



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, October 15, 2024

7:00 PM

Council Chambers/Online

- a. 1317 Paloma Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review for as-built changes to a previously approved new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorical Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Ardalan Djalali, applicant and designer; Behzad Hadjian, property owner) (68 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Attachments](#)

[Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item because she owns property within 500 feet of the subject property. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Behzad Hadjian, property owner, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Lowenthal closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *I can see the justification for the electric fireplace. I'm never a fan of the faux shutters. The house looks okay as-built, but it is different from what was approved; it is an issue without justification. The house immediately to the right is very nicely detailed; it has brackets and bricks. In a side-by-side comparison, what's been omitted in this house is more noticeable.*

> *It feels like it was stripped. I'm not passionate about any one of the items omitted, but where we are going, it has nothing. I'm not supportive of just taking them all out. It could be done differently. There are a lot of opportunities there. If they want to explore those changes, that is fine, but I'm not in agreement with just stripping them all out. The shutters may not work, but they add a balance of positive/negative space to it. I'm not a huge fan of the truss element in the gables, but without the trusses it looks dead. I'm not supportive of this without a better study of how to make it cohesive because it looks like it became cheap. When you look at the photos of the adjoining neighbors, they all do have details and scale to them.*

> *It seems to me that they come to the end of the project and just decided not to add in all the details*

that add character to the house. The house is built, it is functional, it has a roof and all that, but all the aesthetic items have been stripped away. I am also fine with the stone cladding at the fireplace, with the shutters being removed especially because they are not even sized appropriately to match the windows. The deep overhang at the gable ends is calling for something. It was originally intended to have these truss details; it is now missing. Something needs to go there. The ones at the columns can easily be added. I see a hybrid. I am okay to give up a couple of things but some of the decorative elements need to come back in. The house looks fine, but it was not intended to look this way.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners. The knee braces will fit perfectly in that spot. It is just that all of the details have been removed all at once. Some of them can go back.

> It seems like you are at the end of the build and the market is not as hot as it was. There is an opportunity here to get the house in the market and sell it fast. The problem is that I hear a lot of "well, this does not have value" but when you take away all these non-values, you don't add value to the house. I like the fireplace, it adds a little bit of texture, but you are not going to see much of it. You don't need to have the shutters. Adding some molding, knee braces, or whatever it may be, something needs to be proposed other than what is being presented today.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Pfaff

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

Oct 27th , 2024

City of Burlingame

501 Primrose Road,

Burlingame, CA 94010

Attn: Planning Division

Subject: Narrative on Architectural Changes to Elevations

Dear sir/ Madam

Thank you for taking the time to review our drawings for the project located at 1317 Paloma Ave. In accordance with the latest client request, we have implemented several changes to the architectural fixtures on the elevations. Please find below the list of modifications:

- **Removed the gable end from the original design and added corbels**
Due to the depth of the roof overhang and the slope of the roof, there is not enough height between the top of the windows and the bottom of the gable ends. This lack of space would result in a final product that does not look balanced or visually appealing. The overhang was necessary to provide adequate weather protection and achieve better visualization. Removing the gable ends ensures the design is not compromised, and this adjustment complements the rest of the building's form, maintaining a clean and cohesive look
 - **Removed the decorative bracket from the columns**
The decorative brackets have been removed due to height concerns.
 - **Eliminated the decorative window shutters.**
The space between the light fixtures and the windows was too narrow, causing the shutters to be out of scale with the window sizes. This imbalance would have disrupted the overall design of the elevation.
- Omitted the lightweight stone from the chimney. Removed the false chimney from the lower roof.**
Since we are using an electric fireplace, the false chimney is no longer necessary. Additionally, the chimney is located in the side yard with a 4'-0" setback and is not visible from the street, so the additional cost, labor, and materials to cover it with stone would not provide a meaningful benefit to the overall design.

- **Changed the fascia color from white to black.**
To enhance the overall contrast and modern aesthetic of the building. This adjustment provides a cleaner, more striking visual appeal, aligning with the updated design direction.
- **Changed the siding color from white to Gainsboro (color code and manufacturer are shown on material board sheet AX.4).**
The original siding and building color were plain white, but they have now been changed to Gainsboro, a shade that is still close to white with a slightly warmer tone. This subtle shift provides a more contemporary and refined appearance, while still maintaining a neutral tone that complements the overall design.

Please see the images below and the attached drawings for more info

All changes have been clouded with delta #2 on the drawings.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Ardalan Djalali

ardalan@adarchitectes.com

1355 El Camino Real, Unit 527, Redwood City, CA, 94063



Approved Design	Proposed Design
Front Elevation	Front Elevation
	
Left Side Elevation	Left Side Elevation
	
Right Side Elevation	Right Side Elevation
	
Rear Elevation	Rear Elevation
	



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, September 23, 2024

7:00 PM

Council Chambers/Online

- b. 1317 Paloma Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review for as-built changes to a previously approved new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorical Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Ardalan Djalali, applicant and designer; Behzad Hadjian, property owner) (68 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: Staff Report
Attachments
Plans

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item because she owns property within 500' of the subject property.

> *The project applicant nor a representative attended the meeting in person or virtually.*

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to continue the application to the meeting of October 15, 2024. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, Shores, and Tse

Recused: 1 - Comaroto



Sep 27th , 2024

City of Burlingame

501 Primrose Road,

Burlingame, CA 94010

Attn: Planning Division

Subject: Narrative on Architectural Changes to Elevations

Dear sir/ Madam

Thank you for taking the time to review our drawings for the project located at 1317 Paloma Ave. In accordance with the latest client request, we have implemented several changes to the architectural fixtures on the elevations. Please find below the list of modifications:

- **Removed the gable end from the original design.**

Due to the depth of the roof overhang and the slope of the roof, there is not enough height between the top of the windows and the bottom of the gable ends. This lack of space would result in a final product that does not look balanced or visually appealing. The overhang was necessary to provide adequate weather protection and achieve better visualization. Removing the gable ends ensures the design is not compromised, and this adjustment complements the rest of the building's form, maintaining a clean and cohesive look

- **Eliminated the decorative window shutters.**

The space between the light fixtures and the windows was too narrow, causing the shutters to be out of scale with the window sizes. This imbalance would have disrupted the overall design of the elevation.

- **Omitted the lightweight stone from the chimney. Removed the false chimney from the lower roof.**

Since we are using an electric fireplace, the false chimney is no longer necessary. Additionally, the chimney is located in the side yard with a 4'-0" setback and is not visible from the street, so the additional cost, labor, and materials to cover it with stone would not provide a meaningful benefit to the overall design.

- **Changed the fascia color from white to black.**
To enhance the overall contrast and modern aesthetic of the building. This adjustment provides a cleaner, more striking visual appeal, aligning with the updated design direction.
- **Changed the siding color from white to Gainsboro (color code and manufacturer are shown on material board sheet AX.4).**
The original siding and building color were plain white, but they have now been changed to Gainsboro, a shade that is still close to white with a slightly warmer tone. This subtle shift provides a more contemporary and refined appearance, while still maintaining a neutral tone that complements the overall design.

Please see the images below and the attached drawings for more info

All changes have been clouded with delta #2 on the drawings.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Ardalan Djalali

ardalan@adarchitectes.com

1355 El Camino Real, Unit 527, Redwood City, CA, 94063



Approved Design	Proposed Design
Front Elevation	Front Elevation
	
Left Side Elevation	Left Side Elevation
	
Right Side Elevation	Right Side Elevation
	
Rear Elevation	Rear Elevation
	



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, October 24, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

- b. 1317 Paloma Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for a second story plate height for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorical Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Ardalan Djalali, applicant and designer; Behzad Hadjian, property owner) (132 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [1317 Paloma Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1317 Paloma Ave - Attachments](#)
[1317 Paloma Ave - Plans](#)

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

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Ardalan Djalali, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Consider reconfiguring the chimney so that the stone extends up past the first floor roof line.*
- > *The chimney looks like an afterthought because it does not penetrate the roof. It is a zero clearance fireplace, so you don't have to have that minimum required height. The chimney could simply go up a foot or 18 inches, maybe even two feet above the roof line with the same stone so it looks like a chimney that goes up. The zero clearance can come out of the back or you can run it at the top, it only has to be a foot away from the window. You can do it and I would prefer to see that too. It completes the chimney. I like the look of the stone because it differentiates it from the siding. I agree with my fellow commissioner that it will look better with the chimney poking through the first floor roof. Maybe just come up onto the bottom of the window and it will not block anything. It doesn't have to go up past the windows.*
- > *I really appreciate my fellow commissioner bringing up the porch issue at the last meeting. That happens a lot, they are like almost a false porch. It's still not a huge porch but I appreciate you adding more depth. It's definitely improved. I also appreciate the comments offered by my fellow commissioner regarding the chimney. I am still having trouble on the request for the Special Permit for plate height. I understand that the client is tall, but what I am seeing is the use of the verticals help make the impression that something is tall anyway. If anything, I feel that the elements should have been reversed, with the verticals on the bottom and the horizontals on the top. I'm not sure if it is a good precedent.*
- > *I appreciate that a lot of the comments were incorporated from the last meeting. Lowering the plate*

height on the first floor helps in the overall scale of the project. The comments about having the chimney poke through the roof would make it look better. Based on that change, I will be okay moving forward with it.

Commissioner Horan made a motion, seconded by Chair Gaul, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> that the chimney along the right side of the house shall be extended one to two feet above the first floor roof line and shall be reviewed by Planning Division staff based on direction given by the Planning Commission; an FYI application shall be required if staff determines that the chimney is not consistent with the design of the single-unit dwelling.

Aye: 4 - Gaul, Horan, Lowenthal, and Pfaff

Absent: 3 - Comaroto, Schmid, and Tse

**RESOLUTION APPROVING CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION AND
AMENDMENT TO DESIGN REVIEW**

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

WHEREAS, a Categorical Exemption has been proposed and application has been made for Amendment to Design Review for as-built changes to a previously approved new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage at 1317 Paloma Avenue, zoned R-1; Behzad Hadjian, property owner, APN: 026-851-100;

WHEREAS, said matters were heard by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on November 12, 2024, 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 Section 15303 (a), which states that construction of a limited number of new, small facilities or structures including one single family residence or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone is exempt from environmental review. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences maybe constructed or converted under this exemption, is hereby approved.
2. Said Amendment to Design Review is approved subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto. Findings for such Amendment to Design Review are 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 November, 2024 by the following vote:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of approval for Categorical Exemption and Amendment to Design Review

1317 Paloma Avenue

Effective November 22, 2024

Page 1

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division and date stamped October 28, 2024, sheets A3.1, A3.2, A3.5, A3.6, and AX.1 through AX.4;
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 (level of review to be determined by Planning staff);
3. that any changes to the size or envelope of the first or second floors 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

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of approval for Categorical Exemption and Amendment to Design Review

1317 Paloma Avenue

Effective November 22, 2024

- professional, that demonstrates that the project falls at or below the maximum approved floor area ratio for the property;
11. that prior to scheduling the foundation inspection, a licensed surveyor shall locate the property corners, set the building footprint and certify the first-floor elevation of the new structure(s) based on the elevation at the top of the form boards per the approved plans; this survey shall be accepted by the City Engineer;
 12. 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;
 13. 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
 14. 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.

1317 Paloma Avenue
300' noticing
APN: 026-085-100

