



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, November 26, 2018

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin and Senior Planner Catherine Keylon.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent 1 - Kelly

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Sargent, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the minutes with amendments submitted to staff earlier. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

a. Draft November 13, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft November 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes](#)

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

> Item 8b - 1245 Cabrillo Avenue has been continued at the request of the applicant. Public hearing notices will be sent once the application has been scheduled on a future agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no public comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. 832 Linden Avenue, zoned R-1 - Request for approval of a previously approved Design Review and Special Permit for attached garage for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling (approval expired - no changes proposed to previously approved project). This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(2).

(Eric and Siu Fanene, applicants and property owners) (137 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [832 Linden Ave - Staff Report](#)

[832 Linden Ave - Attachments](#)

[832 Linden Ave - Plans](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- b. 100 Highland Avenue, zoned CAR - Application for Conditional Use Permit for an automobile rental business. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Kent Putnam, applicant; 101 California Drive LLC, property owner; Proto Inc., architect) (131 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [100 Highland Ave - Staff Report](#)

[100 Highland Ave - Attachments](#)

[100 Highland Ave - Plans](#)

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

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 1 - Loftis

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 185 Pepper Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Front Setback Variance for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(2). (Barzin Keyhan Khadiv, applicant; Durwin and Carey Beth Tsay, property owners) (83 noticed) Staff Contact: Sonal Aggarwal

Attachments: [185 Pepper Ave - Staff Report](#)

[185 Pepper Ave - Attachments](#)

[185 Pepper Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)

[185 Pepper Ave - Plans](#)

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Payman (last name not provided) represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Have you selected the stone veneer and did you happen to bring a sample? The plans show a very generic representation of stone veneer, and all stone veneer is not equal. Certain stone veneer would look out of place. (Payman: Did not bring a sample, but it is shown on the revised plans. It will be natural stone as recommended by the design review consultant.)*
- > Regarding the chimney at the rear of the house, have you considered using a different material other than the same siding as the house? (Payman: Yes, the same stone veneer proposed at the front of the house will be used on the chimney.)*
- > Will the stone veneer be applied all the way up on the chimney? Proposed plans show the chimney with wood siding and stone veneer only applied at the base. Would like to see it applied to the entire chimney. Looks out of place with the wood siding. (Payman: Yes, we could do that.)*
- > There is an existing skylight to remain. Would you consider replacing the existing acrylic bubble skylight with a flat glass skylight? (Payman: Yes, can replace skylight, will remain in same location.)*
- > The proportions of the existing chimney at the rear of the house don't feel consistent with the craftsman look, feels like 1970's modern. Would you consider redesigning the chimney to be more in keeping with the craftsman style? Suggest a design with a shoulder on it so that it is not so rectilinear, if the flue size(s) allow for tapering. (Payman: Yes, can take a look at changing its design.)*
- > Also suggest at adding something to the top of the chimney.*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Like the changes, project has come a long way.*
- > Would like to see a stone sample, as well as other design items discussed come back as an FYI.*

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the application, with the following condition:

- > that prior to building permit issuance the applicant shall return to the Planning Commission for review of an FYI for the following items:**
 - a. provide a sample of the stone veneer proposed to be used on the project;**
 - b. revise the rear elevation to show stone all the way up the chimney;**
 - c. explore changing the shape of the rear chimney, if the flue size(s) allow for tapering; and**
 - d. revise the plans to show the existing acrylic skylight on the rear and left elevations to be replaced with a new glass skylight.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- b. 1245 Cabrillo Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review for changes to a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling and new detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a). (Eric and Jennifer Lai, applicants and property owners; Chu Design Associates Inc., designer) (113 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [1245 Cabrillo Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1245 Cabrillo Ave - Attachments](#)
[1245 Cabrillo Ave - Plans](#)

> *Item 8b - 1245 Cabrillo Avenue has been continued at the request of the applicant. Public hearing notices will be sent once the application has been scheduled on a future agenda.*

- c. 920 Bayswater Avenue (includes 908 Bayswater Ave., 108 Myrtle Rd., 112 Myrtle Rd., 116 Myrtle Rd., 120 Myrtle Rd., 124 Myrtle Rd.) zoned MMU and R-3 - Design Review Amendment for review of window materials for a previously approved application for a New 128-Unit Apartment Development. (Fore Property Company, applicant; John C. and Donna W. Hower Trust, Julie Baird, Eric G. Ohlund Et Al, Doris J. Mortensen Tr. - property owners; Withee Malcolm Architects LLP, architects) (325 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [920 Bayswater Ave - Staff Report](#)
[920 Bayswater Ave - Letter of Explanation- Milgard Specifications](#)
[920 Bayswater Ave - Attachments](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioners Terrones and Sargent had a conference call with the applicant regarding the proposed window type for the project.

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Mark Pilarczyk, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Main issue was wanting to see a sample of the proposed window product.*
> *While we don't have a specific ordinance regarding windows, we do have design guidelines that encourage, if not require, us to interpret designs and try to enforce those guidelines in order to maintain the quality, character and detail of our neighborhoods. Have often applied those guidelines to issues like vinyl windows, foam trim, etc. Have denied vinyl windows, primarily in situations when an applicant may not have selected a manufacturer and they were tending towards vinyl windows simply because of the price point. If they haven't selected a manufacturer, it opens the door for a lot of poor quality vinyl windows. In other instances, have had applicants wanting to use vinyl windows when they've had a preponderance of existing vinyl windows they wanted to match; have approved some of those cases but in others encouraged them to find other solutions. In this case, being that it is a large, prominent project with lots of windows wanted to evaluate the windows more on behalf of the public and also be able to see a sample.*

- > Glad we are able to see the window sample and its details. Wish there was a bit more dimensionality to the muntins, but they are simulated true divided lite muntins, with muntins on the exterior and interior and a dividing bar in between the glazing. Joinery is cleaner than other vinyl windows we've seen.
- > Appreciate changing the synthetic wood material to real wood material on the guardrail on the ground floor.
- > Concerned with the flat profile on the muntins and don't know how they will appear on the building.
- > Don't know if the windows have gone far enough. Have you check into the other window manufactures/materials such as Fibrex which provide more pronounced muntins? (Pilarczyk: Have considered a few other manufacturers. Performance rating off the CEQA requirements made us to look at sound transfer requirements and STC ratings. Felt that Milgard being reputable and the top of the line vinyl series product, was a solid window that not only would enhance the architecture but would be a long living and viable window for maintenance and performance.
- > Did you look at the Integrity or Infinity series by Marvin? These are price point windows, considered to be a builders series of a good quality windows, but don't know the performance numbers. (Pilarczyk: Understand that the proposed vinyl window was previously approved on an apartment project, so figured that it not only would be a top of the line vinyl window series that has gone through the vetting process, but was also consistent with the high attention to detail.)
- > This is a large project with lots of windows at a very prominent location. Concerned that the proposed windows look cheap, don't think it improves the project. Would rather see a higher quality window without divided lites.
- > Have you considered a hybrid approach where the windows that are more visible from the street would upgraded to a higher quality material and vinyl windows would be used on the interiors of the building? Want entire project to look as high quality as possible.
- > Is other large project you referred to currently under construction where these windows were used? (Pilarczyk: Yes, the Milgard Tuscan Series was approved on that project.)
- > Don't particularly like these windows, but to be fair, if we have approved these windows on a previous project, then we need to take that into consideration.
- > Recollection was that these windows were approved for the previous project specifically to address the CEQA noise transfer requirements. It is in a different location, so don't know if the numbers are different. (Keylon: In the CEQA document prepared for this project, there were issues regarding noise in terms of residents given the proximity to the railroad tracks. Project needs to be under certain decibel levels for residents per building code requirements. Several large projects currently under review are proposing aluminum and vinyl windows.)
- > When project was reviewed the first time, project had proposed windows that met the CEQA requirements for sound transfer. Simulated true divided lites didn't change the sound transmission to make you use vinyl windows, correct? (Pilarczyk: Correct, vinyl windows have always been proposed for this project. Performance of vinyl windows always provides for the STC ratings for noise transfer concerns. Project is close to the railroad, so that was a part of the CEQA documents and acoustical report.)

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Consistency is a really important value we need to adhere to. In the previous project, the windows specifically addressed the noise ratings. Don't know if in this case a different style window wouldn't meet those noise ratings. The Commission has been consistent in asking applicants to look at the muntin bars with more relief that look more like a traditional window. Don't think we can fairly consider cost.
- > If noise rating is an issue here, then need to see more information why other windows don't comply with the sound rating.
- > Although it is nice window, it is not consistent with what we've approved in the past.

- > For previously approved project, had to consider noises from freeway, train and Broadway Commercial Area. In this case there is the train and neighborhood behind it; feel like sound is a little bit different.
- > Don't particularly like look of this window, needs more depth. Suggest applicant look at other types of windows that provide the depth we're looking for.
- > Would be useful to know if deciding factor in approving vinyl windows on the previously approved project was noise and that they demonstrated that they couldn't meet the noise reduction requirements in any other way besides using those windows.
- > For this project, want to understand if the noise reduction requirements can be met with another type of window. Want to be fair, but if there was no other choice in the previously approved project and there is another choice here, then that needs to be considered. This is a highly prominent location; location is not as prominent on the other project.
- > CEQA document would be helpful because it gives standard of what noise reduction is required. Could continue application with direction that the applicant consider other window options that meet previous approvals and come back with more information.
- > Have no issues with other changes included with the application.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to continue the application for additional information regarding the windows.

Comment on the motion:

- > Not specifically rejecting this window type yet. Would like to see more information regarding meeting the sound transmission requirements from other manufacturers relative to this window and meeting the CEQA requirements.
- > There is also a matter of consistency, would like to know whether deciding factor on previously approved project was complying with noise transmission requirements.
- > Is it possible for applicant to come back with two or three options for us to consider once the information is provided?
- > Would feel uncomfortable with that approach. It's up to the applicant to make a proposal based on the design guidelines and what their requirements are.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1613 Coronado Way, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. (J Deal Associates, Jerry Deal, applicant and designer; Gregory Button, property owner) (129 noticed) Staff Contact: Sonal Aggarwal

Attachments: [1613 Coronado Way - Staff Report](#)
[1613 Coronado Way - Attachment](#)
[1613 Coronado Way - Plans](#)

Commissioner Tse was recused from this item as she has a business relationship with the next door neighbor who submitted a letter of concern regarding the project.

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Jerry Deal, represented the applicant, along with Gregory Button, property owner.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > House has a nice, modern feel to it in terms of the first floor roof. Roof over living spaces is striking in terms of a single, flat plane that covers the first floor. It has more depth to it than one can perceive from the drawings. Have you considered replicating that theme to have a big sweeping roof on the second floor? The proposed gable seems a bit foreign because of the strength of the first floor roof. Could also have deep roof overhangs on the second floor that wouldn't count towards lot coverage because it would be a roof over a roof. (Deal: Could look at changing to flat roofs on second floor. Would prefer to have flat roofs at different heights.)
- > Simplicity of roof forms and corner windows give the house a nice feel.
- > Have you spoken to the neighbor to the left regarding the rear patio? (Button: Have spoken to the neighbor, indicated that she did not have any privacy concerns with the proposed addition. Her house backs up to my property and pool is located on other side of house. Have been on roof and you can't see the pool and patio area from roof.)
- > Concerned that a spray foam roof will not look good on a pitched/gable roof, however if roof is flattened then it may not be visible and would alleviate concern.
- > In master bathroom there is a French door out to roof, but no railing is shown. Were you intending to provide a railing or Juliette balcony? If it is a door, most likely will need some sort of railing to comply with building code requirements. (Deal: Original intent was to provide a large window, but not to be used as a door. Also needs access to the roof for maintenance. Will look into changing door to an opaque window in consideration of the privacy concerns expressed by the neighbor to the right.)
- > What is the purpose of having such a large roof deck off the master bedroom? Concerned with privacy and noise issues. (Button: Would like to have a seating area to have a cup of coffee in the morning. Roof deck would only be accessible through the master bedroom. Would be a beautiful area with landscaping, including vines and plants. Interested in making the space private and providing privacy for the neighbors. There is extensive existing foliage that makes it hard to see anything. Attempted to contact neighbors to left, but have been out of the county so have not been able to discuss the project with them yet.)
- > Have you looked at living roofs? One example is a system using trays of succulents that interlock. Perhaps the roof deck can be combined with a living roof.
- > Also concerned with large roof deck, larger than what we've been allowing recently. Could be distracting if there is a large gathering on the deck, especially at night. Would be less concerned if it's well landscaped with permanent landscaping. (Button: If you were standing on the deck right now and making noise, not sure where people would hear it from. Patio of neighbor to left is located on the other side of their house; the proposed second floor addition would block noise to neighbor on right side. Feel roof deck is sufficiently set back from everyone.) Houses are built close together, still feel something should be done to address privacy and noise concerns.
- > Have you spoken to the neighbor on the right? (Button: Yes, noted that he didn't have any objections. Will coordinate with him further.)
- > Gable roof seems out of place. Additional corners created on second floor aren't necessary, could just be a simple rectangle with a flat roof, perhaps the center gets popped up. (Deal: Could move bathroom wall at front of house so that it aligns with the staircase and fill in the area.)
- > Encourage a simple roof with deep overhangs in certain places, with a play of shadows on that depth.
- > Roof deck is approximately 175 SF; typically have asked applicants to limit to 100 SF. However, in previous projects applicants have added planter boxes on deck to soften perimeter and reduce usable area of deck; prevents people from standing at the railing. (Button: Like suggestion, would allow for desired vegetation on roof deck.)
- > Revise plans to show landscaping on roof deck.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> Feel clear direction has been provided, don't see too many changes needed.

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, and Terrones

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 1 - Tse

- b.** 1273 Balboa Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second floor addition and a new detached garage. (Peter Suen, FifthArch, architect; Kevin Lange, applicant and property owner) (153 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1273 Balboa Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1273 Balboa Ave - Attachments](#)

[1273 Balboa Ave - Plans](#)

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.

> Understand that we don't have any input on whether or not accessory dwelling units (ADU) can be permitted, however can we review the design of the ADU? (Keylon: No, since it is a ministerial permit the ADU is not subject to design review. However, the ordinance does require that the design of the ADU should compliment the architectural style of the home, which is determined at a staff level review.)

> Do we have any input on the design of the detached garage which is located in front of the ADU? (Keylon: Yes.)

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Peter Suen represented the applicant, along with Kevin Lange, property owner.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Do you know much about the evolution of the design of the house or its history of alterations and additions? (Lange: Don't know much about the history, purchased the house in May of this year. Believe it is approximately 102 years old. Know there is another house on Easton Drive that has a similar front facade.) (Suen: Architecturally, noticed that the front facade is a mishmash of styles with stucco, boxed posts and shutters which don't match. It appears that there have been awkward additions at the rear of the house.)

> What is the intent of the proposed design? Is it to try to give the house a more contemporary feel? (Suen: Existing stucco at front facade has deteriorated, so changing it to horizontal wood siding which is consistent with several houses across the street. Feel that the horizontal wood siding would help with the articulation of the existing boxy house. Proposed standing seam metal roof helps to add texture to the front facade.)

> Boxed stucco columns are changing to wood posts. Is the intent that it would be a finished wood or

cased lumber? (Suen: Would be clear finished wood posts with steel hardware for attachment to the foundation.)

> Have you considered changing the existing style of the house? My understanding is that the original house was a single story bungalow with a second story added later at some point. The existing structure would not meet current design guidelines. Is this an opportunity to bring it more in keeping with the neighborhood? Have 8 plus foot ceilings on the first floor and 10 foot ceilings on the second floor, feels huge and out of proportion. (Suen: Floor to ceiling on first floor is about 8.5 feet and approximately the same on the second floor. Not proposing to change the structure at the front of the house.)

> Sheet A3.1 notes that the ground floor plate is 8'-5", which is consistent with a traditional house in this neighborhood. However, the second floor plate is 9'-10" and seems to accentuate the boxiness of the second floor addition. Did you look at ways to change the existing house rather than maintaining it and continuing it with the addition at the rear? (Suen: We did consider it, but decided to keep existing house and focus the addition towards one area of the house. Form at the front of the house would be maintained with updated materials.)

> Did you consider extending the roof eaves at the sides of the house to create overhangs? Would give the front elevation more interest as opposed to the gable being flush to the roof. (Suen: We didn't consider it, but could take a look at it.)

> Two different perspective have been provided. Do you have a preference for one or the other? (Lange: Just received the renderings this weekend, didn't like the asymmetrical windows on the second floor, so prefer the design shown on the second rendering.)

> Plans note wood and steel shading devices. Would these be structures or mechanical systems that would retract? (Suen: These would be fixed sun shading devices, not operable systems.) Please provide a detail on the revised plans.

> Are all windows being replaced? (Suen: Some existing wood windows on the ground level will remain. Proposing to replace second story vinyl windows with fiberglass clad wood windows.) Please note on revised plans which existing windows are remaining and which are being replaced. Also note material of new windows on revised plans.

> Understand that your objective is to maintain as much of the front of the house structure as possible. With the removal of the central windows on the second floor, seems that the center of the wall is blank and flat. Can you consider integrating some of the details shown at the rear of the house at the front? Perhaps a dormer roof detail over the front portico or shading devices, something to help punctuate through the front facade and add interest and depth to it. In addition, the roof line is quite minimal at the front of the house, so would you consider changing the roof profile to improve the curb appeal and still maintain the contemporary design approach? (Suen: Reason for removing the windows at the center of the second floor was because they were located in closet spaces of the existing house. Window sizes were chosen based on the size of the bedrooms, one was larger than the other, so there was no reason to keep symmetrical design on the front facade. However, in seeing the renderings, feel that maintaining a balance may be better. Could potentially add smaller windows in closet areas, which would add more elements to the blank area. Regarding the roof design, once we decided to keep the front fairly static and only change the materials, we didn't want to build a completely new roof. Changing the roof may be a good option, but it would require a complete new front facade design.)

> What is the roof profile on detached garage? Is it also flat? (Suen: Yes, it is flat.) Would seem that you could integrate the garage more with the house with the same gable roof.

> Did you consider adding a roof above the porch? Could even extend it out a bit given that there is a floor area ratio exemption for front porches and the existing house has a generous front setback. Existing columns and siding are being replaced, so it wouldn't be difficult to integrate a front porch roof to provide relief to the front facade. (Suen: We did consider it and can revisit adding a porch again. Initially, decided not to add a front porch since the house has an existing recessed porch and thought it would look odd.) Porch doesn't have to be deep; could also add a porch roof, flat work and extend seat walls out further. Would also enhance the front yard in general.

> Really like existing front posts, felt that proposed posts are too small. Please consider making porch posts larger and adding a porch.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> *Existing house has very little charm and has been made more charmless. This is a good candidate for a design review consultant. Exterior design needs a lot of attention.*

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to refer the application to a design review consultant.

Commission Discussion:

> If the roofline is not altered, then need to reduce the plate height on the second floor addition and not match the existing plate height. Could potentially provide a way to incorporate a gable at the rear of the house and create articulation and depth.

> Need to also look at roofline of garage, flat roof structure is a continuance of a portion of the house design but it doesn't work.

> Agree with comments made regarding the front porch, great way to add interest to the front of the house.

> Front facade is not being altered much because it's existing. However, many projects show existing walls to remain, but during construction most of the house is demolished. The premise for not addressing the front facade is that the existing structure will remain, but what if most of the house is demolished? How is it addressed then?

> Existing building would not meet the current design guidelines. If there is an opportunity to address it now, it would benefit the house and neighborhood.

> Comments/suggestions provided will be helpful in coming up with a cohesive design. Changing the look of the house will not be so difficult since the exterior siding, windows and drywall will all be removed, leaving only stud walls to remain.

> Should add planter boxes on second floor deck to reduce it's usable area.

> Problem with this project is that it's taken a box and made a bigger box out of it. Something needs to happen with the roof, with the eaves or with the rake and eaves.

> Looks like a modern salt box with no details, desperately needs details of some sort.

> A contemporary design will be difficult to achieve on this house.

> Flat roofs don't appear to be working as a form, needs to be revisited.

> Pick a design direction that is more traditional if it's not going to be a reworking of the facade and roof form.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- c. 1464 Balboa Avenue, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (Chu Design & Associates, applicant and designer; Matt Nejasmich, property owner) (135 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [1464 Balboa Ave - Staff Report & Attachments](#)

[1464 Balboa Ave - Plans](#)

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

> Is there a copy of the 3D rendering available that is on the sign board? (Hurin: Will ask applicant to provide.)

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Matt Nejasmich, property owner, represented the applicant, along with James Chu, designer.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Is there any reason why the front porch plate height can't be lowered and detached from the adjacent roof? Existing houses across the street have front porches with a cloistered feel, with ceiling heights of approximately 8 feet. Concerned with tall front columns and high freeboard area above doors. (Chu: Yes, can reduce height of front porch.)

> Have you considered adding a railing at the front porch? (Chu: Will look into it.)

> On front elevation, plate level is shown at 9'-6", but that line appears to be below the edge of gutter/fascia board. Is that correct? (Chu: Will look into it and correct plans if necessary.)

> Assuming that you have spoken to PG&E and/or the neighbor about moving the power line that extends across the back yard? (Nejasmich: Yes, have spoken to the neighbor and PG&E about it.)

> Show eave brackets in profile on all building elevations.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> Something about the house is very odd, but can't identify why. House feels really big; the two side walls are huge, partly due to the lot sloping downward.

> Roof seems extraordinarily complex, has a lot of roof planes for a rectangular house. Needs to be simplified.

> Revising the plate heights and front porch height may help with massing concerns.

> Acknowledged concern expressed in letter received from neighbor regarding the house being similar with the house across the street, not sure if that's good or bad.

> Style of house fits in with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Sargnet made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- d. 1341 De Soto Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and Conditional Use Permit for a half-bath in the detached garage. (Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, applicant and designer; Jeff Diana, property owner) (123 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1341 De Soto Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1341 De Soto Ave - Attachments](#)
[1341 De Soto Ave - Plans](#)

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, represented the applicant, along with Jeff Diana, property owner.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > What material is on the gable ends? (Raduenz: Horizontal vertical slats are proposed to provide texture, will be a tight clapboard. It is not functional venting.)*
- > What is a mono vault shown in the bedrooms? (Raduenz: This means that the bedroom ceilings will have one pitch. Will be using fabricated trusses.)*
- > Porch feels that it's been infilled, front door is at front of porch façade and looks flat. Is there any way to recess it a little bit? (Raduenz: This is an option, we can do it by pushing the house back and pushing columns out.)*
- > What is intent of restroom in garage? (Raduenz: Would like to have plumbing in the detached garage if the owner wishes to add an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) in the future.)*
- > If detached garage is converted to an ADU in the future, how would you provide the required covered parking? (Raduenz: Would build a new garage or carport in front of it.)*
- > Is it a double belly-band that is proposed above the porch area that then continues to the side of the house with beams and columns to support the second floor cantilever? (Raduenz: Yes, that is correct.)*
- > Include more detail on capital and base of columns on building elevations.*
- > Would you want to have access to the front porch from inside of house? (Raduenz: Want more sense of privacy in den, so would not prefer to add French doors.)*
- > House is close to floor area ratio now, so may not have enough room to add an ADU in future. (Hurin: Noted that converting the garage to an ADU and adding a carport or garage would increase the floor area ratio.)*
- > Are columns along left side of house necessary? Does it provide enough driveway width? (Raduenz: Owner prefers to have columns to support cantilevered second floor, likes how it provides interest and adds to the design.)*
- > Plans show a 10 foot easement at the rear of the lot, is that correct? (Raduenz: Yes, this is the alley behind the property.)*
- > How much room is between the garage and the new fence? Concerned about maintenance and building the structure, and eaves overlapping each other. (Raduenz: Could increase to 18 inches.)*
- > Assume that fence would continue to the back corner. Would the back of the garage then not have a fence? (Raduenz: Currently, plans shown a fence at the back of the garage, but it could also end at the garage; will clarify.)*
- > May be better to apply for ADU now, plumbing would be in place, would be simpler and less expensive in the long run. (Diana: Plumbing in garage provides flexibility and provide convenience in garage. The ADU is more of an option than a definitive plan.)*
- > Is the siding proposed to be wood siding? (Raduenz: Yes, siding will be wood, it's a finger-jointed product. Siding would be 1x12 or 1x10.)*
- > Specify size of post and beams and other architectural elements on building elevations.*
- > On front elevation, feels like there is tension between the two smaller windows above the entry portico and the series of windows to the right. Can you consider one smaller window centered in the space instead? Was the intent to have an array of windows across the top? (Raduenz: Yes, that was the intent.*

2D drawing is more accurate; can revisit 3D to make sure it is depicted correctly.)

> Does anyone have an issue with the plate heights? 9'-6" on the first floor and 8'-4" on the second floor is proposed. Think plate heights are appropriate; house doesn't feel too tall.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Like design, has nice features and articulates massing really well. Like textured gable ends.
- > Concerned with different roofing materials, seems like there are too many different textures.
- > Renderings help to understand textures better, don't think there are too many textures. Not concerned with metal roofing because there is not much of it on this house.
- > Like diamond roofs, looks classic, don't have any issues with metal roof on lower portion of house.
- > In support of half bath in detached garage.

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar.

Commission Discussion:

- > When adjusting the flat work at the front porch, make sure it is easy and comfortable to get out the door and around to the sitting area on the front porch. Otherwise, it could be an annoyance to take a step down and then a step up to access the porch. If the inconvenience is not there, then the covered porch area is likely to get used a lot more.
- > Agree that front door looks flat, but if it gets pushed back may provide better access to front porch.
- > In support of conditional use permit, have reviewed them closely in the past and have approved them for half bathrooms as a convenience in detached garages.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Kelly

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Commissioner Terrones reported that he and Commissioner Loftis are on an adhoc input advisory committee for the New Community Center. Will be attending additional meetings to discuss design development.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Planning Manager Hurin reported that the City Council reviewed the General Plan in its last meeting, and will consider adoption of the General Plan on December 17th.

The City Council considered residential impact fees in a special meeting on November 15th.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Note: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on November 26, 2018. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on December 6, 2018, 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 \$551, which includes noticing costs.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Community Development/Planning counter, City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.