



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, November 12, 2024

7:00 PM

Council Chambers/Online

1. CALL TO ORDER - 7:00 p.m. - Council Chambers/Online

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Assistant Planner Brittany Xiao, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Horan, Lowenthal, Pfaff, Schmid, Shores, and Tse

Absent 1 - Comaroto

3. REQUEST FOR AB 2449 REMOTE PARTICIPATION

There were no requests.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no meeting minutes to approve.

5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

7. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Consent Calendar Items.

9. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 1345 Columbus Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review for proposed changes to a previously approved new, two-story single-unit dwelling. This project is Categorical Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Audrey Tse, inSite Design, applicant and designer; Rudi Thun and Sonali Arurkar, property owners) (57 noticed) Staff Contact: Brittany Xiao

Attachments: [1345 Columbus Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1345 Columbus Ave - Attachments](#)
[1345 Columbus Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Tse was recused from this item because she is the project designer. Assistant Planner Xiao provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Lauren Lee 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:

> In general, it looks ok. I like the previous design better. It feels that the stairwell window with just the two mullions make it bigger. The rear patio glass door is not an issue for me.

> I agree with my colleague that the previous design held together better with the whole house. In particular, the stairwell window does not look good. Consider other ways to divide it so it looks less massive. It does not provide the house any favors. On the proposed left-side elevation, there is a window on the very far left looks very small and feels like a last-minute window addition.

> The window mullions are a fine substitution for me. I like the entry change. The door with the sidelight made a better entry. That is an improvement to the overall design. Otherwise, I don't have any issues with this project.

> Personally, if there are mullions on the windows, it's hard for me to assert my subjective opinion. I don't disagree with my fellow commissioners, and I'll be inclined to approve this.

> I agree. The windows are a little bit of a sticking point for me. Of the houses on that street, there are some with very nice divided light windows and there are some more recent renovations that do not have divided lights at all. It will stand out a little bit more if it is built this way, but it is not a big deal for me to hold the project. Everything else is totally fine.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Horan, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

Recused: 1 - Tse

- b.** 1522 La Mesa Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review and Hillside Area Construction Permit for changes to a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Jeff Guinta, Innovative Concepts, applicant and designer;

Steven Seyedin, property owner) (48 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1522 La Mesa Dr - Staff Report](#)

[1522 La Mesa Dr - Attachments](#)

[1522 La Mesa Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Tse was recused from this item as she lives within 500 feet from this property. Assistant Planner Xiao provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Jeff Guinta, designer, 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:

> Since the garage is much more prominent now, consider another garage door style. A carriage house style will look lovely and it will not be as disconnected in design to the main house. I'm ok with it if the garage doors are more complimentary to the house.

> I'm supportive of the changes. It is much safer than the existing driveway, which is much difficult to back out from. It also complies with all the setbacks and FAR. The fact that it is fully compliant is great. I do agree with my fellow commissioner, the garage doors should be punched up a bit because it is so prominent now. Before, it was underground and don't even see it. Now that it is almost street level, a nicer garage door is warranted. A two-car garage in front of the house is very visible.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners. Overall, I am supportive of the project. There are a lot of things to consider improving this project. If you rotate the gable roof over the garage it will give you a lot of space in that gable end to add more decorative elements that mirrors the house, and a nicer garage door would also be good. A very prominent garage in front of the house is somewhat the theme for this area because of the slopes. As is, the project is already head and shoulders above what else is on the street. I am happy with how it is so far. With a very minor upgrade on the garage doors, I'll be very happy to support this project.

> I'm supportive of the changes. I agree with the comments about the garage door and the roof. That was a great point. Thinking about arching the garage door to make them look nicer, there is just no head room once you take into consideration that part where the roof comes forward. If the roof was rotated as suggested by my fellow commissioner, you will have a much larger surface to work with to design the doors and an opportunity to align with the rest of the openings.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Pfaff, to approve the application with the following added conditions:

> that the garage vehicle doors shall be of a more decorative design, such as carriage-style, which can be reviewed and approved at staff level.

> that the applicant may choose to reconfigure the roof over the attached garage so that the gable-end faces the street; this change can be reviewed and approved at staff level.

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

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

Recused: 1 - Tse

- c. 19 El Quanito Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Hillside Area Construction Permit for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Tim Raduenz, Form One Design, applicant and designer; Angelique and Chris Rypinski, property owners) (29 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [19 El Quanito Way - Staff Report](#)

[19 El Quanito Way - Attachments](#)

[19 El Quanito Way - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioners Tse, Pfaff, Shores and Horan noted that they met with the neighbor at 15 El Quanito Way. Assistant Planner Xiao provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the application.

Public Comments:

> Ammiel Kamon, 15 El Quanito Way: There are a lot of statements being made about the type of view. The applicant never bothered to knock at our door and look from inside. I don't want to argue on the statements made, I just think they are not accurate. It is a major feature of our house. It is very unique to the house even it's placement. I don't have issues with any other homes. This is just the definition of the ordinance as we interpret them. I'm sorry we are in this situation. Lastly, I don't know what the ordinance means. That view is similar to views that are all throughout hillside and the slope looking towards the bay. We are making a pretty strong statement to the broader neighborhood even beyond our street. I've had other neighbors from the other side of the street comment that it breaks the roof line that we have. I don't want to go into that, I believe you have all the information.

Chair Lowenthal closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I was very sympathetic to the applicant until I got into the neighbor's house. I would describe the neighbor's home as almost an open floor plan. I find that view important, they have it from two faces of the wall facing down towards the neighbor. Yes, it is true that there is a view to the canyon, but I found the argument quite compelling about the kitchen area and the living space. It is an extremely modern home with big open beams. We are very careful with these kinds of decisions. It comes up all the time. Suggests exploring a one-story rendition. I did watch the previous meeting video and my colleagues had a clever suggestion of doing a single story with the possibility of setback variance if necessary. It's a good thing to explore. I am sympathetic of the view of the neighbor at 15 El Quanito Way.

> I understand how challenging this is and see both perspectives from the applicant and the neighbor, with a view that they enjoy everyday that is proposed to be blocked forever. I disagree with it being a tiny slice of a view. If you look at the photos, I can imagine the trees growing so close together that it will fully block the view. I did get a chance to get inside the neighbor's home at 15 El Quanito Way and was able to

see the shape, size and orientation of their window at the combined dining and living room space is almost deliberately towards the bay view. It wasn't just by happenstance that it appeared there. They also have a view of that bay from their kitchen, which from our ordinance is considered a secondary view. Looking at it from the living/dining room space, they clearly enjoy a bay view in a distance. It is difficult to try to support a second story addition here knowing that the said view will be blocked. I don't necessarily believe that everyone from this street won't be able to add a second story, it really is a case-by-case basis depending on one's siting, location and potential blocking view of other homes. There can be a home on the street that can add a second story where an uphill neighbor doesn't have any windows looking towards the view. In this particular case, there is a view being blocked.

> I'm a little bit bothered that we don't get a chance to see a potential one-story plan. I would hope to see at least an attempt to that and then agree or disagree that it works or does not work for the home. With such a creative designer on the project, I can't think that there cannot be some other solution that can be worked out. We've been generous in offering suggestions like the setback or lack of a setback at the front. There seems to have enough space downstairs to add some room to the house. I don't necessarily believe that it can be more costly to expand a one-story plan than to add a second story to the home including having to excavate a new staircase in the basement to go up and down the multiple floors.

> We take it seriously. This is not our ordinance; we are just here to enforce it. In my time as a commissioner, I have never agreed with a homeowner who has said they have a protected view until now. I was skeptical. From outside it appeared that there was not a view, but it looks like that window was purposely designed to take advantage of that view. I would encourage the applicant to go in and see because it changed my mind as soon as I sat down.

> I agree, it definitely is not an afterthought sidelight.

> I was not able to make it inside the house so my point of view is strictly from what I can see from the driveway. I felt it is a much-slivered view, but I concede to my fellow commissioners that there is more to the inside than outside.

> I did not get a chance to see it from the neighbor's home. I agree, from the outside it is not as obvious, but I do defer to my fellow commissioners who were able to go into that house. The ordinance is important. You have a view and it is important to you. My fellow commissioner said it well, it does not set a precedent because each one of these is on a case-by-case basis. There is an option here to do a single story, although it may not be ideal. We can get some good space on this property and a better house. Unfortunately, this second story is an uphill battle.

> I would like to reiterate that we have previously said that we are amenable to variances to go a little bit outside of normal things, like setbacks in order to make this project work in a way that does not detrimentally impact a neighbor's view.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

- d. 1033 Cortez Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permits for plate height and second floor deck for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and Special Permit for side setback for a new 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. (Elaine Lee, Elaine Lee Design, applicant and architect; Raymond Wong, property owner) (52 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia

Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1033 Cortez Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1033 Cortez Ave - Attachments](#)

[1033 Cortez Ave - Rendering](#)

[1033 Cortez Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Assistant Planner Xiao provided an overview of the staff report.

Elaine Lee, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the application.

Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

> Public comment sent via email by Vitas Viskanta, 1704 Sanchez Avenue: The project feels generic, the street frontage does not address Burlingame Design Guidelines. The facade feels intentional in not making a design statement, unfortunate for a site adjacent to a creek with good tree canopy to address. I have no additional comments on the plan, setbacks or other planning issues. Ratchet up expectations.

Chair Lowenthal closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I wanted to acknowledge that you made some windows changes in the primary bathroom and they are amendable to me.

> The designer has done a nice job listening to our comments. The additional details, even if it is as little as adding some lights and downspouts has made the elevation look a lot better. I appreciate the header over the second story window and the extra details in the column at the front porch. The project has pulled together nicely and looks like what I have expected would happen. Job well done; I support this project.

> I like the change to the window in the master bath, it was too big and addresses the neighbor's concern.

> I do agree with the public comment that it is not necessarily making a statement, but it's okay not to make a statement to meet the design guidelines. The changes made are what the project needs to come together. I'm in favor of the project.

> I never saw the first round, but looking at the changes made, the Commission did a good job with the comments to add some details that pull the project together nicely.

> I also would like to acknowledge the edits that were made. I appreciate the change in the slope of the roof over the front room which makes an improvement from pedestrian level from afar. There is some quiet charm to this home. It is not calling a lot of attention to itself. It fits nicely against the edge at the end of the street.

Commissioner Tse made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Horan, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

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

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Tse noted that she met with the property owner and had a tour of the house. Assistant Planner Xiao 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 wasn't present when this project was heard by the Commission, but I've seen this house a couple of times before. This is so stripped down. When you look at something stripped like this, noting that someone may like an unembellished house, you may beef up the landscaping to compensate for it. The landscape, which I believe this Commission has approved, is almost non-existent. Everything is just so stripped back. There would be no purpose to design review if everyone just built what they wanted. We used to do that a long time ago, but that's really not the process. I have trouble with this one. I did drive by and looked at the home but was not able to see the inside.*

> *I too went by and looked at the outside which we are tasked and what we are actually reviewing. It looks flat. Things have been taken out. The shutters may not have any value, most of the shutters in the city don't have any use-value, they are decorative. They are there to provide a level of detail, a material changes or some interest. The brackets on the columns on the porch, they were put it in, and the elevation is that way. They were not a header issue, and I don't see why they couldn't be there. I don't see any reason why the end trusses couldn't be there. Personally, I don't think any one of these items are worth fighting for, but the fact is we gave the feedback last time saying that what was presented was not enough. The beam extensions don't give anything either. The houses on the adjoining area have full on brackets, knee supports and everything that creates depth. This is just a two-foot overhang that is oversized and doesn't have anything holding it up. I have a hard time supporting the removal of everything and getting a corbel beam extension. It is not what we are looking for to enhance this. The last project that we reviewed is a perfect example; it did not have enough detail the first time, the designer heard what we said and came back with much more information that made the house look good. We had the opportunity of driving by the house, and it looks flat. I wouldn't have approved that the first time around either. I don't think we have made any progress on this.*

> I'm concerned about the process. If this were presented earlier on, I might not have a problem with it. This is not what was presented, and it is not what was approved. It is not the applicant's right to change what was approved without prior approval.

> I still think that there is another problem. The neighbor to the right is a highly detailed house, so it looks even flatter by comparison. It is not a bad-looking house; it is just not what was approved. There was not a good will attempt to add some details back in. The reasoning does not hold water for me. Unless you are 7'-2" tall, the brackets on the columns are not going to get in anyone's way walking under them. To say that there is a height constraint does not make sense to me. The slope of the roof and the overhang depth was what was shown on the original architect's drawings and yet you show a truss. Personally, I do not like the truss, but that was what was approved. It is setting a bad precedent to allow an applicant and an architect to present drawings that we spend time commenting on and try to improve, then the builder builds whatever they want and say it looks better than what the architect designed. That's not the way the process works.

> I did get the opportunity to look inside the house and listened to the applicant on the level of detail and quality of effort that was put into the construction of the home. We had a long talk about the process and how we need to be respectful of the process. Looking at the house and the eave extensions, I originally commented on how the depth of the eave projection is too deep to have nothing there. I don't think these beam extensions do much. I'd rather see nothing there than to see those. I am at peace with the way the house looks. I spent a week going around looking at homes with this architectural style, they all have brackets and corbels. There are lots of homes with a similar change in siding orientation at the gable end and no other details. Like what my fellow commissioner said, if this originally came to us for approval, we may have approved it as is. Hopefully, the applicant is learning his lessons from this. Hopefully he is more respectful of the process going forward. I am ok with it as it is now. I see a lot of the details has gone on even to the eave vents that are built in. It is nicely carefully crafted. I don't think this is a cost-cutting measure that is being proposed but simply a design aesthetic that he is trying to transfer from the outside to the inside which is very modern.

> I look at some of these projects with the end-user as a forefront lens. Since this is a spec house, my lens changes and I do that with all the projects that I see. If it is what the homeowner really wants, there are certain things that I can't dictate if they are better or worse. This is a spec house. When I see this house from the street, I see flat and sterile. It doesn't do a lot for me. I see these houses right now sit on the market. They are not selling. They eventually will when the market comes back. The problem is it is a tough market out there. Although we want to say that it is not a cost-cutting measure, I build these things for a living, it is not a couple thousand dollars. You are looking at tens of thousands of trim details, painting, coordination and it is not a minimal amount of money. I could totally respect why some of these things are taken out of the plan. I get asked about that of my clients. I have to say the same thing, if you are going to make substantial changes you have to go back to the Planning Department to ask. It's not a terrible looking house, but like what my fellow commissioner said it sits right next to a very decorative house.

> Trying to restore the original design 100% may not be the way to go. There are some merits to a cleaner, more simplified look but like the last project we reviewed, a cumulative of small details can make or break something. The post on the gable end can be replicated on the inside of the gable end. I don't know if the exact design of the braces is the way to go because they do have some sort of a hand-milled flourish to them. If there is a simpler design that keeps a sleeker aesthetic that still adds something to those corners may be the way to go.

> When we saw this the first time, it had a whole bunch of details, and some comments were made that we may not need to do all those things, and it came back a little bit simpler. But if we have gotten this current iteration, I would ask for a more robust landscaping. Currently, it looks like drought-resistant, there is hardly anything there. They are using an existing very small tree as landscaping which we originally

approved because the house had some interest to it. Now it is extremely flat. To me, it is a package. I do have a problem with the process. I don't know how many times we have discussed this same issue repeatedly. There is a process, and the process was not followed. Everything is half-baked because we are not looking at the whole project. Right now, we are discussing just the details on the house. I cannot approve this the way it was presented today because I have a problem with it not going through the process the right way. Things could have been caught earlier and it wouldn't be a cost issue.

- > We have agreed last time that we can go without the stone cladding and the window shutters.*
- > If the knee braces need to be added I also want to see them at the gable ends because they go together. They don't really do anything if applied just on the post. Now that I've seen the inside of the house, I don't really feel that they go on the outside. That's where I am standing now, subjectively.*
- > It sounds like we need more details on the gable ends and the porch posts.*
- > I'd be open to getting more landscaping because it will make a world of difference in this house. Currently, it is flat, no interest in it and we are not getting anything back for what is being stripped. I am not for approving this project. Something needs to be done. Additional landscaping is another way to dressing this up, otherwise it is just flat.*
- > If this is coming to me just now, I would suggest to have them go through the Design Review Consultant. If the applicant can come back with a more satisfactory design, that is fine. If they can't, they might need help to finish this off. I can sympathize with the applicant and don't want them to be stuck here in limbo, not be able to finish, not get his certificate of occupancy and not get his investment back, I understand that. At the same time, letting it go is not a good precedent for us.*

Chair Lowenthal re-opened the public hearing.

- > Hadjian: Regarding landscaping, this property has a line of trees at the left side of the house. I didn't have to keep them, but I kept everything. This is one of the best landscaping I've ever done. I spent \$28,000 only for landscaping. The landscaping is beautiful. I invite you to come and visit the property to see the landscaping. I kept about 10 trees; each one is over 30-years old. I did not do any cost-saving on the landscaping.*
- > On re-visiting the gable ends where there were decorative trusses, I can do whatever you tell me. The reason why I say the truss is not going to work because I don't have any room, it will kill the light. These are small gables and very low pitched. They don't have corbels because they come with different overhangs. For me, it is zero cost to add these, just let me know what you want, and I can do it. But for me, the truss is not working, and the garage will not work because I have the security camera there. I can make extensions like a corbel but the problem I have is the different overhangs, as shown to Commissioner Tse; they don't work together. Again, I did not mean to disrespect this commission or bypass the process. As mentioned before, I was thinking these are all FYI items.*

Chair Lowenthal closed the public hearing.

- > To clarify, we are not accusing the applicant of cutting cost. If you have added a gold trim to this house, we would be equally upset. It would cost more but it is not what we have approved. It is not about cutting the budget, but that it is different. You could have put marble all over the front yard and it would have cost you a fortune, but we still have a problem because that is not what we have approved. For the record for other applicants, it is not whether it is cheaper or more expensive, it is the fact that it is different from what was approved.*
- > I still would like to see additional details. A straight bracket can be used on the columns and potentially on the eaves of the gable ends may be sufficient.*

> *I would love to see a compromise here. It is not a bad-looking project. It didn't follow the process, and it looks flatter than what we wanted to approve. Personally, I do not want the trusses back at this point. We already said we don't need the brackets and the brick façade on the chimney. We may be down to the brackets. You can use a modern-looking bracket.*

> *Those are the things that I see a project could have based on what we have seen so far.*

> *I'm of the opinion that applicant needs to come back with solutions. The applicant can choose to have their designer do more work on it and come up with a presentation that will help us see value in what is presented. Or if they so choose, they can contact staff and work with one of the Design Review Consultants to help finish this off. We are trying to put a band-aid on something that in the end will say nothing, then that defeats the purpose of our process. There needs to be something done to improve the aesthetic. I am open to landscaping opportunities and to some other things, not just the things that were taken off. We are not getting anywhere on something that has turned out to be flat. I'm open to another way out, but it has to be something that helps this elevation.*

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

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

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

- f. Consideration of City of Burlingame Municipal Code Text Amendments to Title 25 (Zoning) Related to Accessory Dwelling Units Including Amendments to Chapter 25.40 (Parking Regulations), Chapter 25.48 (Standards for Specific Land Uses and Activities), Chapter 25.60 (General Provisions), Chapter 25.88 (Permit Implementation, Extensions, Modifications, and Revocations), Chapter 25.98 (Appeals and Calls for Review), and Chapter 25.100 (Public Hearings and Notice). The proposed amendments are Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15282 (h) of the CEQA Guidelines. Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

This item was continued to the November 25, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

10. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY ITEMS

- a. 739 Laurel Avenue, zoned R-2 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story two-unit dwelling and attached garage. (Antonio Mora, applicant; Richard Terrones, Dreiling Terrones Architecture, architect; Rajiv Gujral, property owner) (64 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [739 Laurel Ave - Staff Report](#)

[739 Laurel Ave - Attachments](#)

[739 Laurel Ave - Rendering](#)

[739 Laurel Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Assistant Planner Xiao provided an overview of the staff report.

Alicia Adler, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the application.

Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Lowenthal closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> It is a really good-looking project. In an area that is zoned R-2, I don't have any concerns about the density since it is fully compliant. I like how the garage is tucked in the middle; it is not visible at all. It is impressive that you have these many garage spaces in this much space built out and it doesn't look like that from the street. That is respectful of the neighborhood. I'm a fan of the Prairie-style architecture. It looks good.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. It is a very elevated design. It is beautifully done, nice and clean.

> I agree with the comment about the tucked-in garages. This is a very handsome design and beautiful solution to meet the program.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

11. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

12. DIRECTOR REPORTS

There were no reportable actions from the last City Council meeting regarding Planning matters.

13. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No Future Agenda Items were suggested.

14. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.