



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, September 13, 2021

7:00 PM

Online

On March 17, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings telephonically or by other electronic means. Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order, the Council Chambers will not be open to the public for the September 13, 2021 Burlingame Planning Commission meeting.

Members of the public may view the meeting by logging on to the Zoom meeting listed below. Additionally, the meeting will be streamed live on YouTube and uploaded to the City's website after the meeting.

Members of the public may provide written comments by email to publiccomment@burlingame.org.

Emailed comments should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting, or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda or is on the consent agenda. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the three minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words. To ensure your comment is received and read to the Planning Commission for the appropriate agenda item, please submit your email no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 13, 2021. The City will make every effort to read emails received after that time, but cannot guarantee such emails will read into the record. Any emails received after the 5:00 p.m. deadline which are not read into the record will be provided to the Planning Commission after the meeting.

To Join the Zoom Meeting:

To access by computer:

Go to www.zoom.us/join

Meeting ID: 871 9985 1317

Passcode: 307273

To access by phone:

Dial 1-346-248-7799

Meeting ID: 871 9985 1317

Passcode: 307273

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Senior Planner Erika Lewit, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

Present 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent 2 - Terrones, and Larios

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Draft August 9, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft August, 9 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no Public Comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

A motion was made by Commissioner Loftis, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- a. 30 Ingold Road, zoned RRMU - Application for a Two Year Extension of a previously approved application for Design Review, Density Bonus, Approval of Community Bonuses, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map for a new 7-story, 298-unit mixed use residential development. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines (Infill Exemption). (SummerHill Apartment Communities, applicant and property owner; Chris Lee, Studio T Square, architect) (53 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [30 Ingold Rd - Staff Report](#)
[30 Ingold Rd - Attachments](#)
[30 Ingold Rd - Plans](#)

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 100 Stanley Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family 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. (Geurse Conceptual Designs, Inc, applicant and designer; Ashley and Tifani Marsay, property owners) (128 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [100 Stanley Rd - Staff Report](#)
[100 Stanley Rd - Attachments](#)
[100 Stanley Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

- > *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *It's a great project.*
- > *This is a beautiful design. I appreciate the applicant listening to the comments brought up by the commissioners. The improvements are very nice and this project is ready to move on and be approved.*
- > *It looks really nice and thanks for the great work.*
- > *It's a nice project. Thanks for making the changes.*

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- b. 722 Acacia Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (James Neubert, James Neubert Architects, applicant and architect; Alexander and Rachel Emanuel, property owners) (134 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [722 Acacia Dr - Staff Report](#)
[722 Acacia Dr - Attachments](#)
[722 Acacia Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

James Neubert, designer, represented the applicant.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *Thanks for making the changes, they were really simple. This is a pretty straight forward project. It's nice and it maintains the general demeanor of the existing structure.*

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- c. 1114 Eastmoor Road, 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 review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Philip and Laila Louridas, applicants and property owners; Shan Sanby Yu, Sy U Design, designer) (105 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1114 Eastmoor Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1114 Eastmoor Rd - Attachments](#)
[1114 Eastmoor Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Comaroto was not present at the May 24, 2021 meeting when this project was reviewed, but did watch the video and reviewed the materials. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Laila Louridas, property owner, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *The bay window at the front of the house looks out of place, it's the only window without divided lights and shutters, consider revising it to match the windows on the rest of the house.*
- > *The changes made the design more coherent. It much more composed than the previous design, thank you for making the changes.*
- > *You've done a wonderful job taking note of our comments, working with staff and with the design*

consultants to come up with a really nice solution.

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

> that an FYI application shall be required if the existing bay window at the front of the house is changed to a window to match the other windows on the house.

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- d. 225 Stanley Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, one-story single family dwelling (existing detached garage to remain). This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Christina Lee and Hieu Bui, property owners and applicants; Jesse Geurse, GCD, Inc., designer) (130 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [225 Stanley Rd - Staff Report](#)
[225 Stanley Rd - Attachments](#)
[225 Stanley Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Loftis was not at the August 23rd meeting where this item was reviewed, but did watch the video. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Thank you for taking a look at that front porch and recessing the entry a little bit. Not only is it going to serve the homeowner better in terms of an approach to the house and some better weather protection, but it adds a little bit more articulation at the front of the house. Overall it's a nice improvement. I don't think you sacrificed anything on the interior.

> There is a nice detail going into that bedroom number one office space. Thank you again, for considering our recommendations.

> The project looks great and should move on and be approved.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- e. 312 Bayswater 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. (Architecture Allure, applicant and architect; Michael Bianchini, property owner) (132 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [312 Bayswater Ave - Staff Report](#)

[312 Bayswater Ave - Attachments](#)

[312 Bayswater Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Adam Bittle, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *They did a nice job with the changes and could see approving this project.*

> *Lowering the plate heights and the head heights have brought this to human scale. Given that the site is narrow, it does make it an interesting challenge but they've addressed what we were looking for at the previous meeting. I appreciate that effort being put in.*

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- f. 1150 Rosedale Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for attached garage for a new, two-story single family dwelling and attached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Quynh and Andrew Legos, applicants and property owners; WH Drafting and Design, designer) (90 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1150 Rosedale Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1150 Rosedale Ave - Attachments](#)

[1150 Rosedale - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Warren Huey, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Suggested to submit an FYI prior to installation in case changes to the windows are made.*
- > *I think it's important for us to say that this is much larger than the roof decks we normally see. This works because of its location on the corner. As we approve it, it's important to emphasize that it's situational that makes such a large roof deck work. Otherwise, we would be pushing back hard because if there were a neighbor next door, there are reasons why this wouldn't work.*
- > *In general, it's nice. I'm worried about the windows. You have to be very deliberate to build those things up to that size. A normal window wouldn't work that way. So you'll end up putting spacers in, framing them between spacers and closing around the window jambs. It feels chunky to me, but that's just my personal taste. It's not as elegant as I would like to see it.*
- > *That roof deck is much larger size than we ordinarily approve. I believe the homeowner got a letter from the neighbor recognizing the size of that proposed roof deck and has approved it since it is not affecting the use of their property or their yard. It's situational in the sense that this deck is looking out over El Camino Real. It's a noisy area with more traffic and it may be difficult to use that yard on that property. I don't have any problems with the size that's being proposed. The deck comes off of two bedrooms, two private areas. There isn't a hallway access to this deck to give it a party deck function.*
- > *The other important piece is landscaping. Moving the house forward from that property line has provided relief as well. Then the three trees that are being added in the back area in between also provide relief on that.*

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- g.** 1260 California Drive - zoned Unclassified - Application for Renewal of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit for vehicle storage. The project is Categorical Exempt from environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Section 15311(b). (E. James Hannay, Rector Motor Car Co., applicant; City and County of San Francisco- Public Utilities Commission and Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and San Mateo County Transit District, property owners) (372 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1260 California Dr - Staff Report](#)
[1260 California Dr - Attachments](#)
[1260 California Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

> *Paul Musi: I own two properties directly across from the parking lot; one is a laundromat and the other is a two-story building with an apartment on the second floor but the first floor is vacant. It was a dry cleaners for many years but they left a couple of years ago. We've had challenges getting a tenant in there and the issue always comes down to the parking. So, any additional parking we get in that area would be very helpful. I'm not asking to deny their continuance, but maybe cut back and give us back half or a third of the parking lot and then they all would help. Five years ago when this first happened, seemingly overnight, Audi took over the lot. When I inquired about it, I was told they were going to leave 20 spaces for the laundromat customers and car repair customers. I was living in the apartment at that time and was parking there. That worked for a week and they posted "No Parking" signs in the little section that they have approved for us, which is by the corporation yard. When I inquired about it, Public Works said that if cars are parked there when the city trucks go into that lot they couldn't maneuver or make a U-turn and makes it difficult for them to access that little yard. So, in a space of a week, we went from a very good parking lot to zero. It left a bad taste in our mouth as business owners because there's nothing we can do about it. Once again, any type of parking you can give us over there would help tremendously.*

> *Ted Catlin: I work for Dreiling Terrones Architecture and I'm working for Paul as an architect on his properties along there. I'm looking at feasibility analysis for what those properties can handle and like Paul said, the parking issue has come up again and again, how these properties can survive and how the businesses can maintain feasibility along this stretch. There is an issue between the developments along California Drive that are envisioned in the general plan with bike lanes and more transit modality and how those align with losing parking along those stretches. But the Planning Commission has an opportunity to look at ways that the businesses along there can have their incomes mitigated with some portion of these parking spaces given back to public use or city use to be booked out. Just an added bit of information about some of these properties across the street, they're all undersized lots. Because they have substandard street frontages, even with the street parking that's currently available there, that amount of parking is limited. This fact and the bike lanes, which again is an unnecessary thing, have resulted in some of these businesses having a really hard time attracting clients and thus have led to the property owners having a hard time attracting tenants. Additionally, as part of our services, we were doing some informal surveys of the use of the Rector Motors lot. Over the last month, at various dates and times, the lot has proven to be underutilized by anywhere from 15% to 30% of the spaces being unoccupied. That's not including spaces being used by cars that are not part of the Rector Motors' stock. I'd like to offer that as a potential reason that this might not even damage what Rector Motors' business is because there are spaces being unused that can be utilized by these businesses. Thank you for the opportunity.*

> *Jesse Geurse: When this whole request was introduced five years ago about placing the fence around Broadway and California Drive, I was concerned in regard to the aesthetics of it all and having the cars parked on the corner. I was wondering if it's possible for the commissioners to take a look whether or not some vegetation can be grown around the fencing area so it softens it up a little bit rather than it being such a cold and not very attractive visual look to it. The wheel stops were not removed, so it looks junky for our main thoroughfare into Burlingame. Maybe if that's something you can take into consideration, I greatly would appreciate it.*

> *Anthony Dimech: I own the laundromat across the parking lot. It would be beneficial to the laundromat and the other businesses as well, to be able to drop your clothes off and go across the street. The parking across the street could be utilized better by the businesses. The parking lot has been underutilized for the last 18 months to two years. I know Rector Motors has another lot on Rollins Road that they've been utilizing. I'm not saying to take all their parking away as mentioned before, but if we can recoup that whether it's a third or a half, I think it would be advantageous to everybody because it's not being utilized for the whole space. My customers, the other businesses and the residents that live across the street could use it.*

> *E-mails from the applicant who's having audio problems: We can secure 20 spaces if needed, but parking designation and vehicle shortages account for underutilization of property. (Gardiner: We have provided him with a call-in number. The other thing that we should mention is that the city does not control this property at all. As much as it may be of interest to have publicly accessible parking, the city doesn't lease the land, doesn't own the land. It's not available to the city. It does sound as though the applicant may be interested in or available to have an arrangement, but given he's not able to fully participate, I don't know if that can really be resolved right now.)*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I got very confused during this conversation because my understanding is what's in front of us is a renewal of the conditional use permit and nothing else. Though it's month to month, there's a lease arrangement existing between these two parties and Rector Motors. We can't get involved in that. I totally get what's being said. There would be better parking there and it seems like an opportunity, but that's not in front of us. I don't want to get distracted by all of that because that's not in our purview.

> I think this discussion got a little sidetracked. I'm perfectly fine with renewing the conditional use permit. Sharing the parking is an issue between the owners of Rector Motors, the Public Utilities Commission and the owners of the laundromat. It's not something that we can weigh in on. I don't see any reason not to renew the previously approved conditional use permit.

> (Spansail: I do want to clarify really quickly, staff is making a recommendation that we not be doing a renewal of the five-year term, so this would be renewing the conditional use indefinitely. As a normal conditional use permit would be, if there was an issue and they were not conforming to the uses and the permit itself, then it could be revoked but this would not have a time limit on it like the last one.)

> That's correct. If they have decided to share the lease in that space with the owners of the laundromat, that wouldn't have an effect on the motion or the action we take tonight. Per the staff report, the grade separation is supposed to take place within the next three to five years. I think we should move forward with it and time will work all of this out.

> I also wanted to note that if you looked through the history of that and the meeting minutes from five years ago, there was a lot of discussion shared, the challenges of insurance and all of that relative to mixing what is a business versus public parking. There's definitely some challenges to it and I don't want to understate the challenges of the applicant nor the people across the street trying to gain parking. I don't know if there's an opportunity to have a greater conversation with Public Works on the remaining space and its use on a temporary basis as well.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1347 Montero Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for building height for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Randy Grange, TRG Architects, Inc., applicant and architect; Anita Tandon and Sujit Chakravarthy, property owners) (120 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1347 Montero Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1347 Montero Ave - Attachments](#)

[1347 Montero Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Randy Grange, designer, represented the applicant.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> This is a really nice project. It improved the property a lot and was nicely detailed.

> A very pretty house. Love that they are retaining some of the existing characteristics and making it better.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

- b. 1617 Chapin Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Special Permit for attached garage, and Front and Side Setback Variances for a new attached garage addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Tim Raduenz, Form One Design, applicant and designer; Debbie and Karl Bakhtiari, property owners) (105 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1617 Chapin Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1617 Chapin Ave - Attachments](#)

[1617 Chapin Ave - Plans](#)

[1617 Chapin Ave - Proposed Project Analysis](#)

[1617 Chapin Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Schmid was recused from this item as he lives within 500 feet. Commissioner Comaroto had some ex parte communications with the applicant and the applicant's architect. Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Acting Chair Loftis opened the public hearing.

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

Public Comments:

> Public comment sent via email by David and Adrienne Weil, 1616 Chapin Avenue: Dear Planning Commission, we live across the street from the Bakhtiari family and have reviewed the architectural drawings. We compliment the architect and the homeowners on an excellent design. We would be pleased to have this project proceed in our neighborhood.

Acting Chair Loftis closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> This enhances the design of the house. I agree with the approach to the existing garage, it's very difficult and this actually gives the house more character as viewed from the street. The only concern, but surely it will be mitigated as the project goes on, are the street trees. It looks like they'll be able to keep

them and there's an arborist report about the condition of the roots that are exposed. I'm sure the applicant and the contractor will be made aware of those as the project goes along. I would like to see this project move forward.

> I went to the applicant's home and viewed that side entryway to the garage. It's pretty tight there for them to get in and out of. When I was there, they were parking a car behind the big front hedge. This is going to make the house just look so much nicer from the street and give it its original character back. It's very complimentary to the historical right side of the home. It's a nice design and they did a nice job on this.

> Conceptually, I like it. The design as it's represented leaves me cold. It feels alien somehow. I worry about the three garage doors directly onto the street. I don't find it very compelling. It feels like it came out of nowhere. It seems like there's an opportunity for something to happen over the two-doors that are together that can somehow distinguish them from the third door. There are some advantages in getting the two-doors together and making the third door its own thing, right now it doesn't feel much thought through. Conceptually, it makes a lot sense. The current situation doesn't work that well. It's very clear.

> The designer could come up with a slightly different design or look at something with those two garage doors. Maybe a planter box or some sort of element that mimics a little bit of what the right side of the house does or something a little bit different. In general, I like the plan. It just needs more detailing to set it apart a little bit.

> Reading the site plan, I like that the mouth or the apron of the driveway was narrowed and that there's a landscape area on the left. Recommends to develop the landscape plan even more, shorten the area to the left of the driveway and add some taller bushes to mask everything from the street. I'm not opposed to an awning or trellis over the double door.

> It is a Mediterranean style home, consider adding something as simple as a nice arbor that's grown around the current garage door opening. Some type of trellis or arbor built around the double garage door so that face of the wall isn't so flat to provide some texture and context there. It will also resonate with the regional style of the home. Otherwise, it's a nice design solution for the parking and in addressing the garage in general.

> Providing direction to the applicant to look further into developing that area because there might be many different solutions. It feels flat for me right now.

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

Aye: 4 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

Recused: 1 - Schmid

- c. 3 Victoria Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (James Kwan, applicant and property owner; Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Designs, Inc., designer) (273 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [3 Victoria Rd - Staff Report](#)

[3 Victoria Rd - Attachments](#)

[3 Victoria Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

- > There were no public comments.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Corner lots are difficult because you have two fronts. This looks like a classic side of a house. The Peninsula Avenue side needs to be reworked so it doesn't look like a side of a house, whether it is or isn't, it's still going to be visible from the street. There are ways to mitigate the view out the window, so you're not looking at the Woodlake apartments or Peninsula Avenue. Mainly those lower floor windows look like they don't fit in. Everything seems to hold together on the rest of the house, all the sides look nice with the larger windows but that one looks like it got lost or missed.
- > On the Victoria Road side, there's a significant amount of landscape on that end of the property, both to the side of the Victoria Road neighbor and the Peninsula Avenue neighbor that's there now. It's important for the next round to have a little bit more landscape definition of what you're going to do there and how you're going to make fences and landscape with the garage being there that can work well with the adjoining neighbor. I'm not seeing enough information.
- > This is a nicely done project and should move forward.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Terrones, and Larios

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Director Gardiner reported that at the September 7, 2021 City Council meeting, the Urban Water Management Plan was presented. Also there was an introduction of revisions to the massage ordinance to allow massage practitioners certified by the state to provide massage services off-site. It may be that some practitioners are already providing this service, so this will allow it to be under the cover of the law, and to protect those who are performing the services.

- a. 708 Newhall Road - FYI for review of requested changes to a previously approved Design Review project.

Attachments: [708 Newhall Rd - Memo](#)
[708 Newhall Rd - Plans](#)
[708 Newhall Rd - Attachments](#)

Accepted.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Notice: Any individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Ruben Hurin, Planning Manager, by 10:00 a.m. on Monday, September 13, 2021 at rhurin@burlingame.org or (650) 558-7256. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for inspection via www.burlingame.org/planningcommission/agenda or by emailing the Planning Manager at rhurin@burlingame.org. If you are unable to obtain information via the City's website or through email, contact the Planning Manager at 650-558-7256.

An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on September 13, 2021. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on September 23, 2021, 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 \$708.00, which includes noticing costs.