

Form + One

4843 Silver Springs Drive
Park City, UT 84098

P+ 415.819.0304

E + tim@formonedesign.com

TRANSMITTAL FORM

To: City of Burlingame Planning Department
Subject: 4 La Mesa Court (Revisions to Exterior)

From: Tim Raduenz
Date Sent: 06/27/19
Number of Pages: 1

Designers Review and Design changes made - 4 La Mesa Court:

Hello Commission:

As we all have known this has been a long process and project, from the very long permitting process to approval for my first clients, and then my clients selling the project to the current owner.

Comments on the changes:

1. We are doing this RFI (review) of the changes to the layout of the exterior materials, they are the same, but the new owner has an interior designer that wants things their way and the client's agree. So we want to review with you the changes and hopefully get your approval. The exterior façade layouts are to me, minimal, and does not affect the overall style that was previously approved.
2. Some of the windows have been deleted per the present Owner's request, and some have slightly moved, and a few fixed units have received small awning units at the bottom, to promote air ventilation as needed. Again most of the changes are small or minimal, we just want to make sure we are following the rules to a tee, as this was a very confrontational project from the beginning.
3. I do hope, you take the time to drive by or see it from the other side of the valley, it really does sit well on the property and doesn't burden the neighbors with a large mac mansion... it actually looks smaller than the most the homes on that block, if we were to compare.

To that end we would love to review the changes the current owner has made and make this a good experience for everyone!

Best + thanks again,

Tim Raduenz – CGBP



From: Alex Pavlovsky [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 11:40 AM
To: CD/PLG-Ruben Hurin <RHurin@burlingame.org>
Cc: Form One <tim@formonedesign.com>
Subject: Re: 4 La Mesa Ct - Next Steps

Hi Ruben,

on august 15th i met with Ray and Barbara Forrest.

i explained that the ONLY change on their side is within bed #3.

we had two small windows that we combined into one window.

glass area coverage remained the same. two small windows became one window.

i confirmed that this new window will be frosted.

Ray/barbara pointed to another window in that bedroom (done per plans and not called for privacy) and asked for it to be also frosted.

i tried to explain that this other window was approved as clear glass and i can not frost all windows in same bedroom and not have any natural light

after the meeting i sent two emails but i have not heard from Ray/Barbara.

i spoke with Mark/Katie (2 La Mesa) and they have no issues with any changes.

Ruben, anything else i need to do at this moment?

thank you

07.22.19 Meeting
Item 11 - fyi
4 La Mesa Court
Page 1 of 1

*COMMUNICATION RECEIVED
AFTER PREPARATION
OF STAFF REPORT*

RECEIVED
JUL 19 2019
CITY OF BURLINGAME
CDD – PLANNING DIV.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Forrest [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2019 10:51 AM
To: CD/PLG-Ruben Hurin <RHurin@burlingame.org>
Subject: 4 La Mesa Court

To: Ruben Hurin, Planning Manager
From: Ray and Barbara Forrest
6 La Mesa Court
Re: Proposed Changes to Design Review at 4 La Mesa Court

We are against any enlarging of windows at the construction site at 4 La Mesa Court. Window sizes were negotiated during a nine month approval process in 2013-2014 after much discussion regarding privacy issues. Now window changes deviating from the originally approved plans are being proposed with no input from the neighbors being affected by these changes.

Any enlargement of windows would further encroach on our privacy issues which were discussed in depth by the Planning Commission during the approval process.

In addition, the installed windows on the north side of the construction site which were required by the Planning Commission to be permanently frosted in the originally approved plans are not. Changes have not been made to these windows after this error was brought to the attention of the Planning Department many months ago.

We request the opportunity for neighbors to give input during a public discussion. These changes affect us and go against the original intent of the Planning Commission in their efforts to help maintain neighborhood privacy.

Chair Bandrapalli called for a voice vote on the motion to approve. The motion passed 7-0-0-0. Appeal procedures were advised. This item concluded at 8:15 p.m.

Commissioner Sargent noted that he would recuse himself from the discussion regarding Agenda Item 7 (4 La Mesa Court) for non-statutory reasons, and Commissioner Terrones noted that he would recuse himself because he has a quasi-business relationship with one of the neighbors. They both left the City Council Chambers.

7. 4 LA MESA COURT, ZONED R-1 – APPLICATION FOR MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, DESIGN REVIEW, HILLSIDE AREA CONSTRUCTION PERMIT AND SPECIAL PERMIT FOR A NEW, TWO AND ONE-HALF STORY SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING AND ATTACHED GARAGE (TIM RADUENZ, FORM + ONE, APPLICANT AND DESIGNER; CHRISTOPHER AWOYINKA AND SUZANNE MCGOVERN, PROPERTY OWNERS) STAFF CONTACT: RUBEN HURIN (CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 12, 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner DeMartini reported he had met with the neighbors at 1510 La Mesa Drive, 2 La Mesa Court, 6 La Mesa Court, the applicant, and the architect. Commissioner Yie met with the applicant and the neighbors at 6 La Mesa Court, 2 La Mesa Court, and 1510 La Mesa Drive. Commissioner Loftis met with the applicant and the neighbors at 1510 La Mesa Drive. Commissioner Gum met with the applicant and with the neighbors at 1510 La Mesa Drive and 6 La Mesa Court. Reference staff report dated May 27, 2014, with attachments. Senior Planner Hurin presented the report, reviewed criteria and staff comments. Forty-one (41) conditions were suggested for consideration. There were no questions of staff.

Chair Bandrapalli opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz represented the applicant:

- Had a meeting with neighbors on Monday. All were present except Mr. Crow.
- Did everything asked, except for taking away the overhang. Concerned that would ruin the architecture, and does not believe it would take away from the neighbor's sunlight.

Commission comments:

- Was the eave added in the most recent revision? (Raduenz: It was added a while ago. Was not a concern previously.)
- Letter from neighbors request lowering office ceiling height to allow more light? (Raduenz: It is a major architectural feature of the front. The project is within zoning parameters – would rather not lower plate heights.)
- Building has been moved again. (Raduenz: Has done what was requested by neighbors. Neighbors at 2 La Mesa are not happy because it has been moved closer to them, though they had been supportive previously. The house is very far back from the setbacks.)
- It is not the job of the Planning Commission to determine where on the lot the house should be sited. It is 30 feet at one corner from 6 La Mesa Court, 27 feet at the other, which is a significant distance.
- 1510 La Mesa Lane wanted screening on the flex room. (Raduenz: Has added baffle system on top floor to mitigate the glass; trees screen the lower levels.)
- Would it be possible to pull back the overhang? (Raduenz: Could take it back by one foot, so it is two feet on the side. Not having an overhang at all would ruin the look.)
- Are the neighbors satisfied with the deck being dropped by two feet? (Raduenz: They did not object to it in the meeting.)

- There have been some positive changes to the building. The baffling breaks up the expanses of glass but does not compromise the design. (Raduenz: It is a good addition. It still provides the light and view, and provides privacy to the cross-canyon neighbors. There will be anti-glare glass.)
- Would lowering the office ceiling height help the light at 6 La Mesa? (Raduenz: There are a lot of trees already.)(Awoyinka: That portion of the lot receives early morning sunlight for about an hour. Any changes would only enable one hour of additional sunlight. There is more than 26 feet between the properties, which is more than enough.)
- On left side of the elevation will be frosting the first and second windows, but not the third window? (Raduenz: Not frosting anything in the Living Room. Is frosting the 30" x 9' window, and the large window in the front to protect the privacy of the neighbors' front deck. Also frosting both small windows in the middle bathroom, and frosting the bedroom window in the middle floor. Also raising the bedroom window 30 inches.)
- Will the bay tree (#9) be retained? (Raduenz: Yes.) Grecian laurel will be replaced by Catalina cherry trees? (Raduenz: Yes.)
- 1510 La Mesa Lane said they wanted one additional thing – shielding the flex room. (Awoyinka: Have done as much as possible with the baffles on the top floor. Had talked about having baffles of the middle floor, but it took away from the aesthetic. Believes keeping the bay tree will provide screening.)
- Comment on dropping the office height? (Awoyinka: Has already shifted the house two feet.)
- The baffle system is to reduce glazing? (Raduenz: Allows ambient light to get in but also creates privacy for the neighbors across the canyon.)
- The ceiling height of the office area is ten feet, not eleven feet, as noted by the neighbor.

Public comments:

Matthew Machlis, 1510 La Mesa Lane, spoke on this item:

- Concern with the glass on the façade.
- Baffles are good, retaining bay tree is good.
- Plans at meeting showed panels on the center room. Plans submitted were different from what was agreed to. Just wants to go back to the plans that were shown on Monday.
- Wants to ensure the trees are retained and kept healthy.
- Ensure blackout curtains and occupancy sensors for the lighting be in the documentation.

Robert Crow, 1512 La Mesa Lane, spoke on this item:

- Improvements to the original design include the bronze siding, and top floor setback. Louvers and treatment of the glass on the top two floors is an improvement, but still over 50% of top two floors are glass. Will be mitigated somewhat by non-reflected coatings.
- Process has had incremental changes in a flawed design. 40-foot structure with 4,000 square feet of floor space is a big visual intrusion into the canyon. Mass and glass remain the two big problems.
- Issue is not the style of architecture. Problem is the massiveness of the structure and the amount of glass on the rear elevation.
- Seems a lot of things about the design do not conform to the Neighborhood Design Guidelines.
- An acceptable house can be built on this site, but this is not the one.

Laura Forrest, 6 La Mesa Court, spoke on this item:

- Concern over blockage of light. Not sure where the one-hour of sunlight calculation came from. There is a lot of ambient light throughout the day.
- Has been hard to keep track of the changes in the plans.
- Ways to mitigate the situation: drop the tall 10-foot/11-foot roof, reducing the overhanging eaves.
- Design guidelines state there should be sensitive placement and height of buildings to avoid substantial blockage of existing sunlight patterns.
- Would not want to modify the side of the 6 La Mesa Court to get sunlight.

Tim Raduenz represented the applicant:

- The house is situated 26 feet away from the neighboring house so would not be detracting from the overall sunlight. Could not build a house in the Easton Addition if this was the standard. There is a flat roof.

Commission comments/questions:

- Would it be possible to drop or wrap the eave facing 6 La Mesa Court so it does not block sunlight, like it is done in the front? (Raduenz: Does not think the eave affects the sunlight – it is projecting out, not up. Could bring it back to 2 feet.)

There were no further comments and the public hearing was closed.

Commission discussion:

- Lots of lines being drawn in the sand. Not the job of the Commission to manage lines in the sand.
- No evidence that making the changes being requested will actually achieve the goal that is claimed will be achieved.
- Believes the building meets the design guidelines. It is massed appropriately for the site, so the only question is whether there is too much glass.
- Applicant has made a lot of changes to appease the neighbors. The FAR has been reduced, it is single-story from the street.
- Every step along the way has been an improvement.

Commissioner Yie moved to approve the application for Design Review, Hillside Area Construction Permit, and Special Permit, by resolution, with the following amended conditions:

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped May 21, 2014, sheets T1.0, GN, GP, SP, C-2, Boundary and Topographic Survey, A1.0 through A5.0, L1.0, L2.0, FAR and Tree; and that prior to issuance of a building permit the Landscape Plans shall be revised to show six, 24-inch box Catalina Cherry trees (*Prunus ilicifolia*) in place of the Grecian Laurel trees (*Laurus nobilis*) located along the left side property line; and that the glazing along the rear of the house shall be anti-reflective;
2. that all existing trees to remain, as shown on the Landscape Plan (sheet L1.0, date stamped May 21, 2014), shall not be removed or damaged, and the applicant shall have an arborist's report prepared which documents how each tree on the site should be protected during construction; this report shall be reviewed and approved by the City Arborist and the contractor shall call for the Arborist to inspect the protection measures installed before a building permit shall be issued;

3. that if any existing tree on the site dies within five years of the final inspection of the project, it shall be replaced with a new, 36-inch box tree with a species determined to be appropriate by the City Arborist; the new tree shall be replaced in the same location unless it is determined by the City Arborist that the location should be adjusted based on the site conditions;
4. that the applicant shall submit a detailed foundation report for approval by the Building Division and City Arborist to establish the bounds of the pier and grade beam foundation prior to the issuance of a building permit for construction on the site; if at any time during the construction the pier locations must be altered to accommodate a tree root, the structural changes must be approved by the Building Division prior to the time any such root is cut or damaged;
5. that a certified arborist shall be on site during any grading or digging activities that take place within the designated tree protection zones, including the digging of the pier holes for the pier and grade beam foundation and digging for removal or installation of any utilities;
6. 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);
7. that any changes to the size or envelope of the lower, middle and upper floors, or garage, which would include adding or enlarging a dormer(s), shall require an amendment to this permit;
8. that the conditions of the Building Division's December 9, November 15 and August 28, 2013 memos, the Fire Division's December 19, November 25 and September 9, 2013 memos, the Engineering Division's September 25, 2013 memo, the Parks Division's December 5, November 18 and September 6, 2013 memos and the Stormwater Division's November 18 and September 4, 2013 memos shall be met;
9. 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;
10. that demolition for 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;
11. 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;
12. 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;

13. 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;
14. 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;

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

15. 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;
16. that prior to scheduling the foundation inspection, a licensed surveyor shall locate the property corners, set the building footprint and certify the first floor elevation of the new structure(s) based on the elevation at the top of the form boards per the approved plans; this survey shall be accepted by the City Engineer;
17. 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;
18. 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;
19. 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;

Mitigation Measures from Initial Study

Aesthetics

20. The project sponsor shall be subject to the design review process to evaluate the aesthetics of the construction of a single family dwelling in the R-1 Zoning District;
21. The project sponsor shall be subject to a hillside area construction permit to evaluate the obstruction by the construction of the existing distant views of nearby properties, with emphasis given to the obstruction of distant views from habitable areas within a dwelling unit;
22. The landscaping shall be provided on the site as shown on the plans approved by the Planning Commission. All landscaping shall be installed prior to scheduling the final building inspection;

Air Quality

23. During construction, the project sponsor shall ensure implementation of the following mitigation measures during project construction, in accordance with BAAQMD standard mitigation requirements:
- a) All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.
 - b) All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered.
 - c) All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry sweeping is prohibited.
 - d) All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
 - e) All roadways, driveways, sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
 - f) Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting off equipment when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.
 - g) All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
 - h) Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

Biological Resources

24. The applicant shall comply with the City's on-site reforestation requirements as approved by the City Arborist'
25. The property owner shall be responsible for implementing and maintaining all tree protection measures as defined in the arborist report prepared by Mayne Tree Expert Company, Inc., dated November 4, 2013. All tree protection measures shall be taken prior to beginning any tree removal activities, grading or construction on the site;
26. All clearing limits, easements, setbacks, sensitive or critical areas, buffer zones trees, and drainage courses are clearly delineated with field markers or fencing installed under the supervision of a licensed arborist and inspected by the City Arborist; and that adjacent properties and undisturbed areas shall be protected from construction impacts with vegetative buffer strips, sediment barriers or filters, dikes or mulching as designed by and installed with the supervision of a licensed arborist to standards approved by the City Arborist;
27. A licensed arborist, hired by the applicant, shall inspect the construction site once a week or more frequently if necessary and certify in writing to the City Arborist and Planning Division that all tree protection measures are in place and requirements are being met;
28. A licensed arborist shall provide a post-construction maintenance program to the property owners with instructions on how to maintain them and identify warning signs of poor tree health;

the property owners shall be responsible for the maintenance of the trees for 3 years after construction is finalised by the City;

Cultural Resources

29. In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and after notification, the City shall consult with a qualified archaeologist and Native American representative to assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant (CEQA Guidelines 15064.5[a][3] or as unique archaeological resources per Section 21083.2 of the California Public Resources Code), representatives of the City and a qualified archaeologist shall meet to determine the appropriate course of action. In considering any suggested mitigation proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the lead agency shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the project site while mitigation for historical resources or unique archaeological resources is carried out;
30. If paleontological resources, such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work will stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with the City of Burlingame;
31. If human remains are discovered at any project construction sites during any phase of construction, all ground-disturbing activity 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and the City of Burlingame and the County coroner shall be notified immediately, according to Section 5097.98 of the State Public Resources Code and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are determined by the County coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours, and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. The project applicant shall also retain a professional archaeologist with Native American burial experience to conduct a field investigation of the specific site and consult with the Most Likely Descendant, if any, identified by the NAHC. As necessary, the archaeologist may provide professional assistance to the Most Likely Descendant, including the excavation and removal of the human remains. The City of Burlingame shall be responsible for approval of recommended mitigation as it deems appropriate, taking account of the provisions of State law, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code section 5097.98. The project applicant shall implement approved mitigation, to be verified by the City of Burlingame, before the resumption of ground-disturbing activities within 100 feet of where the remains were discovered;

Geology and Soils

32. The project sponsor shall submit a detailed design level geotechnical investigation to the City of Burlingame Building Division for review and approval. The investigation shall include recommendations to develop foundation and design criteria in accordance with the most recent California Building Code requirements. All foundations and other improvements shall be designed by a licensed professional engineer based on site-specific soil investigations performed by a California Certified Engineering Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer. All

recommendations from the engineering report shall be incorporated into the residential development design. The design shall ensure the suitability of the subsurface materials for adequately supporting the proposed structures and include appropriate mitigations to minimize the potential damage due to liquefaction;

33. There shall be no pile driving as part of this project;
34. The foundation for the single family dwelling structure, swimming pool and any pool decking shall be a drilled pier and grade beam design;
35. Grading activities shall be limited to periods where no rain is forecasted during the wet season (October 1 thru April 30) to reduce erosion associated intense rainfall and surface runoff;
36. The project shall be required to meet all the requirements, including seismic standards, of the California Building and Fire Codes, 2013 Edition, as amended by the City of Burlingame, for structural stability; and the construction plans and design shall be approved by the Building Division and all necessary permits issued before any grading, tree removal or construction occurs on the site;

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

37. That the applicant shall install fire sprinklers and a fire alarm system monitored by an approved central station as required by the Fire Marshal prior to the final inspection for building permit;
38. That the project shall comply with the following requirements set by the Central County Fire Department:
 - a) All attic spaces created shall be equipped and protected by fire sprinklers.
 - b) The entire house construction shall comply with California Building Code Chapter 7A requirements for buildings in a Wildland Urban Interface.
 - c) The landscaping shall be fire resistive in nature and be in concert with the publication; "Living with Fire in San Mateo County".

Hydrology and Water Quality

39. The project applicant shall prepare and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for all construction activities at the project site. At a minimum, the SWPPP shall include the following:
 - a) A construction schedule that restricts use of heavy equipment for excavation and grading activities to periods where no rain is forecasted during the wet season (October 1 thru April 30) to reduce erosion associated intense rainfall and surface runoff. The construction schedule shall indicate a timeline for earthmoving activities and stabilization of disturbed soils;
 - b) Soil stabilization techniques such as covering stockpiles, hydroseeding, or short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets;
 - c) Silt fences, compost berms, wattles or some kind of sediment control measures at downstream storm drain inlets;
 - d) Good site management practices to address proper management of construction materials and activities such as but not limited to cement, petroleum products, hazardous materials, litter/rubbish, and soil stockpile; and

- e) The post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities and clearing of drainage structures of debris and sediment.

Noise

- 40. The hours for drilling shall be limited to Monday through Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., with no drilling on Sundays or Holidays. The remainder of the construction must abide by the construction hours established in the municipal code, which limits construction hours to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays and holidays;
- 41. To reduce daytime noise impacts due to construction, the project sponsor shall require construction contractors to implement the following measures:
 - a) Equipment and trucks used for project construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, wherever feasible).
 - b) Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or other measures to the extent feasible.
 - c) Loaded trucks and other vibration-generating equipment shall avoid areas of the project site that are located near existing residential uses to the maximum extent compatible with project construction goals.

Transportation/Traffic

- 42. No parking shall be allowed along La Mesa Court in order to maintain a 20-foot wide fire access lane for fire apparatus. During construction, construction vehicles and storage of construction materials and equipment on the street or in the public right-of-way shall be prohibited.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loftis.

Discussion of motion:

- *The meeting between neighbors was constructive.*
- *Believes the concerns of light have been addressed.*
- *Hillside Area Construction Permit describes distant views from habitable areas. Appears the distant views from 2 La Mesa Court will not be affected, even with the house shifting one foot.*
- *Discussion on the landscape plan with the laurel tree being changed to cherry – should be reflected in the approval.*
- *Add condition that if any of the trees die, they be replaced in the same locations and the minimum tree size be 36" box. If there is an issue with the tree location, the City Arborist shall be contacted.*
- *Impressed with the work of the two teams together. However does not believe it fits the guidelines and the neighborhood. Struggles hard to get buildings to fit into the neighborhoods, but does not think this building fits.*
- *Time limit for tree monitoring to be 5 years.*

Chair Bandrapalli called for a voice vote on the motion to approve. The motion passed 4-1-2-0 (Commissioners Sargent and Terrones recused, Commissioner Gum dissenting).

Commissioner Loftis moved to approve the application for Mitigated Negative Declaration, by resolution. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bandrapalli. Chair Bandrapalli called for a voice vote on the motion to approve. The motion passed 5-0-2-0 (Commissioners Sargent and Terrones recused). Appeal procedures were advised.

Commissioner DeMartini moved to approve a motion that if any trees on the site die in the next five years, that they be replaced in the specific location of the previous tree and that the minimum size shall be a 36" box tree. If there is an issue with the location of the tree, it shall be subject to approval by the City arborist. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loftis. Chair Bandrapalli called for a voice vote on the motion to approve. The motion passed 5-0-2-0 (Commissioners Sargent and Terrones recused).

This item concluded at 8:57 p.m.

Commissioners Terrones and Sargent returned to the dais.

7. 1534 LOS ALTOS DRIVE, ZONED R-1 – APPLICATION FOR DESIGN REVIEW AND HILLSIDE AREA CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FOR A FIRST AND SECOND STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING (RYAN MORRIS, VIOTTI ARCHITECTS, APPLICANT AND ARCHITECT; CHERYL TAN, PROPERTY OWNER) STAFF CONTACT: RUBEN HURIN

All Commissioners had visited the project site. There were no ex-parte communications. Reference staff report dated May 27, 2014, with attachments. Senior Planner Hurin presented the report, reviewed criteria and staff comments. Fourteen (14) conditions were suggested for consideration. There were no questions of staff.

Chair Bandrapalli opened the public hearing.

Ray Viotti represented the applicant:

- Extended the overhangs to 24 inches where possible;
- Revised the window layout in the front to make the windows more consistent throughout the house;
- Pushed back the lower roof on the second floor so it does not stand out as much;
- Revised the second story windows on the front.
- Main issue that has come up is a privacy issue with neighbors at 1538 Los Altos Drive. Site is on a downhill slope. Has worked with neighbors; looked at drawings and site study provided by neighbor and proposed landscape screening. Once trees are grown up they will provide privacy.
- Previously had view into 1538 Los Altos Drive back yard, landscaping grew to provide privacy. Anticipates being able to provide similar screening.

Commission questions/comments:

- Considered extending overhangs beyond 24 inches? (Viotti: Would count towards lot coverage.)(Hurin: There is additional lot coverage available, but eaves beyond 24 inches are also subject to setbacks and height requirements.)
- Changes are better, but having a challenge with the forms. Seems too tall for being at the top of hill and being nearly 30 feet. Considered a flat roof on the second floor? 8 feet and 8 feet on both sides? (Viotti: Starts at 7'-6" on the second floor to keep the massing down. If went with 8 feet + 8 feet + crawl space would still be at 20 feet on the downhill side. The highest point as



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

Site: 4 LA MESA COURT

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following public hearing on **MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 2019 at 7:00 P.M.** in the City Hall Council Chambers, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA:

Application for Design Review Amendment for changes to windows and exterior materials of a previously approved new single family dwelling at

4 LA MESA COURT zoned R-1. APN 027.022.550

Mailed: August 16, 2019

(Please refer to other side)

**PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE**

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

(Please refer to other side)

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

4 La Mesa Court
300' noticing
APN #: 027.022.550

