



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

DRAFT

Monday, March 14, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

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 Catherine Keylon, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent 1 - Terrones

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Draft February 14, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft February 14, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

Vice-Chair Loftis abstained from this item because he was not present at the February 14, 2022 meeting. Commissioner Pfaff made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

Abstain: 1 - Loftis

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 Tse, to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

Recused: 1 - Pfaff

- a. 132 Stanley Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new two-story, single-unit 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. (Hector Estipona, applicant and designer; Hakan and Esra Danis, property owners) (144 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [132 Stanley Rd - Staff Report](#)
[132 Stanley Rd - Attachments](#)
[132 Stanley Rd - Plans](#)

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- 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

Attachments: [128 Elm Ave - Staff Report](#)
[128 Elm Ave - Attachments](#)
[128 Elm Ave - Historic Resources Evaluation](#)
[128 Elm Ave - Plans](#)

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 s 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

- b.** 1556 Cypress Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review Amendment for as-built changes to a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling and new detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Tim Raduenz, Form+One, applicant and designer; Kasey and Bill Schuh, property owners) (113 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1556 Cypress Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1556 Cypress Ave - Attachments](#)
[1556 Cypress Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item because she lives within 500 feet of the project site. Commissioner Pfaff was recused from this item because she had previously commented on this project as a member of the public. Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, designer and Kasey and Bill Schuh, property owners, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

- > Public comment submitted via email by Leon Fong and Michelle Margona, 1555 Cypress Avenue: We live across the street from 1556 Cypress Avenue. We received a public hearing notice about this project. Now that the project is complete, we would like to express that the end result is an improvement to the neighborhood and we appreciate that the original house was maintained in details and in size. It isn't often that you see real effort put into maintaining the original architecture with new residential projects. We are happy that the owners kept the house true to the character of the neighborhood.
- > Public comment submitted via email by Liz Horton, 1560 Cypress Avenue: I reside next door to 1556 Cypress Avenue. I'm writing to express how much I appreciate the project at 1556 Cypress Avenue. It was a true remodel maintaining the same exterior details and footprint of the original home. The house turned out wonderful and the updates were all in line with the original details aren't often seen on new construction. It was so nice to see a new building in the neighborhood that maintained the architecture. I know that I speak for others in the neighborhood and we're happy with how the house turned out and see it as an improvement to the neighborhood.
- > Public comment submitted via email by Bob and Donna Heisler at 1566 Cypress Avenue: We're writing to express our support for the approval of the project located at 1556 Cypress Avenue. We live only three houses away and have watched the remodel from the beginning and love the results. We appreciate the Schuh family for taking such effort in maintaining integrity of the home and the final result is absolutely gorgeous. It's our hope the Planning Commission approve the project as is and love it as much as we do.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > In the current photos of the rear of the house provided to us, there's a fairly deep eave over that second story pediment at the gable end. It would seem that without any stucco cutting that this would be an easy application of the details that were originally approved for that particular application. Feel like we're kind of pinned in a corner and forced to just approve what's being proposed. It looked like that was one elevation that could be improved or at least match the approved elevation.
- > Like what my fellow commissioner has alluded to, this really puts us in a difficult situation because we spent a lot of time on this going through the application and all the details. It's unfortunate that Commissioner Terrones isn't here because I think he did pull this application for further review because he had concerns with it as well. He referred to the little portico at the bump out above the front door as a jewel box that adds the architectural integrity of the house and the overall design. I agree with the applicant that adding the wood siding at the gable on the rear may seem out of place because it wouldn't be on the other gable ends. But in the original design that was approved, all of those gable ends had the wood siding and the corbels and dentil work. That held this whole design together. What the applicant is asking for, I find it a little bit plain and lacking the detail that we liked and saw in the original design. This

makes us question what we are doing here as a commission. I could be spending time with my family now if we're going having applicants do what they want when we sit here all night and approve these designs and then the applicant, contractor and designer do whatever they feel like doing. I'm disheartened that the second story gables or bays were added and just that detail was disregarded. So my inclination is it should have been done the way it was originally approved. There's going to be some concessions made because I can't see letting this go the way it is because we're setting ourselves up for more of the same.

> I need to see some of this go along the lines of what was originally approved. I don't think what we have in front of us is approvable, at least not to me tonight. They knew this was coming up, it got called back and there were no proposed changes made to come in line with the original design. There needs to be some effort made by the applicant, owner and the contractor to bring it more in line with what we originally approved.

> I feel like we're in such a difficult position because the homeowners are new to the team, and I'm not necessarily blaming the designer on this either. This is an informed team. I feel like we have no choice. I'm tired of not having a choice but to agree with what's being presented to us. I also feel that adding cost and cutting up a house also seems very wasteful, but at the same time, I want to carry through the integrity of the design that we have approved. I don't know what kind of hybrid approach that they could come up with that would be pleasing. I've been put in that same position as an applicant in the past and had to learn the hard way as well and had to force a client to spend the money to make the changes they made to the design and rectify them to match the approved design. If I were to look at it in all fairness in that sense, I would say that would be a fair approach and that's the same thing that should happen here because part of the team isn't informed, but part of the team is informed about this process. It was hard for my client and it was a waste of money, but they had to do it and that's where I stand on that. I was trying to come up with a compromise with the rear elevation, even though I know there are some gable ends that won't have that detail. It seems like the rear elevation could be a place to add the siding in the gable since it's a side viewed from the backyard and enjoyed, and publicly seen easily by neighboring properties as well. So, I was trying to offer a compromise there.

> It seems to me that we are needing some more to move to the middle of this. I can appreciate that adding the dentils is a path. I can also appreciate the challenge of getting the details in after the stucco. But I tend to agree with my fellow commissioners that it's hard to not get any of the design pieces out of it at this point. So, we need a better proposal.

> Spansail: I don't want to make this go on any longer, but one thing that could be helpful is, it looks like the commissioners have talked about different ways they think this could get to an approval. If we could explore a little more how those might overlap, what it would really look like for an approval at the next meeting, just to see what's in common, that would be helpful.

> We had a job to do and we did our job. The applicant was under-served by the professionals who sold them those services. At this point, it doesn't matter if what gets put back in front of us is exactly what got presented to us the first time we approved it, but what we see right now is the absolute minimum that could be done and that's not sufficient for me. We're not getting anything back here. We asked for something that improves the project in a way and what we got was the brackets which are not sufficient. I know that people add things to the outside of stucco houses all the time. It's not as though it can't be done. You don't have to remove the stucco to add stuff to a house. Somebody needs to go back and figure out something that makes some sense and make this palatable to the commission because we did our job. And now we're being asked to do another job which is to cave in and I can't do it. So I would suggest to come back with something that you can add onto stucco to make the house more attractive because right now, it's just plain and it's not what we approved, very simple. It didn't get approved.

> I agree and I can appreciate that the direction has changed a little bit. The solution needs to add some value beyond where we're at today.

> Recommends the applicant discuss possible solutions with a designer and their contractor that will work for both sides.

> Provide the original plans and some photos that show the house prior to the remodel and the addition, if available.

Vice Chair Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to continue the item. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

Recused: 2 - Comaroto, and Pfaff

- c. 516 Burlingame Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review 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, applicant and designer; Jill and Joe Cannon, property owners) (108 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [516 Burlingame Ave - Staff Report](#)

[516 Burlingame Ave - Attachments](#)

[516 Burlingame Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Loftis noted that he did not attend the February 14, 2022 meeting, but visited the project site and watched the video. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

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

Public Comments:

> Public comment submitted via e-mail by Carroll Fanucchi, 305 Dwight Road: This addition would be to the rear of my home on Dwight Road. A second story may cover my view to the sky and that would be a huge loss for me. I have lived here for 61 years. If their addition keeps the home looking similar to the way it looks now, I have no objection to them building a second story. I would like to look out and not see a huge building covering the skyline. Since I'm elderly, most of the time I stay in the same room and look out back, that's the reason I would hate to see another huge home going up unless it's cut to a minimum. Another home in the back at 514 Burlingame Avenue added another room a few years ago. I don't think they had a permit and if they did, I didn't receive a notice. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my opinion.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> On the window on the west side, out of the two options, I like the way the double-hung version works together and holds the rest of the elevation and the similarity versus the larger cross version. Otherwise, this worked pretty well with the structure that's there and I found it approvable.

> The project is pretty straightforward. I agree with the option on sheet A3.0 as opposed to the double-hung windows. I know that my fellow commissioner had some issues with the additional clerestory height, but the applicant's comment that it was much more compelling in the three-dimensional drawing was true. It works okay despite the difference in the head height of the window.

> I was wondering if there is a reason why the windows on the right elevation have no shutters; it feels awkward. Not sure if it would be impacting the window in the middle on the top. Other than that, it's a nice project.

> The proposed right side rendering seems to show shutters on the window on the left side of the rear

elevation. I would agree with my fellow commissioner that there are some that exist on the right side elevation and then there are new windows that are popped in. We have shutters showing up on the rear elevation; recommend adding shutters to the remaining windows on that right side to be consistent, with the exception of the small window on the main floor. There's a hybrid of window style going around the house, but it seems fairly consistent on the upper floor as there are shutters across all upper windows where space allows. The designs come together very nicely. I appreciate the renderings, they're very helpful in communicating the design. I also do like the proposed transom over the dining room window.

> I agree, it needs some consistency.

> Need to add shutters on the right elevation on the upper and lower floors by that small window prior to the issuance of the building permit.

> I would like some clarity and guidance about the shutters, the center window on the upper floor shows a different window grid pattern and it remains an existing window with a different grid pattern in the proposed elevation.

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

> **that shutters shall be added to the first and second floor windows on the Right Elevation towards the rear of the house (no shutters required for the bathroom window).**

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

- d. 1516 Bernal Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a 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. (Azadeh Masrour, AMS Design LLP, applicant and designer; Behzad Hadjian, property owner) (112 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [1516 Bernal Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1516 Bernal Ave - Attachments](#)

[1516 Bernal Ave - Plans](#)

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Azadeh Masrour and Behzad Hadjian, represented the applicant and answered questions about the application.

Public Comments:

> Public comments submitted via e-mail by Frances Olson, 1520 Bernal Avenue: I have a one-story property next to this new proposed development and want to be sure my house will not be dwarfed or lose sunlight with the size and placement of the new house. Thank you for your consideration of the adjoining properties.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> There are decorative brackets on the gable ends all around the house, but was not reflected on the

detached garage. Recommend adding the same detail to have a more consistent look.

- > Locations for exterior lighting have been identified around the house. Consider providing exterior lighting at the side entry door and the garage as well.
- > The wood siding seems to be drawn bigger than 5" or 6" as intended. It throws the scale of the façade and appears to be close to a foot. It is important to draw the siding correctly and to scale to avoid the doll house impression. In general, it is going in a really good direction.
- > The board and batten siding spacing above the front pediment feels really tight. I don't think you can get batten that close together; it does not feel realistic. Neither of the siding representations feel realistic to me, recommend that you pay some attention to that design element.
- > Suggest to also show board and batten siding on the front and the rear gable ends.
- > Please specify dimensions, any corner conditions and pieces that may need to be added for the window trim details.
- > On the landscape plan, provide more information on what was envisioned for the right hand side of the property by the driveway.
- > This has come a long way. Make sure to have the 3D rendering reflect the correct sidings for a more accurate look. My biggest concern is that the sliding doors are extremely large at the proposed rear elevation. They look out of proportion from the rest of the home.
- > Should think about the detail of how to end the wood siding at the bottom and how it's going to work with the foundation vents.
- > Civil plans do not address any of the site issues raised from the previous meeting. The proposed driveway and retaining wall are two feet from the neighbor's house. I am concerned for the tree on their yard and the potential damage to their home when construction starts.
- > Drawings do not address the wall across the front of the property and the five-foot height difference between the sidewalk and the house, more information needs to be provided. The renderings suggest that you are on a flat lot but you are not. The civil drawings need to show the scope of what was intended for grading and/or retention in this area. Site issues need to be addressed and how that will impact the neighbors.
- > The project is heading in a really good direction. It has made a lot of progress since the original proposal came in. Based on the comments and questions raised by my fellow commissioners, what we are looking for is to see drawings that are close enough to be credible. The windows, window trims and sidings are not credible as shown. Much of the project is acceptable, it is just some parts that are disproportioned. We need to see something adequate to solve the problem so we don't end up with a design that will come back to us later because it was not buildable in the first place. We need to see that the design is close enough to be built so it does not get completely changed in the process of building it. The request for a detailed landscape plan and some sense of topography is reasonable. The complete design is not quite there yet.
- > I agree with my fellow commissioner. The project is going in the right direction, but it definitely needs some more detail and clarifications on the right wall on how it will impact the neighbor's tree.
- > To address the public comment, this is not a very tall project but it can be a lot taller because it is on a hill. Unfortunately, we can't do much about it. The project is definitely much better than before. Details and the topography issue needs to be straightened out to avoid problems at the end.
- > The scale of the windows is too big. You will not have enough room for a bed wall and may be a source of temperature concerns. The window sills are going to be too low which will potentially cause some privacy issues if you have the windows open. The window trim does not have a hierarchy compared to what you see in a more traditional craftsman style. I can appreciate the large doors at the back, but the other windows are big, particularly the one located at the side of the house where the stair is.
- > Some of the details need to be worked out. If it you are using Hardie siding then you need to know how the corners will work. That is an area that the commission constantly has trouble with because it changes the look of the elevation.
- > There is a lot of exterior lighting shown. It needs to comply with the exterior lighting ordinance that we have.
- > The elevations and building sections do not reflect the site topography at all, the street and top of curb was not shown. It isn't a tall house from the top of the hill, but it looks like it well exceeds thirty feet from the average top of curb. The overall height needs to be looked at. Site issues need to be resolved.

- > *As my fellow commissioner said, the design needs to be credible; we need to be confident that what we approve is buildable for the client but also for the neighbors. I appreciate the 3D renderings, but that is not what the street looks like at all. I am missing the entire effect of being able to see three dimensionally how this is going to sit on the site. The rendering should reflect what is actually proposed.*
- > *Need to provide more information regarding the site and the front wall to be able to understand how the front is going to be solved. This is definitely a huge improvement. In order for us to feel confident on this project, more refinement needs to be done.*

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

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

- e. 1928 Devereux Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a 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. (Michael Liu, applicant and property owner; Qing Gan, architect) (106 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1928 Devereux Dr - Staff Report](#)
[1928 Devereux Dr - Attachments](#)
[1928 Devereux Dr - Plans](#)

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Oliver Qing Gan, 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:

- > *Correct drafting errors. Drawings should indicate that the French doors are sliding doors and the deck is existing to remain.*
- > *The front door is very odd given the rest of the house. The house is leaning towards a modernist direction, but the front door is a Dutch door design with a solid panel and glazing. That design element needs rethinking. It seems very out of place on the facade. The general theme is similar to the last project where we need to see some sense of credibility with what is being proposed.*
- > *The wood handrail doesn't work and it would look like it was a temporary retrofit if it's built the way it's proposed. It certainly wouldn't sustain a 200 pound lateral force which is required by code.*
- > *The addition of the window is fine, but there's no reason it shouldn't be the same as the two windows adjacent to it. The answers were rationalizations and there's no real reason for changing it.*
- > *The trellis is an interesting idea but that entire area just doesn't hang together. It feels it was just crammed in there as a response to the plan check comments and I don't think it works.*
- > *The 2" x 4" window trim may work, but it doesn't feel like it's there yet.*

> I appreciate the changes that were made in response to the comments, the windows upstairs and bathroom windows for example, but I don't have a whole lot of confidence in what I'm seeing right now largely because it just doesn't hang together. It feels like a patch work. Had I known we were going to end up here tonight, I would have suggested that this be referred to a design review consultant then. I'm hesitant to do it now, but it needs more work.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner on this. In a lot of ways when I look at the elevations and squint, I like a lot of the window pattern. They're not oversized and they're not wrong; there are a lot of nice things going on in terms of scale. But I'm a little concerned with the trims because if you held some of those trims up against the existing house and tried to put together a vocabulary that works, what I'm seeing might be challenging for somebody. I wish I was feeling more confident that what we're looking at to approve could be built that way and we would all be happy at the end. So, I'd like to feel more confident as well. A trellis is a start in that area, but it doesn't quite go far enough. It's just an eyebrow when there needs to be something a little bit more substantial in that corner. In a way it looks good in elevation, but I don't think it's going to reflect that way when I look at it three-dimensionally and what it does to make that corner any better. There's an opportunity to make the deck a little nicer, it needs a little bit more to it. Overall, it's going in the right direction, but there is some room for it to get better and it would be time well spent so that what we approve can be executed and everybody knows what they're going to get.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners. I do think this would be a great candidate for a design review consultant. I know that they've done a really nice job in trying to tie it all together, but I feel that having somebody to help them out to finish the project would be beneficial and might get them just over that hurdle instead of having them come back.

> I feel compelled to give an example of the challenge that we face above and beyond the wood handrail. If you look at the trellis end shape at the south elevation, you can see the same trellis end shape when you're looking at the west elevation. It's unclear if one is stacked on top of another, that's what I'm seeing, maybe it makes more sense than I think it does. I now see how it's proposed to work. I was lost to how it could be built, but it looks like it can be built. One of the reasons I said it is a mess is if you look at the west elevation, I would expect that trellis to pickup on some line of the building but nothing is lining up there, nothing seems to be associated with anything else. That's the problem, the proposed project doesn't seem to be reflecting the other things going on in the house. One place doesn't reflect what's going on in another place in an incredible way. It's very strange.

> In response to what my fellow commissioner was saying, we've spent a considerable amount of time on this project now in two meetings. I'm not clear if the applicant is understanding all of the changes cohesively to pull everything together. Enough commentary has been provided to assist them, but since the design review consultant fee is a part of the fees paid for the design review, for expediency and consistency of design, it would be a good idea to run it through a design review consultant to work with this applicant to clean up the design, make it cohesive and make it make sense so we will be ready to approve and move it forward the next time we review this project.

> It seems that might be a good motion we can get behind. I don't look at it as a punishment, but us trying to find the best way forward to help the applicant get to the endgame and for all of us to be satisfied that our direction is understood.

> It's just to expedite the process for the applicant. It doesn't need a lot of time from the design review consultant and it would tie the whole project together quickly for them to get them through the system a little bit quicker.

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to refer the application to a design review consultant. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

- f. 1855 Rollins Road, zoned RRMU - Application for a Conditional Use Permit for a commercial recreation use (theater company) in an existing commercial building. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental

Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Bridget Wylie, applicant; ANRM Holdings LLC, property owner) (36 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1855 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1855 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)
[1855 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Bridgette Wylie, represented the applicant.

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *This feels very straightforward. Usually in these cases, we get stuck in a discussion about parking, but as I read the application and the staff report, it looks like we're compliant with parking requirements. I could make the findings for the conditional use permit. It seems like it doesn't overburden the community. It's not injurious to the property and adjacent tenants, and doesn't have a detrimental effect. It seems like a good use for this applicant.*

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

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1273 Balboa Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. (Peter Suen, Fifth Arch, applicant and architect; Betty Chen and Kevin Lange, property owners) (142 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

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

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Peter Suen, 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:

- > *Consider using a different tree species for the front landscaping, the Redbud is diminutive.*
- > *Fix drafting error showing the front door to match the 3D rendering with the proposed elevation.*
- > *This is a modern farmhouse style. Consider a mullion pattern with a 2" x 2" grid overall on the windows versus a 2" x 4" grid. That breaks everything down into more horizontally short and wide panes versus a more vertical pane to accentuate the board and batten siding and the standing seam metal roof vertical lines.*
- > *Provide additional exterior lighting on the side of the garage doors.*
- > *I find the farmhouse style to be the least convincing of all architectural styles to fit into anywhere in Burlingame. This one particular strikes me as very odd. It's looks like a warehouse and that's partly because everything is vertical. The thing that really bothers me the most is the standing seam metal roof and its pitch; becomes very facade-like. I have come to tolerate standing seam metal roofs because they typically are lower in pitch, 4:12 and this is probably 8:12. When they get pitched up like that, they become very insistent in the facade of the building. This is extensive, really long, and unbroken which makes it all the more egregious in my view. My fellow commissioner said something a while ago on another project and it repeats here, that the vertical siding in this case drives directly into the ground, it doesn't stop. In the other case, it was horizontal siding that went all the way to ground. You might say we don't need to worry about that at this point in the project, but it's sort of representative of a certain naïveté about the design. It is equally bazaar that the standing seam metal roof has no ridge cap at all on this building. There's going to be something up there and the skylights are pushed up against the top of that. There's no way they get that close to the top of this building. There are all sorts of things that suggests this building really needs to be looked at harder. It needs to be much more realistic; I don't find it credible at all. There are some massing errors too. If you look at the side elevation of the two renderings with the zip-line gutter that runs from the front to back that separates the upper floor from the lower floor, it's very wedding cake. It's stacked with no gesture to try to break up that horizontality. I might have expected the upper bay to saddleback down to break the line and it doesn't. There's a saddleback on the other side but there's no trim. The vertical board and batten runs right to the ground. I'm going to suggest this goes to a design review consultant because it needs some real attention to more realistic detail. I find it lacking in detail.*
- > *It's interesting that you came up with the warehouse analogy because I had that written on two different sheets on my plans. The verticality of the board and batten siding coupled with the standing seam metal roof, not to mention the four skylights on either side of the ridge, make it look very much like a warehouse. The dual garage doors on sheet A5.1 look like a storage unit; that's going to need help. I agree with the comments about the window trim needing something to be shown there. The window types need to be addressed a little bit more clearly. You've got a real jumbling of awning windows, double-hungs, casements, and arch top French wood windows. I don't see a rhyme or reason to it. The verticality of the board and batten is a little extreme; there are no breaks. There are no belly bands that you would typically see a break at the plate line, so you don't have these lines that go all the way up. You have it where it's offset, but on some of the sides and also at the front and the side of the gable, there should be a horizontal board to break that, not just the two materials coming together. I'm leaning with my fellow commissioner that a design review consultant could help on this one.*
- > *That was the first thought when I opened up the packet, it was very vertical and top heavy. I agree that this is a great candidate for a design review consultant.*
- > *I agree with my fellow commissioners. The neighborhood has a variety of style, this one could potentially fit in. As designed, it looks like it would belong out in a rural environment than in the middle of Burlingame. The verticality needs to be addressed. There are a lot of vertical lines that are really*

accentuating one direction. It's oversimplifying the look of the house and some of the heights. There's a tall brow area over the windows to the right of the front door, that should be accounted for. The sizes of the windows in relationship to the plate heights of the two floors should also be looked at further. I agree that going through the process of the design review consultant would be a good direction to go to and get some help to expedite this project.

> Definitely agree with all that has been said. It looked like a dance hall or a community theater out in Grass Valley or something and it's not meant to be mean, it's just the first thing I thought of when I saw it. It looks thin because of the verticality going all the way down to the ground and the lack of trim, but I'm sure it's very substantial. So, going to a design review consultant would be a great idea.

> I think the plate height needs to be revisited at the ground floor, it's a bit excessive. In general, the project lacks in charm and the round top window which is where all the charm was trying to go, is not very charming. It's just a semi-circular shape on top of the square.

> I agree with what most of you have said. It is out of scale for this lot. This particular structure has maximized the FAR and height. It's actually going over if we took into consideration everything that is being built. The floor-to-floor plate heights are too high. If you stood in that porch, it would be a huge volume. Recognizing that windows are seven feet tall, there is still about three to four feet on top of that. It does not have a homey atmosphere. I'm concerned about the materials going to the ground and not finishing especially since it doesn't have a level lot. As you go up the side, you're going to have a bunch cut off. It's not going to be constructed the way it's drawn in the computer. There needs to be thought about how that finishes off.

> I'm concerned about the porch and the materials around it and the railing. I could foresee us really having a difficult time with this after it is built because I'm not seeing the materials. I see a really poor tile put on there where it would look unattractive. So, we need to be more specific on the materials around that front area. It needs to be more than specifying wood fascia.

> The volumes need to come down, there's a 12 foot second floor open area. That's not something we see in these homes. It would be 16 feet if we didn't have to put in the ceiling in order to deal with the floor area ratio, that would have taken as a double count.

> We need colors. A standing seam metal roof of this size and magnitude with the wrong color is going to look horrible. I went by another modern farmhouse that just finished not that long ago and it's one hundred percent white. No charm, no trim. It was poorly done and we've had people call it out. When you have something like this that's trying to be so different than the other things in our neighborhood, you have to do it well to make it work. There's one on Balboa Avenue, somewhere in the 1300 block, that looked a lot nicer and did a lot better job of combining materials. It's a better composition that might not be a bad one to look at for some inspiration. The no trim thing, it's going to be no detail, I don't think we're going to like that. I agree with my fellow commissioner that without a belly band or other horizontal trims to provide scale to this, it is a warehouse. So, it does need a lot of work and it's too big for the lot it's on. It needs to be rethought.

Vice-Chair Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to refer the application to a design review consultant. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

- b. 1561 Drake Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Side Setback Variance and Special Permit for Declining Height Envelope for a second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Robert Medan, applicant and architect; Paul and Robin Edmondson, property owners) (90 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1561 Drake Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1561 Drake Ave - Attachments](#)

[1561 Drake Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Tse noted that she met with the homeowners to tour the inside of the home and outside of the property. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Robert Medan, 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:

> On the front elevation, compared to the house, the door looks a little small.

> This feels like one of those projects where it will be very helpful to see some 3D renderings, especially how it would look like from Drake Avenue. This site is one of the very odd ones in Burlingame, which strikes me that the rules don't apply like an Italian hill town where you can't force it into regularity, which means you are ignoring the facts of the situation. I have a lot of sympathy for this being rambunctious, it doesn't really bother me given where it sits and the elements surrounding it. A 3D rendering will be helpful to visualize what will be on the property from the street. My guess is that it will not have a huge impact because the way this house presented itself is the garage, even the front door doesn't show itself. I feel sympathetic letting this be what it's got to be, but I'm interested to know what we will see from the place where it matters.

> I will have to agree with my fellow commissioner. Personally I think the rule book does not suitably apply to these sites in this area. We have looked at a couple of projects in these dead ends before and the lots get really crazy back there, but they are also very cool. Overall, I really like the design. I can support the Side Setback Variances based on the conditions of the lot. I don't think they are going overboard with the square footage, they are keeping it well under the allowable FAR. I can support the Special Permit for the declining height envelope on the left side of the house because it is not a square house on a square lot. We need to take that into consideration. I also agree that a 3D rendering will be helpful the next time around. Based on driving that street, everything is kind of jammed in there; this does not appear to be intrusive or invasive of the neighbors' privacies so I am in support of the project.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners and would like to give a lot of credit to the architect for attempting to create all these elevations, because you can't see any of these views anywhere from around the house. The house, as you approach it, has a lot of charm. It is a very nicely designed home. When we see the 3D renderings, I would guess that we would barely see the tips of the roof line that is being proposed for the addition upstairs. I appreciate that the homeowners shared with me their kitchen design, including how their cabinetry will be laid out, which substantiate the reason why there are no windows on that elevation. I am in support of the Side Setback Variances because they really have no choice. I also can support the Special Permit for the declining height envelope. They have done a good job of keeping the addition concise and the core of the home where they could possibly add on. It will be nice to see a rendering, but it is not a deal breaker for me.

> As my fellow commissioner mentioned, there is something going on with the front door, but would like to see something a little bit different there. It feels like the front door needs a little more work.

> I'm not opposed to have a blank wall, this is not a deal breaker, but it would be a really good opportunity to put something on that wall to break up the massing. Consider putting in some vines, trellis or fake windows to make it a little interesting because you are still walking up to that house.

> Those are some good points that my fellow commissioner brought up. Looking at the plans, the front door is proposed to be 3'-0" x 8'-0", would suggest to look at the scale of the door as it may be the reason why it seems off. Additionally, the homeowner shared with me that they are planning for a green wall with vines and trellis on that blank wall outside the kitchen.

- > You have a very charming garage area, it's got a lot of character. Consider the same architectural elements for the front door with columns and a beautiful arch, it is perfectly proportioned in the garage. That would help take up some of the blank wall and be substantial for the front door area.
- > I like the project. The concern I had during the site visit was the second floor windows facing the neighbor. I know it is tight in there, but as long as everybody is in agreement of what is there then I am not worried.
- > There is an opportunity for the porch area to be a little bigger, I agree that the existing condition is not attractive. It could involve the very nice elements that you have in the front. You've got some really nice planting that enhance the structure. It's also nice to have a larger porch area. The blank wall does not bother me at all and it can be a great landscape opportunity. I think it is a great solution. With the creek in the back, the deck and all of the structure in the back, I would encourage to discuss the project with your structural engineer early.

Vice-Chair 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: 6 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, Schmid, and Pfaff

Absent: 1 - Terrones

- c. 1132 Killarney Lane, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Robert Criscuolo, applicant and property owner; Joe Sabel, Aero 11 Design, designer) (112 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1132 Killarney Ln - Staff Report](#)
[1132 Killarney Ln - Attachments](#)
[1132 Killarney Ln - Plans](#)

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Joseph Sabel, 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:

- > Correct drafting errors to avoid conflicting window notes.
- > Consider doing a chimney for the fireplace, which is a nice architectural detail, rather than the proposed bump-out on the side of the house. The chimney, being a zero clearance wouldn't need to clear the roof, so you can go up a couple of feet. If it's something you would consider looking at, it would add to the look of the house as opposed to just having a box seemingly attached to the side of house.
- > Show proposed exterior lighting locations on the plans.
- > Suggests stacking the large sliding doors at the rear and creating a pocket wall to the left on the exterior elevation, which is very dramatic and the doors disappear. It thickens the wall and it's really not an inexpensive solution, but a nice solution.

- > Provide 3D rendering so we could see some of the details a little bit better.
- > There's a lot to like about this project. It has a lot of good things going for it and is consistent in its style. I find the large panel glass windows at the rear to not fit very well with the rest of the architecture. It would be nice to see those things be stackable, sort of disappear and open up entirely. The scale as depicted feels wrong but I like that it's going to open the inside to the outside. The front and the back elevations are pretty good except for the windows. The side elevations leave something to be desired and have that continuous horizontal element, which when viewed from the roof plan and the two side walls feels like a pancake. There's no attempt to break up the continuous horizontal element on either of the two sides and that diminishes the architecture of the project somewhat. I'd like to see that addressed. There are ways to very easily break that horizontal element and make it much more nuanced as a tidy little craftsman project. All in all, it's a good project.
- > I'm conflicted. First of all, I love the current house. It's one of the most lovely houses in the neighborhood. Visiting the site, the use of wood shingle caught me off guard in a craftsman style home. I cannot find a single shingle home around the Village Park neighborhood. It's looks very busy. There were a lot of houses with horizontal wood siding and a lot with stucco. Looking at the design guidelines, it says compatibility of architectural style, the character, and mass with that of an existing neighborhood. The mass and the bulk doesn't bother me, there are plenty of two-story houses there. But the proposed material bothers me. I love wood shingle, but it needs something to make it fit back in the neighborhood.
- > I agree that the neighborhood has more houses with stucco and horizontal siding. But I've seen some shingle homes in the other Ray Park neighborhoods. When they're more painted rather than natural wood color, they tend to fit in a little bit better. Overall the project is nice looking; I do like it. My previous comments are really not so much criticisms of what we've got, it's just that we need to see a little bit more so that it's in the record. It would be a good idea to have more detailing around the window trims and we know that we're getting 1" x 4" and 1" x 6", etc. It's good to have some of the details around the gable ends. Similarly, my questions around the front porch, that's an area of great concern, having those materials nailed down and working is important. The big glass doors at the rear of the house could be incredible, but they are extremely expensive. So I would recommend that before coming back and locking into something that you're not going to want to change or have to come back to us with, it's important that you understand the cost and effort into making those happen. That would be a wise choice. There is also a good opportunity for a rendering on this, it doesn't have to be photo realistic, even some of the black and white renderings that we get have some texture to it and enable us to see more three-dimensionally how the various elevations work, and it's a vast improvement over just elevations.
- > If we can get those comments on the window types cleaned up, that would be helpful. When I looked at the drawings, the shingle graphic was a little bit disturbing, partly because I know the neighborhood pretty well, but also because it's probably just the CAD design program that spits out this particular texture of shingle. My guess is the shingles would be a traditional shingle that would be square cut on the bottom and appear in horizontal rows. There's a house on Eastmoor Road down by Village Park, it actually is nice looking. There may be one or two shingle houses in that neighborhood although there aren't many. To my fellow commissioner's comment about the horizontality of the side elevations, that's along the lines of what I was saying about the chimney. If you incorporated a chimney, broke the roof plane even by a foot or two, and made it of a different material, it would break that side up and help the plain look of that one side.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Terrones

- d. 1855 -1881 Rollins Road, zoned RRMU - Application for Environmental Scoping, Design Review, Density Bonus with Waivers/Modifications, Community Benefit Bonuses, and Vesting Tentative Parcel Map for a new, 405-unit multi-unit residential development.

(Scott Youdall, The Hanover Company, applicant; Jon Ennis, BDE Architecture, architect; SJ Amoroso Properties Co, E and S Property LLC, and ANRM Holdings LLC, property owners) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)
[1855-1881 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Scott Youdall and Ian Murphy, 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:

- > *I love the plaza and I like the sculptures.*
- > *Wondering if there was an opportunity to do a retail use or something that is a little bit more interactive for the public, maybe on a short-term basis, because I'm in that area all the time and I don't see any foot traffic. I don't know why people would use these plazas. I think they're great, but I don't see anybody using them because there's no reason to be walking around down there. So, until the whole area gets a little bit more developed, I'm hoping we can see some small businesses in there that would generate some pedestrian traffic.*
- > *Consider using the culvert as part of the landscape area. There's an opportunity to develop something; you have open space there that you can take advantage of.*
- > *Looking at the rendering of the north end of the project, driving from Millbrae towards your site, there is a large round wall that can be an opportunity for a wall art, a way to recognize that you are turning into Burlingame and Rollins Road. There's potentially a graphic or a texture opportunity to engage the entry of your project at your main plaza. The artwork is a nice piece. I like the plaza there. But there is something bigger that could go vertical in that area that would give more sense of arrival since you are the first property in. Overall, I like the architecture and project. Consider something that can potentially provide a gateway to Burlingame from Millbrae.*
- > *This is environmental scoping, the traffic has got to be a big issue for us to study. I can't think of any new environmental scoping matters, it is really the usual items.*
- > *In general, I like the project. It's hard not to like this kind of development happening in the city and Bay Area and the housing is desperately needed. It's quite a large project and it's struggling a little bit not be too monotonous. The length is 300 plus feet along Rollins Road and it was a wise move to break it in the middle as you have done so. The question is, is that enough? The gesture at the corners are nice, they do something to deflect those important spots in the architecture. However, it feels monotonous in the middle. Consider being more free and playful with the balconies, they are very structured which just adds to the general structure of the 300 feet between the two end points. I looked to see if they were linked to some special units. I don't see any rhyme or reason to them other than they're stacked on top of each other on identical units. Suggest hiding or burying those balconies, they can go up and down and provide some play against the very structured surface for 300 feet. That provides a new level of reading beyond that major break in the middle. It is the nature of these kinds of multi-unit residential projects to be structured similarly to one another. You've done a good job to try to address the monotony. I love the metal snake that runs along each of the corners so there are interesting things going on. It could always*

be improved. You could jazz up the corners a little bit more, perhaps. The beauty of the project really is that, it's going to be like South Beach or Mission Bay. It's going to be years before we see the kind of foot traffic that we need to see down there and the ability to support retail, but it will come. It's just going to take a long time. There's no way to rush it. But anchor projects like this will be the catalyst for the development we're looking for in this part of the city, so I would say in general, well done.

> I would agree with my fellow commissioner. It's a good development; I like the layout of everything. I like the interior spaces where you have community areas for the people who live there. But again, I'm concerned about those plaza areas and how they're going to be used. I too, like the areas like in China Basin and specifically around the ball park. But as I walk around there before and after games, I've noticed the ground floor street-facing units are often shuttered. It looks nice in your rendering because they're lit up, but that's not what you're going to see. If there's foot traffic there, they're not going to want everyone looking in their doors. But if you gave the opportunity for a small amount of retail, you have a captive audience here. There's going to be over 500 people living in this place, so you have the opportunity and at a future date, maybe they can be converted to living spaces. There's a lot of flexibility when you build. I don't see the foot traffic happening. I like the idea of plazas and they may be developed further as some of the commissioners have suggested. I would like to see if we can generate a reason for people to be there out on the street and not just get into their cars, drive to work and leave the area. But overall, good job.

> I'm getting tired of the monotonous height. You weren't at your maximum height so it might be refreshing to have some more interesting areas. Possibly something at the bottom, it would be logical that those would be at the lower level. Because it's large, has so many units, and because of its location, it feels like the right project to look into some variations on certain areas which would tie into it being a gateway.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners. I would like to see some height and different variations of height. That was one thing that just felt a little bit too monotonous. I think we need to have some coffee shops or something. You have so many people there that there are opportunities here to be wasted if we don't create some retail space on the bottom floor. I want to see an invigoration of Rollins Road and we can do that if we create smaller retail spaces that a lot of people can go to and enjoy. We are missing an opportunity here if we don't do that.

> I agree as well. This property has some unique ability to bring in retail on the ground floor because of the close proximity to the In-n-Out burger and that whole complex is within walking distance. There's a lot of traffic at the intersection of Adrian Road and Rollins Roads so it's not a far stretch for someone to go to this block and visit a cafe, restaurant or retail services that could be offered because this location is at the gateway and in a much better position than further down on Rollins Road. I would like to encourage that to be reviewed further. Also, the corners have some great opportunities for whether it's even more artwork or a stronger statement for that gateway to our North Rollins Road area. It's calling for that and would help break some of the monotony that some of my fellow commissioners were talking about. The design is looking quite nice and has put a lot of work into it so far.

> Concerned with the swimming pool being in shade all day long at the bottom of a five-story building. Consider bringing it up onto a higher level so that it actually will get used. We're not in Hawaii where we want that shade in the swimming pool. Otherwise, a really nice job and thank you for your presentation.

> I agree. It's a nice project overall. There are opportunities always. Going back to the idea of the gateway, we do have some gateway monuments at various areas of the city. We have our lighted obelisks at either end of Burlingame Avenue. We have the old Broadway sign going across the road that helps celebrate the entrance into some of our neighborhoods. Being the first property from the north, you almost have the responsibility of being that introduction to what is going to be our newest neighborhood. In hopes that we are going to be creating a more pedestrian friendly environment coming down Rollins Road and not just being the industrial road that it has been for 30 years. There's an opportunity, whether that involves the building architecture on the corner or it's something out in the plaza that gives that gateway feel, it is something to work with. Otherwise, I was pretty satisfied with the drawings and what you're putting forward. I hope to be able to see this project get further along.

> We've got the setbacks in the rear and then the floor area ratio which both could be affected differently depending on that parcel in the back. For me personally, it didn't feel like exceeding the FAR seemed out of whack or we were stuffing too much into too small of a lot. The setbacks seemed

reasonable because it's not backing up to anything that seems unreasonable. This seems like something we would be able to stomach until the time come.

> If that swath involves taking out trees to do something, then I personally would have concerns with that.

There was no motion from the Planning Commission, as this application is required to return on the Regular Action Calendar.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

There were no Director Reports.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Notice: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on March 14, 2022. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on March 24, 2022, 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.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 p.m.