



PROJECT LOCATION
1628 Lassen Way

City of Burlingame

Design Review

Item No. 8d
Regular Action Item

Address: 1628 Lassen Way

Meeting Date: February 25, 2019

Request: Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-family dwelling.

Applicant and Designer: Steve Wu, Master SWU Associates

APN: 025-203-220

Property Owner: Jeff Park

Lot Area: 6,000 SF

General Plan: Low Density Residential

Zoning: R-1

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

Project Description: The existing single story house with an attached one-car garage contains 2,660 SF (0.44 FAR) of floor area. The proposed project includes adding a new front porch, increasing the first floor living space, and adding a new second story. The floor area of the house would increase to 2,946 SF (0.49 FAR) where 3,020 SF (0.51 FAR) is the maximum allowed. The house 74 SF below the maximum allowed floor area.

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

- Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-family dwelling (CS 25.57.010 (a) (2) (4)).

1628 Lassen Way

Lot Size: 6,000 SF

Plans date stamped: February 15, 2019

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	ALLOWED/REQ'D
SETBACKS			
Front (1st flr):	15'-0"	18'-6"	15'-6" (block average)
(2nd flr):	n/a	20'-0"	20'-0"
Attached garage:	15'-0"	no change	25'-0" (for one-car garage)
Side (left):	5'-1"	no change	6'-0"
(right):	5'-8"	8'-3"	6'-0"
Rear (1st flr):	25'-7"	no change	15'-0"
(2nd flr):	n/a	56'-4"	20'-0"
Lot Coverage:	2,660 SF 44.3% ¹	2,384 SF 39.7%	2,400 SF 40%
FAR:	2,660 SF 0.44 FAR	2,946 SF 0.49 FAR	3,020 SF ² 0.51 FAR

¹ Existing nonconforming lot coverage.

² (.32 x 6,000 SF) + 1100 SF = 3,020 SF (0.51 FAR)

1628 Lassen Way**Lot Size:** 6,000 SF**Plans date stamped:** February 15, 2019

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	ALLOWED/REQ'D
# of bedrooms:	4	no change	---
Off-Street Parking:	1 covered (16'-5" x 20'-3") 1 uncovered (9' x 20')	no change	1 covered (10' x 20') 1 uncovered (9' x 20')
Building Height:	17'-4"	22'-5"	30'-0"
DH Envelope:	complies	complies	CS 25.26.075

Staff Comments: Planning staff would note that previous staff report incorrectly stated that the existing house was in compliance with lot coverage requirements. Staff's calculation failed to include an existing covered patio at the rear of the house, which increases the existing lot coverage to 44.3% (40% maximum allowed). As a result, the existing lot coverage is considered to be nonconforming; the development table on page 1 has been revised accordingly.

Regular Action Meeting: At the Planning Commission Regular Action meeting on January 14, 2019 the Commission expressed concern with several issues and continued the item with the direction (see attached January 14, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes).

Listed below is the direction and suggestions provided by the Commission and how each was addressed with the revised project. The applicant submitted a response letter, dated February 14, 2019, and revised plans, date stamped February 15, 2019, to address the Planning Commission's comments and direction.

In addition, the design review consultant provided an amendment to his original analysis, dated February 15, 2019, in which he notes that "the changes respond well to the Planning Commission's original and latest comments and suggestions". The design review consultant recommends approval of the revised submittal.

1. Noted that they could not make the findings for the Lot Coverage Variance, noting that there is nothing unique about the lot or configuration of the house.

- The applicant eliminated the previously requested Lot Coverage Variance by reducing the front porch from 124 SF to 53.7 SF and reducing the great room at the rear of the house by 70.3 SF (see revised floor plans).

Reducing the size of the great room also increased the right side setback from 6'-0" to 8'-3" (see revised Site Plan).

2. Expressed a concern with the 10' plate height at the addition at the rear of the house, noting that it is not in proportion with the rest of the house or with neighboring houses.

- The plate height at the addition at the rear of the house was reduced from 10' to 9' (see revised building elevations). A cathedral ceiling has been incorporated into the design in order to get the volume within the space desired by the property owner (see revised building section).

3. Encouraged retaining a front porch while eliminating the Lot Coverage Variance.

- As noted above, the proposed square footage was reduced enough to eliminate the Lot Coverage Variance. A front porch was retained to focus on the entry area, but reduced in size from 124 SF to 53.7 SF (see revised floor plan and building elevations).

4. Noted that the roof area, where the front porch connects to the garage and upper floor, needs to be resolved.

- The applicant resolved the issue of different height eaves at the front of the house by extending the eave around the entire house to 24" to line up the eave height at the garage level (see revised building elevations).

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

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

Analysis and Recommendation by Design Reviewer: The design review consultant met with the project designer and homeowner to discuss the Planning Commission's concerns and reviewed the revised plans. The design reviewer has provided a detailed analysis in his letter and recommends approval of the project as proposed (see attached Design Review Analysis, dated December 26, 2018).

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

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

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

This space intentionally left blank.

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

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the revised plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped February 15, 2019, sheets A00 through A06 and L01;
2. that any changes to building materials, exterior finishes, windows, architectural features, roof height or pitch, and amount or type of hardscape materials shall be subject to Planning Division or Planning Commission review (FYI or amendment to be determined by Planning staff);
3. that any changes to the size or envelope of the first or second floors, or garage, which would include adding or enlarging a dormer(s), shall require an amendment to this permit;
4. that any recycling containers, debris boxes or dumpsters for the construction project shall be placed upon the private property, if feasible, as determined by the Community Development Director;
5. that demolition or removal of the existing structures and any grading or earth moving on the site shall not occur until a building permit has been issued and such site work shall be required to comply with all the regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District;
6. that prior to issuance of a building permit for construction of the project, the project construction plans shall be modified to include a cover sheet listing all conditions of approval adopted by the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal; which shall remain a part of all sets of approved plans throughout the construction process. Compliance with all conditions of approval is required; the conditions of approval shall not be modified or changed without the approval of the Planning Commission, or City Council on appeal;
7. that all air ducts, plumbing vents, and flues shall be combined, where possible, to a single termination and installed on the portions of the roof not visible from the street; and that these venting details shall be included and approved in the construction plans before a Building permit is issued;
8. that the project shall comply with the Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Ordinance which requires affected demolition, new construction and alteration projects to submit a Waste Reduction plan and meet recycling requirements; any partial or full demolition of a structure, interior or exterior, shall require a demolition permit;
9. that the project shall meet all the requirements of the California Building and Uniform Fire Codes, 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:

10. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, shall provide an architectural certification that the architectural details shown in the approved design which should be evident at framing, such as window locations and bays, are built as shown on the approved plans; architectural certification documenting framing compliance with approved design shall be submitted to the Building Division before the final framing inspection shall be scheduled;

11. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the applicant shall provide a certification by the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, that demonstrates that the project falls at or below the maximum approved floor area ratio for the property;
12. that prior to scheduling the roof deck inspection, a licensed surveyor shall shoot the height of the roof ridge and provide certification of that height to the Building Division; and
13. that prior to final inspection, Planning Division staff will inspect and note compliance of the architectural details (trim materials, window type, etc.) to verify that the project has been built according to the approved Planning and Building plans.

Ruben Hurin
Planning Manager

- c. Steve Wu, applicant and designer
Jeff Park, property owner

Attachments:

January 14, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes
Applicant's Response Letter, dated February 14, 2019
Design Review Consultant's Amended Analysis, dated February 15, 2019
December 10, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes
Design Review Consultant's Analysis, dated December 26, 2018
Application to the Planning Commission
Planning Commission Resolution (Proposed)
Notice of Public Hearing – Mailed February 15, 2019
Area Map