



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, August 9, 2021

7:00 PM

Online

- c. 720 Farrington Lane, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Kaileen Yen, Winder Gibson Architects, applicant and architect; James Whitley and Ashley Wong, property owners) (128 noticed) Staff Contact: Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [720 Farrington Ln - Staff Report](#)
[720 Farrington Ln - Attachments](#)
[720 Farrington Ln - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an over-view of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Geoffrey Gibson, designer and Crenshaw and Ashley Whitley, property owners represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> Public comments sent via e-mail: There's a severe drainage problem on that side of the street that isn't noticeable in these drought conditions. I looked at 732 Acacia Drive and recommended a swimming pool in the back to alleviate the water pressure against the foundation during the winter storms, but the final solution used was pumping of concrete into the basement to create a stable foundation. Two-story homes do not exist on the other side of the street where there's better drainage.

> Public comments sent via e-mail by Athan Rebelos: I find this style of saving the streetscape of a classic design integrated with modern and create a design very attractive and interesting. I would love to see more of this in Burlingame and think it's a wonderful project. I hope the Planning Commission will approve it and support more projects going forward.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I love the front house. I even appreciate the material changes and the updating that is happening. However I really see two totally different houses, front and back. I'm not seeing how they're coming together. They are very different styles. It feels like two different homes colliding. I'm not sure I'm there yet in being able to appreciate the explanation of a more historic front to a more contemporary rear. As we go from window treatments in the front and trims to a more punch through metal window system in the back, it's vastly different.

> I'm seeing a different house shoved on to the back of this one. There may be ways for a con-temporary feel to grow out of the house, but I'm not seeing it growing, blending and marrying. I'm seeing two pieces of architecture slammed together. If we had something in our guidelines where we can say something less visible from the street or only visible from the rear does not have to have any design considerations and we therefore don't have to make findings one through five from our design guideline

standpoint, then maybe we can approve something like this. I can't make finding one for compatibility of the architectural style with the existing character of the neighborhood when that front portion of the house that's going to remain is a big part of this neighborhood and finding number three for the architecture style and mass and bulk of the structure. I don't want to deny the homeowners what they're looking for in terms of that contemporary style, but the project has to hang together from an approachability standpoint, relative to the design guidelines. Looking at the objective points and findings that we have to make, I can't make those specific findings for this project the way that the dichotomy of styles are not wedded, but slammed together. I'm having difficulty from that standpoint.

> The second slide for the concept on the back, you could see it was very intentional, that's a very unorthodox shape. That kind of massing in the back is really humble and respectful towards the neighbors. I can't make the finding for number one which is the compatibility of the architectural style with the existing character of the neighborhood. I feel that the way you can connect these two architectural styles is absent, but nevertheless, I do love the concept. I do like the articulation in the back. I feel like a lot of time and thought was put into it. I don't feel like it was two things coming together but eventually that ended up happening here. There needs to be something that can blend or marry the two better. As far as findings go, I can make the finding for number three. I can't make the finding for number one.

> When I first looked at this, I thought this is a really interesting project. It is reminiscent of the house at 133 Pepper Avenue that was partially historical. I feel like that house is something that this house was trying to do. It's just not quite there. I also cannot find the findings for the compatibility of the neighborhood. I appreciate the back wall and the privacy that the applicant was trying to do for the neighbors, that was very respectful. I feel that the architect could potentially go back and try to give us what we want if we can give some clear and concise ideas of what we're wanting.

> I particularly have a problem when the roofs get steep and the material becomes a significant part of the facade of a building and that's what's happening here. What exacerbating it is it's a large roof surface that's tilted down at a steep angle toward the street. I don't think I would have problems finding that material was consistent and compatible with the neighborhood by and large. What's more acceptable is when the roof is shallower, you're not looking at it and it's not in your face. Especially with the beautiful bungalow like this. I don't find the addition compatible. They do feel like they're slammed together. I get the argument about how this works in Europe and in San Francisco. There are big differences though in a small town like Burlingame and San Francisco. San Francisco has a sea of residential buildings and those residential buildings are largely zero lot lines. So what you've got is a facade that can take on whatever sort of hybrid character it wants to and then the back can take on a more extreme character very easily. That doesn't work here because it's not the same environment. Each one of those projects that happens here happens in a pond instead of an ocean. The bigger the city, the more it can bear that burden of contextual in its morphing over time. Burlingame, I don't think can bear that kind of burden very well. Especially in a small residential neighborhood with small traditional homes to have that happen suddenly. It's not one of one hundred facades, it's one of 15 facades. It makes a big difference. I don't see anything subtle about this project. It's slammed together. What it really takes is a rethinking on the part of the architect about how to approach this.

> We see the copying of the front, traditional architecture and additions to the rear of homes hundreds of times over the course of the 16 years that I've been on this commission, where a copying of the front is done gracefully and beautifully. I have often seen it where that addition takes on a bit of its own character, but it doesn't slam into the rear of the house and with this type of difficulty. This looks more difficult than copying the front. So, perhaps that can be some additional guidance. Honestly, the project would benefit by going through design review consulting, just having that familiarity with the design review guidelines as an additional voice in the room.

> It feels like it's an opportunity for the applicant and owners to re-huddle and think through some of the challenges and see if another swing at this, with a different approach, might help us get to a better resolution rather than just saying that we want design review consultant because there is a skill here. It just didn't hit for us tonight.

> I think the architect could resolve this. However going back to design review consultant, it would maybe fast track this for them possibly. So when they come back the next time, maybe it will be more in line with what we're looking for.

> It would seem that there's nothing stopping us from handing out the contact information in allowing

that to be a voluntary collaboration, if so be, without us necessarily having to force that decision. If they wanted to use the design consultant as a collaborative person to help fast track it, so be it. But if we make a motion to insist on it, then it's something else, right? Have we ever done that before? (Gardiner: I think you could not require it. It is unusual, but you've made the case that there could be a benefit to engaging one of the design review consultants if the applicant feels it will add different ideas or streamline it or fast track it a little bit more. There's nothing to say that an applicant could not on their own behalf go forward and engage one of our consultants. But others have made a point that perhaps it's just more of a huddle and a regroup with the existing architect, so nothing to say they can't still go with a consultant even if the commission does not require it.)

> What are our options? (Gardiner: Typically, as this is a design review study item, where there's a project where it looks as though there's more to review the second time around, it would go to the regular action calendar. We have projects go to regular action and then they have to do another lap on the regular action calendar, too, if it's not quite there yet. We do sometimes help projects come back on the design review study agenda on their own accord if they've made substantial changes and they want to check in again before really firming things up for the action calendar. So, really the two standard options are regular action calendar or referral to design review consultant.)

> Assistant city attorney, can you help us in terms of streamline and permitting processing. Are they, are we required to give them the opportunity for some action? (Spansail: We're required to move the project forward in a reasonable time frame. You could certainly bring it back on regular action, again, as Director Gardiner noted. You don't have to take the action. You could continue it at regular action if there is substantial changes made at that time. I think that's the safer way to do it because that allows the appeal rights to be done if an action is taken at regular action.)

> I would note that we all feel that there's substantial work to be done to be able to get through the next step of this, but we can move it forward.

> We're not dismissing the possibility that the solution involves a more contemporary solution at the back of the building and the front of the building if it can be done gracefully. This is all about trying to knit things together as opposed to slamming things together. We're not saying, go away and come back with something traditional. We're saying come back with something that is more compelling, because the message has been unanimous on that point.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Terrones, Loftis, Schmid, and Larios

Absent: 2 - Tse, and Gaul

Residential Design Review

Date: September 20th, 2021

Re: Letter of Response to the Planning Commission
Dated: September 20, 2021

Project Address: 720 Farringdon Lane, Burlingame, CA, 94010
Project Number: 2006
APN: 029045220

To: Burlingame Planning Department
501 Primrose Road,
Burlingame, CA 94010

Via: 

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for your comments and dialogue at our last Design Review Meeting on August 9, 2021. We have taken the last month to work closely with the owners on a revised project that addresses your comments. We have reconsidered our approach of blending the existing traditional home with the more modern rear addition and the use of the standing seam roofing material.

After considering several design options for the overall style of the home, the owners have decided that they would like to pursue a more unified traditional approach to the rear addition that complements and ties in with the existing home that they love. We are going to lightly alter and update some aspects of the front of the house and will use consistent treatments and details for the front and the rear to create a cohesive home.

The revised design incorporates a consistent 3.5" horizontal painted wood siding that will envelope the entire home, new aluminum clad wood windows (Marvin or similar) for both new and existing openings and a unifying composite shingle roof. In addition, some of the proposed new window sizes and proportions have been updated to tie in with the existing home.

The creative asymmetric gabled form we have designed for the rear of the home remains. It responds to Burlingame's Declining Height Envelope and brings a playful feel to the project. But with consistent window, siding and roofing treatments and the consistent form of the shed roof dormers, the new and old blend together into a creative but cohesive whole.

We believe that the updated design not only respects the history of the existing home but also complements the character of the existing neighborhood. We look forward to your support of this project, allowing us to move this project forward for this young family.

Thank you.

Winder Gibson Architects



PLANNING APPLICATION

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT—PLANNING DIVISION

501 PRIMROSE ROAD, 2ND FLOOR, BURLINGAME, CA 94010-3997

TEL: 650.558.7250 | FAX: 650.696.3790 | E-MAIL: PLANNINGDEPT@BURLINGAME.ORG

PROJECT INFORMATION

720 FARRINGDON LANE
PROJECT ADDRESS

029-045-220
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL # (APN)

R-1
ZONING

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RENOVATION AND REAR ADDITION TO AN EXISTING TWO STORY HOME. PROJECT INCLUDES RENOVATED ADU STRUCTURE AT REAR YARD AND NEW HARDSCAPE.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

CRENSHAW WHITELY
PROPERTY OWNER NAME APPLICANT?

PHONE

KAILEEN YEN
ARCHITECT/DESIGNER APPLICANT?

415-704-8878
PHONE

950931

BURLINGAME BUSINESS LICENSE #

E-MAIL

1898 MISSION STREET, SF, CA 94103
ADDRESS

YEN@ARCHSF.COM
E-MAIL

FOR PROJECT REFUNDS - Please provide an address to which to all refund checks will be mailed to:

AFFIDAVIT OF OWNERSHIP

I HEREBY CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE INFORMATION GIVEN HEREIN IS TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF MY

12/15/20
DATE

THE ABOVE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT THIS APPLICATION TO THE

1/13/21
DATE

AUTHORIZATION TO REPRODUCE PLANS

I HEREBY GRANT THE CITY OF BURLINGAME THE AUTHORITY TO REPRODUCE UPON REQUEST AND/OR POST PLANS SUBMITTED WITH THIS APPLICATION ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE AS PART OF THE PLANNING APPROVAL PROCESS AND WAIVE ANY CLAIMS AGAINST THE CITY ARISING OUT OF OR RELATED TO SUCH ACTION K.YEN (INITIALS OF ARCHITECT/DESIGNER)

STAFF USE ONLY

APPLICATION TYPE

- ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU)
- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (CUP)
- DESIGN REVIEW (DSR)
- HILLSIDE AREA CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
- MINOR MODIFICATION
- SPECIAL PERMIT (SP)
- VARIANCE (VAR)
- WIRELESS
- FENCE EXCEPTION
- OTHER: _____

RECEIVED

JAN 20 2021

CITY OF BURLINGAME
CDD-PLANNING DIV.

DATE RECEIVED:

STAFF USE ONLY

RESOLUTION APPROVING CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION AND DESIGN REVIEW

RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame that:

WHEREAS, a Categorical Exemption has been prepared and application has been made for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling and detached garage at 720 Farrington Land, Zoned R-1, Crenshaw Whitley and Lauren Wong, property owners, APN: 029-045-220;

WHEREAS, said matters were heard by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on October 12, 2021, at which time it reviewed and considered the staff report and all other written materials and testimony presented at said hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is RESOLVED and DETERMINED by this Planning Commission that:

1. On the basis of the Initial Study and the documents submitted and reviewed, and comments received and addressed by this Commission, it is hereby found that there is no substantial evidence that the project set forth above will have a significant effect on the environment, and categorical exemption, per CEQA Section 15301 (e)(2), which states that additions to existing structures are exempt from environmental review, provided the addition will not result in an increase of more than 10,000 SF in areas where all public services and facilities are available and the area in which the project is located is not environmentally sensitive, is hereby approved.
2. Said Design Review is approved subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto. Findings for such Design Review is set forth in the staff report, minutes, and recording of said meeting.
3. It is further directed that a certified copy of this resolution be recorded in the official records of the County of San Mateo.

Chairperson

I, _____, Secretary of the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 12th day of October, 2021 by the following vote:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption and Design Review

720 Farringdon Lane

Effective **October 22, 2021**

Page 1

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped September 29, 2021, sheets A0.00 through A9.12, and sheet 1 site survey;
2. that any changes to building materials, exterior finishes, windows, architectural features, roof height or pitch, and amount or type of hardscape materials shall be subject to Planning Division or Planning Commission review (FYI or amendment to be determined by Planning staff);
3. that any changes to the size or envelope of the basement, first or second floors, or garage, which would include adding or enlarging a dormer(s), shall require an amendment to this permit;
4. that any recycling containers, debris boxes or dumpsters for the construction project shall be placed upon the private property, if feasible, as determined by the Community Development Director;
5. that demolition for removal of the existing structures and any grading or earth moving on the site shall not occur until a building permit has been issued and such site work shall be required to comply with all the regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District;
6. that prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the project, the project construction plans shall be modified to include a cover sheet listing all conditions of approval adopted by the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal; which shall remain a part of all sets of approved plans throughout the construction process. Compliance with all conditions of approval is required; the conditions of approval shall not be modified or changed without the approval of the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal;
7. that all air ducts, plumbing vents, and flues shall be combined, where possible, to a single termination and installed on the portions of the roof not visible from the street; and that these venting details shall be included and approved in the construction plans before a Building permit is issued;
8. that the project shall comply with the Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance which requires affected demolition, new construction and alteration projects to submit a Waste Reduction plan and meet recycling requirements; any partial or full demolition of a structure, interior or exterior, shall require a demolition permit;
9. that the project shall meet all the requirements of the California Building and Uniform Fire Codes, in effect at time of building permit submittal, as amended by the City of Burlingame;

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE MET DURING THE BUILDING INSPECTION PROCESS PRIOR TO THE INSPECTIONS NOTED IN EACH CONDITION:

10. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the applicant shall provide a certification by the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, that demonstrates that the project falls at or below the maximum approved floor area ratio for the property;

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption and Design Review

720 Farringdon Lane

Effective **October 22, 2021**

Page 2

11. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, shall provide an architectural certification that the architectural details shown in the approved design which should be evident at framing, such as window locations and bays, are built as shown on the approved plans; architectural certification documenting framing compliance with approved design shall be submitted to the Building Division before the final framing inspection shall be scheduled;
12. that prior to scheduling the roof deck inspection, a licensed surveyor shall shoot the height of the roof ridge and provide certification of that height to the Building Division; and
13. that prior to final inspection, Planning Division staff will inspect and note compliance of the architectural details (trim materials, window type, etc.) to verify that the project has been built according to the approved Planning and Building plans.



CITY OF BURLINGAME
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010
PH: (650) 558-7250
www.burlingame.org

Project Site: 720 Farringdon Lane, zoned R-1

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following virtual public hearing via Zoom **on Tuesday, October 12, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.** You may access the meeting online at www.zoom.us/join or by phone at (346) 248-7799:

Webinar ID: 835 4435 5120	Passcode: 803754
---------------------------	------------------

Description: Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling.

Members of the public may provide written comments by email to: publiccomment@burlingame.org.

Mailed: October 1, 2021

**PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE**

(Please refer to other side)

City of Burlingame - Public Hearing Notice

If you have any questions about this application or would like to schedule an appointment to view a hard copy of the application and plans, please send an email to planningdept@burlingame.org or call (650) 558-7250.

Individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed, should contact the Planning Division at planningdept@burlingame.org or (650) 558-7250 by 10 am on the day of the meeting.

If you challenge the subject application(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in the notice or in written correspondence delivered to the city at or prior to the public hearing.

Property owners who receive this notice are responsible for informing their tenants about this notice.

Kevin Gardiner, AICP
Community Development Director

(Please refer to other side)

720 Farrington Lane
300' noticing
APN #: 029-045-220

