



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, July 11, 2022

7:00 PM

Online

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Associate Planner 'Amelia Kolokihakauifisi, and Assistant City Attorney Scott Spansail.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Tse joined the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

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

Absent 1 - Horan

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Draft June 13, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft June 13, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

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

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

Absent: 2 - Horan, and Tse

b. Draft June 27, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft June 27, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Comaroto made a motion, seconded by Chair Gaul, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion failed due to a lack of quorum. Action on the June 27, 2022 meeting minutes was continued to the August 8, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.

Aye: 3 - Comaroto, Gaul, and Pfaff

Absent: 2 - Horan, and Tse

Abstain: 2 - Lowenthal, and Schmid

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Community Development Director Gardiner noted that Item 9a - 713 Howard Avenue will be brought forward as the first agenda item since the applicant representing the application is a commissioner. After review of the item is finished, she will then join the meeting as a commissioner for the remainder of the

meeting.

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. 34 Dwight Road, 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 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Design, Inc., applicant and designer; Peter Gorski and Suzanne Nguyen, property owners) (130 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [34 Dwight Rd - Staff Report](#)
[34 Dwight Rd - Attachments](#)
[34 Dwight Rd - Plans](#)

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

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Jesse Geurse, 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 don't see any changes made. Both the doors and windows on the rear elevations, the lowest ones on the right-hand side, still appeared to be very oversized.*
- > *I really enjoy the design. I like the two-tone of the older bungalow where you can see the entry way and the way you have designed that is beautiful, thank you for that.*
- > *I like this project. The last time it was in front of us, I liked the adaptive reuse of the split-level house that was there. I like the height of it and the whole thing is working nicely in that space.*
- > *I agree with my fellow commissioner. I like the design and the designer has done a nice job. I like the architecture, it fits into the neighborhood very nicely.*
- > *I agree with what my fellow commissioners said.*
- > *It's a good job working with split level home which is typically difficult to make of it, this looks real nice.*

> I wanted to echo what my fellow commissioners said and would like to thank the designer for addressing the header heights and the window below the bay window on the lower floor, I appreciate that.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Horan

- b. 1425 Castillo Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for building height 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. (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Designs, Inc., applicant and designer; Rajiv Gujral, property owner) (116 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [1425 Castillo Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1425 Castillo Ave - Attachments](#)
[1425 Castillo Ave - Plans](#)

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

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

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

Public Comments:

> Melinda Earlywine, 1427 Castillo Avenue: Thank you for the planned revisions. They were awesome. I think this is going to be a beautiful home. I would love to have been afforded the same courteous presentation of the plans ahead of time so we could walk through them as you did with the folks at the other house that you're designing. I would like to extend an invitation to have you come out and visit us and see what we're talking about, mostly for the window placement, but also with that 3'-6" setback on the right side of the house with the door, the stairs, and the landscape planting. I think if you come out, you'll see there won't be space for that landscape planting with the birch trees that are currently there. I really would like to have you come out and take a look and talk with my husband and I to address some of these concerns. This home is 108 years old. It's a historic part of Burlingame and it was the first house built on this block. I'm very passionate about why we bought this home, why we have stayed here for so many years, and why we care for it so much. So if someone could give me a call and sit down with my husband and I so we can take a look at these plans and see how it's going to affect the way we live at 1427 Castillo Avenue. For the record, our home does not have a third floor. It's a garage that was dug into the ground as it was subdivided with 1429 Castillo Avenue, which was a two-car detached garage. I don't see why the house which is on a higher hill can't be graded as ours was as with others on this street.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> On the very left-hand side at the rear elevation there's a little bit of a shed roof hanging out by the chimney. It's drawn as a flat roof or soffit on the right side elevation, but on the rear elevation it's coming out as a shed roof. Instead of handling it like a soffit, consider applying a shed roof over that window. It seems like it would be higher than what is showing on the rear elevation. There's something not matching

up.

> That roof you're talking about wouldn't exist if the right elevation is drawn correctly or as intended, then that little roof will not show up on the rear elevation.

> The design has been greatly improved by dropping it down. It's very simple to drop a house into the site and just have your backyard surrounded by a series of retaining walls, and that has given us what we're looking for. I agree with the applicant, the way the house is designed, it steps back on all sides and that will help with the impact. It's always tough when you're at the top of the hill on the street and you're working against the other houses next door. Because of the elevation changes from site to site, you're going to have one house taller than the other, but this works really well.

> I agree. When you look at the elevation it looks like a tall house. However, a lot of the house slopes back to the middle of the site. Using that perceived as attic space from the second floor, this is a compact house in 24 feet of height and we're not asking that of too many second story homes. The applicant has done a good job and I appreciate the extra effort being put into lowering it by two feet, which makes this a lot easier to approve. Again, I don't think this is going to suddenly be the largest house looming over the other houses in the area. Sure, it will be higher than the ones across the street that are downhill, but as far as the immediate neighbors on either side, it should be in similar capacity. I felt from the first time that this is a really nice design. It's going to look well here, so I can support this project.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. The designer did a great job on this design; it's a tough site and it fits into the neighborhood very nicely.

> I would like to echo everything that has been said. I really appreciate you taking the height down a bit in a way that's easily doable and your attention to detail; it's a really very beautiful house. As the applicant has offered, it would be great to meet with the neighbors to figure out how to space the birch trees properly so that they have room to grow and there is room for screening, because that's going to be needed.

> The Special Permit for building height is supportable, especially since it has been pulled back from a Variance. It's a tough lot and slopes up at the top of the hill on the street, so it's going to appear larger but it's not going over the top, the roof slopes to the floor. The floor is going to be a slab on grade and that's going to be significantly higher than the street elevation, so I can see reasoning for approving the Special Permit for the height.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Horan

- c. 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 - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)

[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. Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, designer, and Bill and Kasey Schuh, property owners, 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 was not part of the original commission when this was originally approved, but having looked at this a few times now and looking at the completed project, I really like this project. I don't necessarily miss a lot more detail. What they're proposing is reasonable and helps bridge the gap of what was originally proposed and what maybe is more realistic at this point in time. I would like to see this move forward.

> I'm struggling with this. The pop-out feature over the front door was a nice detail and it tied in nicely with the way the gable ends were done. You can say there's no paneling to match up with because the paneling has been removed. I'm having a tough time with the argument about the waterproofing and the amount of work. If you're going to be punching gable vents into the ends of these things, you're going to have waterproofing issues also. I hate to see things get torn apart, but I thought a really nice job was done with the original design and I'm not completely sold on this design.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner, mainly because we're talking about the entrance. If this was a side or back door entry and it's a little bit more plain vanilla, I can see accepting this. But it's minimizing the effect of the entry. At the bare minimum, the dentil blocks should be added in as the property owner was saying that those were in the proposed design. I would want to at least see that if there was no way to get some paneling detail. The paneling detail does add a nice quality, some nice character to that design. I too was not on the commission the first time this was approved, so I wasn't a part of that discussion. I do like the originally proposed design for that specific area so I'm willing to make a compromise on adding the dentil blocks. If there were a decorative element that could be added over the entry, somewhat like the paneling that was originally proposed, I would appreciate that.

> I don't disagree with any of my fellow commissioners. I wasn't at the original meetings when these were approved. However, I do think there's a compromise here to be done. Seeing the house in person, it doesn't strike me as being stark or unattractive to the neighborhood. It doesn't make me stop and say wow, a couple of blocks here and a couple of blocks there is going to change my opinion. However, I agree that a waterproofing issue from a contractor is not a good reason. We should try and get this going for them. They have been through quite a ride here and I don't see a huge discrepancy on this proposed plan.

Chair Gaul reopened the public hearing.

> Community Development Director Gardiner: We should reopen the public hearing to allow the applicant to indicate whether they would accept this change. It was not what was shown on the proposed plans, so just want to make sure that this is something that is acceptable to them.

> Schuh: If I understood correctly, we are taking the June 22nd drawings and adding the dentil blocks underneath the front area. We would be happy to do that.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Lowenthal made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schmid, to approve the application with the following amended condition:

> that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date

stamped June 22, 2022, sheets T1.0, A1.0 through A5.0, and A9.0, and shall include 6x6 wood corbels below the projection above the front entry.

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

Absent: 1 - Horan

Recused: 2 - Comaroto, and Pfaff

- d. 1345 Vancouver Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review Amendment for proposed changes to a previously approved project for a new, two-story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorical Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (SJA Development, applicant and designer; 16 Goethe Street LLC, property owner) (122 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1345 Vancouver Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1345 Vancouver Ave - Attachments](#)

[1345 Vancouver Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

The applicant was not in attendance to represent and answer questions for the project.

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> The applicant's letter discussed why there was a change in the materials and mentioned difficulty in supplies. I would like to have a clarification of what the actual problem was in more detail; should identify what the material was that they had difficulty getting, if that was really the reason why they made the change. I did notice the changes were already made as if the item was approved.

> I actually thought by looking at the elevations that this was going to be a horrible change. But in reality seeing that it is already done, the siding doesn't look bad with the forms in the shape of this house. So I don't really have any objection to the change to the siding based on what they have done.

> I'm going in a different direction. I do remember this house when it first came up to us for approval and it looked very similar to this. We sent it to the design review consultant who came back and we approved the changes as a modern farmhouse. Part of the problem was there were a number of houses on that street that have been recently built and we didn't want to have too similar of a design. There was work done with the design review consultant. I'm irked by people spending our Monday evenings going over their designs, building what they want, and coming back later saying this is what we have built and we want you to approve it. With that being said, I will not approve the design as it stands now. I would like to see the stucco walls as approved. I'm not buying the reasoning that the revisions were due to material shortage, stucco and cement; that doesn't hold any water to me. I would like to see this built as it was designed. I don't agree with the shortage of the cable railing system. There are plenty of vendors with that material and that fits the design of the house. It was supposed to be a modern farmhouse and the design

has been washed out, so I will not support these changes. The wood siding as specified and the corner boards on it, I could probably live with, but the stucco areas need to be stucco.

> I wholeheartedly agree with my fellow commissioner. For perspective, I had a client where they wanted the whitest colored stucco. Because there's issue in the industry finding that super white pigment, clients reject them because it comes out yellow. This is a horizontal white house and I don't like the way they look in the neighborhood as it sticks out like a sore thumb. Modern farmhouse is a loose term and when you put this white thin rail siding, it just doesn't blend in at all with the rest of the neighborhood.

> I agree with my fellow commissioner. We're working our Monday nights for free and we are here. This project did go to a design review consultant. We asked for certain things and we approved it. We have gone through the system and they just did whatever they wanted. I would love to hear from them, but I can't approve the project the way it sits.

> I agree with my fellow commissioners. If the applicant is not here to speak, are we wasting more time airing all these concerns and having to talk to them at a future meeting? Or are we making a decision tonight?

> These comments can be read into the minutes so the applicant knows our grievances and what we're upset about because we weren't able to do this when pulled as an FYI.

> I'm wondering if we can make the motion to deny this? I don't know that the applicant is going to come back and explain this away and convince us that this is the design we should approve. As much as it doesn't bother me as much, I'm in support of what has happened in the past. The fact is that it went to a design review consultant and the previous commission worked through this. I'm in support of holding them accountable for that and I don't see any reason why we shouldn't be voting this as a denial now.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Horan

- e. 1251 California Drive, zoned CMU - Application for a Conditional Use Permit to convert an existing commercial building to an 8-room hotel. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 – Class I of the CEQA Guidelines. (Ted Catlin, Dreiling, Terrones Architecture, applicant and architect; Paul Dimech, property owner) (114 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1251 California Dr - Staff Report](#)

[1251 California Dr - Attachments](#)

[1251 California Dr - Plans](#)

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

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Richard Terrones and Ted Catlin, architects, and Paul Dimech, property owner, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the project.

Public Comments:

> Michael Grant: My wife and I have been living around the corner from the proposed project for decades on Juanita Avenue. We're excited to hear the building could be used for a different purpose because it's a lovely building, but we are concerned about parking. Because Juanita Avenue is two blocks from Broadway, there's rarely an open space for parking on the street. The proposal is that the clientele might

be airline employees but there's no guarantee of that. So that's our biggest concern, the parking issue.

> Public comment via email by Athan Rebelos: I want to express my support for the proposed boutique hotel at 1251 California Drive. I believe the hotel will benefit the businesses along the Broadway corridor. My understanding is that the current residential tenants are airline employees alleviating any concerns I had about losing housing stock. I would ask City staff and Burlingame Police Department to closely monitor the bicycle lanes for any issues during the construction phase and months after the hotel parking.

> Public comment via email by Holly Allen, 1121 Juanita Avenue: My family and I reside around the corner from the proposed hotel. We're very concerned about the congestion and parking issues at the proposed site. While the claim is that it's for airline employees and mostly Uber, I question the plausibility of that statement and the owner's plans to address parking issues. This is an already congested area with the laundromat, bike lane, and gas station. What's the benefit of this proposal to our local community?

> Public comment via email by Teresa Chambers, 1125 Juanita Avenue: I'm writing regarding project 8e located at 1251 California Drive. I live on Juanita Avenue and I have concerns regarding the hotel discussed. I have concerns regarding parking and congestion in the current area, including bike lane. Caltrain does not stop at Broadway and there are no other hotels on this side of California Drive. I have concerns as a family in the area. Visitors will have cars. There is limited parking on our street.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Suggest including information regarding the parking situation and potential parking areas adjacent to the project on their website or business plan for the hotel as part of the condition of approval.

> It's a great building, so I would like to see this move forward.

> This is a wonderful project. It's very petite' it's not large. I did see a lot of coming and going with the laundromat. I can't help but think that there will be a lot less activity. This would be a project in order to encourage reuse of such properties that would have tipped into a range where the parking requirement would have been reduced or eliminated anyway. I think this is a great developer, sounds like a really responsible owner, and they can find a way to make this work. It's absolutely fabulous; I'm very excited. It has been a laundromat for its entire life. I looked it up, it was built as a laundry place for washing and drying and it's very, very cool. So thank you for your submission and all the explanations.

> I grew up on Paloma Avenue so I would walk by this daily picking my mom up at the train station when I was a little girl. I think this is ingenious; the idea of doing a little boutique hotel here is great. We always see flight attendants with their suitcases going down Broadway and they're all walking around. What better place to have it where it can regenerate and reinvigorate the Broadway area and have people coming and going. Most of these flight attendants take Uber or taxis to where they're going so they don't really have cars and if they live here, they have their own car. This is great and I applaud the applicant for doing this.

> Just as a matter of discussion, I would like to add that as previously said, I lived on that street and the flight attendants do park on those streets because I have seen them. So, I would encourage the neighbors to do something that has been done in other neighborhoods around and that is to approach the city about residential parking permits. It would help ease some of that pressure because the people that work on Broadway also like to park down the side streets. There have been a number of times I would come home near the middle of the day and have to park a block away from my own house because there's no room. Those are steps that may need to be taken by the neighbors, but I would support this project.

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> that the hotel operator shall include on the website information regarding available public parking lots in the vicinity.

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

Absent: 1 - Horan

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 713 Howard Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permits for first and second story plate heights and second story balcony for a new, two story single-unit dwelling and detached garage. (Audrey Tse, Insite Design Inc, applicant and architect; Kevin and Christine Chung, property owners) (98 noticed) Staff Contact: Fazia Ali

Attachments: [713 Howard Ave - Staff Report](#)
[713 Howard Ave - Attachments](#)
[713 Howard Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Audrey Tse, 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:

> *On the second floor at the rear of the house, consider continuing the same roof form all the way across instead of the gable roof.*

> *I share the same concern on the rear elevation, otherwise the materials worked pretty well. All the façades were pretty well broken up. It doesn't feel like it is an overly tall house that it is out of proportion. So, I don't have a lot of concern for the request for the height. Overall, it looks like a good project and can find support for it.*

> *I agree with my fellow commissioner regarding the roof line at the rear of the house. Please provide a 3D rendering so we can really see what that roof line looks like.*

> *On the landscape plan, there were no specifications on the three Japanese maple trees. It would be preferable and would look better to have a maple tree that is a decent height rather than a 5' maple tree. It is a nice looking project. I don't have an issue with the height so much because the spaces are broken down nicely. It would be great if you could look at the roof issue at the rear of the house, there could be a better solution for it.*

> *I have some concerns about the plate heights, especially in the application, the applicant mentioned that there are a number of two-story homes in the area. There are but there is not a preponderance of those. Also, the houses on either side are both single-story homes. I'm worried that this house will really stick out and dwarf those smaller homes on either side. A 9' plate height on a house of this scale is still in keeping with the architecture that is being proposed. For an 8' ceiling on the second floor, most people would coffer the ceiling to get a little bit of height, if you need to. I am not sold on the Special Permit for the higher plate heights mainly because of the scale of the other houses in the neighborhood. This house will be about 9" below the maximum allowable ridge height; it will appear too big. Anything we can do to bring it down will enhance the design and will be better for the neighborhood. The design is nice but I don't know that I can support the Special Permit.*

Commissioner Schmid made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lowenthal, 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: 5 - Comaroto, Gaul, Lowenthal, Pfaff, and Schmid

Absent: 2 - Horan, and Tse

- b. 2229 Adeline Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for Declining Height Envelope for a two and half story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Tim Raduenz, Form+One, applicant and designer; Cameron and Shannon Foster, property owners) (104 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [2229 Adeline Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2229 Adeline Dr - Attachments](#)
[2229 Adeline Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Lowenthal was recused from this item as he lives within 500' from this property. Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

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

Public Comments:

> Public comment via email from George Heeren: I live directly behind this proposed addition. This gives my wife and I little to no privacy in our backyard. It also can make our property lose value if we decide to sell. I am in my 80's with some health conditions. The Foster's sent a letter saying this will be a small rear addition. This does not seem small as stated, I have looked at the blueprints. How long will it take to complete?

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I like the project. I agree that the rear elevation becomes a little bit more cohesive. I like the fact that windows were added. Suggest that the applicant reach out to their neighbors at the rear. There's an opportunity for landscape screening to try and help with the privacy issue. In reality, the rear elevation is already two stories with windows on the second story, so this doesn't make it any worse, it's just a little closer. This is a good looking project.

> I concur with my fellow commissioner. It is really well done; it looks great and holds together nicely. I would also suggest revisiting the landscape, without ruining the existing, to fill in what could be lacking.

> I too appreciate the design that has been developed, even the little details, such as the trim detail on the front elevation being carried over to the right elevation. I like the improvements to the rear elevation. Overall, this is a nicely pulled together project. I also appreciate that we are retaining a nicely designed home, generally in its original state, and improving upon that rather than tearing something down and starting from scratch.

> I too can support the project; it blends in very well. I can support the Special Permit for declining height envelope because part of the house already extends beyond the declining height envelope. I don't find it obtrusive or overbearing on the neighbors. I would encourage the applicant to speak with the neighbors behind them to see if you can add a little bit more landscaping or something that would appease their concerns.

Chair Gaul made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, 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: 5 - Comaroto, Gaul, Pfaff, Schmid, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Horan

Recused: 1 - Lowenthal

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- a. 2758 Summit Drive, zoned R-1 - FYI for revisions to a previously approved Design Review project for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling.

Attachments: [2758 Summit Dr - FYI](#)
[2758 Summit Dr - FYI Attachments](#)
[2758 Summit Dr - FYI Plans](#)

Pulled for further discussion. Commissioner noted the following concerns:

- > *Asked for the landscaping plan along the right side of the house to be further developed; concerned that only one, 15-gallon tree is proposed. Would like to see it developed further.*

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Notice: Any individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Ruben Hurin, Planning Manager, by 10:00 a.m. on Monday, July 11, 2022 at rhurin@burlingame.org or (650) 558-7256. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment.

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

An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on July 11, 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 July 21, 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 \$745.00, which includes noticing costs.