



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, November 13, 2023

7:00 PM

Council Chambers/Online

- a. 36 Bloomfield Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for second story balcony for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling. (Azadeh Masrour, AMS Design LLP, applicant and designer; Nasim Novin, property owner) (59 noticed) Staff Contact: Brittany Xiao

Attachments: [36 Bloomfield Rd - Staff Report](#)

[36 Bloomfield Rd - Attachments](#)

[36 Bloomfield Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Pfaff was recused from this item because she lives within 500 feet of the subject property. Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Acting Chair Lowenthal opened the public hearing.

Nasim Novin, property owner and Azadeh Masrour, designer, represented the applicant and answered questions regarding the application.

Public Comments:

> Juergen Pfaff, 615 Bayswater Avenue: I am a neighbor and I have looked at the plans. There is a 36-inch redwood tree shown on the plans that is on our property. The layout and the placement of the plans look really good; I like it. But I do see that some areas of excavation will potentially affect the trees. In addition to the redwood trees, there are also three mature podocarpus trees on the property. We would like to request that the contractor to be careful and mindful of any tree roots, particularly with the big redwood tree, so that the health and stability of the tree remains intact.

Acting Chair Lowenthal closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I am struggling with the overall design. The windows are not holding together for me as far as their layout and sizes. The window at the front is not a bedroom window, it feels weird to me. Please provide the window details. Typically, we get section details so we can understand how they work.

> I am concerned with the open plan. I love open plans, however I am not seeing where the posts will be in place of the removed walls to support the second floor. I am concerned that before you get too far along you find out that the posts to support the second floor will get in the way of what you have designed.

> I do not see a good reason for the Special Permit for the plate height. We have these height limits so that the houses that are small in proportion don't get tall in proportion. Some of the good reasons for this Special Permit is if you are in a flood zone and you must raise the floor height. I do not see an extraordinary reason why you should be raising the plate height in this case. This needs to have some more design work and I'd like to hear from my fellow commissioners on that.

> I am struggling with what style the house wants to be. I initially thought it wants to be a Spanish style, but now I understand that it is a Mediterranean style design. It needs some additional design elements

that can come into play, especially at the front with the arched window receiving some grid detail. It would be nice to see that applied towards all the windows. Consider having a Mediterranean-style front door. From the roof design, it looks nice, it seemed all pulled together and they make sense. But as I study the elevations, it seems like a lot of details were pared-down to almost none. A Mediterranean style home would be beautiful. Suggests bringing in more decorative elements to reflect that style. The window trims could help. The sill and apron look a bit over extended and some detail could be applied there. Overall, this could be a good candidate for a design review consultant to help pull together the Mediterranean style out of the home. The floor plans work okay. It is about making the exterior come together and be the style that the homeowner would like to have.

> I also don't see the justification for the Special Permit for the plate height increase. The nine-foot plate height should be a sufficient ceiling height; could use up some of the attic space to create extra volume in some areas as applicable. As my fellow commissioner shared, there is a reason why the city has changed the maximum plate height to 9'-0" on the first floor and 8'-0" on the second floor.

> I tend to agree with my fellow commissioners. A design review consultant may be good for this project. Looking at the adjacent properties, the plate height increase would create a substantial visual appearance especially on the one to the left. The one on the right is newer construction, but I don't think that one has a raised plate height above our standards. This one will look out of place in my opinion. The overall design of the house is fine, but there are many details that are lacking. As a builder, I agree with my fellow commissioner that it will be expensive to create that open space. Consider consulting with a structural engineer prior to moving forward so you get an idea of costs, because there is a huge difference between running a 30-foot beam and a 15-foot beam.

> For the public comment regarding the tree, the city usually recommends using a certified arborist to provide a good tree protection plan. That will make sure that any excavation that is happening within the root zone of the tree is not harmed.

> I generally agree with my fellow commissioners. I do like the design of the house; it is very pleasing. Based off the layout of the house, originally this home is more Spanish Revival or Mediterranean Revival and it appears that over time the roof was replaced with asphalt tiles. It is nice to see the design inspiration go back that way. To me, it looks more Spanish Revival than Mediterranean Revival. The styles are very close, and they borrow a lot from each other.

> If the applicant wants to go for Mediterranean Revival, there are a couple of small things they can do to really accentuate that. They are already leaning towards that style with the device over the small gable at the covered walkway, that appears to be recessed stucco. That covered walkway is a great opportunity to put in an arch, both on the street-facing side and the interior-facing side towards the driveway. With those openings arched, referencing the arched windows, that will go a long way. Having lots of small details is the hallmark of this architectural style. Currently, the primary gable facing the street is an open gable end and has been changed into a hip roof. If you were to leave that open, you might be able to take the window that you have and bump it by three feet. This solves some issues with privacy and still retains a very prominent large window at the front which is a hallmark of this architectural style. The knee braces are okay but are not something you normally see with Spanish, Mediterranean and Mission architectural styles. However, there is an opportunity depending on if there are looking for a more elaborate or rustic design, because there are a different way you can take the style. If you wanted to go rustic, you can open the eaves and have exposed rafter tails. If you want to keep it on the slightly elaborate side, you can keep them closed. Also, with the stucco above the gable end on the entry way and other places that is a focal point can be a good place to put in some kind of simple tile mosaic accent. It is also something you see on older versions of the architectural style all the time. It is a great way to add a little bit of color to the façade, otherwise it is just white stucco. It is a good design. I like where it is going and it has a lot of opportunities for small improvements.

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

Aye: 5 - Horan, Lowenthal, Schmid, Shores, and Tse

Absent: 1 - Comaroto

Recused: 1 - Pfaff

Design Review Memo City of Burlingame

Date: February 13, 2024

Planning Commission
City of Burlingame
501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA 94010

Re: 36 Bloomfield Rd.
Designer: AMS Design

Planner: Brittany Xiao

I have received and reviewed the plans reviewed by the Planning Commission for 36 Bloomfield Rd.. I listened to the Planning Commission's comments in the meeting video. I met with the Designer, owner, and Planner at City Hall to discuss the Planning Commission's comments. Per our suggestions, the Designer made revisions and we then reviewed two interim designs resulting in this final version. Following is a comparison between the original design, and the current design.

Revisions to original design:

Floor Plans:

The primary bedroom suite was flipped (mirrored). The front porch was reduced in length.

Front elevation:

- The front porch is pushed back and includes an arched opening.
- The windows have been reproportioned and moved into alignment between floors.
- Grid patterns have been added to the windows.
- The roof eaves have been changed to exposed stained rafter tails with T&G on the underside.
- The plate heights have been reduced from 9'-6"/8'-6" to 9'/8'.

Right elevation:

- Grid patterns have been added to the windows.
- The roof eaves have been changed to exposed stained rafter tails with T&G on the underside.
- The plate heights have been reduced from 9'-6"/8'-6" to 9'/8'.

Rear elevation:

- The Primary suite is flipped such that the balcony aligns with the family room doors below.
- Grid patterns have been added to the windows.
- The roof eaves have been changed to exposed stained rafter tails with T&G on the underside.
- The plate heights have been reduced from 9'-6"/8'-6" to 9'/8'.

Left elevation:

- Grid patterns have been added to the windows.
- The roof eaves have been changed to exposed stained rafter tails with T&G on the underside.
- The plate heights have been reduced from 9'-6"/8'-6" to 9'/8'.

DESIGN GUIDELINES:

1. Consistency with any applicable design guidelines.

The proposal appears to be in conformance with the design guidelines; break-up of the massing, materials consistent with the neighbors, etc...

2. Compatibility of the architectural style with that of the existing character of the neighborhood.

There are a variety of houses on this block. The style of this house is similar to many in this neighborhood and the proposed design should be compatible. The massing is respectful of the neighboring properties.

3. Respect for Parking and Garage Patterns in the Neighborhood

The proposed ADU negates the need for garage parking, however, the driveway and detached accessory structure (ADU) are consistent with the neighborhood.

4. Architectural style and consistency and mass & bulk of structures, including accessory structures:

The revisions made to the initial proposal have improved the architectural style of the project. The mass and bulk of the main house, plus the detached ADU, is consistent with the site and context.

5. Interface of the proposed structure with the adjacent structures to each side:

The proposed house will interface reasonably well with its neighbors, similar to others in the area. The new second floor is set back from the sides of the house and fits within the daylight envelope without the use of exceptions or special permits.

6. Landscaping and its proportion to the mass and bulk of structural components:

We believe that the proposed landscape plan will complement the project and enhance the neighborhood. Landscape design was not discussed at the Planning Commission meeting.

7. In the case of an addition, compatibility with the architectural style and character of the existing structure as remodeled.

This project includes a second floor addition, however, it is also a complete style change. The resulting project is consistent in style overall.

SUMMARY

The project has been improved a lot since we initially saw it. Using the Planning Commission's comments as a jumping off point, I think the design has come a long way and will fit into the neighborhood well. The alignments of windows and massing, along with the addition of window grids and improved eave details pull things together. The updated 3D renderings that we saw did not depict the revised eave detail but were informed that this had to do with the modeling program. The project will really benefit from the new eave detail as discussed but not fully reflected in the plans we have. We had discussed using 3x tails and T&G at the exposed underside of the overhang. With all that said, I can support this project.

Sincerely

Randy Grange, AIA LEED AP



4010 Moorpark Ave. #101,
San Jose CA 95117
Phone: 415.254.1606
azadeh@AMSDesignllp.com

Response Letter to Correction List

Date: Feb 2024
Subject: Response to planning commission Comments of "36 Bloomfield Rd. (Main House)"
Provided by: AMS Design (Azadeh Masrour.)

- . The plate heights have been reduced from 9'6" to 9' for 1st floor and 2nd floor from 8'6" to 8'.
- . Window has been resized and aligned between floors, also it is going 1 foot inside, so we have 2 shelves inside the room and decrease the mass of the windows in the front.
- . Regarding the open space in the family room, we talked about it with structure engineer, and we need to have a steel beam there that owner acknowledged about it and try to be cost effective.
- . We get a consulting from arborist to protect the tree during the construction.
- . Grid patterns have been added to the windows.
- . The roof eaves have been changed to exposed stained rafter tails.

(End of Responses)



Project Application - Planning Division

Type of Application: ☐ Accessory Dwelling Unit ☐ Conditional Use/Minor Use Permit
☒ Design Review ☐ Hillside Area Construction Permit ☐ Minor Modification
☐ Special Permit ☐ Variance ☐ Other

Project Address: 36 BLOOMFIELD RD. BURLINGAME, CA **Assessor's Parcel #:** 029293260 **Zoning:** R1

Project Description:

-ADDITION AND REMODELING AT REAR SIDE OF THE HOUSE TO HAVE A NEW LARG KITCHEN FAMILY.
-ADDITION AT FRONT SIDE OF THE HOUSE TO HAVE A NEW ENTRY INCLUDING POWDER AND CLOSET AND CONVERT THE LIVING ROOM TO OFFICE
-BUILD A NEW 2ND STORY TO HAVE MASTER BEDROOM INCLUDING MASTER BATH AND WALK-IN CLOSET, TWO BEDROOMS, BATHROOM, AND LAUNDRY.

Applicant

Name: Azadeh Masrour

Address: 4010 MOORPARK AVE#101, SAN JOSE, CA 95117

Phone: (415) 254-1606

E-mail: AZADEH@AMSDESIGNLLP.COM

Property Owner

Name: NASIM NOVIN& Ali Daneshjo

Address: 36 BLOOMFIELD RD. BURLINGAME, CA

Phone: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Architect/Designer

Name: Azadeh Masrour

Address: 4010 MOORPARK AVE#101, SAN JOSE, CA 95117

Phone: (415) 254-1606

E-mail: AZADEH@AMSDESIGNLLP.COM

Authorization to Reproduce Project Plans:

I hereby grant the City of Burlingame the authority to post plans submitted with this application on the City's website as part of the Planning approval process and waive any claims against the City arising out of or related to such action.

____ (Initials of Architect/Designer)

Burlingame Business License #: _____ * Architect/Designer must have a valid Burlingame Business License.

Applicant: I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the information given herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Applicant's signature: _____ **Date:** 3/29/23

Property Owner: I am aware of the proposed application and hereby authorize the above applicant to submit this application to the Planning Division.

Property owner's signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Date Application Received (staff only): _____



City of Burlingame

Special Permit Application (R-1 and R-2)

The Planning Commission is required by law to make findings as defined by the City's Ordinance (Chapter 25.78). Your answers to the following questions can assist the Planning Commission in making the decision as to whether the findings can be made for your request. Refer to the end of this form for assistance with these questions.

- 1. Explain why the blend of mass, scale and dominant structural characteristics of the new construction or addition are consistent with the existing structure's design and with the existing street and neighborhood.**

According to owner requirement and several 2 story houses on the street, we added second story to this project which blends well with the adjacent homes within the neighborhood. There are a wide variety of houses on the street (in terms of style, mass and scale). The mass of the second floor is staged over the middle and rear of the structure. This helps blend the house on this block, to be in harmony with the one story houses of the neighborhood at the street view.

- 2. Explain how the variety of roof line, facade, exterior finish materials and elevations of the proposed new structure or addition are consistent with the existing structure, street and neighborhood.**

The proposed style of the addition and new structure is consistent with the existing building and blends well with the surrounding homes. The roof is one of the most important identifying elements for the house and can define the character of the building, for this project, combination of hip and gable roofs helps the facade to be in consistent of the neighborhood. The use of wood brackets, stucco for walls and front entry porch and column are in consistent with the neighborhood style and character.

- 3. How will the proposed project be consistent with the residential design guidelines adopted by the City?**

The proposed project is consistent with the city design review guidelines, and complies with all zoning requirements, except for the plate heights on the first and second floor and another for the 2nd floor balcony which requires a special permit.

- 4. Explain how the removal of any trees located within the footprint of any new structure or addition is necessary and is consistent with the City's reforestation requirements. What mitigation is proposed for the removal of any trees? Explain why this mitigation is appropriate.**

No trees are to be removed from the existing landscaping.

1. Explain why the blend of mass, scale and dominant structural characteristics of the new construction or addition are consistent with the existing structure's design and with the existing street and neighborhood.

How will the proposed structure or addition affect neighboring properties or structures on those properties? If neighboring properties will not be affected, state why. Compare the proposed addition to the mass, scale and characteristics of neighboring properties. Think about mass and bulk, landscaping, sunlight/shade, views from neighboring properties. Neighboring properties and structures include those to the right, left, rear and across the street.

How does the proposed structure compare to neighboring structures in terms of mass or bulk? If there is no change to the structure, say so. If a new structure is proposed, compare its size, appearance, orientation etc. with other structures in the neighborhood or area.

2. Explain how the variety of roof line, facade, exterior finish materials and elevations of the proposed new structure or addition are consistent with the existing structure, street and neighborhood.

How does the proposed structure or use compare aesthetically with structures or uses in the existing neighborhood? If it does not affect aesthetics, state why. Was the addition designed to match existing architecture and/or pattern of development on adjacent properties in the neighborhood? Explain why your proposal fits in the neighborhood.

How will the structure or addition change the character of the neighborhood? Think of character as the image or tone established by size, density of development and general pattern of land use. If you don't feel the character of the neighborhood will change, state why.

3. How will the proposed project be consistent with the residential design guidelines adopted by the City?

Following are the design criteria adopted by the City Council for residential design review. How does your project meet these guidelines?

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.

4. Explain how the removal of any trees located within the footprint of any new structure or addition is necessary and is consistent with the city's reforestation requirements. What mitigation is proposed for the removal of any trees? Explain why this mitigation is appropriate.

Will any trees be removed as a result of this proposal? If so, explain what type of trees will be removed and if any are protected under city ordinance (C.S. 11.06), why it is necessary to remove the trees, and what is being proposed to replace any trees being removed. If no trees are to be removed, say so.

RESOLUTION APPROVING CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION AND DESIGN REVIEW

RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame that:

WHEREAS, a Categorical Exemption has been prepared and application has been made for Design Review and Special Permit for a second story balcony for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling at 36 Bloomfield Rd, zoned R-1, Nasim Novin and Ali Daneshjo, property owners, APN: 029-293-260;

WHEREAS, said matters were heard by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on March 11, 2024, at which time it reviewed and considered the staff report and all other written materials and testimony presented at said hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is RESOLVED and DETERMINED by this Planning Commission that:

1. On the basis of the Initial Study and the documents submitted and reviewed, and comments received and addressed by this Commission, it is hereby found that there is no substantial evidence that the project set forth above will have a significant effect on the environment, and categorical exemption, per Section 15303 (a), which states that construction of a limited number of new, small facilities or structures including one single family residence or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone is exempt from environmental review. In urbanized areas, up to three single-family residences maybe constructed or converted under this exemption, is hereby approved.
2. Said Design Review is approved subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto. Findings for such Design Review are set forth in the staff report, minutes, and recording of said meeting.
3. It is further directed that a certified copy of this resolution be recorded in the official records of the County of San Mateo.

Chairperson

I, _____, Secretary of the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 11th day of March, 2024 by the following vote:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption, Design Review, and Special Permit

36 Bloomfield Road

Effective **March 21, 2024**

Page 1

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped March 1, 2024, sheets A-00.01 through A-00.02, sheets C-1 through C-5, sheets L-1 through L-5, sheets RA-01.01 through RA-02.02, sheets A-01.01 through A-04.02, and site survey;
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 for 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, in effect at time of building permit submittal, as amended by the City of Burlingame;

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption, Design Review, and Special Permit

36 Bloomfield Road

Effective **March 21, 2024**

Page 2

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 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;
11. that prior to scheduling the foundation inspection, a licensed surveyor shall locate the property corners, set the building footprint and certify the first-floor elevation of the new structure(s) based on the elevation at the top of the form boards per the approved plans; this survey shall be accepted by the City Engineer;
12. 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;
13. 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
14. 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.



CITY OF BURLINGAME
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010
PH: (650) 558-7250
www.burlingame.org

Project Site: 36 Bloomfield Road, zoned R-1

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following public hearing **on Monday, March 11, 2024 at 7:00 P.M.** You may attend the meeting in person at City Hall (501 Primrose Rd) or virtually via Zoom at www.zoom.us/join or by dialing 1-669-444-9171. For Zoom meeting access information, visit www.burlingame.org/pcmeetings.

Description: Application for Design Review and Special Permit for a second story balcony for a first and second story addition to an existing single-unit dwelling.

Members of the public may speak in person at the meeting or provide comments by email to publiccomment@burlingame.org.

Mailed: March 1, 2024

(Please refer to other side)

**PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE**

City of Burlingame - Public Hearing Notice

If you have any questions about this application or would like to schedule an appointment to view a hard copy of the application and plans, please send an email to planningdept@burlingame.org or call (650) 558-7250.

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, should contact the Planning Division at planningdept@burlingame.org or (650) 558-7250 by 10 am on the day of the meeting.

If you challenge the subject application(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in the notice or in written correspondence delivered to the city at or prior to the public hearing.

Property owners who receive this notice are responsible for informing their tenants about this notice.

Kevin Gardiner, AICP
Community Development Director

(Please refer to other side)

36 Bloomfield Road
300' noticing
APN: 029.293.260

