



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, June 27, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:08 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Pfaff, and Tse

Absent 2 - Lowenthal, and Schmid

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no Minutes to approve.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Planning Manager Hurin noted that Item 9a - 2313 Ray Drive was continued to a future agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no Public Comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Consent Calendar Items.

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 620 Trenton Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit 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.(Ted Catlin, Dreiling Terrones Architecture Inc., applicant and architect; Patricia and Griffin Tormey, property owners) (96 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [620 Trenton Way - Staff Report](#)

[620 Trenton Way - Attachments](#)

[620 Trenton Way - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Ted Catlin, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I want to thank the applicant for listening to our comments and addressing them with the revised plans. This rendition is beautiful and addressed all of our concerns. The upper floor fits much more nicely against the first story. I appreciate the added detail with the shutters on the second floor windows upstairs. The raised porch roof was a perfect solution to address not only the stacking of the second floor over the first floor, but also to address the interconnection with the roof over the garage. I support moving this project forward.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Pfaff, and Tse

Absent: 2 - Lowenthal, and Schmid

- b. 1829 Sebastian Drive, 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; Gina and Yousef Shamieh, property owners) (88 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1829 Sebastian Dr - Staff Report](#)

[1829 Sebastian Dr - Attachments](#)

[1829 Sebastian Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Horan noted that he met with the neighbors at 1833 Sebastian Drive, 1829 Sebastian Drive, and 1860 Capistrano Avenue. Commissioner Tse noted that she spoke to the same three neighbors, was able to view the impact of the proposed project against the two adjacent neighbors on the left and right on Sebastian Drive, and was able to view the effects from 1860 Capistrano Avenue from the backyard only but did not get a tour inside the house. Commissioner Tse also noted that she contacted the project surveyor to check the accuracy of the drawings as there were concerns expressed by the neighbors. Commissioner Comaroto noted that she reviewed the story poles from inside the home of the neighbor at 1860 Capistrano Avenue, and also visited both neighbors on either side of 1829 Sebastian Drive and had several conversations with Ms. Lee. Commissioner Gaul noted that he spoke with the neighbor at 1860 Capistrano Avenue; he did not get inside the home but walked through the backyard with permission. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, designer and Yousef Shamieh, property owner, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> Neighbor (no address provided): I'm the neighbor a couple of doors way. The house is blocking our dining room and the living room bay view. I realized that several Commissioners have already visited several neighbor's house. But I received this notice about a week ago that's why I joined the Planning Commission meeting so the Commission is able to hear what we have to say and see how we could avoid this blockage of the bay view. I just wanted to bring this to the owner's attention. This is blocking the bay quite a bit because we're up the hill a little bit; the roof was very obvious and it's blocking quite a bit of the bay view.

> Jeffrey Hoeck, 1860 Capistrano Avenue: Some of you came out and visited. I've lived here for 45 years. As Yousef said, I did an addition in 1992-1993 to the house, prior to that I went to all the neighbors, showed them the plans, discussed with them and made a change here and there. I discussed it with everybody. It was passed and wasn't an issue. Unfortunately, through whatever fault, I only saw Yousef for the first time concerning this house on Thursday and Sunday. I was away in Los Angeles, so I really never got a chance to talk to him. It was never discussed, although I saw the drawings at the last meeting, it was never discussed with me about the addendum to the fence or the story poles that are up. The story poles definitely block view from my living room, dining room, and my kitchen, and also from the sitting area by my pool. I don't know if that counts or not, but even if that doesn't, from my living room, dining room and kitchen, without a doubt, you can see the story poles easily from my front door on the other side of the house. If I had more time, I would have talked to him longer and maybe come up with something because the height of the house, without a doubt, blocks everything for me. I appreciate those who came out and looked at the place. When he was over, he talked about the possibility of having a flat roof which would drop it quite a ways. The tree issue which he talked about keeping it cut would amount to a certain height. He thought he could drop the roof by a foot and a half or two feet but he didn't have all the engineering specifications there, but I never had a chance to go over it. So, this is the first opportunity I've had to talk to both him and of course to all of you. It definitely blocks my view.

> Teresa Chang, 1833 Sebastian Drive: I'm the neighbor on the right-hand side. The issue is not having a second story. The main issue is that the building is really bulky when it's extended to the backyard rather than starting on the original roof line. The addition is really obscuring our view and I feel pressure when I stand out there. The other thing I'm wondering about when I look at the plan, I know the lot line is not something that the Commission is dealing with, but if the lot line is not correct when they try to repave the walkway from five feet to eight feet according to the plan, that may change the plan because when the architect prepares the plans, they need to be within the envelope. I'm not sure it will affect the project. Honestly, Yousef just approached me one time briefly and never talked to me further about my concerns. I think the situation would be a little bit better if he tried to open a discussion with us before the hearing starts, rather than giving me surprises when I see the plans, the layout, the lot lines and the bulkiness to my backyard. Thank you Commissioners for visiting my house and listening to my concerns.

> Christine Lee, 1825 Sebastian Drive: Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to speak. Today we had three Commissioners visit my home and Teresa's house. The building addition for the neighborhood is a percentage of lot size, but we are dealing with the yard in the back. I was really shocked when I first saw the story poles and also the large deck. I think the architect wanted to minimize it, but I wish there were no decks at all because the deck looks into my backyard. I have a private backyard. My property is surrounded by trees on three sides. If Yousef puts more landscape screening, I feel like I'm going to be trapped in my backyard so that's a concern. Yousef approached me around 5:30 pm tonight, I talked to him for about 30 minutes. Thank you Commissioner Tse, for checking with the surveyor and conforming that he did the land survey correctly. But we, Teresa and I, measured Yousef's land surveyor's mark that was three feet over to Teresa's side and 1.25 feet on my side and then two feet in the back. I said that in the last e-mail. I need some time to get a survey. We don't have time and my lot checks out to be 72 feet wide from fence to fence, so I really need to confirm the lot dimensions before anybody decides on anything. I would appreciate it if you give could give both our neighbors a chance to

look into this further because we didn't have time for this.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Consider a complete hipped roof over the addition, it may take a big chunk out of considerable view blockage even if the height is not reduced necessarily.
- > It's great that you're planting trees, but they take a long time to grow. Those are good trees, they're evergreen and can be very dense, but perhaps you might consider an obscure railing for the deck rather than a see-through design because part of the issue is probably an increased intensity of use in that backyard.
- > Support the suggestion to do a hipped roof. Looking on the right side elevation, it will help with the massing. There's no setback on the second story along the right side; there is no articulation so it looks like it's an apartment building. With so much space and a big property, there must be other opportunities to improve and meet the program requirements but also look more like the house that's there now. Whether it's a hipped roof or gabled roof, it does help that you have changed the orientation, but it would make a difference to your neighbor.
- > Study other options for the two proposed windows by the stairs facing the right side neighbor, it does feel like they're invading their privacy. Seeing the impact of the addition over their yard, it looks massive from just with the story poles in place.
- > Reconsider the size and location of the deck off the dining/family room area, which has an impact on the right side neighbor's backyard. Safety wise, I would not want to see a deck at all. A reduced size deck facing the backyard would be acceptable since you have the articulation along that rear elevation.
- > Consider using something similar to the existing roof tile on the rest of the house versus the proposed asphalt roof on the addition. The asphalt roof is going to look like it's going in a completely different direction.
- > Ensure that you're going through our City Arborist regarding any proposed tree removal; look to see if there's a way to trim it back so it's stable, because it appears to be protected size.
- > I was not in attendance for the first meeting, but I did watch the video for this part of the meeting. I have a number of issues with the whole project. The idea of the second story being setback would help this a lot because that wall on the right side is pretty sheer, it's pretty blank and flat. The roof material bothers me that they would be different roofs. It's making this look more and more like an addition and it does look like something has been added on. It has been stated a number of times that the lot is really big and they're not approaching the FAR, which is true, but it makes me think that maybe there's a better solution than a second story. That brings me to the main point that though the view of the distant view is through the trees and it's a little bit muted, there is a distant view and it's being blocked. We have rejected projects before for less of a view blockage than what I'm seeing here. I honestly think it would help if the applicant cut the trees down so the neighbor behind could see, and then maybe some kind of a solution could be brought together that everyone could agree on. At the moment, I see this as too much of a view blockage to have a second story. I don't think I could support the project.
- > I agree with most of what my fellow Commissioner said. Subjectively, I don't like the project; it looks like a pimple on the back of the house. It doesn't fit aesthetically. That's my subjective view. I've heard about why different solutions couldn't be done, I'm not there yet in saying that this is the only solution. Putting the addition above the existing house is more about money and not wanting to impact the current home than about it being impossible. To my fellow Commissioner's point, it is a large property and if they're cutting into the back hill, there could be some room for a one-story addition that doesn't minimize the lot too much. But all of that is really driven by this view blockage. I would like to see what the neighbor who called was talking about once they feel comfortable giving an address because all of us had a chance to visit with the property owner at 1860 Capistrano Avenue. I was able to go to each room inside of his house and the addition does block the view, so that's probably the primary concern. While I feel for the neighbors in terms of the privacy concerns and how daunting the addition looks, it's not necessarily a code issue or something that we're able to influence from a design perspective. I do appreciate the architect and homeowner being willing to modify the design based on our recommendations. I just feel like

there's more room for that going forward to find a way to get an approval.

> I echo a lot of what my fellow Commissioner just stated. I had also shared with the neighbors about the applicant's right to add on to their property wherever that addition may be, but I agree that this particular proposed design doesn't seem to fit well with the existing house. It seems like the addition is lopsided. There's a considerable amount of massing to go with it and so it doesn't feel like it's a natural extension of the home. Having visited the two neighbors on Sebastian Drive, I am concerned about the deck, the noise and the privacy issues for the left side neighbor because I can already imagine the impact of that deck even reduced over that neighbor's property. For the neighbor to the right, it's the massing that just doesn't suit the space, the location on that part of the property. I just feel like there can be a better solution. We have a talented designer and it may be budgetary constraints that are creating this design. There are many other opportunities on such a large lot to really come up with a solution to give the family some additional living space. As I see it now, I can't support the project either as it's presented.

> I agree with my fellow Commissioners. I went to Capistrano Avenue as well, although I was having a bit of a hard time understanding the distant views because the trees are in the way. To really understand where that view is coming from, I looked at a two-story house located across the street from the project house and the roof line seems to also be impacting the house at Capistrano Avenue. But it's too hard to really understand the layout of the land with the trees there. I'm not disputing that there's a view ordinance issue, I'm just not sure what it is. But I agree with my fellow Commissioners about the deck. I'm completely not in agreement with the second story deck and would like to see it eliminated for the privacy issues of the neighbor to the left. It's looking right into her backyard. The sheer wall on the right side of the house looks like it's just been placed on top of a cake and it doesn't feel like it fits the neighborhood. There's enough space in that yard and I don't know why we can't utilize what we have as a single story. I'd much rather see giving them more square footage if they kept it as a single-story house versus a two-story house on that property.

> If they cut the trees down to start with because they're going to get cut down anyway, there would be a clearer view of what's being impacted. The applicant has said it would probably enhance the view, but the view impact is there and I saw it today from outside the building. Whether it's filtered or muted by the trees now, it's going to be enhanced by the trees being removed which is going to give the neighbor on Capistrano Avenue a stronger case. That's where they should start cutting the trees. The neighbor to the right of 1860 Capistrano Avenue, to my understanding is tenant occupied. The owner is 90 years old and they have a right to come to us to talk about the project for themselves and the impact it has on them. But standing in Mr. Hoeck's backyard, you could easily see there were some rooms on that property that may or may not be impacted. It's not for me to say and it's not for me to determine that at this moment. Those owners need to take responsibility to come to us. There's more impacts on bay views in that location, so I just want to be cognizant of everyone on that block.

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

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Pfaff, and Tse

Absent: 2 - Lowenthal, and Schmid

- c. 2758 Summit Drive, R-1 - Application for Design Review and Hillside Area Construction Permit for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit 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. (Raymond Frank, applicant and architect; Charles Chiparo and Laura Rupenian, property owners) (77 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [2758 Summit Dr - Staff Report](#)

[2758 Summit Dr - Attachments](#)

[2758 Summit Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Raymond Frank, architect, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Provide drawings to show the location of the neighbor's kitchen and bedroom windows so we can have a better idea of how those windows relate to the proposed addition and decks.

> It's greatly improved from the last time. I appreciate that it looks more together and is a tighter design. We received the e-mail from the neighbor regarding trees and staff responded to it. Suggest helping the neighbor, who appears very close to this project, by planting additional landscaping to make this work out for her, that would be greatly appreciated. The project has come along nicely.

> I would echo that, thanks to the applicant and the architect for listening to all the comments and making all of those changes. It fully reflects the conversation we had at the last meeting.

> Planters should be added at the sides of all three decks in order to provide privacy between the subject property and the neighbor to the right. I would like to make sure we do see those permanent planters put on the decks with the final plan; that could potentially come back as an FYI.

> I would also like to see a more developed landscape plan. It is pretty bare between the two houses and if you go into the neighbor's house on the right, you look right out at the deck. It would be a benefit to both parties, especially if this deck is going to be increased in size, if the applicant would add trees on that property line. A landscape plan showing additional plantings along the right side property line should be provided to investigate further opportunities for new landscaping that can provide enhanced privacy.

Chair Gaul made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Horan, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> that prior to issuance of a building permit, an FYI application shall be submitted showing planters at the sides of each of the three decks and a more developed landscape plan to provide screening along the right side property line between the two single-unit dwellings.

Aye: 5 - Comaroto, Gaul, Horan, Pfaff, and Tse

Absent: 2 - Lowenthal, and Schmid

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 2313 Ray Drive, 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. (Jeff Alan Gard, applicant and architect; Ronan McConnell and Michele McKenna, property owners) (104 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [2313 Ray Dr - Staff Report](#)

[2313 Ray Dr - Attachments](#)

[2313 Ray Dr - Plans](#)

Item 9a - 2313 Ray Drive was continued to a future agenda.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

There were no reportable actions from the last City Council meeting regarding Planning matters, and there were no FYI reports.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.