



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, April 27, 2015

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 7 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, Terrones, Gaul, and Bandrapalli

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### a. April 13, 2015 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

**Attachments:** [Revised April 13, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

*Revisions:*

- > *Item 8b (1906 Easton Drive) the motion shows ayes were DeMarini, Loftis and Sargent, and nays were Gum and Terrones. Should indicate ayes were DeMartini, Gum and Sargent, and nays were Loftis and Terrones;*
- > *References to Chair/Commissioner DeMartini were not consistent throughout minutes;*
- > *Page 10, complete comment marked as "listen to recording";*
- > *Page 10, unclear reference to simulated true-divided lites;*
- > *Page 11, Item d, unfinished comment attributed to Commissioner Gum regarding garage;*
- > *Page 11, unfinished comment attributed to Commissioner Terrones regarding the metal roof.*

**Chair DeMartini made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to continue the review of the meeting minutes to the next Planning Commission meeting on May 11th. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, Terrones, and Bandrapalli

**Abstain:** 1 - Gaul

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

*No changes to the agenda.*

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

*Pat Giorni, 1445 Balboa Avenue, spoke on this item:*

- > *Albermarle gate - send kudos to the hospital for doing first-class job fixing the entrance.*
- > *Either gate should be removed, or latch lowered three feet to be ADA compliant. Someone in wheelchair cannot reach it at 5 feet above ground.*
- > *Outrageous that architectural plans for projects are not being released to the public. Wants to be able to take plans home to study and form cogent questions. Wants to see the arcane ruling that has taken plans out of public purview.*

## 6. STUDY ITEMS

- a. 1509 El Camino Real, zoned R-2 and R-3 - Environmental Scoping for a new three-story, 10-unit residential condominium with at-grade parking (1509 El Camino LLC, applicant and property owner; Rodrigo Santos, engineer) (130 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [1509 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)  
[1509 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)  
[1509 El Camino Real - Public Comments for 15-Unit Project](#)  
[Initial Study for 15-Unit Project](#)  
[Department of Transportation Letter](#)  
[Department of Fish and Wildlife Letter](#)  
[1509 El Camino Real - 04.27.15 - recd after 1.pdf](#)  
[1509 El Camino Real - 04.27.15 - recd after 2.pdf](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site.*

*Questions of staff:*

> *Previous letters from Department of Transportation, and Department of Fish & Wildlife. Will there be new letters? (Hurin: Yes, the revised document will be recirculated to the respective agencies for comment.)*

*Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Public comments:*

*Mark Haberecht spoke on this item:*

- > *CEQA checklist establishes conditions under which an EIR needs to be performed.*
- > *Potential wildlife per Department of Fish & Wildlife letter dated February 21, 2013.*
- > *Cumulatively considerable. Future probable projects such as development of Adeline Market, traffic around the school, possibility other R-2 properties would want to seek higher-density uses.*
- > *Traffic and safety of surrounding streets. Needs a real world parking study.*
- > *Privacy, aesthetics and sense of well-being of single family and duplex neighbors.*

*Samantha Macphail, 1516 Balboa Avenue, spoke on this item:*

- > *Lives directly behind proposed building.*
- > *Concern of sewer. Previously submitted letter is not in the staff packet.*
- > *Outdated sewer system, concern for biological hazards from a failure of sewer.*
- > *Expects 150% increase in effluent from project.*
- > *Review city services ability to provide sewer system that is able to meet demands*

*Patricia Gray, 1616 Adeline Drive, spoke on this item:*

- > *City is becoming a richer.*
- > *Cost is significantly higher, pricing out people. Existing apartments are affordable, tenants will be displaced. Should have an economic mix of people in the city.*

*Nina Weil, 1520 Balboa Avenue, spoke on this item:*

- > Lives directly behind project.
- > Mass and density overbuilt for the project. Does not preserve feeling of the neighborhood as set out in the Housing Element.
- > Not appropriate transition. Needs screening, wants to see screening of trees behind project to create barrier rather than looking at a mass wall.
- > Concerned about trees during construction, ensure that trees on and around the property are preserved.
- > Concerned about noise - wants a sound wall built before construction starts. Screen noise from El Camino Real and the project.
- > Concerned with lighting in the back that will impact neighbors.

Ann Wallach spoke on this item:

- > Concerns about creek bank going back to 2007.
- > Public Works, Fish & Wildlife and Army Corps have taken note of neighbor comments.
- > Repair and fortification of creek bank should be completed before work with heavy grading and construction equipment is begun.
- > Noise from 10 families moving in, with lots of inducements to enjoy the outdoors. Socializing areas should be limited to the front portions of the property. Original plan had a zen garden in the back but it has been lost in most recent revisions. Barbecue with counter with seating. Wants arrangements for large groups to be placed closer to front of property.
- > Large area under the grove of trees on the other side of the property would be wonderful for enjoying the out of doors, less windy than next to creek.

Pat Giorni, 1445 Balboa Avenue, spoke on this item:

- > Tree report in packet states arborist cannot detect every condition that can lead to the structural failure of a tree. Remedial treatments cannot be guaranteed.
- > By ordinance the tree canopy in Burlingame is regarded as infrastructure.
- > Health and Safety considerations should include a mechanical engineering study to assess the danger of the lean. Pruning when cones form is a mitigation. Instance of cone damaging roof did not disclose prior condition of the roof.
- > Requests surety bond for \$100,000 for 5 years after the completion of the project. Precedent was set on a project in the 1500 block of Drake Avenue.
- > Environmental scoping - assuming it is for a mitigated neg dec, not an EIR. Will there be 28 days to review the document rather than 4 days?

(Hurin: Once the environmental document is completed, everyone who has spoken and/or written letters will be notified that it is available. There will be a 30 day review period. It has not yet been determined whether it will be a mitigated neg dec or an EIR; the consultant will be working on revising the document to reflect the current project, and if an issue emerged that rose to the level of an EIR it would need to be discussed.)

Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.

Commissioner comments:

- > Clarify on the tree removal issue. There was some confusion which trees were being removed.
- > If project is being reviewed by Department of Fish & Wildlife it will make comments on the creek bank. The environmental consultant needs to be in the loop with the repair that will be required. Creek bank repair scope is not well defined, should be coordinated with Public Works to define potential impacts.
- > Wastewater sewer line capacity should be evaluated to ensure it can accommodate 150% increase in sewage.
- > Page 52 in the mitigated neg dec mentions 6 feet from top of bank, but letter from Fish & Wildlife

says the amount should increase.

- > Stats in project description need to be updated.
- > Previous document said banks of the creek were not accessible due to fencing, hopefully someone can do a survey.
- > Enclosed secured bicycle storage was proposed previously, not just within garage.
- > Displacement of housing - needs to define what displacement is. Existing units are affordable, those households will not be able to afford the new units so will be displaced.
- > School impact needs to consider fewer units but more bedrooms. Previously based on phone interviews - wants someone's name and analysis.
- > Water demand figures need to be updated.
- > Wastewater numbers need to be updated.
- > Wastewater needs to be looked at more carefully, not just in terms of the wastewater treatment plant. There is a more local concern here - could the project trigger local mitigation improvements to the local sewer at that location?
- > Traffic study - previously anticipated a net negative impact on traffic, but needs to be understood better. Refers to some studies and benchmarks that were used to come up with the numbers.
- > Environmental consultant should explain concept of cumulative effects.

*This is a study item so there is no action.*

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 225 Dwight Road, zoned R-1 - Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Design, Inc., applicant and designer; Sinhad and Medina Begic, property owners) (58 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [225 Dwight Rd- Staff Report](#)  
[225 Dwight Rd - Attachments.pdf](#)

*Commissioner Terrones was recused for non-statutory reasons.*

*All Commissioners had visited the project site.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Jesse Geurse represented the applicant:*

- > *Deck size has been reduced significantly.*

*Public comments:*

- > *None.*

*Comments:*

- > *Changes are in line with the neighborhood, and the house fits better.*

**Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the Action Item. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, Gaul, and Bandrapalli

**Recused:** 1 - Terrones

- b. 1000 Vancouver Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Conditional Use Permit for a new detached accessory structure for a home office use, with windows within 10-feet of property line and for two accessory structures greater than 100 SF (Joseph Bojues, applicant and property owner; Joe Johnston-Shedshop, designer) (57 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [1000 Vancouver Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[1000 Vancouver Ave - Attachments.pdf](#)  
[1000 Vancouver Ave - 04.27.15 - recd after.pdf](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones reported that he had visited site and had conversations with the applicant prior to the submittal of the application. Commissioner Bandrapalli reported that she had met with the applicant.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Joe Bojues represented the applicant.*

*Questions:*

- > *Drawing shows window is 9 feet from the property line, but letter says 9'-6". (Bojues: Was told it is 9'-6"). Could it be moved over so the shed lined up with the garage and eliminated the problem? (Bojues: Wanted to have as much room in front for landscaping.)*
- > *Will the orange tree be retained? (Bojues: It will stay, will not be touched.)*

*Public comments:*

- > *None.*

*Commission discussion:*

- > *Use is home office with no plumbing. It will not be detrimental to adjacent properties.*
- > *Low-lying shed structure and is buffered from the adjacent property.*
- > *Placement of structure to get as far away from property line as possible but also preserve the orange tree is important, so placement of the window is acceptable.*
- > *There will be two structures on the property, one is a garage. The garage is necessary for the covered off-street parking, and the new structure is a home office and is an allowed use under the General Plan with a Conditional Use Permit.*

**Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bandrapalli, to approve the Action Item. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, Terrones, Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- c. 12 Vista Lane, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Hillside Area Construction Permit and Special Permits for attached garage and declining height envelope for a new, two-story single family dwelling with an attached garage (Jacob Furlong, Dreiling Terrones Architecture Inc, applicant and architect; Jiangnang Zhang, property owner) (33 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

- Attachments:** [12 Vista Ln - Staff Report](#)  
[12 Vista Ln - Attachments](#)  
[12 Vista Ln - Received After](#)  
[12 Vista Ln - 04.27.15 - recd after 2.pdf](#)

Commissioner Terrones recused from this item because he has a business relationship with the applicant. Commissioner Gaul recused because he lives within 500 feet of the subject property. Commissioner Sargent recused for non-statutory reasons.

All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Gum met with the neighbor across the street, and Commissioner DeMartini toured the property with the architect and met the property owner on site.

Questions of staff:

- > Can electrical feed lines be discussed? The lines impact the view of the house across the street, so question is if they can go underground. (Hurin: It is not something the City can control in the Planning Commission review process. Since this is an existing neighborhood not sure if PG&E will allow a single lot to underground a utility. The applicant can look into it but it cannot be a condition of approval.)
- > Discrepancy between declining height reduction in the staff report and the reduction cited in the architect's letter. (Hurin: 28 sq ft reflects the surface area, whereas the staff report has described floor area.)

Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.

Jacob Furlong represented the applicant:

- > Interested in undergrounding the wires to house if possible and PG&E is agreeable. Neighbor has reported that some newer houses in the neighborhood have done that.
- > Will accept as a condition of approval using a dwarf tree in the front. Does not want to block the view, and is digging house low into hill to minimize impact.
- > Change of materials.

Commission questions/comments:

- > Appreciates reducing the plate heights.
- > Anything constraining relocating floor area from declining height envelope to rear of building? (Furlong: Yes - view easement extends across the site.)

Public comments:

- > None.

Commission discussion:

- > Well designed, well articulated, likes materials, appreciates reduced height.
- > In the hills when there are slopes in every direction someone will loom over someone else. Given conditions the house is nicely settled into the site.
- > From downslope will see 23 feet of wall. Since there is room in the back and it is a big lot, would like to squeeze the building a bit more or reduce height to avoid encroaching declining height envelope.
- > Fits into the neighborhood, colors fit in.
- > In the lot split application there were footprints could be built that would protect the trees. Given amount of trimming that will be needed to provide 4 feet of clearance, there will be nothing left of the protected tree. There was a promise it could be protected.
- > Arborist report says the tree will be protected.

Commissioner Bandrapalli made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Commissioner Loftis. The motion failed by a vote of 2-2-3-0, with Commissioners DeMartini and Gum dissenting.

Commission discussion:

> Remaining issues are the tree and the declining height envelope. The project is otherwise supportable.

Commissioner Gum made a motion, seconded by Commissioner DeMartini, to continue the Action Item to the May 11, 2015 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, and Bandrapalli

**Recused:** 3 - Sargent, Terrones, and Gaul

- d. 1520 Cypress Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Negative Declaration, Design Review, Side Setback Variance and Special Permit for declining height envelope for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling and Conditional Use Permits to add a cabana and toilet to an existing detached garage (Dreiling Terrones Architecture, Inc., applicant and architect; Jeffrey Hessekiel, property owner) (72 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [1520 Cypress Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[1520 Cypress Ave - Attachments.pdf](#)  
[1520 Cypress Ave - Initial Study](#)  
[1520 Cypress Ave - Historic Resource Study](#)  
[1520 Cypress Ave - 04.27.15 - recd after.pdf](#)

Commissioner Terrones recused from this item because he has a business relationship with the applicant.

All Commissioners had visited the project site.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.

Jacob Furlong represented the applicant:

- > Pushed the second floor back to conform with the setback.
- > Added simulated true-divided lites to the side elevation.
- > Will plant hedges along the side to soften the view from the neighbors.
- > Pushing first floor in would have significantly impacted the layout of the kitchen.

Jeffrey Hessekiel spoke as property owner:

- > The neighbor on the left responded and said the project looked very reasonable. Has seen the neighbor on the right several times, has reached out to them and engaged with them and they have not expressed an objection.

Public comments:

- > None.

*Commission discussion:*

- > *Additional drawing showing fence and plantings is very useful.*
- > *House now looks like it is complete rather than sheared off.*
- > *New windows are good.*
- > *Step-back and further articulation is good.*
- > *Seems like there is enough room in the back to avoid the variance and declining height envelope encroachment. Variance requires exceptional or extraordinary circumstances.*
- > *Existing house is unique, and right hand side works well with the existing house. Because the front of the existing house encroaches into the declining height envelope, the minor encroachment on the side to the rear is supportable.*
- > *Cabana and pool house can be supported given the size of the yard.*

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bandrapalli, to (a) adopt a Negative Declaration of No Significant Environmental Impacts, and (b) approve the Action Item based on the findings in the staff report and stated in the commission discussion. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Sargent, Gaul, and Bandrapalli

**Nay:** 1 - Gum

**Recused:** 1 - Terrones

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1552 Alturas Drive, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review and Hillside Area Construction Permit for a second story rear deck addition to an existing single family dwelling (Eric Cox, Kembcon Engineers, engineer and applicant; Bruce and Linda Carlton, property owners) (47 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

**Attachments:** [1552 Alturas Dr staff report](#)  
[1552 Alturas Dr attachments](#)  
[1552 Alturas Dr - 04.27.15 - recd after 1.pdf](#)  
[1552 Alturas Dr - 04.27.15 - recd after 2.pdf](#)  
[1552 Alturas Dr - 04.27.15 - recd after 3.pdf](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Gum spoke to the neighbor on right side, Commissioner DeMartini met with the property owner and neighbor at 1548 Alturas Drive.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*The applicant was not in attendance. Given that the item was Design Review Study the commission felt it could proceed with the hearing, and that any questions would be recorded to be relayed to the applicant.*

*Question of whether the applicant communicated with downhill neighbors. Would like the applicant to respond to this at the action hearing.*

*Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.*

*Commission comments:*

- > *May want to require story poles. Concern the deck have an impact on neighbors, particularly for neighbor on right side.*
- > *Neighbor has not expressed concern over view blockage. Meeting was noticed.*
- > *House next door is rented, owner lives in China. The property is managed by a management company and has not replied yet. Concern owner will return and question why view might be blocked.*
- > *Story poles are a cost to the applicant. If it was a requirement it would be one thing, but to impose a cost for a concern that might not exist seems unwarranted.*
- > *Neighbor's deck to right is much larger than this deck. View is perpendicular to the decks, so story poles may not be required in this situation.*
- > *Railings are steel cables, view will be minimally impacted so does not warrant story poles.*
- > *Would like to see site plan include all major existing trees and shrubs. Some labels are missing.*
- > *Concern with downhill neighbor – they may not fully understand the potential impacts without benefit of story poles. Should reach out to the downhill neighbor.*
- > *Applicant may choose to put up story poles in response.*

**Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, Terrones, Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- b.** 1812 Davis Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for first and second story additions to an existing single family dwelling (JoAnn Gann, applicant and designer; Candace Nagare, property owner) (43 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

**Attachments:** [1812 Davis Dr staff report](#)

[1812 Davis Dr - attachments](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioners Sargent met with the homeowner but did not have a substantive discussion about the project. Commissioner Bandrapalli also met the applicant.*

*Questions of staff:*

- > *Is there a minimum unobstructed depth for the garage? (Hurin: 18 feet for an existing garage, but if the garage is being altered a minimum depth of 20 feet is required. Existing covered space measures 10' x 20' and no changes are proposed.)*

*Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*JoAnn Gann represented the applicant.*

- > *Would there be cooking facilities so that it could be used as a second dwelling unit? (Gann: No.)*
- > *Have plans been shared with neighbors? (Gann: They did the neighborhood notification.)*

*Public comments:*

*Cathy Smith, 1811 Davis Drive, spoke on this item:*

- > *Lives directly across the street.*
- > *Likes the design and supports the construction of a second story.*

*Commission discussion:*

- > *Not many comments – can be put on consent calendar.*
- > *Massing from front of house is OK. It is a bit awkward from rear and sides, but it is a challenge to*

*add a second floor to u-shaped courtyard houses.*

- > *Good that the courtyard is not being filled in.*
- > *Second story matches houses on either side – both have second story additions. Lack of depth would not be noticed from the street.*
- > *Addition has some hard corners going from front to the back, but courtyard is a constraint.*
- > *Bay above garage is so symmetrical, it accentuates the garage. “Church-like” element.*
- > *Doesn’t like the stepping back – creates a busy roofline.*
- > *With mass at the front avoids issues of views into back yards.*

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Consent Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Loftis, Gum, Sargent, Terrones, Gaul, and Bandrapalli

**Nay:** 1 - DeMartini

## 10. COMMISSIONER’S REPORTS

- > *Next BPAC meeting is May 14th.*
- > *Next Community Center Master Plan meeting is May 20th.*
- > *Next Planning Commission meeting will discuss subcommittee appointments.*

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- > *The City Council has received an appeal of the Planning Commission denial of the 1906 Easton Drive application.*
- > *The General Plan consultant will follow up with commissioners who have not had the opportunity to be interviewed.*
- > *Request for commissioners to reply with recusals when receiving the advance draft agenda prior to the meeting.*

- a. FYI: 14 Stanley Road - review of proposed changes to a previously approved Design Review project.

**Attachments:** [14 Stanley Rd FYI memorandum](#)

*Accepted.*

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

*The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.*

*Note: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission’s action on April 27, 2015. If the Planning Commission’s action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on May 7, 2015, the action becomes final. In order to be effective, appeals must be in writing to the City Clerk and must be accompanied by an appeal fee of \$485, which includes noticing costs.*

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Community Development/Planning counter, City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.*