



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, July 22, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 4 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

Absent 3 - Kelly, Gaul, and Loftis

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Draft June 24, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft June 24, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 3 - Kelly, Gaul, and Loftis

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item 8a has been continued to a future date.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no public comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no Consent Items.

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. Amendments to Interim Zoning Standards for the North Burlingame Mixed Use (NBMU) and Rollins Road Mixed Use Zones (RRMU). Staff Contact: Kevin Gardiner THIS ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO A FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - DATE

TO BE DETERMINED

This item has been continued to a future date.

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 725 Plymouth Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for declining height envelope for a first and second floor addition to an existing single family dwelling. (James Stavoy, applicant and architect; Heather and David Sanchez, property owners) (138 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [725 Plymouth Way - Staff Report](#)

[725 Plymouth Way - Attachments](#)

[725 Plymouth Way - Plans](#)

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

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

- > *Paragraph D of Code Section 25.26.075(b)(3) is merely qualifying the exemption in paragraph B, not the Declining Height Envelope requirements, or whether a Special Permit is allowable, correct? (Keylon: Correct.)*
- > *Why is a protected tree permit required for a Pittosporum, since it's a shrub and not a tree? (Keylon: It is based on the size of the shrub. It is multi-trunked species.)(Kane: It is the circumference measurement.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Jim Stavoy represented the applicant, with property owner David Sanchez.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Why is the tree removal associated with the project? Is it necessary for the project? (Stavoy: Addition would be close enough to the drip line to necessitate removal of the tree.)*
- > *Did you look at any other options that further articulated the west elevation? It is a little flat. (Stavoy: Thought this design would flow with the look of the structure.)*
- > *How was the grid pattern articulation of the windows around the house determined? Should extend the grids all around the house. (Stavoy: Based on discussion with staff, and owners' preference.)*
- > *Why not use the Declining Height Envelope exemption for the window over the stairwell? (Stavoy: Was not aware of that possibility.)*
- > *Did you consider a lower plate height on the second story to reduce the encroachment into the Declining Height Envelope? (Stavoy: It's at 6 feet so it is already very low.)*
- > *There is a 6-inch setback on the right side shown on the plans. Is the entire right side moving 6 inches away from property line? (Stavoy: Indicating from the survey that the house is within 6 inches of the 4-foot setback.)*
- > *Why does the the second floor match the existing nonconforming setback, rather than set back to the required 4 feet? (Stavoy: Thought that was allowed as part of the special permit.)*
- > *To staff: Why is a variance not required for the second floor, since it is proposed to be built above the existing non-conforming setback? (Keylon: Will need to review the particulars of the Code and get back with a response.)*
- > *Has the window alignment on the second floor been considered? (Stavoy: Believes there are not*

windows looking into neighbor's house. Can frost some windows.)

Public Comments:

Jeannie Bosley, 729 Plymouth Way, to the right of the subject property: Submitted letter and photos, and letter from realtor. Opposes the project as presented. Concern with non-compliance with Declining Height Envelope; bookend metaphor is interesting but should not be applied here. Does not believe the Code allows for a Declining Height Envelope encroachment in this instance. Also objects to extending from the original footprint of the home.

Shiela Jambekar and Sean Moran: Lives across the street. Supports the quality of the design, keeps with the character of the community. Will be a nice view. Keeps a look that is consistent with the neighborhood. There are a lot of remodels in the neighborhood.

Cheri Meyers, 438 Cumberland: Lives diagonally across from the property. Supports the project. Plan is consistent with the neighborhood, and reflects themes that make Burlingables special.

David Sanchez (property owner): Respects the perspective of all of the neighbors, including the adjacent neighbor. Believes this will be an investment in the neighborhood and community.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Design guidelines emphasize adding the second story into the roof structure so it minimizes impact to the neighbors. This does more of that than most.*
- > West elevation is very blank and flat. Perhaps change the dormers or add more detail. Stepping the all in might add some nice detail.*
- > Should revisit the window grids.*
- > Would want to see what would be involved in an addition that did not involve the declining height envelope.*
- > Has allowed special permits in similar instances. However sees some revisions in terms of the design guidelines. Special permits are to accommodate particular architectural treatments. Front faceprint is typical of the neighborhood. Side elevation is more typical of a driveway elevation but does not have the relief of the driveway width.*
- > Needs to clarify the setback of the second story, whether it needs a variance.*
- > Front facade is consistent with the neighborhood, but side elevation needs attention.*
- > This is not the only way to design the house. Should look at a less impactful declining height encroachment.*

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

Aye: 4 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 3 - Kelly, Gaul, and Loftis

- b.** 2601 Easton Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for declining height envelope and attached garage for a new, two-story single family dwelling with an attached garage. (Gary Diebel, Diebel and Company | Architects, applicant and architect; Liz and Debanjan Ray, property owners) (90 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [2601 Easton Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2601 Easton Dr - Attachments](#)
[2601 Easton Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the property. 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 Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Gary Diebel represented the applicant, with property owners Liz and Debanjan Ray.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Massing is well articulated and broken down. Why are all the roofs hip roofs? Why no gables? (Diebel: Studied both. Hip roofs seemed to work the best, minimizes the mass.)*
- > Rear elevation has a lot of charm, front seems a bit bare. Some gable roofs would allow more decorative elements.*
- > Have you considered a stained wood door for the garage door to provide depth? (Diebel: That has been proposed, both on the garage door and entry door.)*
- > Would like more of the decorative items in the front.*
- > Is the face of the proposed garage in the same plane as the current garage? (Diebel: Many are built at 15 feet since it is a steep hill. This garage is at about 25 feet.)*
- > On left elevation where there are a couple of cantilevered sections, there is a window over the shower in the center section of the elevation that is offset, almost calling attention for more detail or decoration since it is a projection. Maybe the window should be centered or balanced somehow.*
- > How large is the deck off the kitchen? (Diebel: Approximately 20' x 19'.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Steep slope indicates a need for declining height envelope relief.*
- > Look at adding more charm to the front elevation.*
- > Busy roofline, almost every part of the house has its own roof form. Could simplify. Also consider some gable roofs.*
- > Note on plan indicates wood or stucco brackets; should specify wood.*
- > Tree removal is supportable given it is growing into the house.*
- > Existing front elevation is simple but has nice details; should try some of those types of elements on the new house.*
- > Would like some reference to neighbors, particularly those on the left, to make sure they are OK and windows are not aligned.*
- > Garage is set back so is not in the face of the neighbor.*
- > Cognizant of the deck being close to the neighbors. Assumes entertaining since it is from the kitchen. Suggest some shrubbery to screen for the neighbors.*

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

by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

Absent: 3 - Kelly, Gaul, and Loftis

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioners Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- a. 4 La Mesa Court - FYI for proposed changes to a previously approved Design Review application.

Attachments: [4 La Mesa Ct - Memorandum and Attachments](#)

[4 La Mesa Ct - Plans](#)

[4 La Mesa Ct - Renderings](#)

This item was pulled since there was a written request from a member of the public. Commissioners cited concern with enlargement and additions of any windows.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 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 July 22, 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 August 1, 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 \$1,045 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.