Item No. 8h Regular Action Item



PROJECT LOCATION 1628 Lassen Way

City of Burlingame

Design Review and Variance

Item No. 8h Regular Action Item

Address: 1628 Lassen Way Meeting Date: January 14, 2019

Request: Application for Design Review and Variance for Lot Coverage for a first and second story addition to

an existing single-family dwelling

Applicant and Designer: Steve Wu, Master SWU Associates

Property Owner: Jeff Leung

General Plan: Low Density Residential

APN: 025-203-220 Lot Area: 6,000 SF Zoning: R-1

Environmental Review Status: The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that additions to existing structures are exempt from environmental review, provided the addition will not result in an increase of more than 50% of the floor area of the structures before the addition.

Project Description: The existing single-story house with an attached one-car garage contains 2,259 SF (0.37 FAR) of floor area. The proposed project includes adding a new front porch, increasing the first floor living space, and adding a new second story. The floor area of the house would increase to 3,014 SF (0.50 FAR) where 3,020 SF (0.51 FAR) is the maximum allowed as per the zoning code. The house would be 6 SF below the maximum allowed floor area.

This application also includes a request for a Variance for lot coverage (2,524 SF, 42 % proposed where 2,400 SF, 40% is the maximum allowed). The proposed project exceeds the maximum allowed lot coverage by 124 SF.

The existing house has four bedrooms and with this project the number of bedrooms would not change. Two parking spaces, one of which must be covered, are required for a four-bedroom house. The existing garage (16'-5" x 20'-3" clear interior dimensions) provides one covered parking space. One uncovered parking space (9'-0" x 20'-0") is provided in the driveway, where the required 20'-0" is measured up to the inner edge of the sidewalk. Therefore, the project is in compliance with off-street parking requirements. All other Zoning Code requirements have been met. The applicant is requesting the following applications:

- Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-family dwelling (CS 25.57.010 (a) (2) (4)); and
- Variance for lot coverage (2,524 SF, 42 % proposed where 2,400 SF, 40% is the maximum allowed) (CS 25.54.020).

1628 Lassen Way

Lot Size: 6,000 SF Plans date stamped: January 4, 2019

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	ALLOWED/REQ'D
SETBACKS			
Front (1st flr):	15'-0"	18'-6"	15'-6" (block average)
(2 nd flr):	NA	20'-0"	20'-0" or block average
Attached garage	15'-0"	15'-0"	25'-0" (for one-car garage)
Side (left):	5'-1"	no change	6'-0"
(right):	5'-8"	6'-0"	6'-0"
Rear (1st flr):	25'-7"	no Change	15'-0"
(2 nd flr):	NA	56'-4"	20'-0"

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	ALLOWED/REQ'D
Lot Coverage:	2,259 SF 37.6%	2,524 SF ¹ 42%	2,400 SF 40%
FAR:	2,259 SF 0.37 FAR	3,014 SF 0.50 FAR	3,020 SF ² 0.51 FAR
# of bedrooms:	4	no change	
Off-Street Parking:	1 covered (16'-5" x 20'-3") 1 uncovered (9' x 20')	no change	1 covered (10' x 20') 1 uncovered (9' x 20')
Building Height:	17'-4"	22'-5"	30'-0"
DH Envelope:	complies	complies	CS 25.26.075

¹ Variance requested for lot coverage.

Staff Comments: None

Design Review Study Meeting: At the Planning Commission design review study meeting on December 10, 2018, the Commission expressed several concerns with the project design and with the various Variances requested (see attached December 10, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes). The Commission referred the project to a design review consultant.

The applicant submitted revised plans, date stamped January 4, 2019, to address the Planning Commission's comments and concerns. A discussion of the analysis of the revised project and recommendation by the design review consultant is provided in the next section.

Analysis and Recommendation by Design Reviewer: The design review consultant met with the project designer and homeowner to discuss the Planning Commission's concerns and reviewed the revised plans. Based on the feedback from the review, the applicant made major changes to address Commission's concerns. The applicant has revised the drawings to maintain an 8'-0" plate height throughout the house, except at family/dining room where the plate height would be 10'-0". Since the house is not increasing the height of the non-conforming walls and is now complying with the setback requirements, it no longer requires the previously requested Variances. However, the applicant is now requesting a Variance for lot coverage.

Some other changes made to the design include changing the roof design on second floor from gable to hip roofs, refining the landscape plan, interchanging the location of the closet with the bedroom on second floor, reducing the overall height from 23'-7" to 22'-5", and increasing the area of the front bedroom on first floor and master bedroom on the second floor. With these proposed changes the floor area of the house would increase by 60 SF.

The design reviewer has provided a detailed analysis in his letter and recommends approval of the project as proposed (see attached Design Review Analysis, dated December 26, 2018).

 $^{^{2}}$ (0.32 x 6,000 SF) + 1100 SF = 3,020 SF (0.51 FAR)

Design Review Criteria: The criteria for design review as established in Ordinance No. 1591 adopted by the Council on April 20, 1998 are outlined as follows:

- 1. Compatibility of the architectural style with that of the existing character of the neighborhood;
- 2. Respect for the parking and garage patterns in the neighborhood;
- 3. Architectural style and mass and bulk of structure;
- 4. Interface of the proposed structure with the structures on adjacent properties; and
- 5. Landscaping and its proportion to mass and bulk of structural components.

Suggested Findings for Design Review: The proposed project would maintain the existing one-car garage and respects the garage pattern in the neighborhood. The new house would be craftsman style and would use high-quality materials such as aluminum clad wood windows, stucco siding, composite shingle roof, and a stacked stone base. The new front porch would help in better interfacing with the rest of the properties in the neighborhood. For these reasons, the project may be found to be compatible with the requirements of the City's five design review criteria.

Required Findings for Variance: In order to grant a variance, the Planning Commission must find that the following conditions exist on the property (Code Section 25.54.020 a-d):

- (a) there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to property in the same district;
- (b) the granting of the application is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right of the applicant, and to prevent unreasonable property loss or unnecessary hardship;
- (c) the granting of the application will not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity and will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, general welfare or convenience; and
- (d) that the use of the property will be compatible with the aesthetics, mass, bulk and character of existing and potential uses of properties in the general vicinity.

Suggested Findings for Variance: The proposed addition on the ground floor, which includes a new front porch, would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, general welfare or convenience and would increase the aesthetic appeal of the house. The proposed addition will be compatible with the aesthetics, mass, bulk and character of existing and potential uses of properties in the general vicinity, and since the use on the site is a single-family dwelling and its design has been reviewed through the design review process, the project may have found to be compatible with the Variance criteria listed above.

Planning Commission Action: The Planning Commission should conduct a public hearing on the application and consider public testimony and the analysis contained within the staff report. Action should include specific findings supporting the Planning Commission's decision and should be affirmed by resolution of the Planning Commission. The reasons for any action should be stated clearly for the record. At the public hearing the following conditions of approval should be considered:

- 1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped January 4, 2019, sheets A00 through A06 and L01;
- 2. that any changes to building materials, exterior finishes, windows, architectural features, roof height or pitch, and amount or type of hardscape materials shall be subject to Planning Division or Planning

Commission review (FYI or amendment to be determined by Planning staff);

- 3. that any changes to the size or envelope of the basement, first or second floors, or garage, which would include adding or enlarging a dormer(s), shall require an amendment to this permit;
- 4. that any recycling containers, debris boxes or dumpsters for the construction project shall be placed upon the private property, if feasible, as determined by the Community Development Director;
- 5. that demolition or removal of the existing structures and any grading or earth moving on the site shall not occur until a building permit has been issued and such site work shall be required to comply with all the regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District;
- 6. that prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the project, the project construction plans shall be modified to include a cover sheet listing all conditions of approval adopted by the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal; which shall remain a part of all sets of approved plans throughout the construction process. Compliance with all conditions of approval is required; the conditions of approval shall not be modified or changed without the approval of the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal;
- 7. that all air ducts, plumbing vents, and flues shall be combined, where possible, to a single termination and installed on the portions of the roof not visible from the street; and that these venting details shall be included and approved in the construction plans before a Building permit is issued;
- 8. that the project shall comply with the Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance which requires affected demolition, new construction and alteration projects to submit a Waste Reduction plan and meet recycling requirements; any partial or full demolition of a structure, interior or exterior, shall require a demolition permit;
- 9. that the project shall meet all the requirements of the California Building and Uniform Fire Codes, 2016 Edition, as amended by the City of Burlingame;

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE MET DURING THE BUILDING INSPECTION PROCESS PRIOR TO THE INSPECTIONS NOTED IN EACH CONDITION:

- 10. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, shall provide an architectural certification that the architectural details shown in the approved design which should be evident at framing, such as window locations and bays, are built as shown on the approved plans; architectural certification documenting framing compliance with approved design shall be submitted to the Building Division before the final framing inspection shall be scheduled;
- 11. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the applicant shall provide a certification by the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, that demonstrates that the project falls at or below the maximum approved floor area ratio for the property;
- 12. that prior to scheduling the roof deck inspection, a licensed surveyor shall shoot the height of the roof ridge and provide certification of that height to the Building Division; and
- 13. that prior to final inspection, Planning Division staff will inspect and note compliance of the architectural details (trim materials, window type, etc.) to verify that the project has been built according to the approved Planning and Building plans.

Sonal Aggarwal Contract Planner

c. Steve Wu, applicant and designer Jeff Leung, property owner

Attachments:

December 10, 2018, Planning Commission Minutes
Design Review Consultant's Analysis, dated December 26, 2018
Application to the Planning Commission
Variance Application
Planning Commission Resolution (Proposed)
Notice of Public Hearing – Mailed January 4, 2019
Area Map