



CITY OF BURLINGAME
Community Development Department
MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 8, 2022 **Director's Report**

TO: Planning Commission **Meeting Date:** August 8, 2022

FROM: Catherine Keylon, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: **FYI – REVIEW OF CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT AT 128 ELM AVENUE, ZONED R-1.**

Summary: An application for Design Review and Special Permit for an attached garage and declining height envelope for a new, two and half story single-unit dwelling at 128 Elm Avenue, zoned R-1, was approved by the Planning Commission on March 14, 2022 (see attached March 14, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes).

The Planning Commission approved the application with the following added condition of approval:

- that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI showing a reduction in the size of the three crawlspace windows located next to the attached garage (Southeast Elevation); the size of the crawlspace windows should be similar in size to the windows in the hallway off the garage (Northwest Elevation).

The applicant submitted revised plans (see sheet A9), date stamped July 27, 2022, that show reduced crawlspace windows on the right (southeast) side elevation that are similar in size to the windows on the Northwest Elevation.

No additional changes beyond those requested by the Commission are proposed to the approved design of the house. 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.

Attachments:

March 14, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes
Revised Plans (sheet A9) dated July 27, 2022



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, March 14, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

- a. 128 Elm Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permits for declining height envelope and attached garage for a new, two and a half-story single-unit dwelling and attached garage. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Beth Taylor, applicant and property owner; Elaine Lee, architect) (72 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Loftis noted that he was absent from the February 14, 2022 meeting, but visited the site and watched the video. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Elaine Lee and Beth Taylor, represented the applicants and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *Darren Prock and Ashley Williams, 120 Elm Avenue: Thank you for allowing me a quick minute to speak on behalf of the project at 128 Elm Avenue. My wife and I were in attendance for the meeting in December that both Elaine and Beth mentioned. We've reviewed the plans, looked at the updated plans, have no concerns, and provide full support for the project. We think the proposed house, as it is designed, would be a nice enhancement to the neighborhood and we didn't see any impact to our property that we were concerned about.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *I wanted to thank the applicant for addressing our questions and concerns from the last meeting. I appreciate the very detailed response letter that talks about each of the elements that we asked about, having done the research, and letting us know about their declining height envelope approval or special permit approval. The house is very nicely designed. It has some nice scale and details. I can support the declining height envelope request as well as the attached garage.*

> *The Commission was very rigorous in its intention to the project at the first meeting and the changes that have been made are really nice. I'm skeptical of the windows into the crawl space, because one of the things we have to do is to attempt to know in the future as best we're able. We often hear that neighbors don't have concerns about a proposal, but that may change if neighbors change. I'm worried about the windows into that crawl space being an invitation in the future, when the current owners sell this property, to dig that out and occupy that space. I don't see the need for it, frankly. If they were going to be put in, they should be very small, clerestory type windows and not windows that would provide egress from a habitable unit down there. They look just jammed in, they don't enhance that façade. Other than that, it's a great project.*

> *I was really impressed how the reduction in the height, by only a foot, really improved the front facade of this project. It doesn't appear as tall, especially compared side-by-side to what was originally proposed.*

I can support the project on a design review basis. I also can support the special permit request for declining height envelope, mainly based on the slope of the lot and the point where that projection is taken. I can support the special permit for the attached garage. I feel there are a number of attached garages in the neighborhood and this fits in with that pattern.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners. The applicant did a nice job in reducing the square footage. I can also approve the project for the special permit for the declining height and detached garage. I appreciate the applicant for all the hard work and details provided. I also agree with my fellow commissioner regarding those windows in the crawl space, they are pretty big and can't see the use for them.

> I agree that the windows being proposed into the crawl space is unnecessary. I can support some smaller windows, similar to what we see on the other elevation, which is into the staircase leading up into the house from the garage.

> I'm in agreement with all of the other commissioners on all those points. I appreciate the effort put in by the applicant and I agree with what has been said regarding the crawl space windows.

> It's clear we can make the findings for the special permit for declining height envelope given the nature of the sloping lot.

Vice Chair Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI showing a reduction in the size of the three crawlspace windows located next to the attached garage (Southeast Elevation); the size of the crawlspace windows should be similar in size to the windows in the hallway off the garage (Northwest Elevation).

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 1 - Terrones