

**Mills Park Center Development  
Community Meeting #4 Summary  
May 18, 2020**

---

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| PROJECT LOCATION:     | Mills Park Center Development   |
| MEETING LOCATION:     | Zoom  |
| MEETING DATE/TIME:    | May 18, 2020, 6:00 - 7:45pm   |
| PURPOSE OF MEETING:   | Update the community on the revised Mills Park Center Development and respond to questions and/or concerns.   |
| WELCOME/INTRODUCTION: | Jovan D. Grogan, San Bruno City Manager, welcomed the attendees and reviewed the agenda for the meeting and provided project background.  |
| PRESENTATION:         |   |
| Part 1: Presentation  | Darcy Smith, San Bruno Community and Economic Development Director, gave an overview of the project background, the resubmitted project, and the City approval process. The project proposes 427 dwelling units and a total of 7,950 square feet of ground floor commercial space in two mixed-use buildings that are one- to five-stories in height with 676 parking spaces. The key changes to the plans include the removal of the grocery store, the addition of two dwelling units, and a new community benefits plan. Several public meetings have been held to discuss the project which is located in the Transit Corridors Plan (TCP) area. Measure N allowed the height increase and was approved by almost 70% of voters. There haven't been many TCP projects approved and built. Project is consistent with the TCP vision. San Bruno has not produced enough housing to meet its Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). There are penalties for not meeting our RHNA. Development Agreement with an eight-year term requested. Discussed community benefits. |
| Part 2: Presentation  | Scott Williams, President and CEO of G.W. Williams Co., property owner and project applicant, gave a presentation on the background of G.W. Williams Co., the company's legacy in San Bruno, and the history of the Mills Park neighborhood.  |
| Part 3: Presentation  | Jessica Musick, Project Architect from KTGy, presented the resubmitted project in greater detail.   |
| Part 4: Presentation  | Scott Williams and Jessica Musick, presented an alternative scheme for the site.  |

COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND ANSWER SESSION:

| #  | Comments/Questions/Responses  |
|----|---|
| 1. | <p><b><u>Q: What is the timing for the approval process?</u></b><br/>           A: Staff – Staff anticipates bringing the project to Council for review in Summer 2020, but no dates have been set. Staff is currently updating the TDM Plan and environmental documents for the revised project.</p>   |
| 2. | <p><b><u>Q: A solid wall was proposed for Building A along White Way but I cannot look at these materials online to verify. Where else can this information be found?</u></b><br/>           A: Applicant - [Referring to the retaining wall on the opposite side of White Way] the wall on White Way is on the neighbors' properties and will remain the same as it was in the previous design.</p>  |
| 3. | <p><b><u>Q: Can I come to City Hall to view the project materials?</u></b><br/>           A: Staff – Yes, you can contact staff at the Community and Economic Development Department and schedule a time to view the project materials at City Hall. Though first we encourage you to visit the project website on the City's webpage and the coUrbanize webpage which have a wealth of project information.</p>  |
| 4. | <p><b><u>Q: Are the project's impacts being evaluated in conjunction with the Allen School project?</u></b><br/>           A: Staff – The Allen School project is a separate project with a separate review process. The Allen School project will be required to take the Mills Park Center Development into consideration in its traffic analysis. Staff is working on revising the CEQA checklist for the Mills Park Center project which will be published prior to the City Council meeting.</p>   |
| 5. | <p><b><u>Q: The last time this project was submitted two planning commissioners and one city council member said that this project was way too much in such a small part of the TCP and although they removed the store they certainly haven't reduce the footprint. So on that alone would they be completely within their legal right to vote no?</u></b><br/>           A: Staff – City Council has been advised of their legal rights. When the project is reviewed again by the Council, findings for their decision will need to be prepared. City staff will be preparing findings for project approval as we did last July.</p> |
| 6. | <p><b><u>Q: Will replaced sewer mains be adequate to handle the increased load?</u></b><br/>           A: Staff – Yes. Public Works staff is reviewing the project against the City's infrastructure to ensure it can meet the increased demand.</p>  |
| 7. | <p><b><u>Q: Has staff consulted with PG&amp;E to ensure they can provide power to the project.</u></b><br/>           A: Staff – Yes.</p>   |
| 8. | <p><b><u>Q: How many onsite parking spaces will there be for the 427 units?</u></b><br/>           A: Applicant – The project proposes 594 residential parking spaces. 259 spaces in Building A and 337 residential parking spaces in Building B.</p>   |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 9.  | <p><b><u>Q: Would garbage trucks still need to access the dumpsters from the street level? And, is the main garbage and pick up area still on Angus Avenue across from the Library?</u></b></p> <p>A: Applicant - The trash management plan for the project is the same as the previous submittals. For Building B, trash would be picked up on Angus Avenue and for Building A trash would be picked up on White Way near Kains Ave.</p>   |
| 10. | <p><b><u>Q: It is my understanding the Transit Corridor Plan (TCP) requires a percentage of the apartments in this project be “affordable”. Does the property owner and the City of San Bruno have a clear plan to ensure these apartments stay “affordable”?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – The developer prepared an affordable housing plan for the project which was reviewed by the City Council in conjunction with the project entitlements and City requirements. Affordable housing is required per the City’s Affordable Housing Ordinance. If the Council approves the project, then an affordable housing agreement will be prepared and recorded against the property to ensure the affordability of the specified dwelling units for a period of 55 years. This agreement is a legally binding covenant.</p> |
| 11. | <p><b><u>Q: Why can’t there be more affordable housing? What is the basis for the requirement?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – The City’s code has an affordable housing requirement which sets the amount at 15% affordable. Some projects pay an in-lieu fee instead of providing units on site. The developer has offered to build the affordable units on site which helps the city meet its RHNA and has agreed to a 55-year affordability term which is 10 years longer than required by Code. 15% affordability is the baseline for most municipalities on the peninsula, but some approved projects don’t have an affordability requirement.</p>  |
| 12. | <p><b><u>Q: With the housing crisis, and Sen. Weiner dictating policy for each city in California, there will be only 65 affordable housing units in the project?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – The project is required to provide 15% affordable units, a threshold which has been reached. SB50 did not pass but this type of legislation is not dead. Other project streamlining legislation may arise such as SB35 which is effective now. SB35 is a streamlining state law that takes away a city’s discretionary approval. No SB35 project has been submitted though it was mentioned in the Developer’s presentation and the City takes no position on the viability of the SB35 project. This project is being reviewed pursuant to the City’s current review process.</p>  |
| 13. | <p><b><u>Q: Is it possible to expand Angus to allow for additional Lanes of traffic going through to the school and a dedicated lane turning into the housing complex?</u></b></p> <p>A: Applicant - The project does not propose widening Angus Ave.</p>   |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 14. | <p><b><u>Q: Can you talk a little about the construction process and noise, parking, traffic, pollution, etc. and what regulations or guidelines might be in place for residents who will effectively be living adjacent to a large commercial construction site?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – San Bruno has several large construction sites ongoing. The water quality control board has guidelines to regulate runoff from the site. The City’s noise ordinance regulates noise from construction sites. Large construction projects have an onsite community coordinator who is the liaison for the community. The City has a building inspector that would inspect the site daily for compliance with all regulations. The community can always reach out to the building inspector with questions. This project will take longer because it includes significant underground improvements but the City will work with the developer to ensure construction is smooth.</p> |
| 15. | <p><b><u>Q: Will San Bruno champion for a car-free El Camino Real or join with Millbrae to support a 501(c)(3) transportation management cooperative?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – El Camino Real is a State owned highway right-of-way for many cities on the peninsula. There are no plans to make the roadway car-free and it is not on staff’s work plan. The creation of a 501(c)(3) does not have a direct relationship to this project but the City will be revising the Transportation Demand Management Plan for the project to look for additional opportunities for trip reduction. This includes such strategies as on-site showers, bicycle parking, and having an on-site transit coordinator within the leasing office to serve the residents.</p>   |
| 16. | <p><b><u>Q: I know that Covid-19 was not even a word when the Developer submitted his plans for review. Now that the Pandemic has hit and everyone is having to alter how they do things to comply with distancing. Going forward, is a 5-story building prudent at a time when elevator's will be limited in occupancy, possibly just one person. Are there enough stairways to accommodate the residents?</u></b></p> <p>A: Applicant - The project complies with all Building codes for stairs and elevators. COVID is new and no changes are proposed in response. In the future, the code might change in response to COVID-19. In addition, the project will include a lot of new technology that could respond to COVID related concerns such as increased air exchange in elevators and hallways and touchless entry.</p>  |
| 17. | <p><b><u>Q: Is there not a possibility that you would re-consider a grocery store?</u></b></p> <p>A: Applicant - Whole Foods is no longer interested in this location which was made clear shortly after the City Council meeting. Some members of Council did not want this much intensity at this location. The revised project was designed to address the Council’s concern regarding the traffic intensity.</p>   |
| 18. | <p><b><u>Q: Can the City require a grocery store in the project?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – The City cannot require a grocery store in the project which would have to be built on spec because there is no specific grocery store tenant interested in the site.</p>   |
| 19. | <p><b><u>Q: What is the number of parking spaces in the project?</u></b></p> <p>A: Applicant - 879 parking spaces in the previous project and 596 residential parking spaces in the current proposal. The number of parking spaces is more than what is required by the new Code.</p>  |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 20. | <p><b><u>Q: Given the current budget of San Bruno, how would this positively or negatively affect the city’s financial situation?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – At the last Council meeting staff presented on the solid financial footing of the current budget but COVID has negatively impacted city finances for the next (2020/21) fiscal year. To be presented at the next Council meeting, staff is projecting an \$8M deficit for FY 2020/21, which is 14% of the general fund revenue. The City Manager will present potential solutions at the meeting, but that fiscal reality is not connected to the project because monies will be paid overtime as the project develops. First payment of \$6M for phase one, would be due at permit issuance. However, the project likely would not get permits until Summer 2021 if approved in Summer 2020. That said, a \$10M payment to the city’s general fund would improve the City’s overall fiscal sustainability.</p>  |
| 21. | <p><b><u>Q: What was the previous number of parking spots when the grocery store was incorporated? I ask because the number of parking spots have been greatly reduced yet the number of dwelling units has stayed the same.</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – This question is best answered in a table which will be provided in the updated FAQs and added to the website. The reduction in parking spaces comes from the associated reduction in commercial space. No residential parking permit program participation will be allowed for the project’s residents.</p>  |
| 22. | <p><b><u>Q: Could you talk more about why the City of San Bruno urgently needs more homes and how the lack of having enough housing affects San Bruno?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – There is an unmet housing need on the peninsula as evidenced by our RHNA. We haven’t had a lot of development in San Bruno compared to other cities. Our lack of housing formed the basis of the Transit Corridors Plan which provided a strategy to place the new housing near transit. Supported by the community. Existing dwellings become less affordable when not enough housing is produced. We need different types of housing to accommodate households that are downsizing but want to stay in the city.</p> <p>Our Housing Element is updated every 8 years. Our most recent report showed only 49 housing units produced, many of which were ADUs. The state must certify our report which it has not done yet. Noncompliance can lead to potential fiscal penalties up to \$600K, and loss of grant funding. The lack of housing production also leads to longer commutes and makes it more difficult to attract and retain workers which hurts the local economy.</p> <p>Our legislative landscape is pushing for cities to develop housing, especially if they are suburban and have not met their RHNA numbers. Here we have a project, four years in the making that meets the city’s objective requirements. Challenge to not approve the project. Developer has worked with elected and community leaders and made many changes over the years to address our local context. Now we want to bring it to the Council for consideration. There are alternatives, such as the SB35 alternative from the developer. We have a developer looking to invest in San Bruno. It is a tough conversation that we must have. The City said “yes” to housing and now a developer has come forward to fulfill that vision</p> |

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 23. | <p><b><u>Q: The planned project continues to be too tall, and too dense, for the location. The project proposes 427 apartments, with an average of 3 people per apartment, is approximately 1282 people. This is a dramatic increase in population density. What benefit does this provide for current residents?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – Three people per dwelling is a high estimate because there are a mix of unit types. This project is located along a transit corridor where the community specified support for more housing. The community benefits that were articulated in the proposal state how the project would benefit the community.</p>   |
| 24. | <p><b><u>Q: Will White Way become an area for homeless to congregate or for criminal activity?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – Staff visited the area recently and can attest to its current state of neglect which become a matter for code enforcement. The project would add more eyes on the street and add more activity to the area, so it doesn't appear neglected and criminal activity moves elsewhere. The area would also have modern security and surveillance features. The area would be maintained by the building owners</p>   |
| 25. | <p><b><u>Q: Do you have renderings for White Way?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – Staff will work with the developer to provide renderings for White Way.</p>  |
| 26. | <p><b><u>Q: Can you talk a little about the construction process and noise, parking, traffic, pollution, etc. and what regulations or guidelines might be in place for residents who will effectively be living adjacent to a large commercial construction site?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – Typically, a developer would not offer temporary relocation assistance for this type of project. The City will monitor the dust and other environmental impacts during the construction.</p>   |
| 27. | <p><b><u>Q: What businesses could potentially occupy the retail spaces?</u></b></p> <p>A: Applicant – We will work with a broker to determine the most viable businesses for the commercial space. The commercial spaces won't become available for a few years so it is premature to guess what type of businesses might occupy the spaces.</p>   |
| 28. | <p><b><u>Q: Some have suggested if San Bruno becomes a charter city, somehow we'd have more control and ability to say no to development. Can you please set the record straight and maybe talk about Huntington Beach (a charter city) having reached an agreement that will bring them into compliance?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – Don't know if being a Charter City gives municipalities more discretion. Huntington Beach is likely being mentioned because it had a challenge with a development project and there was state action to reduce their ability to disapprove development projects. Those who watch this issue know that the state is increasingly stepping in to propel cities to approved projects.</p> |

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 29. | <p><b><u>Q: How does Mills Park project align with the long-term goal for San Bruno Ave. and El Camino? Specifically, I think San Bruno Ave. would benefit from being a narrower and more walkable commercial corridor similar to Burlingame Ave. or Broadway Ave. (Millbrae). Seeing pictures of El Camino Real as a narrow street, do we plan to widen the sidewalks and remove a lane as part of the project?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – The project would not remove a lane of traffic but would widen the sidewalks on private property. El Camino Real is under Caltrans jurisdiction who doesn't often remove a traffic lane.</p> |
| 30. | <p><b><u>Q: Will priority for the affordable units be given to San Bruno Park School District teachers? If so, how many and what will the affordable rate be?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – The city cannot require the units to be set aside for city employees. They would be made available to anyone who qualifies. Staff may work with the school district to notify them so that eligible employees could get on the interest list for the units.</p>   |
| 31. | <p><b><u>Q: What are the estimated property taxes that would result from the project once it is completed?</u></b></p> <p>A: Staff – Staff does not have this information for the current project though it was provided for the former project. We will have this information available for the Council review of the project.</p>   |