



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, March 11, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

- a. 2217 Davis Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Paul Yep and Mei Ling Tang, applicants and property owners; MEI Architects, architect) (89 noticed) Staff Contact: Sonal Aggarwal

**Attachments:** [2217 Davis Dr - Staff Report](#)

[2217 Davis Dr - Attachment](#)

[2217 Davis Dr - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Gaul spoke with the applicant and his son.*

*Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Casey Cole, MEI Architects, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > *Consider using some of the other materials to accentuate the second floor? Looks a little flat. (Cole: Can consider that.)*
- > *Consider a lower plate height on the second floor? The volume of the roof is quite tall, could utilize space within the roof to obtain the height. (Cole: Started at 10', now at 9'-6", could consider further reduction.)*
- > *West elevation upstairs looks blank. Consideration of any other windows in the part that recesses back? (Cole: Yes could consider that.)*
- > *A stair window would be a great way to introduce light into the stairwell and study below.*
- > *Should reconsider the second floor plate height.*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Articulating the massing with some alternate materials would help with the flatness.*
- > *A window into the stairwell would help break up the flat mass, even if it breaks up the belly band with a taller window.*
- > *Bringing down the plate height would help bring down the bulk on the back side of the house.*
- > *Because the elevations are so flat, it looks like the windows could happen anywhere. There is no order*

*between the upstairs and downstairs windows.*

*> On the second floor some windows have gravitated to the corners. Seems odd, particularly with the lack of coordination.*

*> Upper plate height needs to be reconsidered. When the second story is higher than the first story it becomes unbalanced. Could use the roof structure to create more volume, either with coffered or vaulted ceilings.*

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

2217 Davis Drive - Planning Department Resubmittal

Comment No.	Discipline	Comment Date	Comment By	Comment	Response
1	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Michael Gaul	Stucco seems like a simple solution, have you used other materials to accentuate the second floor a little more.	Vertical wood siding to match existing has been added to the North façade along with wood trim pieces to terminate the vertical wood siding.
1	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Audrey Tse	Curious if you thought to go with a lower plate height on second floor.	We have revised the second floor height to 8'-6" from 9'-6". We feel that this proportion reduces the bulk of the second story. Lowering the second story plate height any further would cause the second story roof to conflict with the existing first story roof geometry.
2	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Audrey Tse	On West elevation rear, is there opportunity for another window? (At stairs). That elevation looks a little flat.	We have added an additional window above the stair landing on the west elevation.
3	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Richard Sargent	A stair window would be great way to introduce light to stairwell.	We have added an additional window above the stair landing on the west elevation.
4	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Richard Sargent	Look at plate height on second floor. Upper plate height needs to be reconsidered. When second floor is taller than lower, creates balancing problems. Use roof structure to create volume.	We have revised the second floor height to 8'-6" from 9'-6". We feel that this proportion reduces the bulk of the second story. Lowering the second story plate height any further would cause the second story roof to conflict with the existing first story roof geometry.
5	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Richard Torrenes	Articulating massing with alternative materials would help with massing	Vertical wood siding to match existing has been added to the North façade along with wood trim pieces to terminate the vertical wood siding.

6	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Richard Torrenes	Window in stairwell would help with flat mass	We have added an additional window above the stair landing on the west elevation.
7	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	Richard Torrenes	Plate height lowering would reduce bulk.	We have revised the second floor height to 8'-6" from 9'-6". We feel that this proportion reduces the bulk of the second story. Lowering the second story plate height any further would cause the second story roof to conflict with the existing first story roof geometry.
8	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	William Loftis	Struck me most is because its so flat, the windows feel like they could happen anywhere. Little coordination of windows between first and second floor. Do not seem to be associating with eachother.	Window locations have been coordinated on the East, West, and South facades.
9	Planning Commission	3/11/2019	William Loftis	Odd that first floor existing windows have gravitated to corners, second floor windows have gravitated to corners. 6" stucco at corners, I find it odd in respect to lack of coordination.	Windows have been located so that the trim of the new windows is at least 12" from the edge of each exterior wall on all four facades



## APPLICATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

### Type of application:

☒ Design Review ☐ Variance ☐ Parcel #: 025-192-030  
☐ Conditional Use Permit ☐ Special Permit ☐ Zoning / Other: \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT ADDRESS: 2217 Davis Drive Burlingame CA 94010-5410

### APPLICANT

Name: Paul Yip

Address: 2217 DAVIS DRIVE

City/State/Zip: BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Phone: 415 308 6543

E-mail: paul.yip@hotmail.com

### PROPERTY OWNER

Name: PAUL YIP AND MEI LING TANG

Address: 2217 DAVIS DRIVE

City/State/Zip: BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Phone: 415-308-6543

E-mail: paul.yip@hotmail.com

### ARCHITECT/DESIGNER

Name: Mei-Mei Chan - MEI Architects

Address: 239 Ninth Street

City/State/Zip: San Francisco, CA 94103

Phone: (415) 703-0328

E-mail: mchan@meiarchitects.com

Burlingame Business License #: 32617

### 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. MME (Initials of Architect/Designer)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: 860 SF second story addition to existing home. Addition consists of bedroom, bath, closet, and study.

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: 6/18/18

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: 6/18/18

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 2217 Davis Drive, zoned R-1, Paul Yep and Mei Ling Tang, property owners, APN: 025-192-030;

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 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 8<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019 by the following vote:

---

Secretary

## EXHIBIT "A"

Categorical Exemption and Design Review

**2217 Davis Drive**

Effective **April 18, 2019**

Page 1

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the revised plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped March 29, 2019, sheets G0-1 through A4;
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 basement, 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.





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

**Site: 2217 DAVIS DRIVE**

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 for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling at **2217 DAVIS DRIVE** zoned R-1. APN 025-192-030

**Mailed: March 29, 2019**

**PUBLIC HEARING  
NOTICE**

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

*(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)*



2217 Davis Dr.  
300' Radius  
APN # 025.192.030

