



# 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

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner and Senior Planner Catherine Keylon.*

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 6 - Sargent, Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent** 1 - Kelly

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Terrones, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the minutes with the amendments as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

#### a. Draft December 10, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft December 10, 2018 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

#### b. Draft January 28, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft January 28, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

#### c. Draft February 25, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft February 25, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

### 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

### 6. STUDY ITEMS

- #### a.
- 16 Park Road, zoned BMU - Application for Rear Setback Variance and Parking Variance for parking off-site at 12 Park Road for a personal training studio. (Philip Levi, applicant; Park Road Properties, LLC, property owner) (198 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [16 Park Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[16 Park Rd - Attachments](#)  
[16 Park Rd - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Gaul had met with the applicant.*

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

*Questions of staff:*

- > Can the rear setback variance be specific to the type of land use? (Gardiner: Yes. Variances run with the land provided that the pergola remains. There can be specific conditions pertaining to the pergola with the variance.)*
- > Is there information that is provided by the applicant about the lease agreement pertaining to exclusive use of parking on-site? (Gardiner: No, there is only a deed restriction pertaining to one of the pergolas on-site.)*
- > Can there be a condition included that if 12 Park Road gets redeveloped that the variance expires? (Gardiner: Yes. If 12 Park Road gets redeveloped in the future, Burlingame Fitness would have to come back to the Planning Commission for an amendment.)*
- > Is there more information about the Code Enforcement complaint? (Gardiner: There have been a series of unpermitted uses over the site's history but the nature of the proposed project is to rectify these unpermitted uses.)*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Philip Levi, Burlingame Fitness, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > Is your lease for both properties? (Levi: Yes, the lease agreement is for both properties and I did not realize that Planning approval was required to park on the 12 Park Road side.)*
- > Was a contractor involved in building the structure? Did either mention permits? (Levi: Two contractors were involved and permits were not brought up.)*
- > Is there an architect involved or designer that can help you with the plans? (Levi: There is a structural engineer that has verified the structural integrity of both pergolas. I can provide documentation.)*
- > Who did the parking layout? (Levi: Myself and my wife.)*
- > Which driveway will be used? Not seeing how cars are going to be maneuvering on site. (Levi: Depends on which direction they enter. Health coaches park in the back to ease the flow of traffic.)*
- > Needs to show accessible space. Backup space to pergola is not shown correctly. (Levi: Typo. Understands there is a minimum space for backup. Understands it has been met.)*
- > Did you prepare the responses to the variance request? (Levi: Yes.)*
- > What is the extraordinary circumstance with the pergola? (Levi: Had been a house. Slab remained. Sunk posts to create a cover. Did not know about required rear setback. Structure supports a sagging fence adjacent.)*
- > What is the exceptional circumstance for the parking variance? (Levi: Cannot provide parking without the spaces. Permission to park on the lot at 12 Park Road was agreed upon in the lease.)*
- > What was the nature of the code complaint in 2017 for parking? (Levi: Does not know. Has documented use of the lot, but parking on the street is constrained. Has never had parking issues.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion:*

- > For the structure in the back, needs to see elevations to determine plate height and overall height.
- > Having trouble making the findings for the variance. Disrepair of the slab is not sufficient.
- > Cannot make finding for rear structure no matter its size or height.
- > Cannot support findings in the applicant's application for a parking variance.
- > Could support a variance if it states that the properties operate as one property. Because of the way the property is operating, the parking is located on the adjacent lot.
- > Not convinced the layout will work. Needs to show dimensions and backup space.
- > Does not see unique circumstances with the lot.
- > An exceptional circumstance with the parking is with the lease. Would require a condition that if the lease ends or 12 Park Road is sold, the variance would be null.
- > 16 Park Road has space for parking. It's just being used in other ways.
- > Would like to find a way to make this work.
- > Find a way to rewrite the variance request for off-site parking.
- > Cannot support the pergola variance. Would like to find a way to support the parking variance. Likes how the property is being used. The back area is a vital part of the success of the business.

**As a Study Item, there is no Planning Commission action. The application will return on the Regular Action Calendar for action.**

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner Terrones noted that he did not attend the study meeting for 329 Occidental Avenue, but he watched the video.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sargent, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

- a. 1612 Devereux Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (JoAnn Gann, applicant and designer; Ji Yoon Chung & Austin Choi, property owners) (85 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

**Attachments:** [1612 Devereux Dr - Staff Report](#)

[1612 Devereux Dr - Attachments](#)

[1612 Devereux Dr - Plans](#)

- b. 329 Occidental Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Joe and Julia McVeigh, property owners; TRG Architects-Carlos Rojas, applicant and architect) (99 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

**Attachments:** [329 Occidental Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[329 Occidental Ave - Attachments](#)  
[329 Occidental Ave - Historic Resource Study](#)  
[329 Occidental Ave - Plans](#)

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 1125 Oxford Road, zoned R-1 - Application for a Special Permit for reduction in the number of on-site parking spaces. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (James Neubert Architects, architect; Vishal Jangla, property owner) (129 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

**Attachments:** [1125 Oxford Rd - Staff Report](#)  
[1125 Oxford Rd - Attachments](#)  
[1125 Oxford Rd - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications to report. Commissioners Terrones and Comaroto were not in attendance for the study item, but each reviewed the video.*

*Senior Planner Catherine Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Jim Neubert, James Neubert Architects, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > Does the desire to open the door require it to look like a second garage door? (Neubert: No. It is the preference of the owner. The original house had two doors. Wanted to have the same expression, but different uses.)*
- > Was anything done to make the door to the den separate from the garage, so it does not look like a two-car garage? (Neubert: Thought the consensus was the two doors looked good. It is the owners' preference. Thought the only issue was the width of the driveway.)*
- > How are the bottoms of the doors insulated? (Neubert: They are custom-made doors, with insulation at the closing flange and a curb at the bottom for wind and water resistance.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > Surprised to see the doors there. Thought the applicant was instructed to have the garage doors look less like two sets of garage doors.*
- > Could make the garage look like a garage separate from the den, such as a nested gable or*

*additional trim detail... something to differentiate the garage and the face of the garage doors from the den space. Something so it does not look like two garage doors side by side.*

*> The two doors do not fit the neighborhood. French doors could be beautiful.*

*> Meeting notes show intent to not have two garage doors.*

*> There is so much reworking being of the front facade: the doors are being pulled, the gable is being completely redone, the vent is being replaced. It would not be difficult to revise it so it does not look like two garage doors. Understands the desire for the indoor-outdoor aspect, and it would be nice to have patio doors, but it looks odd to have two garage doors with it not being a two-car garage.*

*> Likes the idea of the tree in front with the patio.*

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

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

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

- b.** 1425 Bernal Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Raymond Wong, property owner; Chu Design Associates (applicant and designer) (123 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

**Attachments:** [1425 Bernal Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1425 Bernal Ave - Attachments](#)

[1425 Bernal Ave - Plans](#)

*Commissioner Sargent was recused from this item because he lives within 500 feet of the subject property.*

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

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

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*James Chu, Chu Design Associates, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

*> Has the lighting fixture been selected? (Chu: No.)*

*> Are you aware there are regulations that requires shielding to keep the light from leaving the property? (Chu: Yes.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

> *Likes the changes. The cable railings previously proposed did not fit. Likes the solid rail.*

**Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Loftis, Comaroto, Gaul, Terrones, and Tse

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

**Recused:** 1 - Sargent

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- 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

- b.** 1369 Drake Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for building height for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage (Metropolis Architecture, Lawrence Kahle, applicant and architect; Nick and Sara Adler, property owners) (111 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

**Attachments:** [1369 Drake Ave - Staff Report and Attachments](#)  
[1369 Drake Ave - Plans](#)

*Commissioner Sargent was recused from this item since he lives within 500 feet of the subject property.*

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Comaroto spoke with the neighbor to the left, and Commissioners Tse and Gaul had met with the applicant.*

*Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Nick and Sara Adler represented the applicant, with Larry Kahle, Metropolis Architecture.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > Ten trees are being removed. Are any protected size trees? (Nick Adler: No, they are all smaller.)
- > Were lower plate heights considered? (Sara Adler: We were both raised in houses with tall ceilings. Wanted to have a light and airy feeling.)
- > Why is 10-feet clear proposed for the basement, given it is proposed for storage? (Sara Adler: Intention is to have it as a bare finished space. Has not decided what the use will be.)
- > Be careful with the design of the basement. There has been a history of basement flooding in this area. The deeper the basement, the more complicated with drainage and dewatering.
- > Needs to show how the Hardie siding would be mitered at the corner. Natural wood looks more fitting than the cementitious product. Natural shingles are available that come completely pre-painted.
- > Has there been consideration of windows on the left side (east elevation) where there is blank wall? The wall will be visible from the street since there is a smaller home next door. (Nick Adler: It can be considered.)

*Public Comments:*

*Ted, house to the right: Generally supportive of the proposal. Vast improvement to what is there currently. Has had questions about the shadowing and light; the applicant has been assisting in exploring potential impacts.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > While it is an upsloping lot, which effects the height calculation, this is a brand new house. Difficulty with the request for special consideration for added height, given the plate heights are at 10 feet and 9 feet. Bringing the height down would help with the proportion of the architecture, particularly with the steeper pitched roofs.*
- > While there are taller houses to either side, they're on the uphill side of the street. But the context is mixed, and the other side of the street has a row of single-story houses.*
- > Well-crafted house, and the detailing is well-done; the only concern is the height.*
- > Hard to support the additional height. House feels like it is bursting at the seams. More typically 9' and 8' plate heights are approved since most projects want to maximize the square footage, and higher heights further inflate the volume of the house. Bringing down the plate heights will help with the proportions.*
- > Likes the house and the architecture. Agrees on the plate height, would like to see it lower.*
- > Should look at the siding material.*
- > Window grids need more consistency. Some window grids are horizontal, others are vertically-oriented with different dimensions. Would improve the design to be more consistent.*

**Commissioner Gaul made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to have the item return on the Regular Action Calendar when revisions have been made as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

- c.** 830 Paloma Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Scott Kuehne, Suarez Kuehne Architecture, applicant and architect; Jennifer and Matt Kulin, property owners) (147 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [830 Paloma Ave - Staff Report](#)  
[830 Paloma Ave - Attachments](#)  
[830 Paloma Ave - Plans](#)

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

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

- > Is there a requirement to convert the woodburning fireplace to gas? (Gardiner: Does not know.)*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Scott Kuehne, Suarez-Kuehne Architecture, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*



- > What are the plate heights? Are they 8'-6" on the first floor and 8'-9" on the second floor? (Kuehne: Yes.)
- > Will the woodburning fireplace be retained? (Kuehne: Yes, and we will extend the chimney.) It looks awkward - how will it be supported without ties? If there is a gas insert, would not need to extend it.
- > When a second floor is taller than the first, it looks off-balance. (Kuehne: It's just a few inches more, and seems appropriate for a master level. With the 4:12 roof it felt like it was balanced and proportionate. It is still within the height limit.) Could have a cathedral ceiling within the roof structure to obtain more volume, could be very striking.
- > Existing metal roof (simulated clay tile) may be hard to retain with the construction. Is there interest in something different if it needs to be replaced? (Kuehne: Can explore options.)
- > What other locations were considered for the second story addition? (Kuehne: Looked at a location closer to the front, but it created a tall elevation and would be very narrow, would require a long hall. This design allows a more compact floorplan. Also wanted to group the bedrooms together on the first and second floors. It felt like the best balance for the situation in terms of declining height envelope, setbacks, and low impact from the street.)

*Public Comments:*

Gabriella Addiego and son, neighbor to the left: Concern with losing privacy, and shading fruit trees. Too close to the trees in the yard. Has not seen the shade studies. Believes there is possibility for a second story, but wants it done with least impact on sunlight and privacy of the neighboring house.

Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.

*Commission Discussion:*

- > The garage defines the house currently. The house would benefit from having an addition toward the front to balance the garage.
- > Could place the addition to the north, and closer to the front.
- > Windows are uncoordinated.
- > Needs more detail. Lacking in detail.
- > Not opposed to the addition in the back, but would want a lower floorplate so it fits better with the first floor.
- > Addition does not tie together with existing house's footprint.
- > If the addition was moved over and forward, could incorporate the chimney into the second story.
- > If the bedrooms were put where the family room is, and the family room moved to the back to open to the back yard, it would be a more functional design for the first floor and could integrate with a second floor addition further forward.
- > Would like second story addition brought forward.
- > Looks like a two-story house grafted onto a one-story house.
- > Understands the lot is narrow, but then the placement of the massing becomes more sensitive.
- > Would benefit from a design review consultant.
- > Should look at the proportion between first and second floor. Difference in plate heights not that different but some windows on the second floor are much larger than the second floor and accentuates the height, emphasizes the second floor. Design Review Guidelines minimize the second story and keep the emphasis on the first floor.

**Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to refer the application to a design review consultant. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**Absent:** 1 - Kelly

- d. 748 Plymouth Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story

addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Mark Percy, applicant and architect; Heather & Ekine Akuiyibo, property owners) (109 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

**Attachments:** [748 Plymouth Way - Staff Report](#)

[748 Plymouth Way - Attachments](#)

[748 Plymouth Way - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones had met with the project architect for a pre-application meeting. Commissioner Tse had met with the architect. Commissioner Comaroto had spoken with the applicant.*

*Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Heather and Ekine Akuiyibo represented the applicant, with architect Mark Percy.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > On the left side elevation, looks like it will loom over the house on the corner and be very visible from the Chatham side. (Percy: Has done a lot of work to keep the height in check. There is also a wide sideyard, about 15 feet. It will be somewhat noticeable from the Chatham side, but there is screening in place. Could add additional screening. Given that it is not particularly high, believes it will be a good neighbor. The addition is centered in the rear central portion of the site. Wanted to maintain a modest scale, and retain a one-story feel at the front.)*
- > Would be helpful to have a rendering of the Chatham side, to get a sense of how it will interact with the other house.*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > Interesting project. The addition is relatively modest and compact.*
- > There is a lot going on in a small amount of space, and feels a bit jumbled.*
- > Does not like the northeast elevation; it feels like it is turning its back to the neighbor on that side, with the blank wall and expanse of roof.*
- > The contemporary style seems to fit into the neighborhood. It is behaving like a house, with the massing like a traditional airplane bungalow.*
- > Likes the interplay of the shed roofs. Leads to a massing in the front similar to the existing traditional ranch house.*
- > Would benefit from having a window on the blank side, even a small window.*
- > Appreciates the articulation of the second floor plates.*
- > The neighborhood is eclectic, which lends to the contemporary style. The front has a low profile, as is the shed roof at the back.*
- > The application of materials makes sense. It will blend in with the neighborhood.*
- > Impressed with the house. Creative solution without pushing the envelope too far. Is massed well.*
- > Has done a nice job with integrating a contemporary design into the neighborhood.*

- > *Still has concerns with the Chatham elevation.*
- > *The Chatham side has a lot of vegetation.*

**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

- e.** 1660 Rollins Road, zoned RR - Application for Commercial Design Review and Parking Variance for an addition and facade changes to an existing commercial building. (David Mena, Mena Architects, applicant and architect; Symons Consulting International Ltd., property owner) (35 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [1660 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)

[1660 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)

[1660 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

*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.*

*There were no questions of staff.*

*Chair Gaul opened the public hearing.*

*Mike Symons represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

- > *How do the employees get from BART to the building? (Symons: They walk. It's about a five-minute walk.)*
- > *How many employees walk from BART that currently? (Symons: Three out of seven employees. We intend to add bicycles in the future for employees use, and there is a basketball court in back.)*

*Public Comments:*

*There were no public comments.*

*Chair Gaul closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion:*

- > *Existing simple frame elevation of the existing building is nice, not sure that the proposed changes to the facade improve it. Not sure what the folding metal plate is doing, and the frame disappears behind the glass.*
- > *If less square footage was added, there would not need as much parking and might not need the parking variance. Could build within the confines of what the parking would allow, not sure what the extraordinary circumstances are to justify the variance.*
- > *The existing simple metal frame building could be cleaned up and look quite nice.*
- > *Doesn't have an issue with parking variance because of the transportation corridor so close by, and if employees are taking BART, they are not driving in. Caltrain is also nearby.*

- > Warehouse uses have fewer employees than general office, and may not need the amount of parking required. Seems 18 spaces is plenty.
- > Indifferent to the commercial remodel of the front facade. It's in an industrial area and if it is what the applicant wants, has no opposition to it.
- > Does the recent rezoning change anything? (Gardiner: There may be options for a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, which would allow flexibility with parking. The bicycles mentioned by the applicant is an example of TDM.) Would be great if staff could look at that, the underlying application is a great one and should be encouraged.
- > There have been other instances in this area where the parking demand is less than what the code requires. Other uses such as commercial recreation have had parking reductions based on use of the space compared to the zoning requirements. Warehouse use does not have much parking demand.
- > OK with pulling the floorplate forward on the facade, but the proposal seems to be trying really hard with the bent plates and kinked buttresses. Seems a bit fussy, but does not have an issue with the character of the clad pilasters and glass front facade.
- > Good application in terms of its intent and its uses. The building addition is being built in an area that is not being currently used for parking. It is being added where the existing ramp is. Applicant is infilling an area that does not serve their purposes now.
- > Can support the reduction of spaces given the location, proximity to mass transit, and lowering the need of automobiles with alternative transportation options.
- > Operations needs require additional warehouse space, which is an exceptional circumstance in this instance.
- > Existing building is dated. Can support the design and improvement of the front if it is to make a statement for the business in attracting customers and staying competitive.
- > Would like to see the parking solved in a manner other than a variance
- > Front is trying too hard, should be simplified.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to have the application return on the Regular Action Calendar when revisions have been made as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

## 10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Commissioner Terrones reported that he and Commissioner Loftis have been participating in the design review committee for the Community Center. The process is going well and it is shaping up to be a very nice building. The architect has a good handle on the design, program, and direction from the City Council. The design committee has provided input on various aspects of the project.

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Community Development Director Gardiner reported that the City Council reviewed the residential impact fees at its meeting on March 4th. The fees were generally supported, with some additional clarifications to be incorporated into the ordinance.

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

*Note: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on March 11, 2019. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on March 21, 2019, the action becomes final. In order to be effective, appeals must be in writing to the City Clerk and must be accompanied by an appeal fee of \$551, which includes noticing costs.*

*Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours at the Community Development/Planning counter, City Hall, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.*