



APPLICATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Type of application:

- ☒ Design Review ☐ Variance ☐ Parcel #:
☐ Conditional Use Permit ☐ Special Permit ☐ Zoning / Other:

PROJECT ADDRESS: 722 CROSSWAY RD.

APPLICANT

Name: BILL BUCKLEMAN
Address: 955A AMERICAN ST
City/State/Zip: SAN CARLOS
Phone: 650 483-0414
E-mail: BILL@ALLPHASE.COM

PROPERTY OWNER

Name: JEANNIE TYAN / NOAH HOLMES
Address: 722 CROSSWAY RD
City/State/Zip: BURLINGAME
Phone: JEANNIE 650 814-2206
E-mail: _____

~~ARCHITECT/DESIGNER~~ RE-DESIGN

Name: BILL BUCKLEMAN
Address: 955A AMERICAN ST
City/State/Zip: SAN CARLOS
Phone: 650 483-0414
E-mail: BILL@ALLPHASE.COM

ORIGINAL DESIGNER:
JOANN GANN

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. WJB (Initials of Architect/Designer)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: SEEKING APPROVAL FROM ⁽³⁾ THREE DIFFERENT PLANS, SHOWING RIGHT SIDE ROOF EVE & TRIM BEING INSTALLED, PER ORIGINAL APPROVAL, TO THE SIDE OF THE HOUSE.

EXISTING WINDOWS TO BE REPLACED TO MATCH NEW WINDOWS w/ SIMULATED DIVIDED LITES.

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: Bill Buckleman Date: 3-25-19

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: 3/25/19

Date submitted: MAR 29 2019



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, February 8, 2016

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- c. 722 Crossway Road - Application for Design Review for first and second story additions to an existing two-story, single family dwelling. (Jo Ann Gann, applicant and designer; Jeannie and Noah Tyan, property owners) (76 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Gum was recused from this item for statutory reasons, having a financial interest in a property within 500 feet.

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

Planning Manager Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report. There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Loftis opened the public hearing.

JoAnn Gann represented the applicant:

- > Existing one story house. Adding dormer to the back to keep the massing down.
- > Add to bay to make it wider and add to the proportion.

Commission questions/comments:

- > What are the plate heights? (Gann: 8'-6" on the bottom, 8'-0" on top.)
- > Will the addition have simulated true-divided lites? (Gann: Yes. Back already has simulated true-divided lites.)
- > What will happen to pop-up dormer on the front? (Gann: Will matched existing windows, which are true divided.)
- > Will chimney be continued in brick? (Gann: Yes.)
- > Clapboard siding below, stucco above, shingles in the gables. Why three types of siding? (Gann: Horizontal siding on bottom. Trying to break it up, didn't want to put stucco at the top. Could have horizontal siding or stucco.) Seems like one too many elements. Could have a bigger grate or a lattice or gable vent. (Gann: Could consider a triangular vent with stucco below.)
- > Shared plans with neighbors? (Gann: No.)
- > No changes to landscaping? (Gann: No changes.)
- > Can drawings be crisper? Hard to tell what is proposed for the siding.

Public comments:

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Loftis closed the public hearing.

Commission discussion:

- > Can be placed on the Consent Calendar.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to place the item

on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, February 22, 2016

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- b. 722 Crossway Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for first and second story additions to an existing single family dwelling (Jo Ann Gann, applicant and designer; Jeannie and Noah Tyan, property owners) (76 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Chair DeMartini made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bandrapalli, to approve the Consent Item. The motion carried by the following vote:



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- f. 722 Crossway Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review Amendment for as built changes to a previously approved application for first and second story additions to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (e)(1). (JoAnn Gann, applicant and designer; Jeannie and Noah Tyan, property owners) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Commissioner Gum was recused from this item. Commissioner Kelly took position as chair of the meeting.

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

Planning Manager Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report,

There were no questions of staff.

Commissioner Kelly opened the public hearing.

JoAnn Gann represented the applicant, with contractor Bill Buckleman.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *Why was this not built as approved? (Buckleman: Aspects of the house created a domino effect with the various roof elements. It could not be physically built and tied into the lower roof, as well as be structurally supported from the face of a 2 x 4 wall. Just wanted to get it finished and the occupants moved in.)*

> *Why not come in for the changes earlier after discovering the problems? (Buckleman: Has not worked in the City before, did not know. Multiple structural changes inside. Decided to wait until it was finished. Has come up with some ideas that would simulate what was originally approved.)*

> *Was the designer involved after construction started? (Buckleman: Yes. She worked on the revisions to the doors. Understood from Planning staff that it would take 2-3 months to go back to the Planning Commission, and could not leave the job unfinished without a roof that long through the winter.)*

> *Was the designer involved when the issues developed with the structural elements? (Buckleman: Structural engineer was involved in the issues related to the structure. After learning from staff and the designer how long it would take to go back to the commission, determined couldn't stop the construction for that long, particularly since changes kept coming and knew there would be more. The roof was built like an umbrella over the top, then worked from the roof down to keep the rain off of the project. Was concerned first with the structural aspects, and the appearance would be the last thing as changes kept coming up. Planned to bring all the changes together at the end.)*

> *Massing coming off the back is odd. Coming down from the gable where the fascia comes down, then kicks out at a different angle, is there a reason why it couldn't have come down at an angle closer to what was approved? Then the rest of the mass would have been a bigger dormer off of the other roof. (Buckleman: Would have had problems with an egress window. The problems started around the other side of the house. Could not tie into the pitch of the lower roof.)*

- > Confused with the jogs on the floor plans. (Buckleman: The construction follows the structural plans. There are floor beams carrying the walls - followed those walls. The jogs were not shown on the original plans but were shown on the structural engineering plans, and the construction followed the structural plans.)
- > The originally approved design was simple and elegant, and handled the massing nicely. Have the as-builts been looked at to get closer to the original design? (Gann: The louvered vent was moved down to the other gable since it did not work there, and decided to put a band across to break up the massing.)

There were no Public Comments.

Commissioner Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > The original approval was an elegant design, simple and straightforward. Applicant reports they couldn't wait, or be bothered to follow the approved plans.
- > Would the project be approved as presented now? Probably not. The expectation is that projects should be built as approved. If issues come up, the expectation is for the contractors to come back.
- > Would not expect the homeowner to manage the construction process, but contractors and designers should know better and manage the process. The contractors and designers need to be held accountable to building to the approved plans.
- > Difficult to review major changes after the fact.
- > It appears there may have been some opportunities to come closer to what was approved, in keeping with the aesthetic of the original approval.
- > Professionals have put the property owner in this position. However the property owner retained the professional and also has responsibility.
- > The initial design had a simplicity and elegance that was easily approved.
- > Applicant needs to look at how it can become more in conformance to the initially approved design. Needs to be more than cosmetic changes such as a couple of pieces of new fascia.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to continue the item. The motion carried by the following vote:

JMG
Design ~ Consultant ~ Planner

JoAnn Madeira Gann

244 Fulton Street Redwood City, Ca. 94062

Phone # (650) 464-9182

Email: jmadeira18@aol.com

September 19, 2017

PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. The rear doors off the family was revised and approved by the building department.
2. Right and left elevations were changed due to building restrictions and confusion on the structural plan. They did put the wood louvered vent on the lower ridge to try to stay with the original design. A band will be put on the sides to help break up the side.
3. The plate heights do not change.
4. Six feet was removed out of the bedroom upstairs ~~because of the daylight plane on the left side.~~
5. All existing windows that do not match the new windows will be replaced to match. Clients decided to match the family room design of windows instead of the existing style.
6. See letter from the contractor for more information and letter from the neighbor on the right.

RECEIVED

SEP 21 2017

CITY OF BURLINGAME
CDD-PLANNING DIV.



ALL PHASE BUILDERS

RE: 722 Crossway Rd.

Burlingame, CA

To whom it may concern,

This project started at the end of September with the foundations. The roof was removed around the end of October/1st of November.

That month was the start of the 5th wettest year in 133 years. It rained just about every week. Most storms had strong winds and it was difficult to keep tarps from tearing off.

This was all done because the existing first floor was mostly remodeled and had hardwood floors. The homeowners lived there with their two small children for the first couple months

We started with the posts and ridge beams then installed rafters so we could plywood the upper top roof surface to tarp over them.

The outside walls were framed while we were obtaining structural revisions/changes due to existing structural conditions that were different than originally assumed.

The house was originally built in 1915 and had many framing inconsistencies. One problem was that the main existing roof was framed almost 1ft out of square.

None of the proposed floor space was altered except the top, front left, bedroom was made smaller by 6 sq.ft. of area due to the need for a structural post wall. The structural engineer had shown a ridge line as being longer then needed and required an end post.

One reason the upper sidewall roof eve (in question) was not installed was because it was supposed to tie into the lower rear (1st floor) roof over the family room.

The problem was that the rear lower roof slope was less of a slope (6/12) then the top main slope which was around a 7.5/12 slope. Because the main roof was not square, this added to the problem of lining the roofs up as shown.

The lower rear roof pitch also had to be less of a slope in order for the master bedroom rear windows to have a sill height less then the egress code of 44" in. If the slope was stepper the roof would cut into the lower windows.

1111 Arguello Street #101 - Redwood City, CA 94063 - (V) 650.368.5021 - (F) 650.299.0560
info@allphase.com - www.allphase.com

RECEIVED

SEP 21 2017

CITY OF BURLINGAME



ALL PHASE BUILDERS

It became difficult to figure out how to tie these roofs together correctly and not have an unsightly look and/or water problems later.

We were also concerned as how to structurally support or attach this long length of roof eve, without structural let-ins or supportive bracing.

With the tarps on the house being torn at every storm, we were only able to work on the house 2-3 days a week. The homeowners were expecting a 3rd child the beginning of June and could not afford to rent another house after that. I understood that any design change took 2-3 months to obtain, if possible.

It was necessary for me to make decisions that were in my customers best interest as well as attempt to keep the design of the house within the spirit of the original design.

The two rear patio doors were changed to one large 10" patio door and the two sets of stairs became one large landing with full stairs. That process went through the city as a revision and we believed it went through the proper channels not to become a problem.

My original bid to the homeowners did not include replacing the homes existing windows in the attempt to help save money. I have been told they were supposed to be replaced. The owners intend to replace them and have them match with the style and grid pattern of the existing and new windows we installed at the rear areas.

I hope the commission will understand the difficult position the homeowners and I were in during this project as well as the time constraints and existing problems that arose due to the weather, etc., and the homeowner's family needs.

PS. The homeowners have spoken to the neighbors that can see the sides of the house and have shown them the original plans and explained the changes. They expressed their content with the final look.

Sincerely,

Bill Buckleman

September 19th, 2017

To Whom It May Concern:

We are neighbors of 722 Crossway Road. We understand that the Planning commission has a concern about the change in roofline from the original submitted plans. From our property we can see the roofline. We have seen the original plans and the current roofline and we do not feel like the change impacts our view or the streetscape of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,

M Santana
718 Crossway Rd.
650-722-5215

RESOLUTION APPROVING CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION AND DESIGN REVIEW AMENDMENT

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

WHEREAS, a Categorical Exemption has been prepared and application has been made for a Design Review Amendment for as-built revisions to first and second story additions at 722 Crossway Road, Zoned R-1, Noah and Jeannie Tyan, property owners, APN: 029-051-240;

WHEREAS, said matters were heard by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on April 8, 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 CEQA 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 Amendment is approved subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto. Findings for such Design Review Amendment 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 8th day of April, 2019, by the following vote:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption and Design Review Amendment

722 Crossway Road

Effective April 28, 2018

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped August 11, 2015, sheets A1 through A-7, Boundary and Topographic Survey; and including the revisions shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped March 29, 2019, Plan A, Option 1;
2. that the applicant shall apply for a revision to the approved Building permit prior to starting any demolition or construction for the approved revisions to the as-built conditions;
3. that all windows for the dwelling shall be aluminum clad wood with three-dimensional muntin bars permanently adhered to both sides of the glass and spacer bars in between the panes of glass;
4. 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);
5. that any changes to the size or envelope of the basement, first or second floors, or garage, which would include adding or enlarging a dormer(s), shall require an amendment to this permit;
6. 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;
7. 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;
8. 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;
9. 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;
10. 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;
11. that the project shall meet all the requirements of the California Building and Uniform Fire Codes, 2013 Edition, as amended by the City of Burlingame;

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption and Design Review Amendment
722 Crossway Road
Effective **April 28, 2018**

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

12. that prior to scheduling the framing inspection the project architect or residential designer, or another architect or residential design professional, shall provide an architectural certification that the architectural details shown in the approved design which should be evident at framing, such as window locations and bays, are built as shown on the approved plans; architectural certification documenting framing compliance with approved design shall be submitted to the Building Division before the final framing inspection shall be scheduled;
13. that prior to scheduling the roof deck inspection, a licensed surveyor shall shoot the height of the roof ridge and provide certification of that height to the Building Division; and
14. that prior to final inspection, Planning Division staff will inspect and note compliance of the architectural details (trim materials, window type, etc.) to verify that the project has been built according to the approved Planning and Building plans.



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

Site: 722 CROSSWAY ROAD

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following public hearing on **MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2019 at 7:00 P.M.** in the City Hall Council Chambers, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA:

Application for Design Review Amendment for as built changes to a previously approved application for first and second story additions to an existing single family dwelling at **722 CROSSWAY ROAD** zoned R-1. APN 029-051-240

Mailed: March 29, 2019

(Please refer to other side)

**PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE**

**CITY OF BURLINGAME
501 PRIMROSE RD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010**

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)

722 Crossway Rd
300' Radius
APN # 029-051-240

