



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, August 26, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

STUDY SESSION - 6:00 p.m. - Conference Room A

a. Housing Legislation

> Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner noted that the purpose of the study session is to review current issues in housing and how they fit into the bigger picture of planning, review key legislation applicable to multifamily design review, and discuss "objective standards". He provided a presentation summarizing key points.

Jobs/Housing Gap:

- > San Mateo County is good at creating jobs, but lag in creating housing for those jobs for a variety of reasons. Between 2010 and 2017, 83,000 jobs were created and only 7,100 housing units were built.
- > Since 2011, the median home price has doubled and rent for a two-bedroom apartment has increased 60%.
- > Commutes have gotten longer, approximately two-thirds of the workforce in San Mateo County commutes from outside of the County, which explains why the freeways and bridges are congested.
- > The jobs/housing gap has been getting better; from 2010-2014 it was 24:1 and currently it is 12:1. Result is a combination of jobs growing at a different rate than housing and housing catching up; is a bit deceptive in making the situation look better because the growth has leveled off while housing increased. Although the ratio has improved, it's not great, which explains the pressure on municipalities to ease restrictions on housing.
- > For lower and middle wage jobs, they're having trouble filling them, so they're counting as jobs anymore.
- > This is a statewide issue. Metropolitan Transportation Commission notes that since 2005, California added 308 new housing units for every 1,000 new residents. 3.5 million units are needed statewide by 2025 to close the housing gap. Bay Area needs to add 35,000 unit per year for the next 15 years to close the housing gap.

Legislation:

- > Main legislation that relates to project review is the Housing Accountability Act (HAA); was first passed in 1982; was reinforced and expanded in 2017 with SB167/AB678 and AB 1515.
- > The Housing Accountability Act states, "The Legislature's intent in enacting this section in 1982 and in expanding its provisions since then was to significantly increase the approval and construction of new housing for all economic segments of California's communities by meaningfully and effectively curbing the capability of local governments to deny, reduce the density of or render infeasible housing development projects. This intent has not been fulfilled."
- > HAA applies to all "housing development projects" and emergency shelters, includes residential-only projects, transitional and supporting housing, and mixed use projects with at least two-thirds of the square footage designated for residential use. Applies to both affordable and market-rate units.

Objective Standards:

- > HAA says that if the project complies with objective standards (zoning standards such as height, floor area ratio, lot coverage, setbacks, etc.), the City can only reduce density or deny the project if it finds a "specific adverse impact" to public health and safety (based on a preponderance of evidence) and the impact can't be mitigated in any other way. Standards include general plan, zoning, and subdivision

requirements.

> Discussed recent denial of a mixed-use project in San Bruno as an example; mixed-use project met all objective general plan and development standards, but was denied based on compatibility criteria which was not objective.

> Need to make sure we're not having the effect of removing units from the build on a subjective basis; if going to ask that the number of units be reduced, need to have a clear basis for why that is justified and need to be able to point to something in the record.

> May want to make adjustments in zoning code standards to allow variety in massing and architecture relief to avoid block architecture.

> Taste and charm are indefensible standards under the HAA. Need to stick to objective standards.

> If a city were to deny or reduce the density of a project it must 1) identify objective standards project does not comply with and 2) if project complies with all, must make public health and safety finding.

> Can provide information/guidance in staff reports for multifamily development projects.

> Mandate now is to make project as good it can be given standards we are working with, and not hold it up, and make sure we're not reducing the number of units.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Senior Planner Erika Lewit, and City Attorney Kathleen Kane.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Absent 1 - Kelly

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Draft August 12, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft August 12, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting 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: 4 - Sargent, Terrones, Tse, and Gaul

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 2 - Comaroto, and Loftis

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. 503 Howard Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling and Special Permit for a new attached garage. 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; Joseph and Judith Hamilton, property owners) (121 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

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

[503 Howard Ave - Attachments](#)

[503 Howard Ave - Plans](#)

- b. 2601 Easton Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permits for declining height envelope and an 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) (91 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

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

[2601 Easton Dr - Attachments](#)

[2601 Easton Dr - Plans](#)

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

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- 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 attached garage for one new, two-story single family dwelling and attached garage at 812 Linden Avenue (vacant parcel next to 816 Linden Ave). This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality act (CEQA), per Section 5301(a) (Tim Raduenz, Form + One Design, applicant and designer; 812 Linden LLC and 816 Linden LLC, property owners) (149 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](#)

Chair Comaroto was recused for non-statutory reasons. Commissioner Loftis noted that was not in attendance at the Design Review Study meeting, but viewed the meeting video.

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Acting Chair Tse opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One, represented the applicant.

Public Comments:

Marie McDonald, 816 Linden Ave: In favor of the design, like the way it offsets the houses and provides easy access to the garage. Design addresses privacy concerns previously expressed by the adjacent neighbor. Design with an attached garage also provides better use of the rear yard.

Acting Chair Tse closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Appreciate changes that have been made to the design.*
- > There is a clear pattern of detached garages in the neighborhood; design guidelines require us to review garage patterns in the neighborhood.*
- > Comment made at study meeting was that the house and garage covers the entire width of the lot, still think that project gives it a broad face. Next door house, which is part of this project, also has a detached garage.*
- > Driveway is not necessarily an unusable space, it becomes a play area for children.*
- > Like design of house, but still think it should have a detached garage.*
- > Also like the design of the house; a similar house was design by this designer on Cabrillo Avenue which fits in well with that neighborhood.*
- > Went back and looked at this block of Linden Avenue, the clear pattern on this block and in the neighborhood is detached garages. Therefore, can't make the findings for the Special Permit that this application meets the pattern of the neighborhood.*
- > Based on the way that we've applied the Special Permit requirements and made the findings in the past, we've consistently looked generally at the block in our analysis, not beyond the block. Can't make the Special Permit findings in this case.*
- > Appreciated the comment that the attached garage could improve the possibility of parking in the garage versus on the street, but can't support the Special Permit when evaluating the house against the neighborhood.*
- > At previous meeting neighbor expressed concerns about how close the attached garage was going to be to his house, this is the reason why detached garages are preferred, because they leave more room between buildings.*

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

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- b.** 4 La Mesa Court, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review Amendment for changes to windows and exterior materials of a previously approved new single family dwelling. (Four La Mesa LLC, applicant and property owner; Form + One Design, designer) (69 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [4 La Mesa Ct - Staff Report](#)
[4 La Mesa Ct - Attachments](#)
[4 La Mesa Ct - Plans](#)

Commissioner Tse was recused from this item because she lives within 500 feet of the subject property.

All Commissioners had visited the property. Commissioners Terrones and Sargent noted that while visiting the project site they spoke with the property owner and contractor. Commissioner Sargent noted that when project was originally reviewed, he had a non-statutory conflict related to the previous owner, but since the project was sold he no longer has a non-statutory conflict.

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

- > One of the items noted in an email from a neighbor was that the project doesn't conform to what was approved. Can you explain how staff verifies that what has been approved is actually what is built? (Hurin: The request includes changes to the windows and exterior materials of the house. As a part of the final inspection process, Planning staff will visit the site to verify that the project has been built as approved. If changes have been made, the applicant is then required to submit an application for an FYI or design review amendment for review by the Planning Commission.)*
- > For clarification, if an element of the project is not currently on the structure, it doesn't mean that it won't get installed by the end of construction, and staff will be verifying that it is installed, correct? (Hurin: That is correct.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One, and Alex Pavlovsky, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Request includes removing and enlarging windows throughout the house, which appears to come out even in terms of square footage, correct? (Raduenz: Correct.)*
- > A number of the windows that were approved to be frosted, have not yet been frosted. (Raduenz: Clear glazing in this windows will be replaced with frosted glazing. An applied window film will not be used.)*
- > On front elevation, front bedroom window does not extend up to the roof eave; plans should be revised and verified by staff. (Raduenz: Yes, can make that correction.)*
- > We don't necessarily require a color board, but was there anything ever submitted for the Texas limestone when the project was approved? (Hurin: Don't recall a materials board being submitted for this project.) (Raduenz: Can submit a sample of the limestone.)*

Public Comments:

Isako Hoshino, 1510 La Mesa Lane: Live across the subject property, face rear of house. Have view of house when we walk into our house through the front door, takes up a good chunk of our view. Surprised that the designer is characterizing the proposed changes to the exterior siding material and window sizes as minor. These are two of three major contested issues of the original design. There was a reason why the side and rear facades did not contain the limestone in the original plan submitted. In their review, the Commission noted that it was a monolithic design and that the limestone was going to be too bright. There are existing trees, however the project has severely damaged several trees that would have shielded most of the rear elevation, these trees are dying due to the construction crew piling debris on the tree trunks and completely ignoring the tree protection zone. Trees are not a guarantee to shield the property from our view. See right side and rear of house, total combined glass area is approximately 1,300 square feet; this is a massive amount of glazing into the canyon, which is very dark at night. Previously expressed concerns about light pollution, the Commission agreed, and a lot of effort was made to reduce the window size. Purpose of the dark exterior materials on the upper level and sides of house was to

reduce massing. Changes may be considered minor by the new homeowners, but they should have been disclosed as to why the project was approved the way it was. For these reasons, strongly object to the changes being proposed. Project should maintain the approved window sizing and siding material and color.

Robert Crow, 1512 La Mesa Lane: Share all concerns expressed by Mrs. Hoshino. Approval and review process has taken limited account of the neighborhood; neighborhood not only includes La Mesa Lane, but also includes Mills Canyon. Concerned with affect of the mass of building; use of white stone, rather than bronze cladding, makes house stick out even more. As viewed from Mills Canyon, this house sticks out more than any other house. Mills Canyon is a tremendous asset to the City, its surroundings need to be protected in order to maintain a pleasing visual impact and to not be any more intrusive than they need to be. For this reason am particularly concerned with making house all white with the proposed limestone material, when we had fought hard to get an agreement that it would have bronze cladding so that it would not be so intrusive on the vistas that are afforded from our homes and Mills Canyon. Hard to say what the rationale is from the homeowners point of view is for having the house being all white, because you don't see the visual mass from inside the house. You see a limited view from the frontal section, but what you don't see what impacts everyone else in the neighborhood. Concerned about proposed changes, will compromise the values of Mills Canyon. Please restore the compromised design that was reached earlier when we had discussed this project, in particular change the white exterior to something that blends in with the surroundings.

Raduenz: Have not made any changes to windows at rear of house. Baffles on upper sliding glass doors at rear of house have not been installed because they have not yet been made yet; baffles will be installed near the end of construction. Windows are dark bronze. Tree needs attention, will have arborist come up with an action plan to rehabilitate tree.

> What color is the limestone? (Raduenz: It's a cream color, can provide sample.) (Pavlovsky: One of the reasons we are proposing limestone instead of the metal is that according to some contractors it provides a better waterproofing detail. Also wanted to point out that most of the rear elevation is glazing, so the limestone will not be a large mass, most of the elevation will be dark glazing.)

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Visited site, struck me how much separation there is between this house and the neighboring houses. Typically in new construction we see houses that are built to the maximum envelope allowed with minimal setbacks. This house has larger setbacks than required and is significantly below the maximum allowed lot coverage and floor area ratio.
- > Changes being requested are reasonable and approvable.
- > Zoning code doesn't guarantee a right to privacy, however in this case the larger setbacks, landscape screening and trees provide much more privacy than is typically seen.
- > Have no issues with changes to the windows, garage door, or wood siding at the front of the house.
- > Acompelled by the reminder from the neighbor across the canyon in terms of the discussion we had regarding the rear elevation, in particular darkening the upper floor with dark metal siding. Am concerned with change to limestone on rear elevation, simply because the new owner wants to have more of the Texas limestone. Grounding ourselves back to discussions when the project was originally approved is important and is something we need to consider.
- > As a piece of architecture the building is better with limestone, however it was approved with the dark metal siding as a compromise and project should be held to that requirement.
- > Window changes are acceptable, really like bringing down the garage door size.
- > Was expecting to see more of a massive building, but didn't appear that way when I visited the site. Design is really working there.
- > In support of retaining the originally approved siding, won't be an issue for the property owner because they won't be looking at the rear of the house.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the application with the following amended conditions.

> that approval of this amendment only includes changes to the windows and size of garage door, as shown on the plan date stamped July 16, 2019 (does not include changes to exterior materials).

> that prior to approval of the final inspection, the applicant shall submit an FYI to the Planning Commission which 1) correctly shows the size and configuration of the window in the Office on the Front Elevation and 2) provides an arborist report which evaluates the health of the protected size trees in the rear yard and provides a treatment plan for the trees.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, Gaul, and Loftis

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 1 - Tse

- c. 620 Airport Boulevard, zoned AA - Application for a Five-Year Extension of a Conditional Use Permit for an existing airport parking interim use. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Boca Lake Office, Inc., applicant and property owner) (32 notices) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [620 Airport Blvd - Staff Report](#)
[620 Airport Blvd - Attachments](#)

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Sharon Lai, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *Understand explanation of timeline due to upcoming zoning code updates. Is there any reason why a written progress report couldn't be submitted in late 2022? (Lai: Yes, can provide a written report at that time. Expect to be in close communication with staff before then and are targeting to submit initial application for entitlements in 2022.)*

> *Would have thought we would have seen this much earlier than 2023. Doesn't make sense that we'll be halfway through the entitlements process before we see a progress report. (Lai: Understanding of the process is that the Conditional Use Permit is a separate process than the project approval.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Concern is that there are a lot of different interpretations for what the beginning of the entitlement and approval process could be. At least by the end of 2022, if the project has not been reviewed yet at that that, we would at least know through a written report if the applicant has started to work with staff and putting their submittal together.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the application with the following amended condition:

> that the applicant shall be required to meet the following reporting milestones to provide assurance that satisfactory progress is made towards development of the site:

a. that on the third anniversary of the renewal (September 2022), the applicant shall provide a written update regarding the progress of the development of the site; the written update will be presented as an FYI item to the Planning Commission.

b. that on the fourth anniversary of the renewal (September 2023), the applicant shall provide a written update and an in-person report at a Planning Commission meeting regarding the progress of the development of the site.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1453 Bernal Avenue - zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (Tim Raduenz, Form + One, designer and applicant; Josh and Lisa Friedman, property owners) (122 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1453 Bernal Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1453 Bernal Ave - Attachments](#)
[1453 Bernal Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)
[1453 Bernal Ave - Plans](#)

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

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Josh Friedman and Tim Raduenz, Form + One, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Is there a desire to remove the Magnolia tree? (Raduenz: Yes, we have submitted an application to remove this tree. It is located on the front setback.)
- > Have you looked at ways to trim the Magnolia tree and still make the design work? (Raduenz: Would point out that two other large existing trees are remaining on the adjacent lot at 1457 Bernal Avenue. Also adding a lot of new trees as noted on the landscape plan.)
- > Would you reconsider the neo-classic columns along the front porch? Square columns would work better with the farmhouse style. (Raduenz: Can change columns to a square design. Also looking more closely at the gable-end vent details.)
- > On proposed right elevation, columns are shown to be offset. However, on the floor plan all of the columns are in line with each other. (Raduenz: Porch columns will be in line with each other, will correct plans.)
- > On left elevation, roof configuration above family room and chimney is quirky. Are you trying to bookend the first floor gables along the left side of the house? It looks quirky, not sure if it's necessary. (Raduenz: It is farmhouse style; the chimney chase will die into the roof. Was also trying to create some separation between the first and second floors.) Could extend first floor roof along the chimney enclosure and get the separation just as easily. (Raduenz: Rendering to be provided could help visualize the design intent, but will look into it.)
- > Current proposal has a front door and one sidelite. Could you consider enlarging the front door or having two sidelites? (Raduenz: Current proposal is based on an inspirational photo provided by the owners. Could consider enlarging the front door, perhaps a 42-inch or 48-inch door width.)
- > Railing for second floor balcony at rear of house is not shown on the left elevation. Half columns at front porch are missing on the right elevation. (Raduenz: Will be shown correctly on revised plans.)
- > Should consider increasing the roof overhang above the side entrance for weather protection. (Raduenz: Will look into it.)
- > The muntin pattern for the sidelite next to the front door doesn't match the muntin pattern on the windows, looks tight, perhaps a 3x1 pattern would work better. (Raduenz: Will probably eliminate the sidelite, so it will not be an issue.)
- > Board and batten siding on both floors appears to pull the house together better, rather than using horizontal siding and board and batten siding with two different types of roofing materials. (Raduenz: Worried with board and batten going out of style and looking cheap. Using wider horizontal siding makes it feel more contemporary and is why we chose to use two different siding materials.)
- > Don't understand how the farmhouse style fits in Burlingame, not in support of it. A farmhouse typically sits by itself in an open area apart from other buildings. However, proposed scale and articulation helps make it fit in well with the neighborhood. Combination of horizontal siding and board and batten will work well together.
- > Arborist had suggested trying to maintain the driveway along the right side of the lot. Haven't seen the proposed plans yet for the project to the right, but was wondering if the driveway on that lot will be on the right or left side. (Raduenz: Reason for placing the driveway on the left side is because the porch of the neighboring house to the left is located on the side of the house near the side property line, so the driveway provides separation between the two houses.)
- > Did you consider any plans that would save the Magnolia tree? (Raduenz: Tree is located on the proposed front building setback, could move house further back but would lose six feet of the backyard, backyard space is already standard.)
- > Magnolia trees grow slow and they're great trees...helps to define this block. Have been told by professional tree movers that it is possible to move trees of this size. Encourage you to look into moving the Magnolia tree closer to the street. (Raduenz: Will get an expert opinion.)
- > Concerned with mix of two materials. It appears that the battens are two feet apart. You may want to consider bringing the battens closer together. Can tend to look cheap if the wrong grade plywood is used. (Raduenz: Thinking of using a deeper batten, will provide a detail.)
- > What is size of horizontal siding? (Raduenz: Will be 1x8.)

Public Comments:

Carol Felacio, address not provided: Grandparents were original owners of 1457 Bernal Avenue and parents built 1453 Bernal Avenue, it was their first home after they were married. Not here to oppose the project, requested that before the homes are torn down that some mementos be saved for her.

Viktor Pochron, 1436 Bernal Avenue: Have live here for 31 years, so have seen this home for many years. There is another existing farmhouse style house across the street, which has been renovated and kept same farmhouse character. Would like to see Magnolia tree saved or moved because it is a wonderful tree. Also need to look at whether or not the existing street tree will need to be removed for the new driveway. Liked suggestion of extending roof above side entry of house, will provide protection from rain and wind. Welcomed new property owners to the neighborhood.

Tim Raduenz, applicant: Noted that they will consult with Kielty Arborist Services and Mayne Tree Expert Company to assess the feasibility of moving the tree.

Alisa Ruiz-Johnson, address not provided: Sold house to the Friedmans, their existing house has been a nice addition to Carmelita Avenue, did an incredible landscape design; they are very committed to the community; chose a local architect and building; worked with their friends who purchased the adjacent lot to propose homes that will fit in with the neighborhood. They love the trees and this block of Bernal Avenue; they really care about the community and want to build a good project.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > There are only a few changes to the architecture that the designer and applicant are receptive to making.*
- > Have benefit of a wide open front yard to accommodate equipment to relocate existing Magnolia tree.*
- > Project should move forward with some of the revisions discussed.*
- > At first was confused with the mix of materials, but with some refinement and detailing worked out, especially the batten siding, the project can hold together.*
- > Would like to see rendering provided for next meeting.*
- > Would like to see Magnolia tree saved or relocated.*

Commissioner Comaroto 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 - Comaroto, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 1 - Sargent

- b.** 1515 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, Morris Architecture, applicant and architect, Peter Wise and Stephanie Wen, property owners) (96 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [1515 Los Altos Dr - Staff Report](#)
[1515 Los Altos Dr - Attachments](#)
[1515 Los Altos Dr - Plans](#)

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Ryan Morris, Morris Architecture, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Is there a reason why you're not trying to add a front porch? Up to 200 square feet of front porch area may be exempt from floor area. (Morris: Limited by average front setback requirement. Have a roof overhang, but can't extend out any further. Also constrained by the location of the new staircase.)*
- > What is the character of the front entry? Flat roof above entry gives a sense of a contemporary design. (Morris: Looked at hip and gable roof options, but it didn't really fit with the rest of the house. Second floor is maxed out in building height because of the sloped lot, couldn't make roof any steeper than it already is.)*
- > How many of the windows are being replaced? (Morris: Most of the windows are proposed to be replaced with aluminum clad wood windows as shown on the plans.)*
- > It appears that the house is several feet under the maximum allowed building height, should consider increasing the roof pitch to 5:12, and would improve profile of the house. May also provide an opportunity to work something into the front porch, concerned about how flat roof at front porch fits in with the rest of the house. (Morris: Will consider it since most of the roof is being replaced.)*
- > Sliding glass doors in living room and master bedroom are aligned on floor plan, but not on rear building elevation, should be corrected so that they are the same width and vertical orientation. (Morris: Will look into it, makes sense.)*
- > Consider have three equal panels on sliding door in Bedroom #4, may want to also make the opening wider. (Morris: Will look into it.)*
- > Consider adding a window in the living room for added light and ventilation, also would break up blank wall along left side of house. (Morris: That will be the t.v. wall, but there may be an opportunity to add windows on either side of the t.v. area.)*
- > Is wood siding intended to be painted or stained? Should consider adding wood siding on other parts of the house. (Morris: Called out as stained wood. Intent is to break up two-story wall.)*
- > Consider changing the garage door design and material to bring more cohesion into the contemporary design, perhaps a stained wood garage door to match siding on house. A metal door with frosted glass may also work. (Morris: Note on plans is incorrect, should be a metal garage door.)*
- > Would be helpful to have a perspective drawing to give a sense of the design.*
- > Look at eliminating sidelite and increasing width of front door or adding another sidelite to make it more symmetrical. (Morris: As proposed door is 4' x 8', so it is already a large door. Don't have room for two sidelites, but will look at other options.)*
- > There may be an opportunity to add second floor window above front entry.*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Appreciate comments from Commission, but think that project should be referred to a design review consultant. There is no clarity in the design, evidenced by the number suggestions to make changes. See problems with the scale of windows, variety of windows sizes, and don't understand why building is not taking advantage of the addition allowed height.*

- > *Has elements of a ranch house and a modern house, but design is not clear.*
- > *Proposed sliding doors are seen in a traditional home, but a modern house would have doors with thinner rails and stiles.*
- > *Proposed windows are located in what you would see in traditional homes; in a modern home typically you would find butt glazing at the corners, tall and narrow windows, etc.*

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, to refer the application to a design review consultant.

- > **There needs to be a consistency of character in terms of the direction the architecture wants to take. It's an eclectic mix in the neighborhood, but all of the houses have a consistency within themselves as to what kind of architecture they are.**
- > **Horizontal siding can be extended to second floor, would take it more towards a modern look and help to define the architecture.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- c.** 2345 Poppy Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for an addition to existing attic space above the second story of an existing single family dwelling. (Charles Holman, Charles Holman Design, applicant and designer; Michelle and Bryan Dow, property owners) (137 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [2345 Poppy Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2345 Poppy Dr - Attachments](#)
[2345 Poppy Dr - Plans](#)

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Charles Holman, Charles Holman Design, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *What is the depth of the garage? Didn't see it called out on the plans. (Holman: I think it's 20 feet, will double-check plans.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *This is a relatively simple application; roof form where new dormer is being added is set back far from*

the front of the house, fits in nicely, provides the headroom necessary to get into new living area.

- > Applicant make a good argument that the floor space is already existing within the attic area, and therefore not adding a lot of mass and bulk to the house.*
- > New dormer at rear of house helps with that elevation.*
- > Proposed project fits in well with the neighborhood.*

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

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- d. 1520 Ralston Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling and a Conditional Use Permit for an accessory structure. (Jo Ann Gann, designer and applicant; Thomas and Anna Tracy, property owners) (128 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1520 Ralston Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1520 Ralston Ave - Attachments](#)
[1520 Ralston Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)
[1520 Ralston Ave - Plans](#)

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

- > What is the maximum allowed size for an accessory structure? (Lewit: Up to 640 SF is allowed for an ADU in addition to the accessory structure and an additional 600 SF is allowed for a garage without a Conditional Use Permit.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Jo Ann Gann, project designer, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > What is the reason for needing a 9'-0" plate height on second floor? Concerned that second floor looks top heavy, makes the house look tall and slender. Consider reducing plate height and using coffered ceilings instead. (Gann: Client wanted a 9'-0" plate height, husband is tall. Tried to bring down massing by matching the dutch gables on the second floor. Also tried an 8'-0" plate height on the second floor, but it didn't seem to make a difference. Can take another look at it.)*
- > Is there a reason for the French doors along the side of the garage? (Gann: Client also wants to use the garage for entertaining.) Concerned that the garage won't be used for parking, or that the ADU may be enlarged into the garage space.*
- > Concerned about house looking top-heavy, should consider lowering the second floor plate height and coffering the ceilings.*
- > The knee walls above the ceiling joists shown on the building section, do those continue all the way down or just at that section? (Gann: Just at the dutch gables.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Is a well-designed project, generally like the massing and alignment. But am concerned with the height, looks very slender, should revisit the design. Probably will find some economy in manufactured trusses for this roof form and can be done with a vaulted ceiling, and still get the height they want on the second floor.
- > In support of Conditional Use Permit for bathroom in accessory structure, is there for the swimming pool. In the past have been concerned that accessory structure would be converted to a dwelling unit, but application includes an ADU, so not concerned with proposed bathroom.
- > Massing needs to be reworked, feels narrow and tall.
- > Think the massing is a big deal, really needs to be reworked because it feels really narrow and tall. Think more will need to be done than just lowering the second floor plate height. Design guidelines speak a lot about tucking in the second floor into the roof form, although may be harder to do here since it's a narrow house. Feels like a second story stacked on top of the existing house.
- > Existing house is beautiful, reaction to the design is that it doesn't lose the charm of the existing house. But I can see the concern with the height along the sides of the house.
- > Recently have reviewed houses in the flood plain area that were narrow and tall because of the required raised first floor, this house is not restricted by this requirement but it looks similar.
- > Like the existing house because it has a long running feel to it, shingles and windows work well, it's a charming house. Second story takes away from the charm. You wouldn't know by looking at it that it has an 8:12 pitch roof because it's so short. With the roof being redone and if the pitch is brought down, might help with the massing.
- > Could consider keeping archway over the driveway, would help retain the length of the house.

Chair Comaroto reopened the public hearing.

Gann: Incorporated gables through the center and in the middle to keep the massing down, so you don't notice the 8:12 roof lines. Would look odd to lower the roof line above the existing living room. Gables need to match the same pitch. If you look at the second floor layout, most of the second floor is set back from the first floor.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

- > Should revisit massing as discussed.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly

- e.** 1319 Capuchino 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; Patrick Gilson, property owner) (122 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [1319 Capuchino Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1319 Capuchino Ave - Attachments](#)
[1319 Capuchino Ave - Plans](#)

Chair Comaroto and Commission Sargent were recused from this item because they own property within 500 feet of subject property.

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Acting Chair Tse opened the public hearing.

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

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Plans show full divide lite clad wood casement windows? Will windows be full divided or simulated true divided lite windows? (Chu: Will be simulated true divided lite windows.)*
- > Like interior courtyard. The large bi-folding doors off the den seems to be in the way of the doors in the living room, may want to consider using a multi-slide door or a pocketed multi-slide door that would disappear to help your flow.*
- > Indicate spacing of batts on siding on plans, don't want them to get too wide. (Chu: Believe plans indicate less than 24 inches.)*
- > Would you consider lowering plate height on second floor? This will be a two-story house surrounded by existing one-story houses in the neighborhood; vertical siding on house will make it appear tall and massive in comparison to the neighborhood. (Chu: Client requested proposed plate height, was approved with a 9'-6" plate height on a previous project.)*
- > House is very vertical, is tall in its plate heights and vertical siding makes for some tall pieces, am concerned in that regard. Should also consider lowering plate height at front porch, don't see reason why it needs to be that tall.*

Public Comments:

Elisa Marcaletti, 1315 Capuchino Avenue: Live to the left of the proposed house. Not here to oppose project and am happy that existing house will be replaced. Have three young children, concerned about stairway window looking into kitchen window. Also concerned about proposed height of house, feel like it will dwarf the existing one-story houses in the neighborhood. Recently built house and proposed house across the street are designed differently, so you don't feel the vertical height as much as the proposed house. Noticed that there are several existing trees being removed and new trees to be planted along the left side property line, have questions about whether or not the existing fence is proposed to be removed, just replaced it a few years ago. Existing sewer line was also replaced a few years ago, don't want to see new sewer line damaged.

Chu: Existing fence it proposed to be replaced, however will revisit the fence with the neighbor to determined if it can be retained. Landscape plan show two or three trees to be planted in the rear yard for privacy, no heavy landscaping is proposed along the left side property line. Will revisit stairway window, also want to maintain privacy.

Acting Chair closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Proposed design doesn't fit in with the neighborhood of mostly smaller homes, building is insensitive to the neighborhood. Walked the neighborhood, only remember seeing two, two-story houses, one at the end of the block; all of the other houses are small.*

- > Concerned with the central courtyard, places the noise-making, partying activity against the side wall of the neighboring property, is not a pattern in the city. Takes activity that normally happens in the backyard and places it right at the neighbor's wall. Don't think it fits, have allowed a few of them in the past and regret it. Courtyard is located off living room, dining room and den and will encourage gathering, won't be pleasant for the neighbor. This is a pattern that we should be avoiding.
- > Porch is out of scale.
- > House would be very elegant and beautiful in right context, however in this context the house overpowers and overscales the neighborhood.
- > Have often times disallowed large courtyards on sides of houses that face neighbors, but have allowed small areas such as breakfast patios. In this case, proposed courtyard is large and is in the confluence of semi-public gathering spaces for the house. Concerned that activity in courtyard will be intrusive to the neighbors.
- > Voted against Spanish style house to be built across the street because I didn't think it fit in with the neighborhood; think this proposed design may fit in less.
- > Smaller houses in the neighborhood will begin disappearing over the next 15-20 years, neighborhood now consists of smaller houses, so two-story houses to be built have to be sensitive to the neighborhood.
- > Generally support the rights of the property owner to build what is allowed by right, location suffers the calamity that neighborhood is made up of small houses, not really sure what design would be sensitive to the neighborhood.
- > Design guidelines clearly state that houses should fit in with the neighborhood, should be a slow transition, two-story houses should be sensitive to the neighborhood now.
- > Not opposed to replacing a house with a new two-story house, however design chosen which is vertical and tall in nature, is out of context in terms of architecture and fitting in with the neighborhood.
- > There may be other styles, because of their detailing, whether it's Spanish revival or Craftsman, that might work with the proposed plate heights.

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

Aye: 4 - Terrones, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 2 - Sargent, and Comaroto

- f. 2104 Broadway, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. (Jeanne Davis, applicant and architect; Lesley and Derek Bowler, property owners) (88 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [2104 Broadway - Staff Report](#)

[2104 Broadway - Attachments](#)

[2104 Broadway - Plans](#)

Commissioner Terrones was recused for non-statutory reasons.

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

Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Jeanne Davis, Davis Architecture, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Is there a color you have in mind for the standing seam metal roof? (Davis: Will be bronze or a dark grey color.)*
- > *Indicate size of wood siding and batten spacing on plans; looks cheap if the spacing is too wide. (Davis: Think they're drawn with a 14-inch spacing, but will look into it.)*
- > *Did you consider doing single posts instead of double-posts at the front porch? (Davis: The porch is wider and we were trying not to make the columns too bulky; also studied other options.)*
- > *Double columns help tie in the upper floor with board and batten siding.*
- > *Light fixture above the garage is lonely and barren, perhaps an eave detail could be added above garage door to add interest to that flat plane. (Davis: Did look at a couple of options, including a metal roof with brackets and a trellis, but the owner preferred this version. Will take another look at it.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Don't read this design as a farmhouse, it's a completely different, more of a transformation of the split-level.*
- > *It's an advantage that the split-level has been maintained for the scale.*
- > *Not concerned about the metal roof since there is not a lot of it being proposed on this house.*
- > *Design is formed well and balanced, materials work well.*
- > *Massing is handled really well and materials blend in really nicely.*

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

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, and Loftis

Absent: 1 - Kelly

Recused: 1 - Terrones

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Planning Manager Hurin reported that at the August 19, 2019 City Council meeting, the Council reviewed the appeal at 25 Arundel Road. At the conclusion of the discussion, the City Council upheld the Commission's decision to approve removal of the belly band and the shutters, however overturned the Commission's decision regarding the siding, allowing the use of fiber cement lap siding and corner boards on the project.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 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 August 26, 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 September 5, 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.