



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

- 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

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 is 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 is 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

February 14, 2019

Re: 1628 Lassen Way – Response to Planning Commission comments on 1/14/19

1. Eliminated the request for a 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.
2. Reduced the plate height of the great room from 10 feet to 9 feet. 8 foot windows/doors are kept in the great room to maintain aesthetics.
3. Kept the front porch at the entry area only and resolved the rest of the additional area from the variance request at the great room in the rear of the house.
4. Resolved the issue of different height eaves at the front elevation by extending the eave around the entire house to 24" to match the eave over the garage.
5. The eave height at the garage is dictated by the existing non-conforming garage wall height. The eaves around the lower part of the house were extended to 24 inches deep to line up with the height of the eave level at the garage. The eave around the garage remains at 12" depth.
6. The existing coverage has been revised to be 44.3% because it includes the existing covered front porch and existing covered rear patio. #

RECEIVED

FEB 14 2019

CITY OF BURLINGAME
CDD-PLANNING DIV.

2-15-2019

Burlingame Planning Commission and Planning Staff

Ref: 1628 Lassen, Design Review Comments-Second round

Dear Staff and Commissioners,

I have met again with the applicant and Ruben Hurin to review the resubmitted plans that respond to your latest comments. I am amending my comments below to respond to the latest changes.

1) The initial design was requesting 3 variances for side and front setbacks. The new design eliminates the need for these variances. The side of the rear addition rebuilds that foundation and moves the wall back 4" to meet the 6' side setback required. This wall was reduced from the former 10' plate submitted to a 9' plate to reduce the mass and meets the required setback and declining height envelope. I am in support of leaving the 8' window head heights in this room due to it's size and proportion.

2) The front facing garage has been re-designed with a hip roof and leaves the plate at the existing height thus eliminating need for a front setback variance.

3) The front porch has been reduced in size to just the entry area, and the rear room has been reduced in area to meet the required Floor Area maximum without need for a FAR variance. The smaller entry porch roof is supported by a tapered column that coordinates with the craftsman style windows. The roof of the entry has been aligned with the garage roof, and other overhangs have been reduced to 24" maximum to coordinate and line up.

4) The roof configuration has changed to be all hip roofs. This eliminates prior concern of a mix of flat, hips and gables and awkward proportions and heights.

5) The garage flat roof has been replaced with a lower hip roof which extends around the side. The prior awkward high garage door has been lowered to a better proportion, and this softens the impact of the front facing garage.

6) The drawings have been improved to show the stone veneer properly, projecting beyond the stucco line. The stone base has been extended on the sides to the fences and is wrapped all the way into the entry porch. A new entry door without sidelights allows the stone to be continuous into the recess. This improves the

appearance that the stone is not just a tack-on but is a continuous base to the stucco walls.

7) The landscape plan has been enhanced to show less grass and more perimeter planting and screening. Planting has been extended along the sidewalk to provide a transition between the street and the front yard grass. Patios and walkways have been shown.

The changes respond well to the planning commission's original and latest comments and suggestions.

I recommend approval of the new revised submittal.



Jerry L. Winges, AIA, LEED-AP



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, December 10, 2018

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- a. 1628 Lassen Way, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review for a major renovation and first and second story addition, including Front and Side Setback Variances to increase the height of nonconforming walls and Side Setback Variance for the first floor addition. (Master SWU Associates, Steve Wu, applicant and designer; Jeff Leung, property owner) (139 noticed) Staff contact: Sonal Aggarwal

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

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

- > Do we know what the block average is for the front setback? (Keylon: Can review the plans to see if that information is provided. However, the minimum required front setback to a garage is 25 feet.)*
- > The plate heights are being raised throughout the first floor to 10 feet, except at the garage where it's increasing from 8 feet to 9 feet, correct? (Keylon: No, the garage plate height is also being raised to 10 feet.)*

Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.

Steve Wu, project designer, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > The only area where the plate height is increasing from 8 to 10 feet is the great room, but would a variance still be required for increasing the plate heights from 8 to 9 feet? (Keylon: Yes, a variance is required because the plate heights are increasing on nonconforming walls; considered to be an intensification of a nonconforming wall.)*
- > What is the purpose of increasing the plate heights throughout the ground floor? (Wu: Project includes removing most of the existing walls, increasing bedrooms sizes, and modernizing the space, so it's a matter of proportion. Great room at rear of house includes dining room, family room and kitchen. So given its size, felt that increasing the plate height would be in proportion with the space in plan view. Reason for the front setback variance at the garage was to raise the plate height so that it is consistent with the rest of the house along the front facade. Plate height for the existing garage sits 20 inches below what is being proposed.)*
- > In looking at the building section on sheet A06, you're increasing the plate height to 10 feet, but you're also vaulting the ceiling. Do you still feel you need to increase the plate height to 10 feet even though you're vaulting the ceiling? (Wu: Yes.)*
- > One of the hardest things in justifying a variance is making a finding that there is an exceptional circumstance that is related to the property itself that is different than the surrounding properties. It's unclear from this application what is unique about this property than the neighboring properties. (Wu: Difference is that this property will be improved and have modern spaces, which is why we decided to raise the ceilings to be consistent with the proportions. Larger spaces with an 8 foot ceiling would feel squat. Would point out that the existing living room has a 9 foot ceiling, so property owner has a sense of the difference between 8 and 9 foot ceilings and made the decision to increase the plate height to 9 feet.)*
- > Currently have walkways from the sidewalk and driveway leading to the front door. Proposed landscape*

plan shows eliminating the walkway from the sidewalk and changing the walkway from the driveway to the new front door. Will the remaining area in the front yard and along the side of the house really just be grass? Will there be any planting areas? (Wu: Yes, that is correct.) Would encourage you to revisit the landscape plan to add more planting areas and softening of the building.

> What is meant by "stacked stone" as indicated for the wainscoting on the house? (Wu: Stacked stone is a stone veneer that is attached as a siding material, comes in 4 foot panels.) How thick is the stone veneer? (Wu: It's 5 inches thick.)

> Presume that at the new entry, the stone veneer does not turn back towards the door, but rather shears off at the entry towards the north side. At the garage side, is the stone veneer glued on to the front of the garage or does it return down the side of the garage? (Wu: Stone veneer does return along the exterior sides of the house, as well as on the inside wall towards the entry.)

> Stone veneer is 5 inches thick, so will it sit proud of the stucco by approximately 4 inches. Will there be a cap on the veneer? (Wu: Yes, there will be a cap on it.) This should be articulated on the plans.

> The way the building elevations are drawn, it appears that the stucco is proud of the stone veneer, is that what you intended? (Wu: No, that was not intended. Will revise the building elevations accordingly.)

> How do you propose to increase the plate heights? (Wu: To increase plate heights from 8 to 9 feet, would use a 3 1/2 x 11 7/8 psl beam on top of the existing wall. To increase plate to 10 feet, would build a wall on top of the existing wall and shear it with plywood.)

> So you wouldn't need to remove the stucco? (Wu: The intent is not to remove the existing stucco.)

> Will be doing a lot of work to make the walls taller and the entire existing roof is being removed, so have you thought of moving the walls in to comply with setback requirements and eliminating some of the variance requests? (Wu: Trying to keep costs down, so would be concerned with pouring new foundations for new walls.)

> What type of windows are being proposed? (Wu: Aluminum clad are proposed.)

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> We have on occasion for some variances accepted as a unique circumstance, a building that was built prior to having ordinances and setback requirements. While the existing footprint of the house could be accepted as an exceptional circumstance, could not make the finding that by not granting the variance, the property owner is being denied a property right. There doesn't seem to be a substantial property right that is lost through denial of the variance. Don't see a right to have a 9 or 10 foot plate height as a reasonable property right that if we deny the variance they wouldn't have access to. Can't make the findings for the variance.

> While we may consider a 9 or 10 foot plate on a new house, if it complied with all of the development requirements, we may be able to make that consideration. However, can't make that in this case if we have to grant a variance, especially considering that the house doesn't need to have that height. In fact by having that height, it make the first floor look that much taller relative to a lot of the other houses in the neighborhood. For most houses of the same style and character, the eave is just above the garage door, and that is what is typically seen as the character and pattern in the neighborhood. Having a tall first floor and garage hurts the design. Can't make findings for design review based on the proposed design.

> Having difficulty with the variance requests. Also concerned with the massing, is front-loaded, which is what we try to avoid.

> Concerned with how stacked stone will look like, so would be helpful to see a sample.

> This project is a good candidate for a design review consultant.

Commissioner Kelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to refer the application to a design review consultant.

Commission Discussion:

- > Existing plate heights should be kept as they are, would eliminate a lot of problems.
- > See no justification for the variances, especially in this neighborhood.
- > There are still a lot of single story bungalows in this neighborhood. The intent of the design guidelines is to minimize second floors, think this design has a long way to go to address our concerns.
- > 9 foot second floor plate height also needs to be looked at.
- > Applicant should discuss with the design review consultant the landscape plan. Don't need a lot of detail, but needs to be thought through in terms of planting areas and large species as opposed to a simple indication of just lawn.
- > There are a few large houses in the neighborhood and on that block, would caution the applicant that many of those houses were built prior to design review, so shouldn't look to those as examples to follow.
- > Should consider adding a front porch, is exempt from floor area ratio and would add to the depth of the house.
- > To help with keeping a lower profile on the second floor, should consider changing the gables to hip roofs since there is a predominant profile of a hipped roof.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Sargent, Loftis, Kelly, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

12-26-2018

Burlingame Planning Commission and Planning Staff

Ref: 1628 Lassen, Design Review Comments

Dear Staff and Commissioners,

I have reviewed the original submittal and have viewed the Planning Commission video. I have met with the staff, owner and designer and reviewed comments received from the commission and offered suggestions. I received amended plans by email showing significant and positive changes based on our meeting. Please see the following comments on the new proposed design.

- 1) The initial design was requesting 3 variances for side and front setbacks. The new design eliminates the need for these variances. The side of the rear addition rebuilds that foundation and moves the wall back 4" to meet the 6' side setback required. This wall can now be raised to a 10' plate and meets the required setback and declining height envelope. The front facing garage has been re-designed with a hip roof and leaves the plate at the existing height thus eliminating need for a front setback variance.
- 2) A new front porch has been added to improve the street appeal and provide a friendly neighborhood gesture. This element is supported by tapered columns that coordinate with the craftsman style windows. The suggestion of a porch addition came from the planning commission meeting comments and greatly improves the massing and overall design. This does not add the FAR, but due to the increased coverage on the site, a variance for lot coverage will be required for the small increase. I fully support this variance and it is a good trade for eliminating the other 3 variances while improving the design.
- 3) The roof configuration has changed to be all hip roofs. This eliminates prior concern of a mix of flat, hips and gables and awkward proportions and heights. The plate line for the front and bedroom wing will stay at 8', while greater height will be provided in the family/kitchen room where a 10' plate and a vaulted ceiling to 12'. This will give this larger room the volume it needs. The windows and doors in this room will be raised to 8' height which allows more light and better proportions to inside and outside.

4) The garage flat roof has been replaced with a lower hip roof which extends around the side. The prior awkward high garage door has been lowered to a better proportion, and this softens the impact of the front facing garage.

5) The drawings have been improved to show the stone veneer properly, projecting beyond the stucco line. The stone base has been extended on the sides to the fences and is wrapped all the way into the entry porch. A new entry door without sidelights allows the stone to be continuous into the recess. This improves the appearance that the stone is not just a tack-on but is a continuous base to the stucco walls.

6) The landscape plan has been enhanced to show less grass and more perimeter planting and screening. Planting has been extended along the sidewalk to provide a transition between the street and the front yard grass. Patios and walkways have been shown.

The applicant and designer have changed the design in a major and positive way that improves all aspects. The changes respond very well to the planning commission comments and suggestions.

I recommend approval of the new design.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jerry L. Winges', with a long, flowing horizontal line extending to the right.

Jerry L. Winges, AIA, LEED-AP



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT • 501 PRIMROSE ROAD • BURLINGAME, CA 94010
p: 650.558.7250 • f: 650.696.3790 • www.burlingame.org

APPLICATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Type of application:

☒ Design Review ☐ Variance ☐ Parcel #: 025-203-220
☐ Conditional Use Permit ☐ Special Permit ☐ Zoning / Other: R-1

PROJECT ADDRESS: 1628 LASSEN WAY

APPLICANT

Name: STEVE WU

Address: 205 DEANZA BLVD, #262

City/State/Zip: SAN MATEO, CA 94402

Phone: 650-823-8331

E-mail: MASTER.SWU@GMAIL.COM

PROPERTY OWNER

Name: JEFF LEUNG

Address: 1628 LASSEN WAY

City/State/Zip: BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Phone: 201-686-5832

E-mail: JEFFPARK79@GMAIL.COM

ARCHITECT/DESIGNER

Name: SAME AS APPLICANT

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

Burlingame Business License #: _____

Authorization to Reproduce Project Plans:

I hereby grant the City of Burlingame the authority to reproduce upon request and/or 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. EW (Initials of Architect/Designer)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 141 SF 1-STORY ADDITION, 554 SF UPPER FLOOR ADDITION, 1900 SF RENOVATION

AFFIDAVIT/SIGNATURE: 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: [Signature] Date: 6/6/18

I am aware of the proposed application and hereby authorize the above applicant to submit this application to the Planning Commission.

Property owner's signature: [Signature] Date: 6/6/18

Date submitted: _____

RESOLUTION APPROVING CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION AND DESIGN REVIEW

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

WHEREAS, a categorical exemption has been proposed and application has been made for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling at 1628 Lassen Way, zoned R-1, Jeff Park, property owner, APN: 025-203-220;

WHEREAS, said matters were heard by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on February 25, 2019, 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 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, 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.

Chairman

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 25th day of February, 2019 by the following vote:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Categorical Exemption and Design Review

1628 Lassen Way

Effective **March 7, 2019**

Page 1

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;

EXHIBIT "A"

Categorical Exemption and Design Review

1628 Lassen Way

Effective **March 7, 2019**

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 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.



CITY OF BURLINGAME
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010
PH: (650) 558-7250 • FAX: (650) 696-3790
www.burlingame.org

Site: 1628 LASSEN WAY

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following public hearing **on MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2019 at 7:00 P.M.** in the City Hall Council Chambers, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA:

Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single-family dwelling at **1628 LASSEN WAY** zoned R-1. APN 025-203-220

Mailed: February 15, 2019

**PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE**

(Please refer to other side)

City of Burlingame

A copy of the application and plans for this project may be reviewed prior to the meeting at the Community Development Department at 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.

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.

For additional information, please call (650) 558-7250. Thank you.

Kevin Gardiner, AICP
Community Development Director

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

(Please refer to other side)

1628 Lassen Way
300' Radius
APN #025.203.220

