



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Planning Commission

---

Monday, April 13, 2015

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.*

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### a. March 23, 2015 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

**Attachments:** Draft March 23, 2015 Meeting Minutes

- > *Page 10, sixth line: change "meting" to "meeting".*
- > *Page 16, third line from bottom of page: change "to" to "too".*

**Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve as amended Discussion Item. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

*Community Development Director Meeker indicated that Agenda Item 8b (225 Dwight Road) is being continued to the April 27th meeting at the request of the applicant. The applicant for Agenda Item 8e (712 Lexington Way) has requested that the item be heard as the last item under Regular Action.*

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

*Vice-Chair DeMartini thanked former Commissioner Sandra Yie for her years of service on the Commission. He also welcomed Michael Gaul as the newest Planning Commissioner, noting that he will begin attending meetings on April 27th.*

### 6. STUDY ITEMS

*There were no study items.*

### 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

*There were no consent calendar items.*

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 1336 Laguna Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single-family dwelling (Mark Robertson, applicant and designer; Dan and Michele Tatos, property owners) ( 61 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1336 Laguna Ave Staff Report](#)  
[1336 Laguna Ave attachments](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones noted that he had reviewed the recording of the Commission's February 23rd discussions of this item and other items appearing on the agenda. Vice-Chair De Martini noted that he had an ex-parte communication with the City Arborist regarding this project.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Mark Robertson and Dan Tatos represented the applicant.*

*Commission comments/questions:*

- > How does the owner expect to use the deck? (Tatos: Just wants to use the space to get some sun and read a book.)*
- > Thinks the design changes are a big improvement.*
- > Corner lots are difficult for providing useable yard area. The rationale for the second floor deck is supportable.*
- > Perhaps look at a faux tile vent in the upper part of the gable ends.*
- > Spoke to the City Arborist regarding the trees at the sidewalk. It will not be an easy job to remove the tree in the future. Perhaps circle back with the Arborist.*

*Public comments:*

*Neighbor on the east side of the property: Expressed concern with the number of windows on the second story. Understands that designs for second stories are to be designed to alternate windows.*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.*

*Commission discussion:*

- > Feels that the applicant's arguments for the deck are compelling. However, it feels like a means of adding useable area to the home. Not entirely comfortable, but not necessarily a deal breaker.*
- > Hopes that the second floor decks are not a trend, but this design for the deck is mitigated by its location between two garages and near a tree. Its location and the circumstances of the lot support the deck.*
- > The side windows are a bit more problematic; no one has a right to privacy. The placement of windows is a negotiation between the neighbors. Difficult to design to an unknown future condition. Suggested that the applicant that they discuss the window placement with the neighbors.*
- > The location of windows on the side of a residence is not prescribed by ordinance; applicants are encouraged to work with their neighbors to minimize impacts. Revisit the east side elevation of the second floor to see if the window placement could be minimized. Shouldn't be used as a cause for delaying consideration of the project.*
- > Landscaping may also be used to enhance privacy. This could be used by the neighbor.*
- > Any changes to the window placement on the east side should come back as an FYI.*
- > Perhaps the studio windows could be revised to be clerestory.*

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the application with the added condition that any changes to the windows be brought back to the Commission as an FYI. Vice-Chair DeMartini asked for a voice vote, and the motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- b. 1906 Easton Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and Special Permits for an attached garage, a basement, and declining height envelope (50 noticed) (Jerry Deal, J Deal Associates, applicant and designer; Easton Estates LLC, property owner) (50 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

**Attachments:** [1906 Easton Dr Staff Report](#)  
[1906 Easton Dr Attachments](#)  
[1906 Easton Dr - 04.13.15 - recd after 1.pdf](#)

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

*Community Development Director Meeker provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Vice-Chair De Martini opened the public hearing.*

*Jerry Deal and Frank Wong represented the applicant.*

*Commission comments/questions:*

- > *Requested clarification of the plate heights. (Deal - only the top floor has been reduced in height.)*
- > *Feels the design is much nicer now; certainly has a Prairie-style feel about it.*
- > *Feels that the main character issues have been addressed and are an improvement.*
- > *Questioned why the space between the first and second floor is so thick? (Deal - necessary to permit duct-work to be installed.)*
- > *Is there an opportunity to provide a garage door with greater detail? (Deal - can stain the door the same color as the siding. Could also provide more of a panel-type system.)*
- > *How does the style fit into the neighborhood; he feels it doesn't. (Deal - is a matter of opinion. The style is what the client wants. The changes that have been made with the materials help the design to fit in.)*
- > *Neighbor to the left has requested one of the Oak trees remain. (Deal - the owner is having conversations with the neighbor, but it is a tough issue given the condition of the tree.)*

*There were no public comments.*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.*

*Commission discussion:*

- > *Feels that the home does not fit into the neighborhood. Changes could be made to the roof and with lower plate heights to make the design fit better with the neighborhood.*
- > *Feels the building is massed quite nicely and fits well with the Craftsman-style home next door. Doesn't see the design as Modernist at all. Doesn't see the lack of a peaked roof as a problem. Likes the variety that it adds to the neighborhood.*
- > *Feels that the attached garage is also a factor in the incompatibility with the neighborhood. Would*

*definitely be something new in this part at town.*

- > *The design has scale and good detailing. Adds variety to the neighborhood. Has difficulty drawing a hard line on where Modern styles are appropriate and where they are not.*
- > *The problem with a flat-roof is that it eliminates the opportunity for vaulting the ceilings.*
- > *The project is supportable as designed.*
- > *The current design is a great improvement over the prior design. The massing and detailing is handled well. Still has questions regarding the fit with the neighborhood.*
- > *Projects are considered individually, but also take into account past decisions on other parts of the City.*
- > *If there was going to be a request for an encroachment into height, it should be for some element of the design that is not standard.*
- > *The FAR is maximized with this design, plus the two nine-foot plate heights compounds the problem of compatibility.*
- > *Discussed whether or not to recommend further design changes with a continuance.*

*Commissioner Loftis moved to approve the project with the suggested conditions of approval included in the staff report and with an additional condition requiring a revision to the garage door to include more detailing. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Terrones. Vice-Chair DeMartini called for a roll call vote on the motion and it failed 2-3-2-0 (Commissioners Gum, Sargent and DeMartini dissenting, Commissioners Gaul and Bandrapalli absent.*

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

**Aye:** 3 - DeMartini, Gum, and Sargent

**Nay:** 2 - Loftis, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- c. 115 Occidental Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Environmental Review, Design Review and Special Permit for Declining Height Envelope for a new two-story single family dwelling (James Chu, Chu Design Associates, applicant and designer; JNL Occidental LLP, property owner) (43 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [115 Occidental Ave - Attachments](#)  
[115 Occidental Ave - Negative Declaration - Initial Study](#)  
[115 Occidental Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)  
[115 Occidental Ave - Staff Report.doc](#)

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

*Senior Planner Barber presented an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*James Chu represented the applicant.*

*Commission comments/questions:*

- > *Likes the project, the front window looks better.*

*Public comments:*

*Peter Wantuch, 109 Occidental: Supports the project. Concerned about the removal of the 12-inch Oak tree. Minimize dust during demolition. The garden will be protected during demolition and construction. Gardener will meet with the construction crew. There is an intent to work through this issue. Concern during construction that would like a commitment to build the new fence as soon as possible to preserve the integrity of the property line. Have a non-conforming setback that places the face of the house within eighteen inches of the fence; wants an easement. The house is being built for spec.*

*James Chu: Will work with the neighbor to provide access, but doesn't want to record an easement.*

*Commissioner Sargent moved to adopt the Negative Declaration with the findings stated in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Terrones. The motion carried on a voice vote: 5-0-2-0 (Commissioners Gaul and Bandrapalli absent).*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.*

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the project with the conditions in the staff report.**

**Discussion of motion:**

- > **Commissioner DeMartini noted that the design would fit better in Easton Addition.**
- > **Revise the landscape plan to show the Oak tree on the property line remaining.**

**Vice-Chair DeMartini asked for a voice vote, and the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Nay:** 1 - DeMartini

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- d.** 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 - This item is being continued to the April 27, 2015 meeting at the request of the applicant.

*This item was continued to the regular meeting of April 27, 2015 at the request of the applicant.*

- f.** 1626 Rollins Road, zoned RR- Application for Conditional Use Permit for a transportation services business including fleet vehicle parking and business operations in an existing commercial building (Ronald R. Penny, MV Transportation Inc., applicant; Raphael Cedillos, architect; David Mawdsley, Scott Mawdsley & Diane Schildbach, property owners) (14 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [1626 Rollins Rd - Attachments.pdf](#)

[1626 Rollins Rd -Staff Report.doc](#)

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

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

*Questions of staff:*

> *What constitutes an intensification of a use? ( Barber/Meeker - measured by the difference between the City Code's parking standards for one use versus another use. Doesn't take into account the unique operational characteristics of a particular business.)*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Donald Penny represented the applicant.*

*Commission questions/comments:*

- > *What type of shuttles? (Penny - Caltrain.)*
- > *What are the typical routes? (Penny - Highway 101 and I-280 corridors.)*
- > *Are alternative fuel vehicles being used? (Penny - no, regular fuel vehicles.)*
- > *Expressed concern that the hours of operation could be too restrictive.*
- > *Is there any potential that all employees will converge on the site at the same time? (Penny - no.) May wish to craft some sort of condition to address this. (Penny - typically only five employees present on the site at a time.)*
- > *How likely will it be that twenty-two employees will be present on the site at any given time? (Penny - maximum of 27 vehicles would be parked on the property at one time. Some employees will use BART to get to work. Barber - noted that there is interior space within the building that can be used for additional vehicle parking.) Satisfied that the parking can be met, but wants to be certain that Fire Department vehicles will still have the required turnaround.)*
- > *Will the drivers take breaks at the site? (Penny - Usually leave the site.)*
- > *Requested that the landscape be upgraded and the fences cleaned up.*
- > *Asked what the hours of operation should be? (Penny - 9 p.m. will be doable given normal traffic conditions.)*

*Public comments:*

*None.*

**Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve with an amendment of the condition for operating hours to indicate that the business closes at 9 p.m. rather than 8 p.m. Vice-Chair DeMartini called for a voice-vote on the motion, and the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- g.** 1310 Rollins Road, zoned RR - Application for a Conditional Use Permit for auto sales (Octane Motorsports LLC, applicant; Travel Fare Inc., property owner) (23 noticed)  
Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [1310 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[1310 Rollins Rd - Attachments.pdf](#)

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

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

*Questions of staff:*

- > *Requested clarification regarding the 1993 variance approval, particularly related to the parking required for the motorcycle use. (Barber - parking is based upon the retail and showroom spaces. The parking spaces shown on the plans were traditional vehicle parking spaces, not motorcycle parking)*

spaces.)

Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.

Syed Husain represented the applicant.

Commission comments/questions:

> Simple application; agrees with conditions in the staff report.

Public comments:

None.

Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair DeMartini, to approve with the conditions included in the staff report. Vice-Chair DeMartini called for a voice vote on the motion to approve, and the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- e. 712 Lexington Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Special Permit for declining height envelope and Side Setback Variance for first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling (Wehmeyer Design, applicant and designer; Rahul Verma and Monali Sheth, property owners) (56 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [712 Lexington Way - Staff Report](#)

[712 Lexington Way - Attachments](#)

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

Community Development Director Meeker presented an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.

Rob Wehmeyer represented the applicant.

Commission comments/questions:

> The changes made are great. The porch change makes a difference, as does the changes to the windows.

> Appreciates the applicant making the changes to eliminate the parking variance.

> Consider revising the 2 x 10 fascias; perhaps something a bit more delicate.

Public comments:

None.

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve with the conditions listed in the staff report. Vice-Chair DeMartini called for a voice-vote on the**

**motion to approve, and the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 833 Alpine Avenue, zoned R-1 Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with detached garage (Waldemar Stachnuik, KWS United Technology, Inc., applicant and designer; Bryan and Lindsay Morris, property owners) (47 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [833 Alpine Ave- Staff Report](#)  
[833 Alpine Ave - Attachments.pdf](#)

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

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

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Waldemar Stachnuik and Brian Morris represented the applicant.*

*Commission questions/comments:*

- > *The roof slopes are significantly different than what exists currently. Needs to be much more delicate in its approach to integrating the second-floor roofline into the house. The design detracts from the character of the house.*
- > *The front view of the house is being altered in a negative way.*
- > *The mass of the side elevations is increased by the second floor sheer-wall addition. The dormers should be made subordinate to the main roof.*
- > *Noticed the tall fence on one side of the driveway; was it done with permits? (Morris - wasn't aware of the code requirement at the time. Was installed because there is no back-yard; the side-yard serves as the yard area.) Try to correct this issue.*
- > *Agrees with comments about the shed roof.*
- > *Has any thought been given to making the windows consistent? (Stachnuik - is difficult to make them consistent. Intends to use the windows with grids to match the windows on the front of the house. Will install aluminum-clad wood windows.)*
- > *The dormers are very prominent from Alpine. Important to do a correct design.*

*Public comments:*

*None.*

**Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to refer the project to a design reviewer. Vice-Chair DeMartini asked for a voice vote, and the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- b. 2753 Burlingview Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Parking Variance,

and Hillside Area Construction Permit for a major renovation of an existing single family dwelling which includes a first floor addition and a new second floor (Dreiling Terrones Architecture, Inc., applicant and architect; Alvin and Jacqueline Chan, property owner) (46 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

**Attachments:** [2753 Burlingview Dr Staff Report](#)  
[2753 Burlingview Dr Attachments](#)  
[2753 Burlingview Dr - 04.13.15 - recd after 1.pdf](#)  
[2753 Burlingview Dr - 04.13.15 - recd after 2.pdf](#)

Commissioner Terrones indicated that he would recuse himself from participating in the discussion regarding this item as his firm has a business relationship with the applicant. He left the City Council Chambers.

Community Development Director Meeker provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.

Wayne Hu represented the applicant.

Commission questions/comments:

- > Doesn't find the justification for the parking variance compelling. There is already major reconstruction going on with the project.
- > Is troubled by the massing of the house; take a look at this. (Hu - have looked at the massing in general.)
- > Appears to be possible to relocate the stairs into the interior of the house to improve parking.
- > The home approved on the adjacent property was massed better.
- > Need to engage with the neighbors regarding view impacts.
- > Question regarding landscape plan at the front; will there be turf? Clarify on the landscape plan.
- > Believes the plan could be "sculpted" a bit more to make it look less boxy.
- > Agrees with the comments regarding the garage.
- > A color rendering would be helpful in understanding the design.
- > The design is not truly Mid-Century Modern.

Public comments:

Terry McAloon, 2969 Burlingview Drive: expressed concern about size, mass and bulk of house. Twice the size of most homes in the area. The lot is similar in size to all other lots in the area. Concerned about losing the open view and partial Bay view from his house. Requested story poles.

Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.

Commission discussion:

- > Suggested story poles following refinements to the design.
- > Encouraged the applicant to meet with the neighbors when refining.
- > Require story poles before coming back for action.
- > Could warrant design reviewer, but feels that the firm has the ability to address the design concerns.
- > Doesn't feel that conditions warrant the parking variance in this instance, based upon the arguments presented in the application.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to place the item on

the regular action calendar when ready for action, with further direction to erect story poles for the project once revisions to the design are completed, prior to consideration by the Commission. Vice-Chair DeMartini asked for a voice vote on the motion, and the motion carried by the following vote:

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

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

**Recused:** 1 - Terrones

- c. 1700 Devereux Drive, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review and Parking Variance for a major renovation including a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with an attached garage (Wehmeyer Design, applicant and architect; Stephen and Kimarie Matthews, property owners) (43 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Barber

**Attachments:** [1700 Devereux Dr - Staff Report](#)  
[1700 Devereux Dr - Attachments.pdf](#)

*Commissioner Terrones returned to the dais.*

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Vice-Chair DeMartini met with the neighbor at 105 Ray Drive. Commissioner Terrones met with the applicant. Commissioner Gum met with the neighbor on the left side of the site.*

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

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.*

*Rob Wehmeyer and Stephen Matthews represented the applicant.*

*Commission comments/questions:*

- > *Feels the change in materials on the side elevations creates a wedding cake effect. Looks like the center of the house has been scooped out and something place into it.*
- > *The second story deck is quite large. Perhaps reduce the size.*
- > *Likes the direction that the home design is moving.*
- > *Feels that the "freeboard" between the overhang on the garage and overhang appears incorrect.*
- > *Let the overhangs on the front porch extend somewhat to enhance the Craftsman effect. Perhaps consider not wrapping the eaves on the second-story.*
- > *Looks at second floor decks in context with its surroundings. Would not have much impact in this instance.*
- > *Likes the deck. Doesn't believe its that large.*
- > *The eye is drawn to the garage; try to minimize the appearance.*
- > *With respect to landscaping; revisit whether or not more landscaping can be installed.*
- > *Looks like the window choices shown on one of the plan pages are true divided lights or simulated true divided light windows; should be simulated true divided light windows..*
- > *Agrees with considering second-story decks on a case-by-case basis.*
- > *Hard to make the case for the parking variance when so much of the house is being changed. Appreciates the increase in the useable space in the garage, but are also reducing the overall length of the garage. The pantry appears to be enlarged into the garage space, when the plans could be adjusted to pick up more length in the garage.*
- > *Agrees with comments on the parking variance.*

> Feels that the deck may be too large for the massing of the house. A smaller deck may be more appropriate given the size of the bedroom adjacent to it.

Public comments:

None.

Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to place the item on the regular action calendar when ready for consideration. Vice-Chair DeMartini called for a voice vote, and the motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

- d. 1601 Sanchez Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permits for attached garage and basement ceiling height for construction of a new, two-story single family dwelling and attached garage (TRG Architects, applicant and architect; Bryant McLaughlin, property owner) (73 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [1601 Sanchez Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[1601 Sanchez Ave - Attachments](#)

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

Community Development Director Meeker provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice-Chair DeMartini opened the public hearing.

Randy Grange represented the applicant.

Commission comments/questions:

- > Feels the band of windows across the pop-out on the second floor front elevation a bit bothersome.
- > Not a fan of the metal roof in the residential neighborhoods in Burlingame.
- > Likes the approach to the design and the rendering. There is a lot of variety in the neighborhood regarding garage placement. Would tend to favor having a detached garage rather than the attached garage as shown.
- > Feels that this block is one that can possibly handle a metal roof, but will need to see the alternative.
- > Concerned about the Oak tree, but understands that the neighbor concurs with the removal.
- > Is there to be pumping of water to the street from the basement. (Grange: is pumping water now.)
- > Likes the design with the traditional form on the front and the more Modern approach at the rear is not problematic.
- > Likes the standing seam metal roof. Permits the introduction of a Modern element while maintaining traditional forms.
- > The attached garage request is problematic.
- > How useable is the curved driveway? (Grange - considered the radii and it all appears to work. Feels the attached garage is no different than what was approved on Drake Avenue. Need to be consistent.)
- > Why does the basement ceiling height need to be nine feet? (Grange - permits more room for ductwork in the area.)
- > Doesn't have an issue with the metal roof. When looking at metal roofs, looks at the color and the

entire pallet of materials to ensure harmony with finishes and colors. Appreciates the need for increased durability.

> On the right elevation; is a bit concerned about the upsweeping roof element on the rear, side. (Grange - the client likes the feel of the interior volume this element creates.)

> The pattern of the neighborhood includes an attached garage next door. The garage includes only one stall so that it minimizes the impact of the presence of the garage; also pushed back from the street. Wishes more people would embrace the detached garage approach as it provide additional flexible outdoor space on the driveway.

Public comments:

Neighbor: the existing driveway that is there now allowed him to build a swimming pool. The reduced setback would prohibit him from accessing his pool area.

Vice-Chair DeMartini closed the public hearing.

Commission discussion:

> Likes the project, but has a concern about the garage. Hard to support the design approach. Front-facing garages are not the predominant pattern.

> Doesn't see a condition that exists to warrant the attached garage. Requested a detached garage.

> Doesn't feel strongly either way on the garage. Doesn't believe the driveway will work.

> Doesn't care for the metal roof.

> The awning over the front window looks flimsy.

> Doesn't have a huge problem with the garage design.

> Concerned that the driveway design lends itself to parking in front of the house.

> Agrees with comments regarding the driveway, but not opposed to the garage design.

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair DeMartini, to place the item on the regular action calendar when ready for action. Vice-Chair DeMartini called for a voice vote, and the motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - DeMartini, Loftis, Gum, Sargent, and Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Gaul, and Bandrapalli

## 10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Vice-Chair DeMartini noted that meetings of the BPAC are now scheduled every two months.

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Community Development Director Meeker noted that the City Council approved Rector Motors' request for a conditional use permit for vehicle storage at 1260 California Drive at its meeting of April 6th.

- a. FYI: 1048 Balboa Avenue - review of proposed changes to a previously approved Design Review project.

**Attachments:** [1048 Balboa Ave - FYI](#)

The changes reflected in the FYI were accepted by the Commission.

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 10:27 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 13, 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 April 23, 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.*