



**PROJECT LOCATION**  
251 California Drive

# City of Burlingame

*Commercial Design Review*

Item No. 8e  
Regular Action Item

**Address:** 251 California Drive

**Meeting Date:** February 11, 2019

**Request:** Application for Commercial Design Review for changes to the front façade of an existing commercial storefront.

**Applicant and Architect:** Marco Fung

**APN:** 029-211-040

**Property Owner:** Ken White

**Lot Area:** 4,600 SF

**General Plan:** Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan: Howard Mixed Use District

**Zoning:** HMU

**Current Use:** Automobile repair shop (rear portion); Vacant (front portion)

**Proposed Use:** No land use is being proposed for this application

**Environmental Review Status:** The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 - Existing facilities, Class 1(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that interior or exterior alterations involving such things as interior partitions, plumbing, and electrical conveyances are exempt from environmental review.

**Summary:** The applicant is proposing changes to the exterior façade of the existing commercial storefront at 251 California Drive, zoned HMU. The building is currently vacant at the front portion and is still being used as an automobile repair shop at the rear portion.

The proposed front elevation consists of a new aluminum frame and glass (double pane) storefront. Above the new storefront, the applicant is proposing to replace the existing transom windows with new transom windows and repaint the parapet border and existing stucco bands. No new signage or changes to the existing signband is being proposed. Improvements also include updating the stucco on the ground border wall and updating the outside light fixtures (dark bronze aluminum finish). Minimal interior improvements are proposed as part of the project.

The following application is required:

- Commercial Design Review for changes to the front façade of an existing commercial storefront in the HMU Zoning District (CS 25.33.045).

**Parking Background:** The property at 251 California is located within the boundaries of the Burlingame Avenue Off-street Parking District, which was created in 1962. Assessments were collected from property owners within the district to pay 60% of the cost to acquire and build public parking lots in the downtown area. Since this property has no off-street parking, the assessment was paid.

Those property owners who chose to take a credit for parking which was provided on their site did not pay the full assessment (they got a credit). Once a credit was taken, the property owner was obliged to maintain the parking on the site which was the basis for the credit.

In November 2016, the property owner had inquired about a potential tenant classified as a commercial recreation use. At the time, in addition to required approval of a Conditional Use Permit, commercial recreation uses also triggered a request for a Parking Variance because it was an intensification of the existing use (auto repair shop). A commercial recreation use requires 1 parking space for every 200 SF of floor area and an auto repair use requires 1 parking space per 800 SF of floor area.

The subject property lies within the Parking Sector of the Downtown Specific Plan. Retail uses and food

establishments on the ground floor that are located within this Parking Sector, are exempt from parking requirements (CS 25.70.090 (a)). After evaluating the circumstance of this property, the Planning Division concluded that the net increase calculation for parking should be based on the most intensive use that would otherwise be exempt (food establishments at 1 space per 200 SF of floor area) rather than strictly the existing use. Therefore, commercial recreation uses (parking ratio of 1 space per 200 SF of floor area) would not require any additional parking (or a Parking Variance) based on this determination.

**Staff comments:** None.

**Design Review Study Meeting:** At the Planning Commission design review study meeting on November 13, 2018, the Commission had concerns about the proposed exterior façade changes and referred the applicant to a design review consultant (see the attached November 13, 2018, Planning Commission Minutes).

Some of the comments that the Commission had included:

- Existing storefront/façade and block has charm, project should not take away from this;
- Stripped down design is not approvable as proposed;
- Existing rhythm, scale, and pedestrian friendly nature need to be captured by proposed design;
- Existing façade does not have to be preserved but elements such as the transom windows and scale/interface of the transom windows and doors/storefront should be replicated.

The applicant submitted revised plans date stamped January 28, 2019 to address the Planning Commission's comments and concerns.

**Analysis and Recommendation by Design Reviewer:** The applicant and property owner met with the design review consultant to address the Planning Commission's comments. Please refer to the attached design reviewer's analysis and recommendation, dated February 1, 2019, for a detailed review of the project. The design reviewer notes that the "revised design is incorporating the original elements of the building" and retains its "existing rhythm." Based on the design review analysis of the project, the design reviewer supports the proposed changes.

**Design Review Criteria:** The criteria for Commercial Design Review as established in Ordinance No. 1652 adopted by the Council on April 16, 2001 are outlined as follows:

1. Support of the pattern of diverse architectural styles that characterize the city's commercial areas;
2. Respect and promotion of pedestrian activity by placement of buildings to maximize commercial use of the street frontage, off-street public spaces, and by locating parking so that it does not dominate street frontages;
3. On visually prominent and gateway sites, whether the design fits the site and is compatible with the surrounding development;
4. Compatibility of the architecture with the mass, bulk, scale, and existing materials of existing development and compatibility with transitions where changes in land use occur nearby;
5. Architectural design consistency by using a single architectural style on the site that is consistent among primary elements of the structure, restores or retains existing or significant original architectural features, and is compatible in mass and bulk with other structure in the immediate area;
6. Provision of site features such as fencing, landscaping, and pedestrian circulation that enriches the existing opportunities of the commercial neighborhood.

**Suggested Findings for Design Review:** That the new aluminum framed storefront window and door system, transom windows, added ground border wall for the main entry, and stucco siding is consistent with the pattern of diverse architectural styles that characterize the city's commercial areas; that the proposed storefront promotes pedestrian activity by allowing views directly into the business; that the proposed storefront improvements are consistent with the architectural style and mass and bulk with other structures by using stucco siding and an aluminum and glass storefront system on the ground floor, the project may be found to be compatible with the requirements of the City's five design review criteria.

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

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped January 28, 2019, sheets A0.01 through A10.05;
2. that any changes to the size or envelope of the building, which would include changing or adding exterior walls or parapet walls, shall require an amendment to this permit;
3. 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);
4. that demolition or removal of the existing structures and any grading or earth moving on the site shall not occur until a building permit has been issued and such site work shall be required to comply with all the regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District;
5. 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;
6. 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;
7. that the applicant shall comply with Ordinance 1503, the City of Burlingame Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Ordinance;
8. 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.

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

9. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection, the project architect, engineer or other licensed professional shall provide architectural certification that the architectural details such as window locations and bays are built as shown on the approved plans; if there is no licensed professional

involved in the project, the property owner or contractor shall provide the certification under penalty of perjury. Certifications shall be submitted to the Building Department; and

10. 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.

‘Amelia Kolokihakaufisi, Associate Planner

- c. Marco Fung, applicant and architect  
Ken White, property owner

Attachments:

November 13, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes  
Design Review Analysis, dated February 1, 2019  
Application to the Planning Commission  
Planning Commission Resolution (proposed)  
Notice of Public Hearing – Mailed February 1, 2019  
Area Map