



CITY OF BURLINGAME
Community Development Department
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 12, 2019 **Director's Report**

TO: Planning Commission **Meeting Date:** November 12, 2019

FROM: Michelle Markiewicz, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: **FYI – REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PROJECT AT 1345 VANCOUVER AVENUE, ZONED R-1.**

Summary: An application for Design Review for a new two-story single family dwelling with a detached garage at 1345 Vancouver Avenue, zoned R-1, was approved by the Planning Commission on October 28, 2019 (see attached October 28, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes). An application for a building permit has not yet been submitted.

At the hearing, the Planning Commission expressed a concern with the size of the second story deck at the rear of the house and voted to approve the project with the following condition of approval:

- that the rear second floor deck shall be reduced in size and the revised plans shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission as an FYI prior to building permit issuance.

Please refer to the attached letter submitted by the property owner, dated October 30, 2019, in response to the Commission's direction as it pertains to the condition of approval above. The applicant submitted the proposed building elevations, date stamped October 30, 2019, to show the changes to the previously approved design review project.

Other than the changes detailed in the applicant's letter and revised plans, there are no other changes proposed to the design of the house. If the Commission feels there is a need for more study, this item may be placed on an action calendar for a second review and/or public hearing with direction to the applicant.

Michelle Markiewicz
Associate Planner

Attachments:

Explanation letter submitted by the owner, dated October 30, 2019
October 28, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes
Originally approved and proposed building elevations, date stamped October 30, 2019

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2019

CITY OF BURLINGAME
CDD-PLANNING DIV.

Oct 30, 2019

This is a revision to a 2 stories new construction at 1345 Vancouver Avenue after planning commission meeting on Oct 28, 2019. Commission approved the project with additional condition of approval which requests to reduce rear deck at 2nd floor to no greater than 100Sf. Please see below the response to the project.

Response:

Rear deck at 2nd floor has been reduced to 91Sqft. Please see changes on site plan/A1.0, Proposed 2nd floor plan & roof plan/ A2.1 and Proposed elevations/A3.0 and A3.1.

Should you have any question, please contact Joseph Ho at [REDACTED] or Xiaochuang Lin (Henry) at [REDACTED]. Thank you

Sincerely,

Joseph Ho



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, October 28, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

- d. 1345 Vancouver Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for building height for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (a). (Joseph Ho, applicant and designer; Xiaochuang (Henry) Lin, property owner) (122 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Loftis noted that he did not attend the design review study meeting for this project, but was able to watch the video. There were no ex-parte communications to report.

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Henry Lim and Joseph Ho, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Is there going to be a guardrail required at the front porch? (Ho: A guardrail is not required since the height of the porch is less than 30 inches with the landscape planter below.) You may need a guardrail at the side of the porch because there is no planter there, so the porch is more than 30 inches. (Ho: Yes, thank you.)*
- > Did you consider reducing the size of the second floor deck at the rear of the house? (Ho: Yes, we reduce the size of the second floor deck.)*
- > Think plans state that the second floor deck was reduced from 196 to 143 square feet, is that correct? (Ho: Yes, that's correct. We also have a partially solid wall at the deck so it provides more privacy to the neighbor.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Like the changes they've made, think it's a nice project.*
- > Concerned about size of second floor deck. We consistently ask applicants to limit them to 100 square feet or less out of a concern for a privacy for neighbors.*
- > Also concerned with the deck, would like to see it reduced to 100 square feet, if that's possible.*
- > Struggling with this one, can see that some of the changes have softened the design, but still feel*

that it doesn't have a clear design direction. Not sure that just by applying these materials to the house makes it more a contemporary home; not convinced this is the right house for this block or this location. It's working too hard to try to be something it's not.

> Struggle to generate much enthusiasm for transitional modern homes, it's neither modern nor is it traditional in a way that would easily fit into the neighborhood.

> Concerned with the metal roofing and roof pitch.

> Concerned with stark pseudo modern buildings in residential neighborhoods.

> Applicant has addressed previous concerns with project; was previously concerned that the application of the materials wasn't consistent from the renderings to the actual application, and notes and details on the elevation drawings. However, in looking at what they worked through with the design consultant, am more in support of project now because they've made the scale more residential, they've reduced the scale on the stone and on the horizontal siding, and the window patterns and the type of windows are more residential in character, and better scale for the neighborhood. Can support the project as proposed.

> Is definitely different from other houses in the neighborhood, but also look to see whether or not it feels residential in scale and character.

> Can reduce size of second floor deck by adding planters or by increasing the amount of roof to get it closer to 100 square feet.

> Think you did a nice job with the design consultant, like the project with the revisions.

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

> that the rear second floor deck shall be reduced in size and the revised plans shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission as an FYI prior to building permit issuance.

Comment on the motion:

> With the reduced roof pitch, the house is raised fairly well above the street, so it may not be as visible.

> Can support the special permit for increased building height based on the change in roof slope and reduction of the second story plate height; contributed to a tighter, shorter building.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Nay: 1 - Gaul

Absent: 1 - Kelly