



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, June 25, 2018

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Kevin Gardiner, Senior Planner Catherine Keylon, and City Attorney Kathleen Kane.*

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### a. Draft April 9, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft April 9, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

*The meeting minutes were inadvertently not included in the packet. The minutes will be reviewed in the next Planning Commission meeting.*

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

*There were no public comments.*

### 6. STUDY ITEMS

#### a. Consideration of amendments to Chapter 25.70 (Off-Street Parking) of the Burlingame Municipal Code to amend motel and hotel parking requirements.

**Attachments:** [Code Amendment to Chapter 25.70.034 - Staff Report](#)  
[Code Amendment to Chapter 25.70.034 - Attachments](#)

*Planning Manager Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report. There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > At least one hotel is interested in park-and-fly. Have other hotels expressed interest in other uses, or expanding with more rooms without needing to provide more parking? (Gardiner: The hotels that we know have expressed interest in expansion of existing park-and-fly program, and reduction in the parking requirement for a new hotel. This would provide the opportunity for hotels not interested in park-and-fly to expand if they wanted to.)
- > Does park-and-fly require a Conditional Use Permit? (Gardiner: Yes, currently. Depending on the approach, hotels may request a separate Conditional Use Permit for park-and-fly in addition to a Conditional Use Permit for parking reduction.)
- > What other uses are permitted on those sites? Are restaurants permitted? (Gardiner: Offices, restaurants, lodging, commercial recreation. For example, a hotel could expand its restaurant offerings. There may be a wider range of uses that could be accommodated beyond just park-and-fly.)
- > Does a Conditional Use Permit run with the property? (Gardiner: Yes, provided that the characteristics documented with the issuance of the CUP remains, it would run with the property. If a hotel changed ownership but the operations stayed the same, the CUP would still run with the hotel. It could be amended over time if the hotel changes its business model, for instance.)
- > Will not see the effect of this for years from now, but an alternative use to parking such as another amenity like a restaurant would be a better utilization of the space. Would prefer a reduced parking ratio or a Conditional Use Permit for parking reductions.
- > Concerned with setting a lower ratio because it may go too far. The San Mateo 0.4 ratio seems low. However the arguments are compelling with rideshare and other similar services.
- > Open to reducing the ratio, and reducing it in half would not be unreasonable given the survey findings. Was the South San Francisco example for parking reductions based on certain criteria? (Gardiner: There are two different types of parking reductions - one specific to hotels and another that is more general and applies to all land uses. Would opt for the more general option because the main challenge is figuring out the right parking ratio. May better serve hotels if they could put forth their own proposal based on their documented demand and intended use of the spaces.)
- > Concerned that we reduce the ratio and something changes in the hotel industry where parking demand increases. (Gardiner: Not aware of existing planning trends or dynamic that foresees an increased demand for parking. Trends we are seeing with rideshare and possibility of self-driving cars in the future would both reduce parking demand.)
- > How would parking needs be met when hotels have large events such as weddings and conferences? (Gardiner: It is something the hotel operator would need to take into account. Even with a reduced ratio, they may still need to build in a buffer for such occasions. Hotels have mentioned one option for special events is providing valet service which allows stacked parking. Some hotels may opt to retain more parking even if it would be allowed to be reduced.)
- > A Conditional Use Permit would allow for special circumstances. Letters submitted from the hotels state that the circumstances for each hotel are unique. We should look at each circumstance on a case by case basis. Allows the Commission to ask questions about special circumstances.
- > Via a Conditional Use Permit, let the hotel propose their own parking ratio instead of setting one parking ratio that tries to address each hotel's unique circumstances.
- > The option of no parking requirement and leaving the applicant to decide is a slippery slope. Applicants for apartment and condominium residential projects have just as much interest to say that they should determine their own parking standards. There is community interest in the Planning Commission being involved and there should still be control and review in what parking is required.

There was no action on this item since it was a Study Item.

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

- a. 2117 Carmelita Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for a One Year Extension of a previously

approved application for Design Review and Rear Setback Variances for a major renovation and first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(e)(1). (Lin and Sharon Li, applicants and property owners; Javier Medina, Mark Davis Design, architect) (38 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [2117 Carmelita Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[2117 Carmelita Ave - Attachments](#)  
[2117 Carmelita Ave - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

- b. 715-717 & 719-721 Linden Avenue, zoned R-2 - Application for a One Year Extension of a previously approved application for Design Review and Tentative Map for Lot Split for construction of a new, two-story duplex on each proposed new lot. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (b). (1448 Laguna LLC, applicant and property owner; TRG Architects, architect) (37 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [715-717 & 719-721 Linden Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[715-717 & 719-721 Linden Ave - Attachments](#)  
[715-717 & 719-721 Linden Ave - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 834 Crossway Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (John Nguyen, Dulon, Inc., applicant and designer; Diane Mcglown, property owner) (58 noticed) Staff contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [834 Crossway Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[834 Crossway Rd - Attachments](#)  
[834 Crossway Rd - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Questions of Staff:*

> *Is there proper turnaround space in front of the garage? (Keylon: They are required only to have one uncovered parking space. As long as they can back out the space, it meets requirements.)*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*John Nguyen, Dulon Inc., represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > Will the new wood fence go all the way around the property? (Nguyen: Yes.)
- > Note specifies aluminum-clad windows with grids. Familiar with specifications for simulated true divided lites? Not a snap-in grid or grid between the glass. (Nguyen: Yes.)
- > Window sill is drawn differently on the front elevation compared to the detail on Sheet A2.03. Will it be a 3-inch trim all the way around? (Yes, all the way around.)
- > There will need to be railing on the steps at the rear deck and a guard rail for the steps in the front. (Nguyen: They will be wood railings.)
- > Could knee braces be added to the cantilever roof element in front? (Nguyen: Yes, could add that.)
- > Elevation specifies lap siding but it appears vertical in the elevations. (Nguyen: Note should specify vertical siding.)
- > Will it be vertical wood siding? Not T1-11? (Nguyen: Vertical wood siding.)
- > Would suggest windows in the laundry and master toilet room. Would help the elevation and bring in light. (Nguyen: Distance between the beams could not fit a standard window.) Could fit a transom or skinny awning window.
- > On the right elevation on either side of the fireplace there are blank walls. Could be an opportunity to add more glazing. (Nguyen: The Master Bedroom has a lot of windows on the other wall. Left these walls to allow for more wall space.)
- > Will the siding be painted? (Nguyen: Yes.)
- > Railing on the back deck should be shown on the elevation.
- > Front stairs could be a bit wider to be more inviting.
- > What roofing material will be on the eyebrow roof on the front? (Nguyen: Asphalt shingle.)

*Public Comments:*

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion:*

- > Great improvements, but still a few small details that need to be addressed.
- > Still unclear on the siding. Sample of the siding and photographs of other projects with the siding would be helpful. Not clear what is being proposed.
- > Does not like the farm house style, and the metal roof. Does not believe it fits into Burlingame.

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to continue the item. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Sargent, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

**Nay:** 1 - Loftis

- b. 705 Walnut Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review Amendment for changes to a previously approved new, two-story single-family dwelling with a detached garage. The project is Categorical Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a). (705 Walnut Burlingame LLC, applicant and property owner; James Chu, Chu Design Associates, designer) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [705 Walnut Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[705 Walnut Ave - Attachments](#)  
[705 Walnut Ave - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.

*Planning Manager Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Matt Nejasnich represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

> *Wasn't the stone a key element of the design? (Nejasnich: Not sure they were totally sold on it. Could not find a stone that felt right. Wanted to find a material that works with the floorplan and elevation.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

> *Likes the change. Front elevation has a bit more depth on the right side.*

**Commissioner Kelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

- c.** 1250 Jackling Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Fence Exception to increase fence height limit to 8'-0" for a fence along the side and rear property line of an existing residential property at 1250 Jackling Drive. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (e). (Greg and Lisa Ott, applicant and property owners; Alejandro Maldonado, designer) (46 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [1250 Jackling Dr - Staff Report](#)  
[1250 Jackling Dr - Attachments](#)  
[1250 Jackling Dr - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Sargent had a brief email exchange with a neighbor of the project.*

*Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Greg Ott represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

> *Can see through the slats of the fence. How would the additional height provide more privacy? (Ott:*

*There will be creeping ivy.)*

- > *If the plan is to plant something and let it grow up, why the need for the additional height? (Ott: To let it grow to 8 feet.) Typically vines grow higher than the top of a fence; an 8-foot fence would potentially become a 9-foot fence.*
- > *What was there before the fence was built? (Ott: Low box hedges, no fence.)*
- > *Would the ivy be planted on the street or house side of the fence? (Ott: Street side.)*
- > *Has there been consideration of a lower fence with trees? (Ott: Would be expensive to have trees along such a long stretch. Already has rhododendrons on the other side; wants to keep them since they look nice from the inside.)*
- > *Has there been thought on breaking up the long, flat expanse of fencing along the property line? The horizontal pattern further accentuates. The fence across the street does a better job of being broken up and having vegetation. (Ott: Unique circumstance, since there is no planting between the sidewalk and the street, it is paved over. Would suggest a planting strip with trees, like the rest of Vancouver Avenue.)*
- > *Was there not a permit for the fence? (Ott: Did not get a permit.)*
- > *Any other details considered for the one foot of open portion on the top of the fence? (Ott: Likes what has been built for the contemporary look.)*
- > *How far is the fence being moved back on the Vancouver Avenue side? (Ott: 2 feet. Already has it scheduled to be moved back.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Likes that the fence is being moved back, with ivy at the base, and the suggestion to plant the planting strip along the street. However does not see why it needs to be so tall to solve the problem, especially once the ivy grows on it. The ivy and the planting strip will make it feel settled in the neighborhood.*
- > *Landscaping will be key. Curious why landscaping was not included in the plans. Would suggest something other than ivy, maybe jasmine or honeysuckle.*
- > *Suggests planting on the inside of the fence as well. Would be easier to maintain and provide shielding from the street.*
- > *Ordinance allows a 6 foot fence with 1 foot open above it. Top foot on this fence does not feel open. Feels like an 8-foot fence.*
- > *Understands the desire for privacy, but does not see the exceptional circumstance unique to the property.*
- > *Supports planting street trees in the planting strip area.*
- > *Does not see unique circumstances with this property that would warrant the exception. Sees similar conditions on other properties, but they are not addressed with with 8-foot fences. Others utilize planting to create privacy. A greener solution would work better here.*
- > *8 feet feels excessive, even with the setback. The top foot feels as closed as the rest of the fence.*
- > *Feels very tall, would like to see greenery and open space on top of the fence.*

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kelly, to deny the application without prejudice. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

- d.** 1615 Ralston Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines

Section 15301 (e)(1). (Thomas A. Saviano, Saviano Builders, applicant and designer; Henry and Jaclyn Eng, property owners) (55 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [1615 Ralston Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[1615 Ralston Ave - Attachments](#)  
[1615 Ralston Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)  
[1615 Ralston Ave - plans - 06.25.18](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.

Planning Manager Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Thomas A. Saviano represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > The west elevation finishes abruptly on the back side. Was there consideration to adding a roof over the rear door? (Saviano: It is one of the few remaining aspects of the house. It is only visible from the rear of the house. A trellis has been added to the rear.) Would provide some protection to the doors and windows.
- > The rear elevation has an element with a shed roof and a blank wall on the side of a bedroom. There is a window on the side of the bedroom; was there consideration to adding windows to that back wall? (Saviano: It is part of the existing structure, and was not looking to modify it more than necessary. There is foliage already screening it, and the trellis is intended to mitigate the abrupt nature of the blank wall.) It would help the bedroom programmatically to have windows on two sides, though it's not a deal-breaker. (Saviano: Has been trying to be cost-conscious. Emphasis has been on the aesthetics.)
- > Was there consideration on the west elevation to do something with the large window to the left of the door? It's existing but seems a bit out of place. (Saviano: Has considered an apron or flower bed off the window to improve the aesthetics.)
- > Is there confidence that the interior flow works the way it should and that the windows will not need to move around? (100% of the interior layout is by the owners desire.) If windows move, will need to come back. (Saviano: Yes, the interior layout has been determined by the homeowner. Has ensured that what is proposed can be accommodated by solid engineering.)
- > All of the windows have a prairie-style grid pattern except for the two rear bedrooms on the left. Was there thought to changing those windows? (Saviano: Thinks there will be an effort to change all the existing windows to something that will accommodate the aesthetics. Needs to review with the client. They are covered with foliage so not visible, but client is interested in continuity.) They would look good from the inside of the house as well. Could also look at the fenestration, so the sizes could match those around the rest of the house.
- > Gable vent on front could be more decorative. (Saviano: Will review with client. It is one of several nuances that could be accommodated to make the house more attractive.)
- > The double-hung windows on the front are not shown correctly; the upper sashes are smaller than the bottom, not equal. Not sure how that would look if the windows on the second floor are true split double-hung and have the prairie muntins. (Saviano: They are on different planes. The upper windows are set further back.)
- > On the east elevation there appears to be a drafting error, that the existing window is not centered on the gable as shown on the plans, and that the existing gable wall is wider than shown. (Saviano: It is not intended to be a modification so is probably an error.)
- > Corbel gable brackets are shown as 4 x 4s, but they should be 4 x 6s since they are wider than they

are tall.

> Is this the project that is intended to be built? Seems like there are still a number of things that might change. (Saviano: Yes, needs to get it approved so it can be built, but is malleable. If there are suggestions that the approval will hinge on, will be accommodating.)

Public Comments:

John and Kathleen Weatherwax, 1611 Ralston next door on the east side: Loves the idea of upgrading the house, but concerned the new upstairs might impact the light on the property, especially in the the front. How far from the front of the house will the new addition be? (Gaul: Suggests meet on site with the applicant so they can show where the addition will be.)(Tse: Looks like the second floor would be around 19 or 20 feet from the front.)

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > East elevation is far enough off, not comfortable with that not yet being resolved.
- > The proportion of the double-hung windows needs to be corrected so it will be able to see how they will look with the new windows.
- > The corrections can be made with a continuance.
- > Should double check the space planning on the interior. Doesn't look like it will be a comfortable house. Concerned the first floor powder room with 2-foot hallway will be unusable, but could be relatively easy to fix. The upstairs hallway is so narrow, it will make the whole floor feel claustrophobic. The interior layout is not the purview of the Planning Commission but it's a concern.
- > The changes that have been made are good and the house is much improved. The only concern was whether there are still changes anticipated.

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to continue the item. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

- e. 723-A Laurel Avenue, zoned R-2 - Application for Design Review Amendment for changes to a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing duplex dwelling. This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1). (J. Deal Associates, applicant and designer; Robert and Germaine Alfaro Tr, property owners) (66 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [723-A Laurel Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[723-A Laurel Ave - Attachments](#)  
[723-A Laurel Ave - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.

Catherine Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Jerry Deal, J. Deal Associates, represented the applicant with property owner Germaine Alfaro.



*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > *Would the addition on the front house have the corner boards like what appears on the rear house? (Alfaro: Similar. Does not need to be exactly the same.)*
- > *There is existing T1-11 siding? That will not be applied to the new project, correct? (Deal: No T1-11 siding on the project.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Does not think the rear building fits into the neighborhood. Likes the triple-bevel siding on the front. The rear house looks colder and cheaper. Front house has character and would like to see that maintained.*

*Commissioner Gaul made a motion to deny the request, and not have the substitution of the different siding. Commissioner Kelley seconded the motion.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *It's difficult to get the same type of siding as the front house.*
- > *Likes the older look on the front house, but it's difficult to find that type of narrow siding.*
- > *Does not like the wider siding.*
- > *The narrow siding is still available. Does not need to be custom-made.*

*The motion failed 4-3.*

*A new motion was made to approve the amendment.*

**Commissioner Kelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, and Terrones

**Nay:** 3 - Sargent, Gaul, and Tse

- f. 1500 Cypress Avenue and 101-105 El Camino Real, zoned R-3 - Application for Design Review, Condominium Permit, Tentative Condominium Map and Tentative Map for Lot Combination for a new three-story, four-unit residential condominium. This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (b). (Derrick Chang and Wayne Hu, applicants; Gary Gee Architects, Inc., architect; Opal Investments LLC, property owner) (79 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [1500 Cypress Ave & 101-105 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)  
[1500 Cypress Ave & 101-105 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)  
[1500 Cypress Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)  
[105 El Camino Real - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)  
[1500 Cypress 101-105 El Camino Real - plans - 06.25.18](#)

Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item as she lives within 500 feet of the subject property.

All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.

Planning Manager Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

> The neighbor is asking for an 8-foot fence. Is that in the purview of the commission to allow? (Gardiner: Would require application for a fence height exception.)(Kane: Would need to meet the findings required for a fence height exception to be approved.)

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Gary Gee, Gary Gee Architects, Inc., represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Has the applicant seen the letter submitted from the neighbor? (Gee: Property owner can address.)
- > Could the center portion of the side elevation be bumped out to provide deeper articulation? (Gee: Yes, or alternatively could be recessed in 6 inches.)
- > South elevation second floor balcony rails are shown as cement plaster on the elevations, but they look different on the renderings. Would they be painted differently? (Gee: Was one of the considerations; could paint it off-white to set it off a bit, but intention is to have a solid rail for privacy. The balconies are shallow, not for parties or sitting.)
- > Cypress elevation has a wall along the parking area. Could it be broken up with some openings, or wrought iron? (Gee: Could integrate some along the top to create a rhythm, about 8 inches down. Simple detail.)
- > Could the Pittosporum along the side be larger than the 5-gallon plants specified on the plans? (Gee: Would need to check with the landscape architect. 15-gallon could be considered. Pittosporum is a fast-growing hedge.)

Public Comments:

Peter Comaroto, 1576 Cypress Avenue: Good changes to the project. Busy traffic location, requests a traffic study. Side elevation facing Cypress Avenue looks like a great wall that divides neighborhoods, is very stark. The front of the building looks great. Concern roof decks will create noise and privacy issues for neighbors.

Fredy Bush, 1508 Cypress Avenue: Nice changes to the building, but the changes have more windows and balconies facing my house, so less privacy than the previous version, and building is closer. Rooftop patios as well as balconies. Sight line is misleading, trees are not all 22-feet tall and garage is only one story. Privacy is a big concern. Concern with the noise of garage doors, and wants a solid wall to reduce noise rather than a fence.

Calvin Paes and Stephen Wolf, 107 El Camino Real: Concerns with the distance between the two buildings and the height. Property now is 10 feet from fence, project would be 4 1/2 feet from the fence

and straight up. Concern with appearance of the wall and sunlight. Requests distance of the new building be the same as existing. Has a patio adjacent. Also lives in a three-story building, would want the same side setback. 107 El Camino Real does not have roof decks.

William Steul: Lives next to 1508 Cypress. Shares concerns with sight lines and noise levels. East side of building facing Cypress needs more work. Looks very blank, will not show well in the neighborhood.

Kirby Altman, 1537 Cypress Avenue: Plans are much nicer than previous version. Does commission have purview to require maintenance of the cypress tree? Concern with entrance on Cypress, intersection is dangerous and sight line could be blocked by parked cars. Cypress elevation is too austere, stark. Should be more consideration for the current neighbors' privacy, responsibility of the applicant rather than the existing owners. El Camino addresses should not be eligible for street parking permits, parking should be provided on site.

Wayne Hu, project applicant: Believes has addressed most of the privacy issues in the neighbor's letter. Has prepared site line drawings. Rear setback is 20 feet, and neighboring house has a 12-foot driveway for a total of about 32 feet between buildings. Living areas of the adjacent house are on other side of the house. Garage of adjacent house is 15 feet tall. Roof decks are set back so view into adjacent property is obscured. Agreeable with request for garage door openers.

Questions to applicant:

- > Does the entrance to the driveway have a gate? (Gee: No. It is open so there would not be queueing up.)
- > How are the roof decks expected to be used? (Gee: Used as open space for the unit. Could restrict types of activities if needed. Not large gathering spaces. Have been moved closer to the El Camino side.)
- > (Gee: Interior side setback is 7'-2" on the ground floor, and 9'-2 1/2" on the second and third floors. Has exceeded the required setbacks.)
- > Could the fence along the south side be changed from redwood to a solid 6-foot wall? (Gee: Would be amendable to it.)

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > The fenceline along Cypress should be addressed. Right now it's a long, flat wall, could use some deviations. The wrought iron sounds like a good idea.
- > The height of the building is consistent with the pattern along El Camino Real.
- > Privacy issues are noted; the last iteration was better in terms of the neighbor's privacy.
- > East wall should jut out more to increase the depth.
- > Would like some detail on the solid wall on the Cypress side, rather than a solid block wall. At least the portion viewable from the street.
- > A lot has been done to the rooftop decks to address privacy. Decks and noise could be addressed in CC&Rs, but they're not large enough for a big party that would create impacts for neighbors.
- > Has not maximized the building envelope.
- > Approach from El Camino heading north is an important viewpoint. On Cypress elevation would like to see more articulation or integration of materials to enhance the Spanish Revival style.
- > Could add additional fenestration on blank part of wall on east elevation. (Gee: Originally had more windows on that side, but in the revision a closet was positioned against the wall. Could put a window in the closet.)
- > Painted railings on the juliet balconies look a bit commercial. (Gee: Has designed similar type of balcony at 824 Linden in Burlingame - can be viewed at [824linden.com](http://824linden.com).)
- > Revisions to the project are significant and to the better. Four units are replacing two, so while it is an intensification it is not a huge revision. The height is less than allowed, and it meets the setbacks.

- > Landscaping has been broken down so the residences have a presence on street. Not insular like the previous version; laudable that it addresses El Camino in a manner that most projects do not.
- > Concern with roof decks, despite ambient noise from El Camino. Could be reduced in size, currently 15' x 15'. Not clear what people will do on the roof decks, but does not think noise will be an issues.
- > Sight line studies are not particularly helpful, but does not believe people will be standing on the edge of decks, particularly the lower-floor decks. However it is important to have more robust pittosporum.
- > Does not think there will be noise issue with El Camino, but could reduce the size. Does not expect they will be used that much given the attractions of Downtown Burlingame. Appreciates the positioning of the decks, mitigates the sight lines well.
- > Simple straightforward solution with good architecture, not trying to have too many units on the site. Just needs work on the Cypress side.
- > Would want a bit of outdoor amenity for residents, and that is provided by the roof decks. The small outdoor seating area is useful but not as significant, and would not necessarily want more activity on the ground level since it would be adjacent to the fence. The roof decks provide the amenity; maybe they can be reduced in size but they are nicely placed.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the application with the following condition:

The project shall go before the Planning Commission for review of an FYI for the following items prior to building permit issuance:

- a. both the Cypress Avenue (exterior - east) and the interior (west) elevations shall be revised to add articulation;
- b. the size of the proposed pittosporum shall be revised with the consultation of a landscape architect (current size proposed at 5-gallon);
- c. the south side (rear) fence shall be revised from redwood to a solid material;
- d. the Cypress Avenue (east) wall along the parking area shall be revised to add articulation and/or openings;
- e. consider reducing the size of the roof decks.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

- g.** Proposed amendments to Chapter 25.59 (Accessory Dwelling Units), Chapter 25.08 (Definitions), Chapter 25.26 (R-1 district regulations), Chapter 25.60 (Accessory Structures in R-1 and R-2 districts) and Chapter 25.70 (Off-street parking) of the Burlingame Municipal Code related to Accessory Dwelling Units to be consistent with recently adopted amendments to California Government Code Section 65852.2.

- Attachments:** [ADU Staff Report - 6.25.18](#)  
[ADU ord change 6.25.18- PC minutes 5.14 and Resolution](#)  
[ADU ord change REDLINES 6.25.18](#)  
[ADU ord change CLEAN 6.25.18](#)  
[ADU ord change Attachments 6.25.18](#)

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

- > What are the fire sprinkler requirements for ADUs? (Keylon: The ADU is not required to be sprinklered if the house is not required to be sprinklered.)
- > Would fire-rated windows be required if there is proximity to the property line? (Keylon: In non-sprinklered structures the Building Code does not allow openings within 5 feet of the property line, and

one-hour construction is required. If the structure is sprinklered the distance is 3 feet.)

> If there is not a kitchen, would it be considered an ADU? (Keylon: There would need to be a kitchen to be considered an ADU. Otherwise it would be considered an accessory living space.)

> A fire-rated window that is one-hour rated could be allowed on the property line. (Keylon: Correct. Building Code provisions are attached to the staff report for reference.)(Kane: Intent is to minimize inconsistencies between Conditional Use Permit provisions that consider issues differently than fire and building codes.)

> The complexity of issue is why some commissioners supported eliminating the requirement for a CUP for windows within 10 feet of the property line, because of the various different issues related to the the fire and building codes that govern and dictate openings within proximity to a property line.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

Jerry Deal: Having an additional unit can help people afford to stay in town. Conditional Use Permit is required for staircase from a basement to outside; this is a perfect example of a second unit that would not be on property line, which would be preferable. Otherwise a structure in the backyard could be disruptive to neighbors if the windows are open. Does not mind having an accessory unit in the back, but having a window close to the property line is an issue since sound carries.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> Concern with window openings being close to property line. The Planning Commission needs to consider privacy. ADUs can be on the property line, so seems like it is worthwhile retaining. There will be instances where it doesn't matter at all, but it needs to be evaluated.

> ADUs are otherwise approved ministerially, but one would come before the Planning Commission if it proposed a window within 10 feet of the property line. However in that instance it would not be before the commission for anything other than the CUP.

> Would expect the commission will be reviewing a lot of CUPs for windows within 10 feet of the property line given the constraints in accommodating ADUs on small lots.

> Needs to determine whether the CUP requirement restricts ADUs from happening. A project could be designed with no windows within 10 feet of the property line, so would not need the CUP. Doesn't mean the project itself cannot be within 10 feet of the property line.

> The CUP window requirement will not necessarily limit the number of ADU applications, it will just change the nature of the ADU designs, while possibly preserving quality of life for neighbors.

> The issue is not just noise, it can be light shining into an adjacent yard too.

**Commissioner Kelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to recommend the amendments to the City Council with the requirement for a Conditional Use Permit for a window within 10 feet of a property line retained. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1660 Westmoor Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single-family dwelling. (Sonia Jimenez, TOPVIEW Design Solutions, applicant and designer; Amauri Campos Melo, property owner) (52 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [1660 Westmoor Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[1660 Westmoor Rd - Attachments](#)  
[1660 Westmoor Rd - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

> What is threshold for requiring landscape plan? (Keylon: Required for new construction projects. Projects just involving additions are requested to at least show landscaping on the site plan. Can request it from the applicant if submittal does not provide enough information.)

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Amauri Campos Melo represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Discuss with designer whether or not to have muntins/grids in the windows? (Melo: Was divided on whether or not to have them. Likes the cleaner look a bit better, but would not be opposed to grids if the commission feels it would help with neighborhood compatibility.) Would add some nice scale and detail. Could just have dividing muntins along the top portion of the windows.
- > Massing is handled nicely.
- > Any consideration to adding a detail to the front gable? Gable vent, or siding. (Melo: Can consider it.)
- > Needs windows with muntins on all sides since house is on a corner.
- > Could have a window on the rear elevation second story, in the bedroom. It would make the elevation look better and would make the bedroom nicer to have two windows and improve ventilation. Also another window at the open area at the top of the stairs, would add some nice light to the space.
- > Front porch and garage door are craftsman style, but everything else is more pedestrian. Slider windows are huge, and out of proportion with the craftsman elements. Should rethink the placement, size, and treatment of the windows.
- > Massing is right, but the windows are wrong. Diminishes the charm of the building. (Melo: Can look at it so it is more consistent with the Craftsman style.)
- > Double-hung windows that slide up and down will look good and match the craftsman style, or casement windows if needed for egress. Could still have 6-foot openings, but could have three sashes including possibly a wider middle sash.
- > Chimney looks massive on the front elevation with combining two of them. Could be scaled down if they are gas-burning fireplaces, would not need to go all the way up.
- > Is the RV parked on this property? What is the plan for that part of the site? (Melo: It is planned to be a back yard. RV will go into storage, and will close the fence.)
- > Would help with neighborhood compatibility if the plate height on the second floor was 8 feet instead of 9. (Melo: Should not be an issue.)
- > Per the neighbor's letter, can there be netting during construction? (Melo: Yes, talked to contractor. Can put netting on the fence to increase it to 9 feet to avoid debris going over fence. There is a large setback now, so it is not too close to the fence.)

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > *Could be wrapped up quickly with the guidance of a design review consultant.*
- > *Items to be addressed would be the fenestration/windows (size, treatment, and location), the second floor plate height, fireplace details, gable treatment, and landscaping shown on the plan.*

**Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kelly, to refer the application to a design review consultant. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

- b.** 434 Bloomfield Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with an attached garage. (J Deal Associates, applicant and designer; Parshadi & Kaushal Shah, property owners) (63 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [434 Bloomfield Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[434 Bloomfield Rd - Attachments](#)  
[434 Bloomfield Rd - Plans - 06.25.18](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Jerry Deal, J Deal Associates, represented the applicant, with property owners Parshadi and Kaushal Shah*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > *What's happening with the triangular window on the Lexington side? Is it being replaced? (Deal: The existing windows are all metal sash and not operating well. Leaving the recess but will put new windows into those areas. Trying to replace almost all of the windows, except for one on the back side.)*
- > *The same type of siding is being used on the gable ends? (Deal: Yes.)*
- > *(Deal: Tree clarification: One of the trees is listed as a flowering plumb, but it's actually a blossoming cherry tree. It would count towards the tree requirement since it is not a fruit tree. The other two are Crepe myrtles, but would rather have something other than those. Can change those for the next meeting.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Project is straightforward, integrates well.*
- > *It is a challenging house to add a second story to.*
- > *Not sure how to add to the project given the idiosyncrasies of the existing house.*
- > *Does not have the charm and detail of the existing house - the deep recessed windows, the flair on the base of the front elevation.*
- > *OK with the basic program and massing, but needs some more articulation and charm to replicate some of what is already there. Perhaps replication of the gable vents, or deep recessed windows.*

*Otherwise it's just a box on top of the house.*

- > *Feels very box-like. Concern with the east elevation, looks like a box on top of a box.*
- > *Charm has disappeared. Could repeat some of the tapering/soft curves on the upper floor. The horizontal siding element on the existing house could possibly be added to the upstairs as well. Otherwise does not see the upstairs tying in with the lower floor.*
- > *New gable vent does not relate to the current gable vents.*
- > *There is not consistency with the shapes and sizes of the windows.*
- > *Needs to be tied together better.*

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

**Aye:** 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

## 10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

*There were no Commissioner's Reports.*

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- a. 119 Loma Vista Drive - FYI for as-built changes to a previously approved Design Review project.

**Attachments:** [119 Loma Vista Dr - Memorandum](#)  
[119 Loma Vista Dr - plans - 06.25.18](#)

*Accepted.*

- b. 2721 Easton Drive - FYI for proposed changes to a previously approved Design Review project.

**Attachments:** [2721 Easton Dr - Memorandum](#)  
[2721 Easton Dr - plans - 06.25.18](#)

*Accepted.*

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

*The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 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 June 25, 2018. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on July 6, 2018, 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 \$551.00, 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.*