



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, August 12, 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 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

a. Draft July 8, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft July 8, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

b. Draft July 22, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft July 22, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item 7b (1669 Bayshore Highway) 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

- #### a.
- 709 Plymouth Way, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a previously approved first and second floor addition to an existing single family dwelling (previous approval expired - no changes proposed to project). The project is Categorically Exempt from

review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Jesse Guerse, designer; Luai Kaileh, applicant; Ibrahim and Maha Kaileh, property owners) (134 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [709 Plymouth Way - Staff Report](#)

[709 Plymouth Way - Attachments](#)

[709 Plymouth Way - Plans](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the Consent Item. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- b. 1669 Bayshore Highway, zoned IB - Application for a One Year Extension of a previously approved Conditional Use Permit and Parking Variance for a commercial recreation business. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Craig Ranier Gadduang, applicant; 1669 & 1699 Bayshore LLC, property owner) (28 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi - THIS ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO A FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - DATE TO BE DETERMINED

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 920 Bayswater Avenue, zoned MMU & R-3 - Application for Design Review Amendment for changes to a previously approved application for Mitigated Negative Declaration, Lot Merger, Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for Multifamily Residential, and Density Bonus Incentive for a New 128-Unit Apartment Development. (Fore Property Company, applicant and property owner; Withee Malcolm Architects, LLP) (325 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [920 Bayswater Ave - Staff Report](#)

[920 Bayswater Ave - Attachments](#)

[920 Bayswater Ave - Plans](#)

[920 Bayswater Ave - Elevator Shop Drawings](#)

All Commissioners had visited the property. 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.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Mark Pilarczyk, Fore Property Company, represented the applicant, with architect Dirk Thelen, Withee Malcolm Architects.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Elevator drawing shows 5 feet overrun above the elevator car? (Pilarczyk: Correct. Serves 7 stops, two in the garage plus each floor including roof.)
- > Why not side mount elevator mechanical? (Pilarczyk: Has looked at options for minimizing the height. This configuration is because it has 7 stops.)
- > Do the plans identify all of the edits from the entitlements to the proposed drawings? (Pilarczyk: These are the items that are called out from staff.)
- > Shadow line on the elevation does not correspond to the floor plan. (Pilarczyk: That line is showing a downspout for drainage from the roof.)
- > Revised overrun does not have roof details. Were roof forms considered? (Pilarczyk: Intent is to minimize the design so as not to draw the eye to the element.)(Thelen: Did a study with a roof form, and it looked like a mushroom. It would attract the eye to it.)

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Understands why the changes have been brought forward. Has to ask if the revisions would have been approved if the revised elements had been proposed originally. Some of the changes such as the sheer walls are an improvement.)
- > Elevator tower will not be particularly noticeable from the ground floor. However could have some additional detail to be appreciated from the roof deck itself, such as a trellis.
- > See if there are additional options to improve the aesthetics or reduce the overrun of the elevator tower.
- > There is a lot of articulation and interest, so most of these revisions will not be noticeable.
- > The elevator tower constructed on the roof of the former Burlingame Hotel is hardly noticeable from the street.
- > Changes to the elevator tower can be reviewed by staff.

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

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- b.** 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. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (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.

Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Jim Stavoy represented the applicant, with property owners David and Heather Sanchez.

There were no questions from the commission.

Public Comments:

Leslie Reisfeld, 724 Lexington Way, located behind the subject property: Thrilled they will add on. Understands the need for expanding. Questions the tree permit to cut down the shrub; the arborist report mentions that the drip line from the expansion of the house will be impacted. Concerned acacia at neighboring property at 724 Lexington would also be impacted. Wants reassurance that the acacia tree will not be impacted given how the roots are. Also in the file it showed that the applicants met with lots of neighbors, but we were not contacted. Might impact the fence, curious if there has been a survey and whether the fence is on the property line.

Jeannie Bosley, 729 Plymouth Way: Concern adjustments are not adequate. The 7-inch solution may have some technical merit, but in terms of impact it has no practical merit. More than half of the western side would still be out of compliance. The second story of the house extends 12'-11" beyond the rear wall of 729 Plymouth Way; other houses in the neighborhood that expanded beyond the original footprint only expanded the first floor, not a second story addition. There are options available that would not impact 729 Plymouth Way.

Jim Stavoy: Happy to work with neighbor on the adjacent tree. The house is not approaching the required rear yard setback.

Question to applicant: Clarify declining height envelope not in front? (Stavoy: Wanted to maintain character of the front. If it was shifted over it would look off-balance. Thought they were maintaining the look of the other second stories in the area.)

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Does not see much of a change from the prior submittal. Could leave the first dormer and keep the front of the house, but beyond that it is hard to support the special permit. It will create an alley effect.*
- > Likes the change with the added window grids. Will help it fit into the neighborhood.*
- > Has done a lot to tuck the second story into the roof structure. But hung up on the declining height envelope special permit. Declining height envelope exceptions are typically applied in the hillside where the calculations do not work. There are probably lots of other options that would have less impact on the neighbor.*
- > Massing seems off, is creating the problem for itself.*
- > Issue is not with the declining height envelope special permit itself, but from design review - the west elevation still needs work. Second story builds on nonconforming setback, then asking for a special permit to violate the declining height envelope.*
- > In other instances the second floors asking for declining height envelope exceptions do not go straight up. It's usually for dormers etc.*
- > Tucking some of the second floors can go further with the design, might be able to apply some of the exceptions for dormers.*
- > Seems like there are opportunities with the floorplan to reduce the encroachment. The hallway is wide.*
- > Does not see the unique circumstances for the special permit.*
- > Likes the design with the traditional detail and massing, but cannot support the special permit.*

Vice Chair Kelly re-opened the public hearing.

> *Stavoy: Can look at options that would not require a special permit.*

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission comments:

> *Issue is not with having a second story in itself, it is with the massing and encroachment into the declining height envelope.*

Commissioner Kelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to continue the application to a future meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- c. 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 and attached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (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.

Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Gary Diebel represented the applicant.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> *Change in details has been beneficial.*

> *Stained doors are a good change.*

> *Headers should be situated above the windows, not raised above with spaces between, which would make them look like eyebrows.*

- > *Given the slope of the lot, it would be impossible to have a garage that was not attached.*

This item will need to return to the Planning Commission because of a discrepancy in the wording of the public notice.

Commissioner Kelly made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to place the item on the Consent Calendar for final action. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- d. 2918 Adeline Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for a Conditional Use Permit for a new detached garage in front of an existing single family dwelling. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Leslie Jones, Jones Street Design, applicant and designer, Brent and Stephanie Jenkins, property owners) (59 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [2918 Adeline Dr - Staff Report](#)

[2918 Adeline Dr - Attachments](#)

[2918 Adeline Dr - Plans](#)

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

Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Leslie Jones represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Existing house has two types of siding. Why is the garage stucco? (Jones: Wants to replace the rustic siding on the house to match garage.)*
- > *Willing to do board and batten on the front of the garage? (Jones: Would be willing.)*
- > *What kinds of windows will be on the garage? (Jones: Marvin aluminum-clad.)*
- > *What is dimension between the left wall of garage and retaining wall? (Jones: 3 feet.)*
- > *On drawing almost looks like the eaves are touching. Suggest reducing the garage slightly to avoid conflict.*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > *There is just cause for the special permit.*
- > *Staff can review the materials changes.*

Commissioner Gaul made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the application. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- e. Adoption of the Burlingame 2030 Climate Action Plan and Addendum to the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Staff Contacts: Andrea Pappajohn and Kevin Gardiner

Attachments: [Staff Report](#)

[MIG Memorandum - Response to Comments](#)

[2030 CAP – Revised Public Review Draft](#)

[EIR Addendum](#)

[Resolution - EIR Addendum](#)

[Resolution - 2030 CAP Update and GP Amendment](#)

[Public Notice](#)

Andrea Poppajohn, City of Burlingame Sustainability Fellow, introduced the item.

Chris Dugan, MIG, made a presentation of the Climate Action Plan.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Are reach codes typically associated with incentive measures or programs? Or is it more typical that there is a code, and a reach code on top of that? (Dugan: More typically it is the code, and the reach code on top of it.)(Kane: Staff is looking at the matter comprehensively to see if there could be incentives built in that would function in the same way. The City does not need to adopt a reach code in the same manner as other municipalities if it wants to create its own structure that reaches the same result but through a different procedural mechanism.)

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

Doug Silverstein: Climate Action Plans are important because they directly address harmful greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change, and they help the City prioritize effective solutions that cities can take to reduce emissions. Growing concern in the community for climate change and global warming. Confident more residents will become engaged with the City to ensure the community has a strong plan that we can confidently say addresses the true impact of global warming. The CEC advocated for more aggressive goals, and will continue to stay engaged and want to be involved. This year's update cycle is a good foundation for building more aggressive plans in the future with larger goals and regular progress reports, and make deeper cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. Looks forward to the updates on the measures that have been proposed, and adding more measures in the future.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Gratitude and debt to the CEC.
- > This is an important document. Would like to make more of the public aware of it.

- > Could look at moving 2050 goals to 2040, rather than 2030. Might be more workable.
- > Suggest allowing the use of EV chargers at municipal facilities to be available to employees in a subsidized manner, similar to the transit pass subsidies.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to recommend approval of the Climate Action Plan, General Plan Amendment, and EIR Addendum to the City Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 812 Linden Avenue (vacant lot adjacent to 816 Linden Avenue), zoned R-1 - Application for a Conditional Use Permit for re-emerging lots, Design Review and Special Permit for one new, two-story single family dwelling and attached garage at 812 Linden Avenue (vacant parcel next to 816 Linden Ave). (Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, applicant and designer; 812 Linden LLC and 816 Linden LLC, property owners) (148 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [812 and 816 Linden Ave - Staff Report](#)
[812 and 816 Linden Ave - Attachments](#)
[812 and 816 Linden Ave - Plans](#)

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

Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

- > *What are the findings that need to be made for the CUP for re-emerging lots? (Kolokihakaufisi: Same findings as a regular CUP.)(Gardiner: Findings would need to determine if the new lot pattern would be consistent with the pattern of the neighborhood. If it's a double lot and the new lot would make it consistent with the other lots in the neighborhood, that would be a finding.)*

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Why not miter the wood siding corners? Design is well-crafted, but would look better with mitered corners. (Raduenz: Can miter them.)*
- > *Neighborhood is predominantly detached garages: only 4 out of 16 on the block are attached. (Raduenz: Trying to keep a good livable space in the back yard. Lot is slightly smaller than others.)*
- > *Not convinced by request for the special permit for the attached garage.*
- > *Why is there a window well on the second floor? Egress? (Raduenz: Yes. It's also a traditional detail seen in a lot of craftsman homes.) It is a nice detail but it is so broad. Could it be half the size, and then have smaller windows on each side? (Raduenz: Yes can look at the scale.)*
- > *Are solar panels proposed both in the well as well as on the side roof? (Raduenz: If needed.)*
- > *Should show a detail of the shingles rolling up into the flat well, so that there does not need to be a metal flashing detail that calls attention to the flat roof.*
- > *What is the resulting width of the driveway at 816 Linden Avenue? (Raduenz: Minimal, just over 9 feet.*

Needs to remove a bay window to obtain the driveway width.)

> Why is the front setback so large? Allowed to have a 15-foot setback, since the block average is less than 15 feet. Could bring the house forward and have enough room for the back yard with a detached garage. (Raduenz: Wanted enough space to fit a car onto the driveway, but could bring the house forward.)

Public Comments:

Bob Liedtke, 802 Linden Avenue: Driveway encroaches onto 812 Linden. Part of the condition of sale was to give up the encroachment. Only concern is what will the roofline look like in the backyard. Story poles? Wants to see what it will look like. House at 802 Linden Avenue is only 3 feet away from the property line, and with the new house only 4 feet from the property line there will only be 7 feet between the two houses. Wants to know if the roofline will cut off sunlight.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Story poles are not typically required. They are typically reserved for areas of the city where there may be impacts to distant views. Not sure what the purview for requiring them here would be, would need to have a specific reason.*
- > Pattern of the neighborhood is detached garages. It's a well-crafted design, but the house stretches all the way across the lot.*
- > Could modify the plan to bring the office around toward the front, have it be part of a wrap-around porch, and still have enough room for a 9- or 10-foot driveway along the side. Would provide some relief to the neighbor next door.*
- > Detached garage would work better with the neighborhood. Has a hard time making the findings for the attached garage.*
- > Well crafted, massing is handled nicely.*
- > Can make the findings for the CUP for emerging lots. The pattern in the neighborhood is single lots, not double lots with vacant land.*
- > CUP and design review is supportable, but not the special permit for the attached garage.*
- > Intent of having a detached garage is to bring down the massing of the house. Otherwise the house spans the entire lot. Detached garages are the pattern of the neighborhood. As a paved surface the driveway is a usable space.*

Vice Chair Kelly reopened the public hearing.

Raduenz: If the garage is moved to the back, would need to have more windows on the second floor. The intent was to match the attached garage on the new house with the attached garage on the neighboring house, which would create privacy for the neighbor.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Comments:

- > Commission is looking to interpret the design guidelines and zoning code. The recommendation for the detached garage is to conform to the design guidelines and zoning code.*
- > The ordinances do not address privacy. Neighbor appears to be concerned with light, air, rooflines, and massing. These are addressed in the design guidelines.*

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

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- b. 503 Howard Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition and Special Permit for a new attached garage to an existing single family dwelling. (JoAnn Gann, applicant and designer; Joseph and Judith Hamilton, property owners) (120 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [503 Howard Ave - Staff Report](#)

[503 Howard Ave - Attachments](#)

[503 Howard Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the property. 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.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Jo Ann Gann represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Did you look at any other options that would retain the existing detached garage? (Gann: Driveway is really wide and takes up a lot of space on the lot. Wanted to put the garage on the side and keep room in the backyard. Most houses on the street have attached garages, and most are closer to the street than this one.)

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

> Predominant pattern in the neighborhood is attached garages. Would be consistent with the pattern, and is providing a side setback of 5 feet rather than 4 feet so is providing more relief than required.

> Can support the attached garage.

> Nicely crafted. Likes that the second floor has been tucked into the roof with dormers.

> Likes the dormers on the front, adds some interest.

> Rear family room wall could benefit from some windows looking into the back yard. There is still 16 feet beyond the family room. Perhaps could add windows to either side of the fireplace - smaller windows if there is a desire to provide space for bookcases.

> Should add landscaping for screening on the side for the neighbor. This would mitigate concerns with the sight line and would complement the architecture.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

- c. 1509 Bernal Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (James Chu, Chu Design Associates, Inc., applicant and designer; Ljs LLC, property owner) (118 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [1509 Bernal Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1509 Bernal Ave - Attachments](#)

[1509 Bernal Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the property. Commissioner Gaul talked with the neighbor across the street at 1512 Bernal Avenue.

Associate Planner Kolokihakaufisi provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

James Chu, Chu Design Associates, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Has the survey and location of the fence been discussed with the neighbor on the right? The existing fence is set back from the property line, but if it is removed and rebuilt on the property line it could conflict with planting they have on their side. It is within the rights of the property owner to rebuild the fence in the correct location, but should coordinate with neighbor so they are not surprised.*
- > How does the first floor plate height relate to the eave overhangs? It seems the overhangs and eaves seem pretty high relative to the plate height. (Chu: In most cases the second story is situated directly above the first story. Here has extended the floor joists have to the plate/beam, which makes it easier for the sheer transfer.) Should provide a section or partial section to clarify.*
- > Windows above the shower/tub in the bathrooms should be shorter. (Chu: Drawing error, should be square.)*
- > Window in the powder room does not show in the elevation. (Chu: Drawing error.)*
- > Consider shifting the window in Bedroom #1 out from behind door. Would then align nicely underneath the window above. (Chu: Agree.)*

Public Comments:

Camille Hoogasian, 1515 Bernal Avenue: Concern with the fence, and with the trees. All the large trees are on their property line but impacts her property. Roots have lifted the driveway and garage, and have disrupted the sewer line. Curious about the french doors facing her house, and fireplace along the property line, unfamiliar with vent rather than chimney. Currently multiple families live in the house. Recently there were sewer problems at the house. A tree on the property fell last year and crushed a car on her property. They are birch trees. The property is not being maintained.

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Planning staff can get in touch with the neighbor to discuss her concerns.*
- > Design of the house is quite nice.*

- > *Might be good to have the fireplace vent go out the top with a chimney, so that mechanical noise and fumes do not interfere with the neighbor.*
- > *There are two pairs of french doors, could eliminate one set in consideration of the neighbor.*
- > *Side-facing french door is set back 20 feet from the fence. Does not ordinarily use privacy as a criteria.*

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to place the item on the Consent Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

- a. 615 Airport Boulevard - Update regarding the progress of the development of the site (Anza Parking).

Attachments: [615 Airport Blvd - Memorandum & Attachments](#)

Informational item. No action required.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:32 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 August 12, 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 22, 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.