



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, January 14, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin and Senior Planner Erika Lewit.*

### 2. ROLL CALL

*Commissioner Tse arrived at 7:02 p.m.*

**Present** 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Terrones, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to approve the minutes with amendments submitted to staff earlier. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, and Terrones

**Absent:** 3 - Kelly, Gaul, and Tse

#### a. Draft November 26, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft November 26, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

> *Item 8a - Consideration of an Ordinance Adopting Residential Impact Fees for New Residential Development has been continued to the January 28, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.*

> *Item 8e - 1268 Cortez Avenue has been continued at the request of the applicant. Public hearing notices will be sent once the application has been scheduled on a future agenda.*

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

*There were no public comments.*

### 6. STUDY ITEMS

*There were no Study Items.*

### 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

*There were no Consent Calendar Items.*

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. Consideration of an Ordinance Adopting Residential Impact Fees for New Residential Development

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[Exhibit A - Residential Impact Fees Chapter 25.82](#)

[Seifel Consulting Report](#)

[Proposed Resolution - Residential Impact Fees](#)

[Proposed Resolution - Prevailing Wages](#)

[Public Notice](#)

> *Item 8a - Consideration of an Ordinance Adopting Residential Impact Fees for New Residential Development has been continued to the January 28, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting.*

- b. 1101 Rosedale Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Parking Variance to legalize an uncovered parking space within the front setback that does not lead to a garage or carport. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Martin Miller, applicant, property owner, and designer) (92 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1101 Rosedale Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1101 Rosedale Ave - Attachments](#)

[1101 Rosedale Ave - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Martin Miller, property owner, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

*There were no questions for the applicant.*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

> *Think changes are for the better. Asked applicant to reconsider their Variance application and they've done so.*

- > Legalizing the parking that is already existing.
- > There are extraordinary circumstances that the applicant pointed out, including that the lot has three street frontages.
- > Parking will not be detrimental to the neighborhood and is consistent with the parking pattern in the neighborhood.
- > This is a unique lot, can make findings for the Variance.

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

**Aye:** 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

- c. 800 Winchester Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit to attach a new garage to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Mike Amini, Craftsmen's Guild, applicant and designer; Neel and Adrienne Patel, property owners) (113 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** 800 Winchester Dr - Staff Report  
800 Winchester Dr - Attachments  
800 Winchester Dr - Plans

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Mike Amini, project designer, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > Looks like there is a big roof cricket that will be required, hidden in the middle of the roof, is that right? (Amini: Yes, there will be a cricket to bring the water to the downspout.)
- > There appears to be water flowing into the backside of the gable at the face of the garage, how does the water get out? (Amini: Yes, there is a valley at the gable.)
- > Don't see the pitches for the proposed roof. On Rear Elevation, there appears to be a pitched section at the top. May be an error on the plans. (Amini: This is an error on the plans.)
- > Suggest visiting some of the other houses in the neighborhood to see how the garage roofs are handled. (Amini: Have looked at other houses in neighborhood.)

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Being asked to consider a Special Permit for attached garage. There is a preponderance of attached garages, so there is support for a Special Permit.*
- > *It appears that the addition has rear ended the house and is not gracefully attached.*
- > *There is a lack of a unified roof. The major wall size, the side wall of the rear of the addition, is the widest portion of the house. Should look at starting with a hip structure there, with the front of the house coming off of that; it would be more unified and simpler roof form.*
- > *As proposed now, will have a cricket up against another cricket and water won't be able to drain out. Confident that it will get resolved in the field, but should be resolved on plans now so it doesn't need to come back for our review later.*
- > *This is a good candidate for a design review consultant.*
- > *Addition is not very well integrated into the existing house, has a lot to do with the roof.*
- > *What's making it hard to integrate is the attempt maintain as much of the existing roof as possible.*
- > *Would be helpful to use consistent hatching for roofing on building elevations.*

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

**Aye:** 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

- d. 2683 Summit Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review Amendment to change the roofing material of a previously approved Design Review project for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (TRG Architects +Interior Design, Samaneh Nili, applicant and designer; Sunil and Katherine Koshie, property owners) (77 noticed) Staff Contact: Sonal Aggarwal

**Attachments:** [2683 Summit Dr - Staff Report](#)

[2683 Summit Dr - Attachments](#)

[2683 Summit Dr - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Randy Grange, project architect, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

*There were no questions for the applicant.*

*Public Comments:*

*Resident at 2667 Summit Drive (name not provided): New second story blocks our view of the airport. Not here to argue the approved project, but want to make sure there are no additional changes being proposed to the project that would affect views. (Hurin: Clarified that with this application, there are no changes to the height, massing or width of the house, just the roofing material.)*

*Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Can't support the request to change the roofing material. Don't believe standing seam metal roofs are appropriate for Burlingame. This is not a seaside, farming or rural community.*
- > *Don't think the argument that you can't see the roof is a good one, we review a lot of things that aren't visible.*
- > *Urge staff and Commission to discuss this issue in the future.*
- > *Concerned that we're seeing metal roofs in more projects.*
- > *Disagree that it won't be visible from the street, could see the roof when visited the site.*
- > *Can support it, think it is an appropriate look for this architecture and it's something we've approved before. Think it fits in the neighborhood.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto reopened the public hearing.*

- > *Why are you proposing to change the roofing material? (Grange: Proposed metal roof has one-inch seams, it's very subtle. Think the metal roof is so much nicer than the asphalt shingles made from a petroleum product. It lasts longer, is recyclable, and makes it easy to install solar panels. It's crisp and clean look.)*
- > *Not about what we like and don't like, but determining whether it fits the guidelines and pattern of the community. Don't think they belong in Burlingame. (Grange: Using one-inch seam, so it's not clunky looking. Don't see how it doesn't fit in. See this as similar to when roofing changed from wood shake to asphalt shingle.)*

*Sunil Koshie, subject property owner: When began working with the architect years ago, did contemplate using a metal roof. At that time, budget was a concern, so decided not to proceed with a metal roof to save costs. However, as we continued to work on the project with the architect, he convinced us that this would be one area to spend extra upfront and look into other areas where we could save. Would like to install solar panels in the future, metal roof provides benefits for installation and looks cleaner.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the application.**

**Comment on the motion:**

- > **Concern is whether or not the project starts to look too commercial. When we've approved metal roofs or have reviewed any other materials, it's based on whether or not the application is done in an appropriately residential fashion. Think the application is consistent with the residential application.**
- > **City Council has debated, on behalf of community and for us, where it's appropriate to have more contemporary designs.**
- > **Architecture previously approved fits this neighborhood. Metal roof for this particular project fits the architecture and therefore is supportable.**
- > **Like metal roofs, have had plenty of discussions about metal roofs in different neighborhoods. Have seen metal roofs scattered throughout several neighborhoods.**
- > **Concerned that once we start approving them, when do we say one project be approved with metal roof and another one can't.**
- > **Feel that Burlingame Hills is an area that can support modern architecture.**
- > **When assessing appropriateness of metal roofs to the house, style of house had a lot to do with it. This style can support a metal roof.**
- > **Preponderance of composition shingle and clay tile roofs in neighborhood made me question whether or not it is appropriate, even though the design warrants it.**

- > Because house is located uphill rather than looking down on an entire roof, helps solidify decision that this is the right roofing material.
- > There are cases where a metal roof may not be approved where it's been allowed elsewhere. It's not a matter of preference, but whether or not it fits a given context of a project. That is the criteria we use throughout the design guidelines.
- > Worried that there will be metal roofs everywhere, it would significantly change character of the City.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Nay:** 1 - Loftis

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

- e. 1268 Cortez Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a project that was previously Denied Without Prejudice for a new, two-story single family dwelling and Special Permit for an 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. (Eric Nyhus, applicant and architect; GLAD Trust, property owner) (103 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

**Attachments:** [1268 Cortez Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[1268 Cortez Ave - Attachments](#)  
[1268 Cortez Ave - Plans](#)

> Item 8e - 1268 Cortez Avenue has been continued at the request of the applicant. Public hearing notices will be sent once the application has been scheduled on a future agenda.

- f. 1245 Cabrillo Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review for changes to a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling and new 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. (Eric and Jennifer Lai, applicants and property owners; Chu Design Associates Inc., designer) (113 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

**Attachments:** [1245 Cabrillo Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[1245 Cabrillo Ave - Attachments](#)  
[1245 Cabrillo Ave - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*James Chu, project designer, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

> There were no questions for the applicant.

*Public Comments:*

*Frank and Robin Knifsend, 1243 Cabrillo Avenue: Thanked designer and owners for changes made to the project, they are improvements to the plan. This house, with a tall foundation and sloping lot, has a lot of mass from our perspective. Noted a number of items that we hope would be considered as additional changes before design is approved. Have brought down the plate height by 10 to 11 inches, but concerned about almost three foot extension at rear of house. Doesn't seem like a lot, but it's the last open area without a structure along property line. Also concerned with gable dormer along left side of house, seems a lot bigger, there isn't much of a roof below the dormer to help minimize the wall of gable. In addition, window is much bigger, which is the reason for the large well. Would like to see window size reduced from 5'-6" to 4'-0" tall, allowing for more roof in front of wall to reduce its mass. Some windows on first floor are still five feet tall, seems to scale well on plans, but one doesn't realize how big this house is. At point of gable, finished floor of house is five feet off ground and house is almost 30 feet tall. Still feel there could be a few more changes that would improve the design, without significantly changing the overall design. Would hope that before final approval of the project, the surveyor would also shoot the plate heights in addition to the roof peak, because we still don't have trust in the design, nor in the communication between the designer and contractor. Would have liked more articulation along left side of house.*

*Chu: Based on feedback provided on the original design, shifted second floor dormer to not align with the neighbor's window. Working with landscape architect to revise landscape plan. There is a chance that the existing birch tree, located at rear of house, may need to be removed; it's not a very attractive tree and is tilting to one side. Will replace with a better tree. Also thought about providing additional privacy screening along left side of house, particularly in front of the kitchen and bedroom #1 windows. Trying to work very hard to satisfy neighbors' concerns.*

*Melissa Macko, neighbor: Understand that creek is not a part of the Planning Commission's purview. However, as a neighbor that is located down creek from this site, concerned that there is no plan to address creek stabilization along this property. Creek flooded two years ago. There is nothing but dirt behind this lot. If we have another storm like we did two years ago, it will be a disaster. Would encourage someone to look at the situation and stabilization of the creek, needs to be someone more like an engineer to address stabilization of creek. Wanted this to be noted because it is a concern of the neighbors.*

*Sally Brown, neighbor: Live in house across creek from project site. Very concerned about the creek and agree with comments from previous speaker. Planting will not be sufficient to stabilize creek. Our house and house to right is only area with a natural creek bank that is not culverted. Creek has been eroding naturally for last couple of years. Feel that bank along subject property will end up in creek if stabilized only by vegetation. Is a really big concern for us.*

*Chu: Concur with concerns expressed by neighbors. Landscape architect is working with Building Division to protect creek. Solution recommended by the Building Division is to plant specific groundcover to stabilize creek, also have erosion control in place.*

> *What is sill height in gable along left hand side in Bedroom #3? Is there a reason why sill height is pushed down so low in this bedroom? (Chu: Approximately 14-16 inches because window needs to meet egress requirements.)*

> *What is the minimum size required for an egress window? (Chu: Clear opening has to be a certain size.)*

> *Have never seen a bedroom window with a 6'-8" header that has a sill that low. (Chu: Reason for size is because window is double-hung. Could meet egress requirements with smaller casement window.)*

- > May have a problem with window as proposed, will not be able to open window all the way if sill height is 18 inches, is a safety issue. (Chu: Understand that this requirement only applies to windows facing the street.)
- > Would you consider changing the window to a casement window and still keep the same grid profile? (Chu: Yes, can consider it.)
- > Required sill height for an egress window is higher than 18 inches, so the sill height could come up.
- > Window looks like it fits the house, but it is a very large window. Should consider making this window smaller.

Philip Ross, 1248 Drake Avenue: Concerned about the way the contractor has treated protection of the creek bank. There has been significant erosion in the last month to the point where there is no soil under the existing fence. Contractor has done bizarre things on site, took live power line across creek, wrapped it around our oak tree and tied it to our metal fence. Would like to see inspectors visit the site more regularly.

Steve Macko, 1257 Cabrillo Avenue: Have built adjacent to and over the creek on their house, aware of requirements regarding building in and around the creek and the care you have to take in doing so, have not seen that care on this project. Creek comes down the hill and make a 90-degree turn at the rear of this property. With the force of water flowing through there during a big storm, no amount of groundcover will deter further deterioration of that creek wall. It will require a built structure to the property. Surprised that as owners, they are not more concerned about the safety of the detached garage being built at the rear of the property as the creek bank gives way over time. When the soil erodes under the foundation, the garage will end up in the creek and cause problems for a lot of homeowners up the creek. More investigation needs to be done regarding impact to creek; measures have not been taken to ensure that this is going to be a safe build.

Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion:*

- > Can staff provide a status regarding what work staff is doing with the applicant about protecting the creek? (Hurin: Will forward comments and concerns to the Department of Public Works, Engineering Division, who is working with the applicant regarding creek stabilization. Additional work may be required after the Engineering Division visits the site and determines what appropriate action is required. Appreciate comments and concerns expressed by neighbors.)
- > Very sympathetic to the neighbors, it's a big change compared to what was there before.
- > Applicant has not executed this project well, but has done a lot of work to bring a project that fits into the neighborhood and meets the design guidelines. The revised project is less impactful to the neighbors than the originally approved project.
- > Project has come a long way. There were a number of special considerations asked for initially, but since then have eliminated those by lowering the height and removing encroachments into the side setback.
- > Project design complies with the design guidelines.
- > Project is working with the existing foundation, that is quite tall but typical of the house of this era. Have mitigated that by lowering the plate height and overall height of building.
- > Have done the massing and articulation we see in projects typically approved for design review. Can support project.
- > Changes made along the left side are significant, especially pulling house back to comply with four foot setback requirement.
- > Changes made to windows on upper floor to reduce apparent size of wall are significant, now see more sloped roof and less wall.
- > Concerned about size of window in Bedroom #3, should revisit sill height and window size.
- > Is a well designed project.

**Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the**



application with the following condition:

> that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI for Planning Commission review of the window located in the second floor dormer along the left side of the house, with direction to raise the sill height and reduce the size of the window; could consider a casement window at this location.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

- g. 1020 Toyon Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new two-story single family 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. (Genesis King Hwa LLC, applicant and property owner; Christian Ruffat, designer) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

**Attachments:** [1020 Toyon Dr - Staff Report](#)

[1020 Toyon Dr - Attachments](#)

[1020 Toyon Dr - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Christian Ruffat, project designer, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

> *Design review consultant suggested changing the header above porch columns to wood; is a good way to set off the porch as opposed to continuing the stucco from either side of the header. Curious to know what you thought about that suggestion. (Ruffat: Originally, that was the goal. In detailing the porch, wanted to almost mimic an additional column on the right hand side, so the wood would then run through. But then encountered issues with setbacks and the public utility easement along the rear of the property, so decided not to go that route. Would be open to highlighting the porch with an additional wood header piece.)*

> *Wood header provides good transitional point between the different elements of the house.*

> *Have you picked a specification for the metal roofing? (Ruffat: Yes, it's 29-gauge material with a one-inch seam.)*

> *Appreciate changes made in working with the design review consultant, including lowering the immediate roof and bringing down the overall building height. However, am concerned that it exposed more of the second floor wall and made the second floor look taller. Did you consider lowering the plate height any further? (Ruffat: Proposing an 8'-6" plate height on the second floor; didn't think it was a deal-breaker. Considered making the windows a bit taller.)*

> *Is there a reason for the 8 foot tall door in the detached garage? (Ruffat: Want to accommodate SUVs with roof racks. Garage is crunched into the back corner and is a tight fit, so wanted to maximize it as best as possible given that the garage can't be pushed back any further.)*

> *Are there any wall surfaces on the second floor that are co-planer with the wall surfaces on the first*

floor? It looks like they all step back, is that true? Trying to find a way to marry the lower floor with the upper floor. There is something odd about having a ground floor that is all stucco and an upper floor that is almost all clapboard, especially once the walls are stepped back on all sides. Exacerbates the sense that it's almost wedding cake like. (Ruffat: In my neighborhood in San Mateo for example, there are homes that are 50 plus years old that contain stucco on the first floor and siding on the second floor. In keeping with that vernacular, that was our intention here.)

> Is there a step up from the porch into the house or is the intention that the patio be generally at the same level as the finished floor of the house? (Ruffat: There is a step up from the porch to the finished floor of the house.)

> Is the roof over the bay window in the living room a metal roof? (Ruffat: Yes, that is correct.)

*Public Comments:*

There were no public comments.

Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion:*

> Like the way the massing has come along. Gable and added bay at front provides nice scale to front facade. Also like scale of porch.

> Second floor being stepped back supports a change in material from stucco to wood siding on second floor.

> Bringing down the plate heights has helped to settle the massing.

> Project is supportable with additional detailing at front porch as suggested by the design review consultant.

> Like the direction it's going, but still feel that it is too vertical. This is a neighborhood that's still in transition, with many single-story small houses in the neighborhood. Design guidelines speak a lot about keeping second stories within the roof form. This project feels like it doesn't do that. Taller plate heights make a difference here.

> Garage with an 8 foot door and 9 foot tall plate doesn't fit the pattern of the neighborhood.

> Can't support the project as it is currently proposed.

> Will soon see more massing behind this street with the Summerhill project that is currently under construction.

> Concerned with different siding materials proposed on the first and second floors, gives the feel of a layer on top of a layer.

> Would like to see first and second floors tied together better.

> Can't support project because of concern with the metal roofs being proposed in Burlingame, don't think it is an appropriate roofing material for Burlingame's character.

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to continue the application so that the applicant can address the concerns and suggestions made by the Planning Commission.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, and Tse

**Nay:** 1 - Terrones

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

- h.** 1628 Lassen Way, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review and Variance for Lot Coverage for first and second story addition to an existing single-family 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. (Master SWU Associates, Steve Wu, applicant and designer; Jeff Leung, property owner) (139 noticed)  
Staff contact: Sonal Aggarwal

**Attachments:** [1628 Lassen Way - Staff Report](#)

[1628 Lassen Way - Attachments](#)

[1628 Lassen Way - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*> The current house conforms to lot coverage requirements, correct? (Hurin: Yes, the existing lot coverage is 37.6%.)*

*Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.*

*Steve Wu, project architect, and Jeff Park, property owner, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

*> On front elevation where the roofline above the entry door transitions to the second story above the garage and where the garage roof is, there seems to be something that's not coming through in the drawing or in the rendering. In the perspective views, it looks like the roofline over the porch is above and proud of the upstairs bedroom above the garage; but on the front elevation it shows it tucked behind. Because it's at the entrance of the home, it's important to know how it's intended to be designed. (Wu: It's tucked underneath because we decided not to raise the walls of the garage.)*

*> So if it's tucked underneath, then the front elevation is not drafted correctly. Curious how the roof transitions in that area, it's a little awkward where all of those planes meet. Roof porch may need to be taller; appears that detailing issues still need to be worked out. (Wu: The rendering is correct, detailing still needs to be worked out.)*

*> "Stacked Stone" is called out, this the model for the proposed stone veneer, correct? (Wu: Yes, correct.)*

*> Is there something that would keep the fascia of the garage from aligning with the fascias on the rest of the house or vice versa? Is the lower fascia on the garage deliberate? (Wu: Yes, it is deliberate because there is a step up at the front porch and the garage floor is lower. The roof above the garage will be placed on top of the existing walls.)*

*> Appreciate some of the changes made to the project.*

*> Did you consider lowering the plate height at the addition down from 10 feet? Could still keep volume of interior room and lower the exterior walls a bit. Feels out of proportion with the rest of the house. (Wu: Decided to rebuild the side facing wall so that a Variance wouldn't be required. Rebuilding the wall to 10 feet tall because it is in proportion with the size of the room.)*

*> Front porch is a nice addition. However, am concerned about making the findings for the Lot Coverage Variance. If we weren't able to make the findings for the Variance, how would you handle that? (Wu: We would need to significantly redesign the front of the house.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Project has come a long way, appreciate work that has been done to the project.*
- > *Can't make the findings for the Lot Coverage Variance, there is nothing unique about the lot or configuration of the existing house that would allow me to make the findings.*
- > *Still concerned with 10 foot plate height at the addition at rear of house, doesn't feel in proportion with the rest of the house or with the neighboring houses. It would be easy to reduce the plate height to 9 feet and keep a cathedral ceiling inside, could even add more interest on the interior. Lowering plate height would make it fit in to the neighborhood better.*
- > *Like the front porch, encouraged front porch to resolve some of the material issues that were coming together and to resolve the fact that the front door just seemed to be squeezed in on the front facade, but at no point did we suggest applying for a Variance for a porch. Granted that lot coverage is over by approximately 124 square feet and the porch is about 125 square feet, but at the same time they're adding the front bedroom and bathroom. Additional square footage is not just due to the front porch. Don't see any extraordinary or exceptional conditions in order to grant the Variance.*
- > *Proportions of house have come a long way. Like that the roof forms have been changed to hip roofs, has helped to settle down the second floor.*
- > *Seems like a big mass that ran into the back of the house. You can do 8 foot plates and coffered ceilings, especially when there is no second floor above that area.*
- > *There seems to be plenty of space on the lot to accommodate the lot coverage requirements without having to request a Variance.*
- > *Still not clear as to what is happening at the front porch roof where it connects to the garage and upper floor.*
- > *Can't support 10 foot plate height at addition, consider reducing plate height and adding volume in ceiling within the space.*
- > *Project still needs more work.*
- > *Hip roofs consistently around the house works much better. Do like that changes suggested by the design review consultant have been implemented.*
- > *Something more needs to be done at front porch area.*
- > *Variance application is incorrect in that it states that the existing lot coverage is maxed out at 40%. The existing lot coverage is actually 37.6%, issue needs to be revisited and corrected on the application.*

**Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to continue the item with the direction that the applicant consider the issues that have been raised. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 475 1/2 Rollins Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Front Setback Variance for a new, two-story single family dwelling with a detached garage (Brad Gunkel, Gunkel Architecture, Architect; Amy Chung and Francis Kim, property owners) (99 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

**Attachments:** [475 1/2 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[475 1/2 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)  
[475 1/2 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report.*

*Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.*

- > *Since the City Arborist denied removal of the existing redwood tree, is that discussion over or can the*

Planning Commission comment on removal of the tree? It appears that it still may be open for discussion. (Lewit: City Arborist can consider comments from the Commission. During review of the project and direction provided by the Commission regarding the design of the house, it may be determined that the tree can be retained.)

> Noted that the survey indicates different front, side and rear property lines so the setback lines are inconsistent with the staff report. (Lewit: Survey was completed several years prior to the project being designed and submitted for review. Staff determined required setbacks after project was submitted.)

Acting Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Brad Gunkel, project architect, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Found renderings to be useless because the trees are shown at a certain growth in the future and you can't see the house. (Gunkel: Italian cypress can be purchased at a height shown on the renderings. The Japanese black pines are shown what they may look like in ten years.)

> Would be very easy to look at that area of town and say any architecture would fit in. Not sure that's entirely true.

> What is thinking behind the tall tower at the end near the garage? This element is aggressive in some ways. (Gunkel: Initially, the tower element contained more glass, we scaled it down in coordination with staff and the property owners. It is an entry atrium space, owners wanted a space for a grand piano. Sloped roof in two-story volume also adds articulation rather than having just a flat roof.)

> The arborist report notes recommends a tree protection zone 27 feet out from the main trunk. Site plan shows a tree protection zone of 16 feet from the trunk. (Gunkel: Had subsequent discussions with the City Arborist where he felt there was potential for a smaller protection zone for that tree.)

> Was City Arborist able to quantify that projection zone? (Gunkel: He was even questioning whether we could keep this design and provide a root barrier and preserve the tree as it is.)

> At 16 feet, the family room foundation would be within the dripline. (Gunkel: Owners and neighbors would prefer the tree be removed, so thought it would be a good idea to bring it before the Commission for further consideration.)

> Have what feels like a private road leading to property with symmetrically lined apartment buildings on either side. Did you consider a lower profile elevation at the approach to the house from the driveway? (Gunkel: As you approach the house, you'll first see the fence and the garage, not the house. Owners like the idea of having a two-story atrium at the entry.)

> Pianos should not be placed in direct sun, will get damaged. Placement of piano in atrium will receive direct sun. Was there a consideration to place the atrium on the northern side of the house? (Gunkel: Don't think there will be much direct sun since trees will shade much of the space.)

> Describe the landscape area to right of entry, are they low lying shrubs? (Gunkel: Yes, there will be low lying shrubs and a row of Italian cypress along the property line.)

> Still unclear from arborist regarding what is required to maintain the existing tree and how it would affect the project. Can you explain? (Gunkel: We are unclear as well. Initially, we thought he was okay with removal of the tree, so continued with a design based on the tree being removed. On second review of project, which included a site visit, received comments from the City Arborist questioning whether the tree can be preserved.) (Lewit: Although this is a protected size tree, the City Arborist noted that it is not a significant tree. City Arborist would like to see tree saved, but would also like to hear Commission's opinion regarding redesigning the project to save the tree or allowing the tree to be removed.)

Public Comments:

Ray Jackson, 471 Rollins Road: Single-story duplexes on either side of the driveway, not two-story apartment buildings. Concerned with second floor windows, extending from the floor to the ceiling, and looking into property. Ask that they consider reducing the size of the windows. Everything around us is single-story. Also concerned about size of vegetative screening at planting, will be small.

Shauna Rose, 428 Dwight Road: Don't think the proposed style, with floor to ceiling glass, fits in with the neighborhood and character of Burlingame. Concerned with two-story glass wall. Cypress trees will take years to grow to the height shown on the renderings. Concerned with removal of Redwood tree.

David Young, 424 Dwight Road: House will impact ten residents in houses built in the 1940's. Concerned with the easement to access property, don't see how a fire truck will access house in an emergency. Doesn't fit in with the neighborhood.

Acting Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion:*

- > There is support for the requested setback variance given the unique and extraordinary property in its triangular shape.
- > Appreciate that the applicant worked with staff to determine the required setbacks.
- > Being asked to consider the second floor setback for the front side, which would be required to be 20 feet, as opposed to 15 feet for the ground floor.
- > In terms of land use logic, can see how someone making an argument that this property should only have one front and two sides, and therefore could potentially impact two sides of the triangle. This is a good compromise to settle on for the front, side and rear. Have an acceptable logic for what the setback should be for this triangular shaped lot. But then it triggers in terms of the design, the need for the second floor setback variance based on the style, structure and massing. See logic and support for the variance.
- > Have trouble with this particular contemporary style, but not with a contemporary style at this location. Architect has referenced other properties in the neighborhood, including some in the flats and properties on Trenton Way and Paloma Avenue. Note that the properties on Trenton Way have been received with mixed reviews within the community and neighborhood. However, supported those projects because the massing and character were very residential in style.
- > Concern with this project is not necessarily that it's contemporary, but that the massing feels more commercial, has to do with the flat facade. Contemporary style could work here, but needs to be in keeping with the massing, style and character of the residential neighborhood where this is trying to fit in. This shape could work with other rooflines and roof forms that could be applied to this massing.
- > Programmatically, the layout and floor plan works well, but character and articulation of contemporary style needs to be revisited.
- > The existing tree is massive, will get bigger and is the only tree remaining that adds character to the lot. Would encourage applicant to find a way prepare a protection plan to retain the existing tree because it adds character to center enclave of lot. Also adds vegetation now, we don't have to wait for years for a tree to grow. Realize redwood tree is on a property line and that they are messy, but they are safe trees.
- > Encourage architect to revisit style, try to make it more residential in keeping with the character, massing and qualities of the existing neighborhood.
- > Textures and materials used on contemporary house built at 1580 Barroilhet Avenue were very warm and delicate. Encourage you to drive by and take a look at it.
- > Feels like second story is in your face, not sure if it fits in with the area. Not opposed to a modern house here, but the design needs to be more sensitive to the neighbors around the perimeter of the property.
- > Should bring massing down and encourage to make design more nature-like with use of wood materials.
- > House would fit in well if redwood tree is kept, would like to see tree retained as it would add screening for the neighbors.
- > Feels very commercial and aggressive. Don't have a problem with a contemporary style, but this lot is very unusual in the lot patterns of Burlingame. Touches nine or ten other lots, so it's completely surrounded by other buildings. This building will stand out in the middle, has additional burden and responsibility that other more typical sites don't.
- > What you do here will have a huge impact on the neighborhood. Needs to tone itself down.

- > Needs to have more relation to the lower profile properties in neighborhood. Proposed tall plate heights and aggressive contemporary style doesn't help to create a home that is warm and inviting.
- > See an option on site plan to rotate massing of house 45 degrees and tuck it into bottom side of triangle, would free house from tree which we're trying to protect, and could move yard to that side of the property.
- > Redwood tree could stand with a lot of pruning that would help with maintenance over time.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar.

**Commission Discussion:**

- > There aren't many grounds to limit house to one story. There are no ordinances that outright protect privacy, but there is enough area in and around this property where this can be a satisfying project for the applicant and could be a delightful surprise as you come down driveway to the property. Applicant has right to develop lot.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 5 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 2 - Kelly, and Gaul

## 10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

*There were no Commissioners reports.*

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

*Planning Manager Hurin reported that the City Council adopted the General Plan and certified the EIR on January 7th, as well as approving the interim zoning standards for the North Rollins Road and North Burlingame Mixed Use Districts.*

- a. 133 Crescent Avenue - FYI for changes requested by the Planning Commission to a previously approved Design Review project.

**Attachments:** [133 Crescent Ave - Memorandum and Attachments](#)

*Accepted.*

- b. 705 Vernon Way - FYI for changes to a previously approved application for Design Review for a first and second story addition.

**Attachments:** [705 Vernon Way - Memorandum and Attachments](#)

*Accepted.*

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

*Note: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on January 14, 2019. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on January 24, 2019, 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 \$551, which includes noticing costs.*

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Community Development/Planning counter, City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.*