



Property Owner Forum #2, July 25, 2018

Meeting Summary

PURPOSE

As part of the community outreach effort for the Bayhill Specific Plan, the planning team held a second Property Owner Forum on July 25, 2018 at San Bruno City Hall. The purpose of this session was to review and discuss four concept land use and circulation alternatives with Bayhill property owners, and understand their preferences, priorities, and concerns.

ATTENDANCE

In addition to City staff and members of the consulting team, representatives from the following properties were in attendance:

-) YouTube and their consultants (owns several properties throughout the Planning Area)
-) 901 Cherry Avenue (Gap, Inc.)
-) 801 - 851 Traeger Avenue
-) 1250 Grundy Lane (SF Police Credit Union)
-) 855-875 Bayhill Drive
-) 851 Cherry Avenue (Regency Centers)
-) 801 El Camino Real (GW Williams)

FORMAT

The forum began with an introduction from City staff, followed by a presentation from the consultant team reviewing the four concept Alternatives and their resulting transportation, housing, and fiscal impacts. The remainder of time was spent discussing the following questions:

-) Do you have any clarifying questions?
-) Are there any aspects of any of the alternatives that you particularly like?
-) Are there any aspects of the alternatives that you don't like?
-) Are there any items that concern you?

KEY THEMES

As a result of the discussion with property owners, the following key themes emerged:

-) **Preference for Alternative 4.** Generally, property owners were in agreement that Alternative 4 was their preferred option, principally because it allowed greater office development and did not require as many other uses. Some property owners expressed that they bought sites within the office park with the expectation that they would be allowed to redevelop the properties with new office uses. It was noted at the meeting by the planning team that the amount of net new office development considered in the Alternatives ranges from 1,086,000 to 2,301,000 square feet, while the City’s General Plan only assumes 683,000 square feet of new office development in the Bayhill district. Some expressed that housing would be best developed in the Transit Corridors Plan area and/or in other locations around San Bruno, outside of the Planning Area. It was stated that the City’s commercial linkage fees and future development agreements could help support the development of housing elsewhere.
-) **Maintain flexibility for the potential of housing in the future.** Some property owners (Traeger and Bayhill Shopping Center) are interested in potentially having housing on their sites in future. However, they would not like to be bound by a required housing designation and would prefer having an “overlay” which enables property owners to have the ability to develop housing in the future, if market conditions allow. Furthermore, property owners want to have flexibility on where on their property housing should be located, rather than locations be mandated by the Specific Plan.
-) **Height is a limitation to developing housing.** Property owners are concerned that the 3-story/50-foot height limit established by Ordinance 1284, which governs much of the Planning Area, will make it financially infeasible to develop housing on sites outside of the Transit Corridor Plan area.
-) **Provide more detail about how impacts were calculated.** Some property owners expressed a desire to better understand the methodology used to determine the identified housing and fiscal impacts. A request was made and City staff agreed to provide information regarding the amount of commercial linkage fees that could be generated by redevelopment within the Planning Area.
-) **Continue to involve property owners.** Property owners expressed an interest to be involved in future discussions around what level (i.e., threshold) of redevelopment would “trigger” the need for proposals to be consistent with the Specific Plan’s new land use map and standards.