



STAFF REPORT

Exhibit C

AGENDA NO:

MEETING DATE: March 19, 2018

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council

Date: March 19, 2018

From: Margaret Glomstad, Parks and Recreation Director – (650) 558-7307

Subject: City Council Study Session Regarding the Proposed Community Center Conceptual Plan and Next Steps

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council review the presentation on the conceptual design options for a new community center and provide feedback on the next steps.

BACKGROUND

Since 2012, City staff, in collaboration with Group 4 Architecture, the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC), and community members, has been working on developing plans for a new community center in Washington Park. The work includes development of a Master Plan for the active areas of the park and identifies the site locations of the park amenities (Community Center Master Plan) and conceptual designs of the proposed building within the Master Plan. The City Council approved the Community Center Master Plan on July 7, 2014.

On August 17, 2015, the City Council held a study session on the community center. The attached staff report from the study session provides a thorough background of the master and conceptual plan processes (Exhibit A). At the study session, the City Council provided the following input on the conceptual plan: create a more active presence on Burlingame Avenue, strengthen the civic aspect of the design, and create more depth and detail in the facades. With this feedback, Group 4 continued to refine the conceptual plan for the building.

On August 25, 2015, staff brought the conceptual plan to the Planning Commission to gather further input. On April 14, 2016, staff presented the completed traffic study to the Traffic, Safety & Parking Commission (TSPC) to seek additional input regarding parking options, the impact of construction on parking, and the phasing options of the project. TSPC Commissioners offered suggestions including seeking options for bike and pedestrian access. Overall, the Commission favored the under the community center building parking option. They also offered suggestions if both parking options (under the community center building and one-half level under the tennis courts) are considered, including looking at permitting for the lot under the tennis courts and/or seeking meters for the tennis court lot to offset the cost of added parking. Additionally, Commissioners expressed interest in using the tennis court parking area as an option for downtown parking.

The CAC met again on April 20, 2016 to discuss the input from the City Council, Planning Commission, and TSPC. From the comments generated at the previous meetings and additional input from the CAC, Group 4 further refined the conceptual plans.

DISCUSSION

Conceptual Plan

The proposed community center is being designed to meet the needs of today's community and to have the flexibility to evolve to meet the ever-changing needs of future patrons. The new community center's site has been developed with direct, ongoing consultation with the community-at-large, park users, neighbors, and City staff. Located slightly to the west of the existing facility, the new multi-generational community center will be nearly 43% larger than the existing facility through the addition of a second floor and will act as a nexus for the park, organizing events around the patios that connect interior and exterior spaces.

Additionally, a small surface parking lot with ample trees and landscaping will be located adjacent to and east of the new building, providing a buffer between the new building's activity and the homes directly adjacent to the east edge of the park. A wide, organically-shaped promenade clearly links the park's existing and new amenities with the landscape and mature trees. From west to east, this new promenade links the tennis courts, horseshoe pits, bocce courts, a basketball court, the Lions Club, picnic area, a fenced children's play area, and the new community center with a well-lit, safely-designed linkage for both pedestrians and cyclists.

Parking

As outlined in the Master Plan, there are two options for meeting the parking need:

1. The first option places 70 parking spaces directly under the building. The added construction cost of mechanical ventilation for under-building parking is offset somewhat by sharing a single structural system with the new building above. These spaces also have the advantage of being able to directly tie into the new community center through a lower level vestibule containing interior stairs and an elevator into the community center lobby and outdoor plaza. The cost estimate ranges from \$6,944,000 to \$7,924,000.
2. The second option locates parking under the tennis courts on the western end of the park. Moving the courts up a half-level creates an opportunity to have terraced, amphitheater-style seating facing the park. With this option, parking is depressed a half-level below grade to provide approximately 70 parking spaces. Natural ventilation reduces the overall cost relative to parking that is fully below grade. The cost estimate ranges from \$5,334,000 to \$6,307,000.

In both scenarios, the remaining 73 spaces would be accommodated at the new parking lot on the southeast edge of the park adjacent to the new building and at the parking lot adjacent to the Lions Club (with a slight reduction in surface parking at this location to accommodate the relocated basketball court).

A third cost-saving option, which was not included in the Master Plan, involves using surface only parking. In this scenario, parking would be provided next to the Lions Club building as well as

east of the new community center. This option would require a smaller building footprint and a larger surface parking lot next to the community center.

Building Design

The community center design is a contemporary reinterpretation of Burlingame’s civic use of Mission styled architecture (as seen in the Burlingame Library, Fire Station 34, and Burlingame Avenue Caltrain station). While the design is rooted in the Mission style through its use of gabled roof forms, overhangs, deep inset windows, and primary materiality, the community center’s stylistic reinterpretation occurs in several ways: the breakdown of building mass in response to the immediate site context and building program, arrangement and expression of interior program space, the contemporary use of building technologies and materials, and incorporating best practices for sustainable design.

Massing, Arched Great Windows, Facades and Accents and Building Materiality

A complete description of the massing, arched great windows, facades and accents, and building materiality can be found in the executive summary attached to this report.

Sustainability

One area the Council may wish to consider is whether the building should be LEED-certified and/or Zero Net Energy (ZNE). LEED is a green certification program managed by the US Green Building Council. LEED-certified buildings are considered leading examples of environmental sustainability, water and energy efficiency, and healthy and productive spaces for occupants. A ZNE building is a building that produces as much energy as it consumes by being extremely energy-efficient and generating onsite renewable energy. To achieve ZNE, a building must be well designed by an experienced team and generally includes extra insulation, high performance windows, natural and LED lighting, smart HVAC systems, and onsite solar power systems. A ZNE building may cost incrementally more (approximately \$2-8 per sq. ft. according to some studies) than a conventional building. However, the operational costs of a ZNE building are significantly lower than in a conventional building over the long term. The current cost estimates for the project assume that the community center is built to the LEED Gold standard.

Project Budget

The project’s cost estimate has been revised as of January 2018. The proposed community center building itself is estimated to range from \$20,863,000 to \$22,827,000 (including FF&E). The site work, including parking and relocation of the playground and basketball court, ranges from \$13,329,000 to \$14,863,000 depending on which parking option, described above, is selected. The total project budget including soft costs and contingencies is estimated to range from \$51,550,000 to \$56,740,000.

Cost Reduction Strategies

Staff and Group 4 have identified two cost-reduction strategies that reduce the scope of the construction area in the park. All construction identified in the Master Plan that is west of the Lions Club is removed from the project scope to achieve the cost reduction.

1. Reduce the project’s scope by limiting the project to a new community center with the same building square footage as described above. Under this option, the project includes both

surface parking and parking under the community center. This option also includes relocating the playground and reducing the size of the basketball court to half-size. No site work would be done west of the Lions Club building. The estimated total project cost with this open is \$38,037,000 to \$41,711,000.

2. Reduce the project's scope by limiting the project to a new community center with a reduced building square footage (approximately 3,700 square feet less) from that described above in order to allow for a larger surface parking lot adjacent to the community center. Under this option, there would be no subterranean parking. This option does include relocating the playground, reducing the size of the basketball court to half-size, and the loss of the drop-off area in the surface parking lot. No site work would be done west of the Lions Club building. The estimated total project cost with this option is \$30,097,000 to \$32,924,000.

Other Cost Reduction Strategies

Other cost reduction strategies, in addition to reducing the project scope, have been explored. Research on these options indicates that, while there may be some cost savings (10-25%), they would not be appropriate for the proposed new community center for the following reasons:

Pre-engineered Buildings: Pre-engineered buildings are metal buildings that consist of a structural steel framing system supporting a metal roofing system, with a variety of wall panel choices. Pre-engineered buildings lend themselves to single story, large volume spaces such as gyms or warehouses. The proposed community center is a series of program spaces, with one large-volume space for the community hall. It has been designed as a two-story building in order to minimize its footprint, and therefore minimize the impact of the proposed new center on the park.

Modular Buildings: Modular buildings are sectional prefabricated buildings that consist of multiple sections called modules. The modules are fabricated offsite and transported to the site for assembly. Modular construction lends itself to smaller, repetitive types of volumes that deliver efficiency in their ability to be reproduced.

Concrete Tilt-up Buildings: In tilt-up construction, the building's walls are poured directly at the jobsite in large slabs of concrete called "tilt-up panels" or "tiltwall panels." These panels are then raised into position around the building's perimeter, forming the exterior walls. Concrete tilt-up construction lends itself to buildings with simple geometries and openings. The proposed new community center's massing has been carefully designed and sculpted to be respectful of the residential neighbors and to respond to the indoor/outdoor connections that exist on the park side of the building.

Next Steps

Based on the direction and preference of the City Council, staff can proceed in one of two ways:

- Option 1. Update the current conceptual design for the new community center project based on the input received from the Council tonight. This effort would include the consultant team working with staff to develop an updated conceptual design package and sharing it with the Parks and Recreation Commission, the community, and the

Planning Commission. Once the conceptual design is updated to integrate review comments by the various stakeholders described above, the conceptual plan would be brought back to the City Council for review and consideration. The anticipated timeline to complete this work is 3-4 months at a cost of \$50,000.

- Option 2. Revise the current conceptual design for the new community center project based on the input received from the Council tonight. This option includes a redesign of the community center building and would require the consultant team to develop a revised conceptual design package that would reflect the input received from the Council. This effort would include the consultant team working with staff and the City Council to develop the revised conceptual design. Study sessions would be scheduled early on with the City Council to integrate their early input into the development of the revised design. The revised conceptual design package would then be shared with the Parks and Recreation Commission, the community, and the Planning Commission for their input. The revised conceptual design package would be brought back to the City Council for their review and consideration. The anticipated timeline to complete this work is 6-8 months at a cost of \$90,000-\$100,000.

Once the conceptual design has been approved by the City Council, the consultant team and staff can begin to complete the CEQA requirements and the construction document phase of the project. Staff anticipates that once the City Council accepts the conceptual design, the construction document phase and CEQA approvals will take approximately 18 -20 months.

Council Direction

In order to proceed with the plans to build a new community center, staff requests direction on several questions. Many of these are iterative; the answer to one question may change the answer to another. Thus, Council may wish to consider the questions in a different order than presented below.

1. What is the preferred parking option?
2. Should the scope of the project as described in the cost reduction strategies above be revised? If so, in what way?
3. Does the Council wish to keep the current conceptual design or revise it? If the Council wishes to revise the design, what is the Council interested in seeing?
4. Should sustainability features remain in the design? If so, is LEED Gold appropriate, or is the Council interested in a lower (Certified or Silver) or higher (Platinum) certification level or the building achieving zero net energy?
5. What is the recommended maximum budget for this project?

FISCAL IMPACT

In November 2017, the voters of Burlingame approved Measure I, a ¼ cent sales tax measure that will generate an estimated \$1.75 million to \$2 million annually. At the January 27, 2018 goal-setting session, the City Council discussed the City Manager's recommended expenditure plan for the Measure I funds. (The City Council approved the recommendation on February 20, 2018.)

As noted at the goal-setting session, an annual pledge of \$1 million toward debt service on the issuance of lease revenue bonds for the project would yield bond proceeds of approximately \$15 million. Therefore, in order to fund the Community Center project, the City will need to rely on a combination of Measure I revenues plus ongoing General Fund revenues and/or monies from the Capital Investment Reserve. Staff thus recommended that the Council consider an additional \$1 million annual General Fund transfer to allow for a lease revenue bond issuance of approximately \$30 million, with the remaining financing for the Community Center project to be provided from the Capital Investment Reserve or some other source not yet determined.

Exhibits:

- Staff Report from the August 17, 2015 Study Session
- Executive Summary