

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

May 31, 2019

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)
Rebecca Coates-Maloon, Principal Permit Analyst (415/352-3634; rebecca.coates-maloon@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Burlingame Hotel at 1499 Old Bayshore Highway; Second Pre-Application Review
(For Design Review Board consideration on June 10, 2019)

Project Summary

Project Proponents & Property Owner. EKN Development Group LLC (“EKN,” Developer) and 1499 Bayshore LLC (Property Owner)

Project Representatives. Andrew Davies (EKN, Developer); HKS Architects, Inc.; N Consulting Engineers, Inc.; SWA Group

Project Site. The project site is located at 1499 Old Bayshore Highway, in the City of Burlingame, San Mateo County. The site is bounded by Old Bayshore Highway to the east, Mahler Road to the north, industrial buildings to the west, and the tidally-influenced Mills Creek to the south. The City of Burlingame Shorebird Sanctuary and San Francisco Bay Trail (Bay Trail) are located opposite Old Bayshore Highway from the project site (Exhibits 1-2).

Existing Conditions. The 2.19-acre project site is currently developed with two 2-story office buildings, totaling approximately 44,000 square feet, with accompanying utilities, paving, parking spaces, and planting areas. There are no BCDC permits or existing public access requirements associated with the site. The Bay Trail, located opposite Old Bayshore Highway from the project site, provides nearby public access to the shoreline. There is currently no public trail or other public access improvements along Mills Creek at the project site or at any other property west of Old Bayshore Highway.

Proposed Project. Since the project’s first review by the DRB on May 7, 2018, the project proponents have worked to address the DRB’s comments in the project design. Responses to the DRB’s comments by the project proponents about the project design are provided in Appendix A.

The proposed project would demolish the two office buildings, a parking lot, 10 trees, and all other features at the project site. A 279,000-square-foot, 11-story hotel would be constructed, containing 404 guestrooms, along with a 2,929-square-foot free-standing restaurant, and a 117,000-square-foot above-grade, 4-level parking structure for 289 vehicles.

Within and beyond the Commission's 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction, the proposed project includes the following:

1. **Hotel (Exhibits 3-10, 18-19).** A 279,000-square-foot, 11-story (approximately 136-foot-tall), L-shaped hotel would be constructed on the eastern and northern portions of the site. An approximately 50,610-square-foot portion of the structure would be located within the 100-foot shoreline band. The hotel would be dual-branded, and would contain 404 guestrooms, in a combination of both standard room and extended-stay suite formats. The hotel would also include kitchen, laundry, storage, security, maintenance, and office facilities. Approximately 550 guests and 15 to 35 employees are expected to use the site at any given time. Within the 100-foot shoreline band, the hotel also includes planting and hardscape areas and a 790-square-foot open outdoor patio (not intended for public use). *Since the first DRB review, the height of the proposed hotel has been reduced from 12 to 11 stories (154-foot-tall to 136-foot-tall), and has slightly increased in square footage from 268,515 square feet to 279,000 square feet.*
2. **Parking Structure (Exhibits 3-6, 8-10, 19).** A 117,000-square-foot (200-foot by 200-foot at longest point), 4-story parking structure would be constructed immediately adjacent to the hotel. An approximately 28,268-square-foot portion of the garage (7,092 square feet per floor) would be located within the 100-foot shoreline band. The parking structure would contain spaces for 289 vehicles and would also include a fire water tank and pump room, elevators, stairs, a vehicle ramp, delivery dock, trash and recycling areas, and an emergency generator. Self-park vehicle access to the structure would be located on Mahler Road, outside of BCDC's jurisdiction. A hotel valet service would operate from a 13-foot-wide, 210-foot-long one-way drive aisle on the southern side of the hotel and parking structure within BCDC's jurisdiction, including 115 linear feet (1,500 square feet) along Mills Creek. Bicycle racks are proposed inside the parking structure. *The proposed parking structure has been reduced in size by approximately 28,000 square feet, from 145,000 square feet to 117,000 square feet, since the first DRB project review. The majority of the reduction in area of the proposed parking structure has occurred within the 100-foot shoreline band, a reduction of approximately 24,532 square feet within the 100-foot shoreline band (from 52,800 square feet to 28,268 square feet). The number of proposed parking spaces has been accordingly reduced, from 360 to 289.*
3. **Restaurant (Exhibits 3, 6-10, 13, 18).** A one-story, 2,929-square-foot restaurant would be constructed at the northeast corner of the site, near the intersection of Mahler Road and Old Bayshore Highway. Approximately 940 square feet of the structure would be located within the 100-foot shoreline band. A 650-square-foot outdoor dining area with a wood deck and café seating would be constructed in association with the restaurant, including 475 square feet within the 100-foot shoreline band.
4. **Mills Creek Open Space (Exhibits 2-4, 10- 12, 16-17, 19).** The proposed project would preserve an approximately 54-foot-wide, 14,750-square-foot open space corridor (for future public access) between Mills Creek and the hotel and parking structure. The corridor would contain the valet drive aisle, as noted above. A grasscrete emergency vehicle access road would be located along a portion of the Mills Creek open space area and would continue around the west side of the parking structure to connect with Mahler Road to the north, allowing for pedestrian access to Mahler Road. Bollards would prohibit

vehicle access to the grasscrete at Mahler Road. Several trees would be removed from the open space area with the intent to preserve future connections along Mills Creek in the event of future development. Per City requirements, a view corridor would also be established adjacent to, and along Mills Creek. *Since the first DRB review, the proposed Mills Creek open space corridor has been expanded from a minimum 24-foot-wide, 6,700-square-foot area to a minimum 54-foot-wide, 14,750-square-foot area. The revised design for this area has removed a portion of the proposed grasscrete emergency vehicle access road from along Mills Creek, and incorporated a pedestrian walkway, seating, an overlook point, and additional plantings and trees. The pedestrian walkway provides separated access for pedestrians from the valet drive aisle.*

5. **Mills Creek Public Seating Area (Exhibits 4, 7, 10-11, 17).** The first-floor corner of the hotel adjacent to Mills Creek would be set back by approximately 15 feet to create an 825-square-foot (15-foot by 55-foot) covered public seating area, with café tables, chairs, and trash receptacles. A food and beverage area is proposed for the ground floor use adjacent to the seating area.
6. **Offsite Public Access Improvements (Exhibit 4).** Immediately adjacent to the property, per City requirements, the sidewalk would be widened from 4-feet to 8-feet along Mahler Road and Old Bayshore Highway. Improvements would also be made to the crosswalk on Old Bayshore Highway at Mahler Road, which connects the project site with the Bay Trail. Signage would be installed to highlight access to the Bay Trail. Trash receptacles would be located near the crosswalk.

Project Approvals and Proposed Construction Timeline. Based on city zoning, the project proponents have requested a Conditional Use Permit to exceed the density of 65 hotel rooms per acre (the proposed hotel would have 184 rooms per acre), additional height exceeding 35 feet (the proposed hotel would have a height of 136 feet), an incidental food service building exceeding 1,500 square feet, and the operation of a restaurant that sells alcoholic beverages. The project has received approval from the Federal Aviation Administration to construct the proposed building heights but has not yet received other regulatory approvals. The City of Burlingame is in the process of preparing an Initial Study under the California Environmental Quality Act, and local approval processes will likely take place in July 2019. The proposed construction timeline would begin in late 2019 and be completed in approximately 18 months, pending regulatory approvals.

Operations and Maintenance. EKN will develop the hotel, parking garage and other hotel features, and public access improvements, and has entered into a 99-year lease with the property owner, 1499 Bayshore LLC.

Resilience and Adaptation to Rising Sea Level. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (“FEMA”), current 100-year base flood elevation (BFE) for the project site is +10.0’ NAVD88. As proposed, the project site, including buildings and parking garage, will be raised by approximately 1 foot to an elevation of +11.1’ NAVD88. The proposed public access open space and seating area along Mills Creek would be graded between +7.83’ NAVD88 where it meets existing grades at the property line, and +13.0’ NAVD88 at the top of the decorative mounds. The edge of the proposed public access open space along Mills Creek would be at +11.0’ NAVD88 (Exhibit 10).

Under current conditions, the lowest portions of the public access open space (+7.83' NAVD88) are expected to flood approximately 3.4 inches with the King Tide (1-year storm) events, while the edge of the public access open space along Mills Creek (+11.0' NAVD88) is sufficiently elevated to avoid flooding. At 2050, under the projections in the 2018 State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance ('Guidance') document for medium-high risk aversion projects in a high-emissions scenario, the lowest portions of the public access open space are expected to flood with approximately 3.4 inches at mean high water (+8.11' NAVD88) and 4.4 feet in a 100-year storm event. At 2050, the edge of the public access open space along Mills Creek is anticipated to flood with approximately 4.8 inches in a 25-year storm event and 1.2 feet in a 100-year flood event. The upland portions of the project site, including the buildings and parking garage, are anticipated to flood beginning with the 25-year storm event at 2050. These calculations do not take fluvial flooding into account and therefore may be low estimates of when and how much flooding may occur.

The hotel, parking structure, and open space and public access features along Mills Creek have a design life of 50 years, until year 2070. Under the Guidance document, at 2070 under a low-emissions scenario, the lowest portions of the public access open space are anticipated to flood with approximately 1.5 feet of flooding at mean high water and 5.6 feet of flooding in a 100-year storm event, and the edge of the public access open space along Mills Creek is anticipated to flood with approximately 2.5 inches of flooding in a King Tide (1-year storm event) and 2.4 feet of flooding in a 100-year storm event. At 2070 in a high-emissions scenario, the lowest portions of the public access open space are anticipated to flood with approximately 1.9 feet of flooding at mean high water and 6.0 feet of flooding in a 100-year storm event, and the edge of the public access open space along Mills Creek is anticipated to flood with approximately 7.3 inches of flooding in a King Tide (1-year storm event) and 2.8 feet of flooding in a 100-year storm event. The upland portions of the project site, including the buildings and parking garage, are anticipated to flood beginning with King Tide events under both low- and high-emissions scenarios at 2100.

If the project remains in place past 2070, all of the public access is anticipated to flood at mean high water at the end of the century. The upland areas of the project site, including the buildings and parking garage, are also anticipated to flood at mean high water in year 2100 water levels.

As the project is located adjacent to Mills Creek, interactions of tidal flooding with fluvial flooding may need to be considered when planning for sea level rise. To date, a sea level rise adaptation plan has not been proposed for the public areas. According to the Bay Area Flood Explorer, the entirety of the Burlingame shoreline and inner shoreline planning areas could be subject to flooding from a 50-year storm at current water levels, which represents a total water level of 24 inches above mean higher high water.

Commission Findings, Policies & Guidelines

San Francisco Bay Plan Policies. The Bay Plan **Public Access** policies state, in part, that "...maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline..." Further, these policies state, in part: "[a]ccess to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare..." Additionally, "... improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should permit barrier free access for persons with

disabilities to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs.” The Public Access policies further state that roads near the edge of the water “...should maintain and enhance visual access for the traveler, discourage through traffic, and provide for safe, separated, and improved physical access to and along the shore.” The Public Access policy findings also state that San Francisco Bay “...provides an environment for numerous forms of public enjoyment including viewing, photography, wildlife observation, nature study, fishing, wading, walking, bicycling, jogging, or just sitting beside the water,” and that public access is an integral component of development.

The proposed project would provide open space and a public seating area along Mills Creek, and improvements at the crosswalk that connects the project site to the Bay Trail. The proposed public access open space has been expanded since the first DRB review of the project.

Bay Plan Public Access policies, as they relate to wildlife, state that “[p]ublic access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife,” and that “[p]ublic access improvements provided as a condition of any approval should be consistent with the project and the physical environment, including protection of Bay natural resources, such as aquatic life, wildlife and plant communities...”

Bay Plan Public Access policies, as they relate to sea level rise, state that “[p]ublic access should be sited, designed, managed, and maintained to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding,” and that “[a]ny public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby.”

The Bay Plan **Appearance, Design, and Scenic Views** policies state, in part, that “all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay” and that “[m]aximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas...” Furthermore, “[s]tructures and facilities that do not take advantage or complement the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the and shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline.” In addition, these policies state, in part: “Developments along the shores of tributary waterways should be Bay-related and should be designed to preserve and enhance views along the waterway, so as to provide maximum visual contact with the Bay.”

The project would include a view corridor along Mills Creek, a tributary waterway to the Bay.

The Commission’s **Public Access Design Guidelines** state partly that public access should be designed “so that the user is not intimidated nor is the user’s appreciation diminished by large nearby building masses....” Furthermore, “public access improvements should be designed for a wide range of users,” should “provide basic public amenities, such as trails, benches, play opportunities, trash containers, drinking fountains, lighting and restrooms that are designed for different ages, interests and physical abilities,” and should be designed for the weather of the site. The guidelines also state that viewing the Bay is the “most widely enjoyed ‘use’ and projects should be designed to “enhance and dramatize views of the Bay.”

Board Questions

The Board's advice and recommendations are sought on the following issues regarding the design of the proposed public access:

1. Given the proposed intensity of use of the site and anticipated increase in demand for public access, does the revised project design provide sufficient opportunities for public access on the site?
2. Would the revised design for the Mills Creek open space and public seating area provide waterfront activities for a wide variety of users, and create a "sense of place," that "feels public" which would be unique and enjoyable to the greatest number of people?
3. Is the revised design of the Mills Creek open space and public seating area compatible with a creekside public access corridor should one be developed in the future?
4. Are the revised connections between the various public areas (Mills Creek open space, public seating area, sidewalks and crosswalk to Bay Trail, etc.) designed appropriately to connect people to and along the shoreline?
5. Have the hotel and parking structure been sited and designed to minimize potential view impacts from the shoreline? Are the revised drive aisles, public seating area, and landscape features designed to maximize views to and along the Bay and Mills Creek?

The Board's advice and recommendations are sought on the following issues regarding sea level rise:

6. How can the public areas be appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

REVIEW COMMENT | RESPONSES

May 31, 2019

EKN Job #: EKN-113

Project Name: Burlingame Hotel

Respondent: Andrew Davies

Requested By: Rebecca Coates-Maldoon

Comment Responses:

The information below is taken from the May 7, 2018 Design Review Board Meeting Minutes and forms the basis for the redesign of the public spaces of the project:

Design of the Proposed Public Access

(a) Given the proposed intensity of use of the site and anticipated increase in demand for public access, does the proposed project design provide sufficient opportunities for public access on the site?

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board does not feel there is sufficient public access on the site with the current design.

Response: *The revised design includes a much larger area for public access with a minimum width of 54 feet where the previous minimum width 24 feet. The revised design also includes a dedicated pedestrian access along Mills Creek. In an expression of area, the prior proposal included 6,700 square feet and the proposed area is 14,750.*

Mr. Strang suggested focusing on the Mills Creek side. It has the potential for future connection. There are many issues on the creek that could be addressed. The way that the design maxes out the site is aggressive. Although it is clever, putting the ADA in the setback area and then sharing with pedestrians makes sense. He stated the need to think about the geogrid and fire lane on the top of a steep, mushy slope, and how that relates to valet parking interrupting the experience for visitors - the public open space faces onto the creek but at the same time is cut off by the valet parking.

Response: *The revised design has eliminated much of the EVA in the setback area by utilizing a hammerhead turn for EVA access at the southwest corner of the site. This change allowed the revised design to incorporate a dedicated pedestrian walkway along Mills Creek.*



Mr. Strang stated in terms of the geogrid, it is hard to get lawn to grow on a fire lane. Some pave path would be necessary to go through the fire lane to get the pedestrian connection to work. The geogrid and the lawn sit on top of an engineered base for a fire lane so there are three to four inches of soil to grow the grass in. In this Mediterranean climate with nine months dry, it is hard to keep it irrigated. He stated he has never seen a successful installation of that.

Response: *While the geogrid has largely been eliminated from the public access area, the project Landscape Architect has included sample projects where the geogrid has been successfully used.*

Mr. Strang questioned how inviting the public outdoor space is, given that the main public outdoor space faces onto the valet drive aisle, which might be heavily used at times, and then backs up to the windows, where potentially high-end food service is going on but does not offer food service to the seating area.

Response: *The revised proposal includes a dedicated path that leads along the Mills Creek amenity beginning at the sidewalk making the area much more inviting for the public.*

Ms. McCann stated there is a distinction in the questions between the section of appealing access and the provision of functional access. This is definitely functional access, although it is unclear whether individuals would see this as an inviting place to walk into. Project proponents tried to incorporate measures to make it greener. Whether they function or not is another question.

Response: *We believe the addition of the dedicated pedestrian path leading from the Old Bayshore sidewalk along Mills Creek adds to the function of the open area.*

Ms. McCann questioned the size of the garage and asked if it is being shortsighted to build it out so close to the property line if, in five years' time, automated and connected vehicles might be more in play, when individuals' behaviors may have changed in terms of vehicle usage, and when the clientele for this hotel may be coming from the airport.

Who knows how much real use of the parking garage will occur? What if 20 percent of the stores were not being used? She suggested stepping the garage back to capture something great and create something that would be a terrific experience from both perceptual and functional standpoints.

Response: *We have stepped back the parking garage as discussed with the Design Review Board at the earlier hearing. This has resulted in a substantial increase in the amount of open space.*



Ms. Alschuler stated, historically, developers have stayed away from the 100-foot shoreline band. The BCDC supports building public amenities into the 100-foot band to encourage the public to visit, feel comfortable and safe, and enjoy the natural areas of the Bay.

The open view to the parking garage in the tributary band along Mills Creek will never satisfy that requirement. She stated the need to be more respectful of creeks around the Bay. She suggested reorienting the building, moving it back, and including a pathway and a driveway.

Response: *We have stepped back the parking garage as stated in the prior response and included a dedicated pathway.*

Ms. McCann stated this is a time of great change in terms of what should be built for parking. She suggested building 20 percent less parking in Phase 1 and, if it is determined that more parking is required, adding it in a future phase. Improving the public space along the creek will add value for hotel guests and the general public.

Response: *The parking garage has been substantially reduced in the revised proposal resulting in a reduction of over 60 stalls and a total over 159 stalls below City of Burlingame Zoning Code requirements. We believe the revised proposal balances the projected reduction in parking and the existing parking requirements.*

Ms. Alschuler stated there is also a wildlife value in pulling the structures back because Mills Creek runs from the Shorebird Sanctuary, past the proposed project, and up into the hills.

Response: *The revised proposal pulls back the structure and becomes the guideline for future development.*

Ms. McCann stated the project proponents have done a good job trying to make a more public edge by adding tables and chairs. She suggested enhancing it with more casual seating. She stated she liked having the public zone there but the space is tight.

Response: *The revised proposal has added less formal seating, added a green planted edge with randomly scattered seating and an overlook point at the southwest corner of the site.*

Mr. Leader stated the design has gone too far in maximizing the benefit of the hotel while the creek receives nothing. He suggested finding ways to add space next to the creek that is usable for the public and to add something that will benefit the creek environment next to the creek. It would make a difference to provide a space where the hotel staff and guests could go next to the creek, and to improve the creek environment where the public can connect to the creek instead of falling off the edge. The creek side does not provide a stable edge for a fire lane as it is, especially when flooded. It is not fair, if it is a public space, to force visitors and guests to walk across the valet entrance to the parking garage with cars going in and out.



Response: The revised proposal has provided additional space for the creek and removed much of the fire lane from the shoreline band from Mills Creek.

Mr. Leader stated the seating along the creek is not public seating; it seems more intended to be café seating for the restaurant, although it is nice to have it there.

Response: The revised proposal has added public seating throughout the open space.

Mr. Strang stated under the fire lane at the blue-dotted line in the presentation slide is the stormwater catchment area. That is a load on the soil there, too. He suggested putting a retaining wall there and possibly putting the tank inside the garage.

Response: The stormwater tank has been moved away from the slope to reduce possible slope stabilization issues.

Ms. Alschuler stated this project provides an opportunity to do something as a great example for the rest of the life of the creek.

Response: The revised proposal is a substantial improvement to provide an example for future development along the creek and provides the potential for connectivity to future developments.

Mr. Leader referred to Ms. Alschuler's earlier question about what the public is getting out of this project. He stated it is an open question at this point.

Response: Addressed in previous responses.

Ms. Alschuler stated she asked but only heard about maximizing the value to the hotel of being on the Shorebird Sanctuary but not what the project will contribute to the public realm, which is why the 100-foot band is there.

Response: Addressed in previous responses.

(b) Would the proposed design for the Mills Creek open space and public seating area provide waterfront activities for a wide variety of users, and create a “sense of place,” which would be unique and enjoyable?

Ms. Alschuler stated there is barely a connection there with the current design. There is a public gesture at the corner but there needs to be more - something that hotel guests and the public would use.

Response: The revised proposal includes a dedicated pathway to the open space, increasing the likeliness of use by the general public.



(c) Are the public access areas designed in a manner that “feels public” and makes the shoreline enjoyable to the greatest number of people?

Ms. Alschuler stated the current design does not feel public.

Response: The revised proposal includes a dedicated pathway to the open space, increasing the likeliness of use by the general public.

(d) Does the proposed Mills Creek open space and public seating area provide the best opportunity to enhance shoreline public access and enhance views of the Bay and Mills Creek in the vicinity of the project site? Are there additions and/or alternative improvements and locations that should be considered?

Ms. Alschuler stated the idea of a public corner in the current design is not executed in a way to enhance shoreline public access or to enhance the views. She suggested asking for a crossing to the Shorebird Sanctuary across Old Bayshore Highway, perhaps by fitting two lights together. There should be an ability to circulate there.

Response: The revised proposal includes a dedicated pathway to the open space, increasing the likeliness of use by the general public. The City of Burlingame Public Works is not supportive of an additional crossing of Old Bayshore Highway because of its proximity to the existing crossing at Mahler Road and the speed limit on Old Bayshore Highway.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, if thinking about offsite improvements or improvements to the Old Bayshore Highway that would come in with this project, then an additional southern crosswalk would be valuable. There is a huge portion of the site that is within the shoreline jurisdiction, but the entire roadway, as well, is fronting the park. If the Old Bayshore Highway was thought of as a system and there is an opportunity for many individuals to be encouraged to come off of city streets and come into the Bay, this becomes an important location.

Response: The revised proposal includes a dedicated pathway to the open space, increasing the likeliness of use by the general public. The City of Burlingame Public Works is not supportive of an additional crossing of Old Bayshore Highway because of its proximity to the existing crossing at Mahler Road and the speed limit on Old Bayshore Highway.

Mr. Pellegrini stated, if a hotel is going to happen here, he suggested the funding of initial improvements to start to put that in the proper direction, and then maybe something that the city can pick up on. If the parking demand will reduce, then the traffic demand will also reduce on this portion of the highway. He suggested including prioritized bus stops in this location, considering if four travel lanes are necessary, and maybe putting in a bicycle track along Old Bayshore Highway.



Response: The revised proposal does not include additional bus stop but does include bicycle parking within the parking garage. However, additional mitigation measures may be conditioned by the City through its approval process.

Ms. Alschuler stated it is a great location for a test project.

Response: Noted.

Mr. Pellegrini stated some of that may be out of the purveyance of this project, but it is important.

Response: Noted.

(e) Is the design of the Mills Creek open space and public seating area compatible with a creek side public access corridor should one be developed in the future?

(f) Have the project and its public access improvements been designed to

(g) minimize adverse impacts to wildlife, including along Mills Creek and at the bird sanctuary opposite Old Bayshore Highway?

Ms. Alschuler stated nothing has been done in the current design that would be attractive to wildlife. It would benefit the wildlife to pull the buildings back.

Response: The revised proposal has added more open space and increased the number of trees and provided more natural habitat with mounds/topography, etc.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if BCDC staff uses the Audubon Society's guidelines for bird-safe buildings when looking at projects. Ms. Gaffney stated staff generally asks the Audubon Society to comment on projects. Mr. McCrea stated the Site Assessment and Environmental Impact Report contain information on impacts to wildlife.

Response: The Audubon Society was given the opportunity to comment on the initial study for the project. The developer is unaware of any comments as those would be submitted directly to the City of Burlingame.

Ms. Alschuler suggested giving the area 40 feet instead of 20 feet and including both a walking path and a road.

Response: The revised proposal has provided a dedicated walking path and increased the open space.

Mr. Strang agreed. He stated the slope could be laid back with shallow areas where the landscape can retreat.



Response: The revised proposal has provided a dedicated walking path and increased the open space.

Mr. Strang stated the Old Bayshore Highway is important and should be given breathing room. He suggested detailing a section through there at the next presentation to help the Board better understand how the street section works. He referred to Slide 11, the arrival court and outdoor dining area. He stated the trees need some space, and it would be nice to have some room between the back of the sidewalk and the restaurant. It is difficult to see how wide the sidewalk is on the slide.

Response: The revised proposal has provided a dedicated walking path and increased the open space. An updated section has also been provided through the proposed open space area.

Mr. Pellegrini agreed that there is an opportunity to provide more breathing room at the garage and the southern elevation facing the creek and what can happen on the building side in terms of public rooms or amenities that might be facing that. There is an opportunity for public art or a green wall, if there will be a garage program, to make the side of the building an interesting backdrop and amenity. There is an opportunity for this project to set an example for further redevelopments.

Response: The revised proposal has provided a dedicated walking path and increased the open space. An updated section has also been provided through the proposed open space area.

Mr. Pellegrini stated all that is parking lot today drains into the creek. There is an enormous amount of runoff that will be eliminated through this project. There is an opportunity to improve the water quality in this location that should be showcased with landscape to tell that part of the story.

Response: The existing runoff into Mills Creek will be eliminate in the proposed condition as stated by Mr. Pellegrini.

(2) Physical and Visual Connections

(a) Does the project provide safe and convenient pedestrian access across Old Bayshore Highway between the project site and the Bay Trail? Would an additional pedestrian crosswalk on Old Bayshore Highway at Mills Creek improve access to and along the shoreline of the Bay and the Creek?

Ms. Alschuler suggested recommending a second crossing where it is safe. Board members agreed.



Response: Two cross sections have been provided, one through the mounded area and one through the seating and pedestrian path area.

- (b) Are the connections between the various public areas (Mills Creek open space, public seating area, sidewalks and crosswalk to Bay Trail, etc.) designed appropriately to connect people to and along the shoreline?**
- (c) Are the valet drive aisle and emergency vehicle lane compatible with the Mills Creek open space and public seating area, or could the experience be improved?**
- (d) Have the hotel and parking structure been sited and designed to minimize potential view impacts from the shoreline? Are the proposed drive aisles, public seating area, and landscape features designed to maximize views to and along the Bay and Mills Creek?**

Response: The Design Review Board did not comment on these areas as they were addressed in other areas. Similarly, we have responded to those concerns in the areas above.

(3) Sea Level Rise

(a) Are the public areas appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise?

Mr. Strang stated the elevation of the garage along the creek is worth thinking about and understanding what that experience is like in the creek corridor. He asked if the parking garage floors can be repurposed for some commercial use later if the demand for parking is not there.

Response: If parking was not required in the future, it may be possible to repurpose the parking garage; however, it is likely that the top floors would be repurposed, leaving minimal parking on the first floor.

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board suggestions come under an umbrella of opportunity and responsibility for being on this site. The Board would like to see the recognition of the importance of this site in greater public access and amenities with a better open space design. Thirty-six percent of the site is within the 100-foot band and too much of that is parking lot.

Response: We believe the revised proposal has taken the Board's comments to heart and we have returned with a development that the BCDC Board and staff can support.

Ms. McCann suggested including some type of layback on the slope, an Environmental Vulnerability Assessment, and opportunities for individuals to sit and enjoy the space. She suggested softening the façade with climbing plants or art.



Response: The revised proposal has increased the seating opportunities and moved the parking garage away from the slope.

Mr. Leader suggested thinking of some way that individuals do not have to walk across the valet garage entry to access this public space.

Response: The revised proposal has separated the valet garage entry from the pedestrian access.

Ms. Alschuler stated, if the design of the corner is turned and the shape of the hotel food service is changed, it would be a wonderful idea that this is an observed corner and that individuals coming across or starting down the creek will have the opportunity to enjoy a place to gather and look out onto an inviting public space. She suggested not closing off the corner.

Response: The revised proposal has increased the seating opportunities and moved the parking garage away from the slope.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he can imagine the Bay Trail in the lower right-hand corner of the presentation slide coming across a new high-quality pedestrian crossing and continuing with some similar width across the southern portion of the property that would all happen outside of the valet drive aisle and emergency vehicle access locations.

Response: The revised proposal has separated the valet garage entry from the pedestrian access.