restaurant if you have a tenant? (Calkins: We fully intend for these spaces to be cafes; we just have not committed to a certain operator because the project is not entitled yet.)

> There is another project down by the Marriot hotel, which is under construction now, where part of its program has some public meeting space. It's not that we don't have the indoor public space coming up, it's just in other parts of our ongoing projects in the area.

> This project came really baked for the size of it. You have a plan that was pretty defined, and you did some tweaks. I really appreciate you working with the city on all the phasing and other development issues. We know that meetings are going on even if we are not privy to them. I brought an espresso cup and saucer for visuals because I don't know how to express my concerns properly. We see that they are proportioned to each other, that's how design is, that's how any designer thinks normally. I realize there are some constraints, and everybody has a piece of this pie in your big development. What I see happening is there is too much mass in that site. I appreciate the gentleman who said he understands the big buildings in the area. Yes, there are a lot of big buildings, but they are not as close together. These are extremely tall. I personally have no problem with height. I love tall buildings. Iconic, great. This could be taller but have enough greenery and space around it. I just don't know how plants are going to grow in between buildings and the space that you have in the shadow. All these native plants need a lot of sun. The drawings are great. I see a potentially very beautiful project, but it's got too much mass. I went back to the design guidelines that were put together by two previous Planning Commissioners, Richard Terrones and Stan Vistica who is no longer with us. They came after the residential design review guidelines and they were needed very badly, they talk about human scale. I am having trouble finding a human scale on this one. It has a lot of mass, not so much about the height but the void in between the buildings.

> I think the project is really exciting from the get-go. This corridor of Burlingame is in a much-needed state of disrepair. This project checks a lot of the boxes. The size is probably one of the big gulps that we must make because it must be profitable for the developers. Although we want perfect viewable spaces, less square footage, and parking, unfortunately it's hard to pencil these things out. So, you have that on one side of the scale, and you have the public benefits on the other. From everything that I have heard from the cities of Belmont all the way to South San Francisco, it is how important the bay trail is.

*This connection of the bay trail is different from any other bay trail project that has been proposed since I've been on the Planning Commission. This is a game changer. As far as the EIR goes, I've been in support of that since it came out. There is minimal impact as they found through many reports, especially on a project of this scale. It is quite remarkable some of the minimal impacts that were shown in that report. I am happy to pass this on to the City Council. Second, the entitlements, again on one side we must take some of the negatives of a big project, but where else in Burlingame do you put a big project? Do we just not do big projects in Burlingame, or do we look at it as, yes, it is a big project, the biggest improvement in Burlingame but also one of the most impactful? The impacts put together far outweighs the negatives. I am in support of the entitlements and the commercial design review. The last one and the least exciting for me is the recommendation of the Development Agreement. I wish this could all be built at once, but I am a contractor and I understand how things need to be phased out not only to make sure it is built, but to make sure that it is built well. It is not great that we will be looking at some dirt mounds for 10 years with a finished space in the middle, but we do get our bay trail. We do get a lot of a much-needed change to the landscape. I spend a lot of my time across the street at Bayside Park with my son in the little league. This will change a lot of what we do down there. That really is exciting. All in all, I am very excited about the project. It brings a lot of natural and environmental impact with the resurrection of Easton Creek, the bay trail, the marsh lands and obviously the impact of the sea level change, you don't get that without a project like this. The grade change is extremely expensive to do. We all know that Burlingame is having a hard time funding the grade separation at Broadway, one of the worst intersections in California. This project allows us to check another box of highly needed environmental impact. I totally understand some of the drawbacks, no argument there. I just feel that there is a largely holistic weighted community benefit from this project.*

*> This project brings a lot of benefits to the community. The building heights are not outrageously higher than the other projects that are being proposed right now. We changed the FAR in this area so we would gain more density and make projects feasible. At 1.0 FAR, nothing pencils out. All we have is a warehouse space that was dilapidated. We are seeing movement now in an area that the City Council wanted to see changed. The lower FAR that is being proposed at under 3.0 is commendable, also that they are at 45% lot coverage. To make this pencil out and do 45% lot coverage, you must go up. What that lower lot coverage is getting us are these amenities up against the bay, the bay trail, and the Easton Creek. Once you draw those lines, there are not many places to build on the site without getting density. Overall, there has been a lot of listening, a lot of changes made and evolving of these buildings so that we can get better space and try to minimize light impacts. The project has gotten better over the time that I have been watching it and the discussions that I have been a part of. I like the project; I am in support of it. I did not see anything in the EIR that concerned me. The design has come a long way. There is always an opportunity to tweak, there is still time and effort to be made for it. I hope it continues to get better. The Development Agreement is a part of life, I hope we can do it faster and not longer.*

*> I am really happy to see that the completed bay shore is now part of Phase 1, that wasn't what I recalled when it first came to the commission. It is a really big deal. I wanted to say thank you. If that was easy, it would have been in there in the beginning. I appreciate that and it will make a huge difference to a lot of people. I generally agree with all my fellow commissioners' comments. I appreciate the analogy of the cups, that was illustrative, thank you. I will be hesitant to say that this project would fit in with Burlingame in almost any other site in the city. If this is along Rollins Road or closer to downtown Burlingame this would be crazy. In this specific site, where it is right across a highway entrance, it is doing the best that it can while still being economical. I certainly hope that the landscape planners have considered shading when it comes to their plants because it is a shame if it does not work a couple years down the line. Generally, it could be better but there are significant benefits that come with the overall project that I am happy about.*

*> I really appreciate the applicant for listening and being collaborative with accepting feedback. I agree that the community benefits are clear. Some of the proposals are not so clear, like the size of the open space, the bay trail connection is great. The phasing has been a big improvement from what was presented the last time. I do like the architecture; you've put a lot of effort into the details. It is a beautiful project. I am really struggling with the size of the parking garages, not struggling with the square footage of the office and laboratories. Those parking garages are big. In my view, there will be a thousand empty spaces to the extent that we are successful with public transportation with the new Burlingame train*



station after the grade crossing. With 600 bicycles, that's a lot of parking. I would love to see these become a smaller garage to make room for more open space. First, I can support the project and recommend it to the City Council but with these strong comments that 3,400 parking spaces encourages more vehicular traffic. Traffic is my number one concern. I spent five hours combing through these documents. The Level of Service assessment is scary. The traffic light on Broadway on the overpass getting to highway 101 south bound will be an 8-minute delay to make that left turn. I will lose it if I am sitting in traffic for 8 minutes just to make a left-hand turn. That is partly the developer's problem but also the city's problem. Traffic as a cumulative effect of the development on those traffic lights will be a disaster. The consultant said both ramps will be backed up beyond the onramps at rush hour which will cause highway 101 traffic. It is a real issue beyond what we are talking about. I am not thrilled with the height, but there will not be much of a difference between 150 to 200 feet overall.

> I agree with the comment about the parking garages. I was driving to the bay side today and drove by the Facebook campus. For me, it would be interesting to understand if we could get some numbers from them to see how much of their parking garage is being utilized. It is a pretty big parking garage as well. What I did notice is that the coffee shop is really busy. I saw a lot of people walking around and I see more parking at the street level that I have not noticed before. Suggests getting more information from them regarding parking garage usage. I don't know if we need this many parking spaces over by the bayside. Some of the biomed companies have these big buses that transport their employees, would that space be better used if you had a space for these buses where they can park and where they can bring their employees to Marin or the East Bay? I would like you to investigate that a little further. I like the project. I feel that the design can go a little bit further, there is something missing. The alcoves where people can come in and look at the bay should feel like a hotel room, instead, it is an office. Overall, I like it. It just needs to be tweaked a little bit. I agree about the traffic. I'm pretty worried about the stop lights and the amount of time that people will be waiting. Other than that, I appreciate the hard work that you have gone through to come up with this design; be creative, how you have subdivided lots, and how you've created the different entities. I would also ask for more public benefit and more open space to be built early in the construction phase so that we as a community can enjoy it. I can see approving this project.

> My fellow commissioner has a great idea about providing more public parking spaces. The 40 spaces allotted seems anemic to me. If you keep the 3,400 parking spaces and be flexible with the public use of them. It will be a shame if the public is limited to 40 spaces and there will be 3,000 empty spaces next door.

> For the Development Agreement, if the extension happens, then it allows for the public plaza not to be finished until 2039. I think it's a little bit too many loopholes. It will be great if the Development Agreement will be tightened up. Again, I can recommend the whole thing to the City Council with those comments for them to consider.