



CITY OF BURLINGAME
Community Development Department
MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 2019 **Director's Report**
TO: Planning Commission **Meeting Date:** January 14, 2019
FROM: Erika Lewit, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: **FYI – REVIEW OF PLANNING COMMISSION REQUESTED CHANGES TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT AT 133 CRESCENT AVENUE, ZONED R-1.**

Summary: An application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling with a detached garage at 133 Crescent Avenue, zoned R-1 was approved by the Planning Commission on September 10, 2018 (see attached August 13, 2018 Design Review Study and September 10, 2018 Design Review Action, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes). The project is currently under review for a building permit.

At the Planning Commission meeting on September 10, 2018, the Planning Commission approved the project with a condition of approval that the project return to the Planning Commission as an FYI item to show several revisions. Please refer to the designer's response letter, date stamped January 7, 2019, for an explanation of the changes made. The revisions requested by the Planning Commission, along with the changes made by the designer for the FYI submittal, are listed below:

1. That the front setback for the house be increased 3-4 feet to reduce the appearance of mass from the street and so that the proposed architectural style blends better with the existing fabric of the neighborhood.
 - a. The front setback has been increased by 2'-0", from 27'-6" to 29'-6" (where 27'-5" is the minimum required). See sheet A1.0 highlighted in yellow on the revised plans.
2. That the brick base shown on the main house be extended to the mudroom at the right, rear side of the main dwelling.
 - a. The brick base has been extended to the mud room on the right side elevation, although the proposed height of the base for the mudroom is approximately one-third of the height of the brick base shown on the rest of the house. No change to the base has been made at the rear of the mudroom, however the same brick is now shown as part of the rear stoop/patio that extends from the rear of the mudroom and across the length of the house. See sheet A3.1 highlighted in orange on the revised plans.

If the Commission feels there is a need for more study, this item may be placed on an action calendar for a second review and/or public hearing with direction to the applicant.

Erika Lewit
Senior Planner

Attachments:

Explanation letter submitted by the designer, date stamped January 7, 2019
September 10, 2018 (Action) and August 13, 2018 (Study) Planning Commission Minutes
Proposed plans, date stamped December 21, 2018

Form + One

12098 Highway 42
Ellison Bay, Wisco. 54210

P+ 415.819.0304
E + tim@formonedesign.com

4843 Silver Springs Drive
Park City, UT 84098

RECEIVED

JAN 7 2019

CITY OF BURLINGAME
ODD-PLANNING DIV.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

To: City of Burlingame Planning Department
Subject: 133 Crescent (B18-0445)

From: Tim Raduenz
Date Sent: 12/21/18
Number of Pages: 2

Response to Planning Commission FYI:

1. Comment about mud room:

Answer: We added the brick foundation veneer to make it more cohesive. We still did keep the wood band board as we want that small building to differ from what the main building is!

2. Site Plan and moving back the structure:

Answer: We moved back the house towards the rear yard to give it a lesser impact at the streetscape.

In talks with Erika, after submittal of drawing: *I would like to stress that I had said we could do 24" we are already way behind the planning minimum setback and we are hoping this will satisfy the planning committee! We really put time and thought into this project and hope to get building soon! The reason for not adding more is we would like to dedicate it to the rear yard and family area!*

3. Mud Room Covered entry:

Answer: We added a small covered entry at the mud room.

To that end we hope the changes have been impactful and reads as an approvable project!

Best,



Tim Raduenz – CGBP



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, September 10, 2018

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- b. 133 Crescent Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Tim Raduenz, Form+ One, applicant and designer; Greg Gambrioli, 133 Crescent LLC, property owner) (113 noticed) Staff contact: Erika Lewit

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Why not the change to plate heights as suggested in the study meeting? (Raduenz: The scale of the two houses next to each other. Does not think the proposal is unreasonable. Seems like 8 feet on the second floor hurts the scale.)*
- > The 3D rendering does not show the revised height? (Raduenz: Correct.)*
- > What is the design logic of the mud porch with the vertical siding and flat roof? (Raduenz: Characteristic of older houses. Would typically have a different vernacular than the rest of the house. This is meant to follow that tradition. Flat roof is meant to reduce the scale.)*
- > Could use a different gesture to better integrate the added-on element, such as the same brick/stone from the rest of the house continued onto this piece. Would show intent and care. (Raduenz: Agreed.)*
- > Reference at 160 West Poplar is set further back, and on a wider lot. Could this one be set back further? Should have a larger front yard, a more formal approach. (Raduenz: Could be set back 3 or 4 feet. Neighboring house is close.)*
- > If homeowner is parking in the driveway or garage, maybe a covered porch at the mud room door to come in with groceries.*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Likes the house and the changes, but has an issue with the plate heights. Typically requests the second floor to be no more than 8 feet. Needs to be applied fairly.*
- > There are not other taller houses in the neighborhood. If the ceilings upstairs are 8 feet volume could*

still be gained with coffered ceilings.

> Nice application, approvable as stands. The commission does not have a hard and fast rule with the plate heights; 10 feet/9 feet seems like more of an issue.

> Special permit for height has been removed. Only request is design review. Would benefit from being pushed back on the lot further.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the Action Item with the following condition:

- **An FYI application shall be submitted to show that the front setback has been increased by 3 to 4 feet, that the stone base for the main house has been extended to the mud room at the rear, right side of the house, and that a roof cover be considered at the back door.**

The motion carried by the following vote:



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, August 13, 2018

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- b. 133 Crescent Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and a Special Permit for building height for a new two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (Tim Raduenz, Form+ One, applicant and designer; Greg Gambrioli, 133 Crescent LLC, property owner) (113 noticed) Staff contact: Erika Lewit

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

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

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *It is a traditional style but has been broadened. Has there been consideration of changing materials between first and second floor? Or some kind of articulation such as a flair line, or trim with dentils and corbels. (Raduenz: Would be open to it. Tried to do something at the bottom with the clinker brick and the band. Would be open to doing a flare with the trim detail at the second floor line.)*
- > *Have the concerns in the neighbor's letter been addressed? (Raduenz: Yes. Will make the change to the landscaping and get a letter from the neighbor.)*
- > *Sheet 3.1 the driveway elevation looks like it is the same as the left side elevation. (Raduenz: Will correct it.)*
- > *Was 9' first floor/8' second floor considered? (Raduenz: Looked at it, but the design has been patterned off of a remodeled house on Poplar Avenue in San Mateo Park with the same proportions.)*
- > *There are a lot of lines on the drawing, it is confusing to read. Would like to see a model, or photos of the inspirational house. (Raduenz: Had submitted a model to staff.)*
- > *If there is precedent with a house in San Mateo Park it would be helpful to see photos.*
- > *Why is there a curved wall in the back from the first floor to second floor. (Raduenz: It is a detail to create some flow. Could make it more rigid and square off the cap, or put more detail on it.)*
- > *Would suggest more parity to the windows in Bedrooms #3 and 4. Bedroom #2 has nice windows on two sides of the bedroom. The elevation on Sheet A3.0 shows a spot above the Living Room window to put a bedroom window in that corner. On Bedroom #4 where the curve detail is, it accentuates a blank spot; perhaps a window facing the back yard. (Raduenz: Bedroom #4 can be done, Bedroom #3 might have impacts on neighbors. Will take a look at it.)*
- > *Tension in the center window above the front porch pediment. Could the sill be raised in line with the other two windows? The bottom of the casing is touching the top of the ridge. (Raduenz: Yes.)*
- > *Needs to see a roof plan. (Raduenz: Will include in the next round, as well as the 3-D rendering.)*

Public Comments:

Joe Holmes: Adjacent on the south side. Spent some time with the applicant on the positions of the windows. Matched the placement so they are not staring at each other, particularly on the second floor. Large redwood in back is next to property line is uplifting the patio and fence, would like to have it removed.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Confused by the design. Seems broad at the front, and would be a big house for the neighborhood. A lot of the houses in the area are broken up more. This seems like it would overpower the block compared to the other homes. House seems to be more appropriate for a wider lot with more room in front.
- > Could change materials between the first and second floor or adding a flare would be helpful.
- > Not as supportive of special permit. Lowering the plates to a more standard height would reduce the height. With the large roof form there is room for the second floor to have vaulted ceilings to make it more spacious.
- > Other houses in the neighborhood have second stories tucked more into the rooflines, including the neighboring house to the right. The neighboring house could be overpowered by this house, so would be hard to grant the special permit for height.
- > Has approved a similar design previously, but it was broken down with two layers.
- > Most of the front porches in the neighborhood have larger sitting areas.

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