



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, June 13, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Senior Planner Catherine Keylon, and City Attorney Michael Guina.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Draft May 23, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft May 23, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no Public Comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

a. 1430 Palm Drive, zoned R-1 and R-3 - Application for Conditional Use Permit for a preschool use in an existing church building. (Rita Enright, applicant; Alan William Coon, architect; New Life Community Church of Burlingame, property owner) (210 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1430 Palm Dr - Staff Report](#)
[1430 Palm Dr - Attachments](#)
[1430 Palm Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Rita Enright represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> Public comment sent via email: Can the small lawn accommodate 45 children? (Enright: We can actually have one classroom at a time, which is a group of 20 children. The requirement is 25 square feet per child so we can have at least 20 to 25 children on that lawn area at one time.) (Hurin: Sounds like the play time might be staggered then. (Enright: Yes, we can rotate the play time.) (Hurin: You're restricted by State regulations like you said, 75-square feet per children? (Enright: Yes.)

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> This is a good alternative use to the location during different hours. It's a great cause and I don't see anything with the program itself that is of concern.
> This is great use for the facility during the week when there are no church services so I don't see any reason to hold this up.

Chair Gaul made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schmid, to place the item on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Consent Calendar Items.

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 320 Bloomfield Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single-unit 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. (Zohar Schwartz Design, applicant and designer; Todd Lindstrom, property owner) (114 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [320 Bloomfield Rd - Staff Report](#)
[320 Bloomfield Rd - Attachments](#)
[320 Bloomfield Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Zohar Schwartz, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Drainage for the roof balconies and the planting areas have not been addressed. It is important that you get that in there because if you just put brown downspouts there, it will mess up the rhythm of the architecture and a good solution. So, if you're going to do something that's going to change the look of the outside, that would require an FYI back to the Planning Commission so you're not caught at the end. Downspouts can be an opposite color and it would change things for you if you don't incorporate it correctly.

> As someone who wasn't thrilled the first time around because of the bulkiness of what was so close to the street on the corners and because of the prominent facade all around, I really think, beyond the comments about the drainage, it has been vastly improved. The railing looks much better than just the stucco and I appreciate that you took the height down a bit. The trim has been altered. The small little things have made a difference. I can see them and really appreciate the attention to detail, it's going to make a big difference. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Pfaff, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> that if the drainage downspouts from the balconies are moved to the exterior walls, an FYI application shall be submitted for Planning Commission review.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

- b. 1766 El Camino Real, zoned NMBU - Application for Design Review, State Density Bonus and Tier 3/Community Benefits for a new 8-story, 311-unit residential apartment development. This project has been determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 15332 which is intended to promote in-fill development within urbanized areas. (Carmel Partners, applicant; Certosa Inc., property owner; TCA Architects) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1766 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Previous NMBU District & Density Bonus Code Sections](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Materials Board](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Plans](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Class 32 Infill Exemption](#)
[Appendix A - TDM Plan](#)
[Appendix B - Tree Report](#)
[Appendix C - Environmental Site Assessments](#)
[Appendix D - Transportation Impact Analysis](#)
[Appendix E - Supporting Noise Information](#)
[Appendix F - Air Quality Analysis Modeling](#)
[Appendix G - DPR Forms](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Schmid noted that he met with the applicant, the project architect, and representative on Zoom. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Greg Pasquali, Teresa Ruiz, and Take Katsuura, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> Athan Rebelos: I'm excited about 1766 El Camino Real. My wife and I live at the top of Trousdale Drive and go through the intersection dozens of times each week. Conceptually, this is the correct development, in the correct place, at the correct time. So let's embrace this much-needed multi-unit residential development and keep the ball moving forward.

> Karen Rosenberg: I'm a resilience associate with Greenbelt Alliance. In addition to sending a letter in advance, I wanted to provide a public comment. For over 60 years, Greenbelt Alliance has helped create cities and neighborhoods that make the bay area a better place to live. Healthy places where people can walk and bike, communities with parks, shops, transportation options and homes that are affordable and resilient to the impacts of climate change. After careful review, Greenbelt Alliance is excited to endorse the proposed 1766 El Camino Real project. We would like to commend the City Council and staff for their leadership on housing and for creating a Specific Plan that creates a clear vision and policy basis for dense housing and the inclusion of affordable housing in a transit and service rich location. 1766 El Camino Real is a wonderful representation and embodiment of the objectives of the City's Specific Plan. The developers have done a wonderful job in engaging the community and incorporating feedback in the current rendition of the site. The proposal reflects a comprehensive TDM which will result in a 25% reduction below baseline and major investments in a sustainable energy and water efficient design. The proposed projects close proximity to jobs and transits and commitment to affordability and sustainability aligns with the City of Burlingame's General Plan. Greenbelt Alliance believes 1766 El Camino Real will play a pivotal role in re-imagining a more climate resilient and inclusive Burlingame for all residents to enjoy and we're proud to give this project our endorsement and we hope our approval will expedite the process to turn this vision into reality. Thank you.

> Niko Nagel: I'm speaking on behalf of the Housing Action Coalition. We are a 20 year old nonprofit organization supporting building new homes at all levels of affordability to help alleviate the Bay Area in our statewide housing shortage which is driving our displacement and affordable housing crisis. I would like to speak in support of the project which will bring 311 much needed homes to Burlingame. I would like to thank the Councilmembers and staff for your tireless efforts to help meet that housing demand. Tonight, I ask that you support the project and move it forward without delay. Thank you.

> Alex Torres: I am the director of the government relations for the Bay Area Council. Thank you for the time today. I'll align my comments with some of the points Mr. Pasquali made on this project. But I want to highlight the level of outreach by Carmel Partners noted by him as well as the excellent staff report analysis. On behalf of our 350 plus members we want to voice support for this project at 1766 El Camino Real. This project alone will account for nearly ten percent of Burlingame's total 2023-2031 regional housing needs allocation, RHNA assessment of 3,257 units. As noted, it's an ideal location, one half mile from the Millbrae transit center and also within walking distance as our friends from Greenbelt Alliance and the Housing Action Coalition have noted. The project leads an environmental design as well. Great project all in all. We strongly support and urge you to support it as well. Really appreciate your time. Thank you.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I'd like to thank the applicant and their team for the work that they've done from the various versions of this project. The renderings have dramatically increased in quality which also shows more thought into the details that they're trying to put into the project. The first versions didn't communicate those details well so it was making it hard to see the quality of what was going to happen. It got them to do some better

details. I like the added depth in the windows and the material transitions a lot better. The simplification has really helped. I appreciate the effort put into the material board as well because that shows they're thinking through the materials and make it easier when we're reviewing this information to back check that against their elevations and renderings. All of that really helped the submittal package this time. It was very well done and it communicates the quality of the project that I was hoping it would be. So, I stand in support of the project and it would be a good project moving forward.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. I wanted to add a few minor positive comments. Since the last rendition, I appreciate the thoughtfulness and the locations for the bike parking. They're in great locations in relationship to the most typical bike path to our more centralized transportation nodes. The thoughtfulness for the location of the courtyards make a lot of sense. I appreciate seeing the shadow study and how a good part of the time those courtyards would be used are actually well lit. That takes really good planning and thought. This rendition has come a long way as well. I like the look at the corner of Trousdale Drive and El Camino Real that defines the building and the development at that corner calls attention to itself. It's essentially the gateway into Burlingame for the bulk of our city. I also wanted to thank the team, personally, for producing a finish board for each and every one of us. That was quite an effort, but really appreciate seeing the actual finishes in hand and not just a colored rendition of it. Overall, I really like how this project has progressed and developed. The color palette looks really nice together, it's very cohesive, interesting and has nice textures. I like the horizontal elements that are brought out now with a clean delineation of materials and elements around the whole development on all sides. I, too, can see supporting this project going forward and look forward to seeing its construction.

> I want to thank you for all your hard work on this project. I agree with everything that my fellow commissioners have said. I want to thank the applicants for the extra affordable housing element to this project. As we all know, we definitely need to help our own here in town and I appreciate all that, that they've created more space for families and workers here and nearby towns.

> I find this project very palatable. I like the use of all the materials. It's a perfect site for housing. I am just having trouble with the California Drive side. Our Design Review criteria addresses gateway sites, where the design fits the site and should be compatible with the surrounding development. I don't find that with this project. I come from the train station a lot and come down California Drive to my house, so I'm very familiar with that part of the drive and this, especially in the renderings, just looks overwhelming. The project is very big. But stepping it back on the upper floors on the California Drive side could really soften that. It dominates those townhomes that are to the south of it. I don't think that's fair to that architectural element of the town. It's possible it may get torn down one day, but that's not what is happening there. That's where my questions were leading to, if those could be pulled back and with 311 units. I believe knocking a few units back wouldn't kill the project, but it doesn't sound like that's going to happen for the applicant. It looks like 90% supports the project, but that elevation is just killing me and I don't know if I can support it.

> I pretty much want to echo that. I love the presentation, the materials board and colors are great. Thank you so much for listening to the architects who are no longer on the Planning Commission, but they were very assertive and helpful with their comments about pulling the whole thing together. It made a huge difference. But I'm having a hard time because there's a very similar project that is much smaller in scale in Millbrae. It has a dog leg on it and the minute that came up on California Drive, I thought it must be a mistake. Ours is going to be even larger and it's very close to those adjacent townhomes, so I'm really having a hard time with it.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the application with the modified condition of approval as noted by staff. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Horan, Lowenthal, Schmid, and Tse

Nay: 2 - Gaul, and Pfaff

- c. 500 Airport Boulevard, zoned BFC - Application for a Special Permit for building height for a new elevator enclosure on the roof deck of an existing four-story office building. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental

Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 of the CEQA Guidelines.(Carlos Castillo, Element One Architecture, applicant and architect; Waterfront Plaza Properties LLC, property owner) (13 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [500 Airport Blvd - Staff Report](#)
[500 Airport Blvd - Attachments](#)
[500 Airport Blvd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Carlos Castillo, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *The existing building does not have a parapet. The roof is the top of the elevation and the elevator enclosure is going to stick up a lot more. For Hillside Area Construction Permits we ask for story poles to analyze potential impacts. I'm concerned with this proposal; some of the other buildings with large penthouses look like a topper to the building. This is going to be a miniature box but yet standing 20-feet tall; it's going to look weird. Looking at the section and then looking at the roof on Goggle Earth, this feels like it's going to stick way up. Would like to request some sort of mockup so we can see what it's going to look like on the building. It could be as simple as a flag that is at the same height. It's hard to tell from here and being a z-shaped building, it's going to be unusual.*

> *In your letter, it says that there was additional space needed so an elevator technician standing on top of the elevator cars is not crushed or badly injured. Suggest you consider an access through the roof as a practical solution. You can access it to the top if it was in the path of travel, you could have a hatch on the top to access the equipment. I could be wrong, my experience with commercial elevators is very limited, but in residential elevators the cart takes up the whole shaft. You can't idiot proof everything obviously, you can step off the side of the building, too, but I'm not asking you to put a handrail around it. Consider looking into another solution. I'm in full agreement with my fellow commissioner that if there's a structural shear requirement, typically it can be put to the side of the opening and you can make the penthouse wider and not so tall. Suggest going back to the engineer and the elevator company to see if you can work out a different solution. because this is really tall compared to what we're seeing.*

> *It feels like a pimple on the roof that sticks up too far. The other penthouses in the building surrounding them have HVAC equipment and they have other things in them, so they really look like a structure on the roof where this is going to be a different. Looking at the smaller one that is there now, I agree, but this is going to extend higher. We need some sort of mockup and it could be as simple as a couple of 2x4's sticking up on the one corner and going high enough to show us that we can't see it. But right now, I feel like it's going to stick up quite a ways and really all of the surrounding buildings that are five floors or above will be looking at this thing. So that's my concern.*

> *I would agree with that comment. If there were to be some poles erected, I would ask for two, one in opposing corners so we would get something closer to the street than away and the first one might not have the same effect, but there has to be a better solution. When we cut an opening in the side of a house, we put a shear panel on the side. You could make this structure and put the shear on the side. You don't have to have the shear underneath it. That's like what they did on the Golden Gate Bridge. They put their cross braces underneath the deck so they didn't have to have shear up above, but you could put*

the shear to the side because you have the room. You don't have to have the height. There's a solution for that access space on the top which could be some kind of lid on the top. My experience with elevators, which I have put some in residences, we get to six inches on the top.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. There's a different solution to this problem and as everyone knows, there's more than one option. It might have to cost a little bit more to get it done. I'd like to see some other alternatives before this project can move forward.

> I don't know if there's really an appealable solution here at the moment that makes sense to deny the application, so we should continue to give them a chance to come back with another solution that's more viable. If we're still looking at something as tall as this solution here, then we're going to need to be convinced with story poles. That would be up to the applicant to decide which way they're going but if they could reduce the overall height quite a bit, then I would maybe not be so anxious about story poles. At the moment, with it sitting six feet above the roof just feels really weird.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to continue the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 620 Trenton Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Ted Catlin, Dreiling Terrones Architecture Inc., applicant and architect; Patricia and Griffin Tormey, property owners) (96 noticed)
Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [620 Trenton Way - Staff Report](#)
[620 Trenton Way - Attachments](#)
[620 Trenton Way - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Richard Terrones and Ted Catlin, architects, and Patricia Tormey, property owner, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Consider using a more craftsman style garage door and less of a ranch style look.

> I like the character that was present with the shutters on the left side of the main floor under the gable end. Consider adding shutters on the central element of the second floor. It would be nice to add some ornamentation to it to bring a little bit more attention to itself since it is very symmetrical and balanced.

> There is a feeling of heaviness on the upper floor that you might want to study further. It can be because of the deep eaves on the front balcony at the lower level or the hatching of the shingles, but please look into other solutions which can reduce that effect. Suggest raising the plate height in the garage, which can help the roof work better so as it terminates at the roof of the porch. It can help tie in the levels and the addition of the second floor.

- > Provide a colored 3D image to help answer our questions and concerns.
- > Regarding the front elevation of the second floor looking heavy, most of the windows around the house are grouped together in three's or four's. The four windows at the front of the house look a bit small and it gives more wall space. I think that's where the illusion of that weight comes from. I understand that these are bathroom windows, but consider rearranging and look for a different solution.
- > I agree on the heaviness and some of the comments that my fellow commissioners made. I think part of it is the density and the color of the hatch that is making it graphically look that way. I like the opportunity of increasing the roof vents or shutters in the middle area to make it look a little bit more celebratory. Another good solution is to add a planter box beneath the window sill to take up some of the extra space and make the middle portion a bit more prominent; this could take some pressure off the two sides. Otherwise, it is a great project and would like to see it move forward.
- > I completely agree with my fellow commissioner, I would also like to suggest a planter box. All the other comments are helpful. It is going to be a great project. It would be wonderful to see the transition of the house with simple means and keeping the core house is great.

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

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

- b.** 1425 Castillo Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Variance for building height for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Designs, Inc., applicant and designer; Rajiv Gujral, property owner) (116 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [1425 Castillo Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1425 Castillo Ave - Attachments](#)
[1425 Castillo Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Gaul noted that he met with several neighbors, including the tenant who currently lives in the house, the neighbor to the right, and the neighbor across the street. He noted that he was also able to access the rear yard of the neighbor to the right. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

- > *Public comment sent via email: We are homeowners next door to 1425 Castillo Avenue. Concerned with height variance being upwards of 6' – 8' higher than allowed. This property is on a hill which will increase the height even more which affects our privacy with windows on the second floor. We would like to request a side-by-side drawing of the footprint and setbacks between 1425 Castillo Avenue and 1427 Castillo Avenue so that we can see where the windows will be located. We would like to ask why the property couldn't be graded 3'- 4' lower and set closer to the street to offset the variance request to increase the height?*
- > *Melinda Earlywine, 1427 Castillo Avenue: Those are the questions that I have sent via email. Also, just listening to the meeting, the fact that there is a door on the right side and a four-foot setback has me a little bit concerned, especially if there is no planting in front of it; that is a question I am raising as well with the ones I have sent via email.*
- > *Stuart Hosman, 1418 Castillo Avenue: We live right across the street from the house that they are planning to getting a variance for. We have lived on this street for over 30 years and we have seen*

driveways like that having problems, that driveway specifically, we have watched the car roll down the driveway. So just by taking 2'- 4' out of there makes it that much safer for everybody who lives on Castillo Avenue. Additionally, bring it down so it doesn't look like a skyscraper up there and that would give them the ability not to have the variances as much as they are asking for. I've built two houses on the street and have stayed within the variances by not going up, so it can be done. It would be better for the neighborhood and it will make everything more uniform. We like the look of the house and we like the ideas that they are coming up with, but between the height of the house and where it sits, it is overwhelming based on what we see from the plans that they currently have.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Consider adding a roof element for weather protection over the side door on the left to be consistent with the door at the right.
- > Look at lowering the grade to reduce the height and get away from the variance; there are ways to do it. Typically, if the cut is below three feet, you can do it without engineering. The concerns from the neighbors were about the building height and I tend to agree because the existing house is so high off the ground.
- > Provide the window locations of the next door neighbors' houses on both sides because there is some concern about privacy.
- > Consider adding some planting, maybe an evergreen that can grow tall, on the right hand side toward the second entrance to the kitchen to help provide screening and privacy.
- > I can appreciate the comments by the neighbors. I am looking at the house on the right side and it looks like that one has pretty close to a 3-story presence on the street. So it is not that this will actually be the tallest house. I can appreciate the uphill nature of the site and we have seen quite a few of these. The designer has done a nice job with the architecture. Suggest evaluating what some regrading would look like on this for the next round. As we think about having this property graded down, we have to consider that the neighbors on both sides are going to be above it and will be dumping water into this property. So, we have to be sensitive of the fact that you cannot just depress it and not have unintended consequences. It needs to be looked at appropriately. If he can get a foot or two out of it, that would be great. All in all, it is sitting on a sizable hill which is not much different than what we have approved in the last couple of meetings on this street. Looking at the other homes that the applicant mentioned, this design is handsome and plays out nicely three-dimensionally. I would like to see the project move forward, but I see some opportunity for the applicant to come back with a few more answers for us before we look at it in the action calendar.
- > The house looks really nice. We have a couple of streets that we have this uphill slope and Vancouver Avenue is one of those. We have made adjustments and have variances on some of those properties on the uphill side of Vancouver Avenue and this is like the same project. I agree with my fellow commissioner. I'd like to see this project move accordingly. If the applicant can take a quick look at it and see if they can come up with an alternative, but it is not a deal breaker for me. I do like the project and would like to see this come back to the action calendar.
- > I agree, it is a good looking project. I think it is a simple solution to do a grading cut, you end up with a terraced retaining wall but it will be just like a terraced backyard and it is not really a big deal. I'm not saying to scrape it down 4 feet from property line to property line. It gives you an opportunity to have an enclosed patio with the planter area. It is a simple solution to getting away with the variance and maybe keeping the height down a little bit. I agree with my fellow commissioner about bringing this back to regular action.

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

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

- c. 2758 Summit Drive, R-1 - Application for Design Review and Hillside Area Construction Permit for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Raymond Frank, applicant and architect; Charles Chiparo and Laure Rupenian, property owners) (77 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [2758 Summit Dr - Staff Report](#)

[2758 Summit Dr - Attachments](#)

[2758 Summit Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Gaul noted that he spoke with both the property owner of this project and the neighbor to the right, who provide him access to the home to see the back of the subject property from her kitchen window. Commissioner Tse noted that she contacted and left a message for the neighbor, Faith Chan, and unfortunately was not able to coordinate a visit in time. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Raymond Frank, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> Public comment sent via email by Eugene and Sylvia Chinn, 2751 Summit Drive: We live directly across the street from 2758 Summit Drive and have reviewed the renderings and plans for the proposed addition. Our house is the only one that has a direct view of 2758 Summit Drive. We have lived here for 43 years and the project improves the neighborhood, as such, we endorse the project.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> This is a very interesting house. Please revisit placement of doors and windows as some of them seem not to align with the windows on the other levels of the home, especially on the rear elevation. Consider using a consistent mullion size. There seem to be a lot of different mullion sizes proposed which is distracting and makes it a less solid design.

> The site plan shows a tree next to a gas meter. I didn't see that at the site, but there is a big tree at the corner that looks to be at the neighbor's property. Please look to see if that is correct and adjust the plans accordingly.

> I can certainly appreciate the comments from the neighbor directly to the right as you are facing the house. It is a little bit downhill. They are also dealing with a remodel of the house on the other side of them that we have looked at not that long ago. So they definitely are going to have some change, but the reality is that the protected views from that property are out the back side towards the canyon. I would be more concerned about blocking views from her deck and views of the canyon. I can appreciate that they have the side window open for this long, but I also can appreciate that the neighbor has the right to build and they are not building something large and oversized. That really is a very modest home for what is a fairly sizable site. They are well under the FAR with this little addition that is going to be below the neighboring house. As much as I sympathize with the neighbor, I feel that this project does it's best to minimize and yet was able to take advantage of their lot and their ability to build. So, I can support the project and can see it going forward.

> It is very modest. I did notice how close that home is to the neighbor on the right. What the designer has proposed to block the view would be helpful. I absolutely love the current front railing, the proposed glass is fine but it has an industrial look. It is not a deal breaker for me but the existing front has this very nice warm feel. It was just a very interesting railing. I can see this move forward as well. Just need to tighten up what we have discussed about aligning the windows and making the moldings uniform.

> I had some concerns about the sizes of the decks and that they all extend out the same distance. I was at the neighbor's house to the right as you face the property, her kitchen window certainly looks out to what is there now. But what has more impact for that neighbor is behind the kitchen on that same side is a bedroom. You've got a pretty good size deck coming off the living and dining areas potentially where you are doing your entertaining. I know in the hillside area we are not really limiting the size of the decks as we are in the lower areas of the city, but it might even look better if the upper deck will step back a little bit and same with the lower deck. It would be helpful to see an outline of the house next door to see the relationship distance between the two properties and show where the windows are located just so we get a better feel of how close we are putting people together up there. Overall, I like the project. I just wish it is a little bit farther away from the other house. Stepping the decks back might help but it might be something to look at.

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

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

- d. 34 Dwight Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Design, Inc., applicant and designer; Peter Gorski and Suzanne Nguyen, property owners) (130 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [34 Dwight Rd - Staff Report](#)

[34 Dwight Rd - Attachments](#)

[34 Dwight Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> The two windows on the south elevation are very narrow and very tall, they look squished in there. There is also a set of four sliding doors on the left hand side at the basement that are very tall and oversized. Consider bringing down the height.

> On the proposed left elevation, the relationship of the door that is underneath the bay window and the window next to it seems odd. The door looks miniature and the window looks really tall. Consider relocating the door in the garage or lowering the window header height.

> I think you made a really beautiful house. You're good at designing the entrances of homes and it looks lovely coming at the front. I hope you can revisit some of those window heights.

> I did notice that there were always a lot of plants or bushes on the left-hand side on the driveway and they seem to all be gone now. Consider putting a hedge or something in there because it would be more in proportion to the house, to make it feel warmer and such.

> I'd like to say thank you for being able to adapt and reuse the forms of this house. We're seeing two

story homes that are really tall; this home and design has taken great advantage of a split-level opportunity to be able to update something but not make it a lot bigger. So, I commend the owner and the team for really putting forth a really good adaptive solution on this project. I can support this and love to see it go forward.

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

Aye: 7 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

- e. 777 Airport Boulevard, zoned BFC - Application for Environmental Review, Commercial Design Review, and Special Permits for building height and Development under Tier 3/Community Benefits for new 13-story Office/R&D building. (LPC West, applicant and property owner; Gensler, architect) (21 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [777 Airport Blvd - Staff Report](#)

[777 Airport Blvd - Attachments](#)

[777 Airport Blvd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Marc Huffman, Jacob Peterson and Chris Payne, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *Consider incorporating low-level pedestrian lighting that's close to the ground at sidewalks and crosswalks into the overall lighting plan.*

> *The building is so strong in shape and so tall, provide shadow study to see impacts.*

> *At the Burlingame Point project there's a lot of ground floor amenity, but it's not accessible to the public; to me that doesn't fit the bill of community benefit. This project has a plaza that's 7,600 square feet and the walking diagram showed you walk around the building and the plazas but you can't go in. I would like to see more of a community benefit here. I don't know why people would go walking through there. Maybe to get to the Bay Trail if coming from the Embassy Suites Hotel but for people who enjoy a plaza, you have to give them a reason to go there. It's not just a place to sit down. So, I really would like to see more of something that the community can use there. It could be a combined use and it doesn't have to be open 24 hours, but we're looking for a community benefit and not just the open space.*

> *There was a comment about less pedestrian activity on Anza Boulevard behind the building between the Bay Trail and the triangle at the rear. Because of all the vegetation back there, there's going to be a lot of pedestrian activity because it's hidden, that should be taken into consideration. That wooded area is a place that could encourage not such desirable activities. You might want to look at a pathway through there somehow and incorporate a plaza there. Something not too wooded that would encourage people not to be back there, because that end of the Bay Trail gets a lot of use by transients; it's an opportunity for mischief, if you will.*

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. I feel that this building is way too big. It doesn't give any relief to the corners and it's just a big box that's put up right in your face on the lagoon side. You've done a good job with the exterior materials for bird remediation and I like the bottom floor. Having been involved on the bay side for the last few years and understanding the amount of work that goes into subterranean parking, I know it's very costly and I can appreciate and understand that. But putting cars on the top floors is not creating a public amenity as my fellow commissioner have mentioned. It's not creating that public amenity that I really want to see on that bay side. I want to see a coffee shop; I want to be able to go out there, enjoy what we've created and I want kids to go out there. We're going to have a nature preserve out there and hopefully Topgolf. There's no place to go out there to enjoy an evening. The building's owners need to create some restaurants for us in the evenings and the weekends for bike riders, it doesn't have to be late. Just even up to 6:00 pm, but that give us something. When you say public amenities and you give us the park and the sea level rise improvements, well that's awesome but that is also something that BCDC mandates for us and they're responsible for that. So in a perfect world, I don't know if that's a social benefit. What a social benefit to me is having this plaza, music, and something out there to go to. I don't see that here. I really feel that this is a very tall building and it needs to be scaled down. That's why I was hoping that the applicant could potentially look at going below grade for some of the parking because it would push the building height down a bit.

> I can appreciate the complexity of this project and the amount of effort being put into it. A lot of the exterior does work nicely. Most buildings these days are having to provide exterior areas just to not make them be boxes on the land. The open space is nice but it's not as much of a community benefit as my fellow commissioner has mentioned. It's just a little more open space. The height is tall, that's why I was asking about some of the comparable buildings in the area. This building is going to be double the height of the DoubleTree Hotel which is the next tallest building you can see out there. It's going to be a lot like Salesforce Tower being half a building taller than the rest of the city. It's something that needs to be looked at harder. Being able to look at some of the new projects which have not been built yet, but understanding the relationship to some of these other tall structures, it might help us get over 225 feet. The applicant is going to need to show some of that a little bit more. It may mean three-dimensional drawings and seeing where the other big buildings are that they're next to. I'm not really feeling the architecture. One of the other buildings we looked at earlier today, a multi-unit residential building on El Camino Real, that building started off stark and not very well designed, but it has come a long way. I'm not seeing a whole lot of material definition on this one. I'm not seeing a lot of depth and it is a big box. Unless we're going to see a lot more rendering of details of how it goes together and start to see more pedestrian scale, it's not doing anything for me. It's boring glass. The applicant is going to want to try and do some more with this in order to push this forward. It's an incredibly complex project. I can appreciate the efforts being put in it and what the team is doing but architecturally, it's not doing it for me right now. I would like to see more effort into that portion of it and obviously the sooner they do that, the sooner it will be reflected within their environmental scoping.

> It's worth repeating what someone said around retail, that's an important aspect on community benefit. On their plan, it says retail/amenity. Retail comes with the definition that it's public. I do think that's an important aspect of a community benefit. With respect to the height, I'm open to the height because it seems like it's compliant with the General Plan. If we want the height of the buildings lowered, it seems like we might want to look at the General Plan and what that allows. I don't fault the developers for maximizing what we have allowed in that zoning district.

> I know that this site is challenging and that the team has done a nice job of trying to work with this site. What I want to see more is some kind of organic relationship to this site, the shape, the neighborhood, the context of buildings in the area; as proposed it looks like it doesn't belong on the site. I'm okay with the height; they have met the FAR. Of course it's very expensive to develop these properties, so I want them to get out what they can in their development, but this building looks like it's plopped on the site and doesn't relate itself to the area. That pinched corner is concerning because it's so tight, it's coming right off the freeway exit and almost seems like you can drive right into the side of the building. Driving from afar, I came from a far distance to approach this site, and the new buildings at Burlingame Point made the buildings feel tall. Those four buildings are approximately 140 feet tall and this is one singular building that is on a narrow lot that would be 220 feet tall or so. Again, I don't have a problem with the height but it somehow needs to relate to the site, the shape of it. Setting itself back from a corner

or some other shape and softening of the edges, it needs something so that it feels like it organically belongs on this site. There are efforts put towards the public amenity spaces, the park and such and I appreciate that, but by looking at what has been offered in terms of imagery and the types of furnishing or seating arrangements, it's not telling a complete story. It's just pictures from here and there, but would love it to feel a little bit more cohesive like it's really thought through as a space that's intended to be enjoyed by people and not just a side thought to the project.

> I agree with what has been said, I keep thinking of the Facebook project as well. It's not in our list from staff this time but I believe the building is the tallest one there. They're significantly shorter but my point is that they have an organic shape to them and that's what my fellow commissioner is saying. With this, it was plopped on the site and it needs to feel like it fits. It's not a graceful height. Sometimes the height, if it's tall and narrow can work, but the goal is to make a space that can accommodate any tenant and so that is a bit of a conundrum. The issue with retail at the Facebook project was that they promised a lot. It was going to be daycare and a restaurant open to the public, but as soon as that tenant changed ten years later, none of that was allowed because it was all going to be private. The eating spaces needed to be private, so we were left at the end of the day with no daycare, just this tiny little cafe, which is publicly accessible but it's a far cry from what we started with. It would be great to have but I don't know if that can be promised with this. Certainly it does feel very large for this site and that is a bit foreign. I do like what you've attempted to do with the rear of the site; we use that area a lot. I love what you're envisioning, the pathways and certain areas under that bridge that people can hang out.

> I don't disagree with what anybody said; I echo my fellow commissioner's viewpoint. The General Plan dictates our guidelines and height is allowable. When you compare the facade and the height to what's in the area, we're comparing it to very old and in my opinion, very ugly architecture. So, yes this will stand out in a good way. I totally agree with the retail aspect, but as a retailer myself, this is a terrible area for retail. It might be self-sustaining because of how many people will work in the office building; maybe there's a study that can bring that up. I would love to see that retail but I'm not going to tell my kids to go to a coffee shop on Anza Boulevard and Airport Boulevard. It's nice to have., but I don't know if I would want it as contingent. All in all, it's an improvement for the area. Life science is indeed in demand and I would love to have the tax dollars and the interest level come to Burlingame. That's a part of the plan and as the developer said, this is a hallmark-type building and that's really important to remember.

> I've been a big proponent of the retail. I remember the Facebook project at the drive-in site with a proposed 26,000 square feet of commercial space. I'm not looking for a destination. It's going to be incidental to you going they're. The rendering shows people walking their dogs, an older couple, and a family with two little kids. It may not be a profitable space but that's the community benefit I'm looking for and I'm disappointed with what we got at Burlingame Point. I brought it up ten years ago whether we were doing that Burlingame Point, but Kincaid's is out there all by itself and it does really, really well. The people who stay at some of those hotels are looking for a place that's not the buffet breakfast at the Embassy Suites. That's why the Red Roof Inn does well because the hotel breakfast's are not good. So if you had a little breakfast café that would be great. If the people of Burlingame found out it was great, they would ride their bike every Saturday and Sunday.

> I agree with this being a tall, skinny box. One of the criteria of the Commercial Design Guidelines note "compatibility of the architecture with the mass, bulk, scale and existing materials of surrounding development and appropriate transitions to adjacent lower intensity of development and uses". I don't see them achieving this goal with that. I get that you want to maximize what you can, but I can guarantee that there are smaller life science companies that would look for a smaller building. So, I am concerned with the proposed height of 226 feet. I would like to see a list or a map of the heights of buildings around it for our next meeting.

> I would like the applicant to look at the proposed development at 1200-1340 Bayshore Highway that came in front of us at our Annual Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting because that building, although it's big and it's right there on the water, it is beautiful architecturally. That's something that I would look for on the project like this. It's too big but if it the architecture was better, it could work. I want the architect to pull out the stops because I know it can be done.

The application is required to return on the Regular Action Calendar because it includes environmental review. No vote was taken.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- a. 2201 Hillside Drive, zoned R-1 - FYI for revisions to a previously approved Design Review project for a single story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling.

Attachments: [2201 Hillside Dr - Memorandum](#)

[2201 Hillside Dr - Attachments](#)

[2201 Hillside Dr - Plans](#)

> *Accepted.*

- b. 1345 Vancouver Avenue, zoned R-1 - FYI for proposed changes to a previously approved Design Review project for a second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling.

Attachments: [1345 Vancouver Ave - Memorandum](#)

[1345 Vancouver Ave - Attachments](#)

[1345 Vancouver Ave - Plans](#)

> *Pulled for further discussion. Commissioners noted the following concerns:*

Concerned with proposed changes to exterior and balcony; there was no explanation given of why changes were being proposed; plans need to show originally approved and proposed front elevation on same sheet (this should be done for each building elevation); and plans need to clearly label previously approved and proposed elevations.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

Notice: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on June 13, 2022. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on June 23, 2022, 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 \$708.00, which includes noticing costs.