



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Tuesday, October 15, 2019

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Senior Planner Erika Lewit, and City Attorney Kathleen Kane.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Sargent, Kelly, Comaroto, Terrones, and Tse

Absent 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item #8c (1319 Capuchino Avenue) was continued due to lack of quorum for that item.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no Public Comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

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

Absent: 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

- a.** 2104 Roosevelt Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(e)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (J. Deal Associates, Jerry Deal, applicant and designer; Tom and Katie Eiseman, property owners) (107 noticed) Staff contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [2104 Roosevelt Ave - Staff Report](#)
[2104 Roosevelt Ave - Attachments](#)
[2104 Roosevelt Ave - Plans](#)

- b. 2108 Clarice Lane, zoned R-2 - Application for a One Year Extension for a previously approved Design Review project for a second story addition to an existing one-story duplex dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Janice Samuelson, applicant and property owner; Jaime Rapadas, AR Design Group, architect) (77 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [2108 Clarice Ln - Staff Report](#)
[2108 Clarice Ln - Attachments](#)
[2108 Clarice Ln - Plans](#)

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 1543 Cypress Avenue, zoned R-1- Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling with an existing detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1). (Christian Ruffat, applicant and architect; Alicia Sanguinetti, property owner) (131 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1543 Cypress Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1543 Cypress Ave - Attachments](#)
[1543 Cypress Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)
[1543 Cypress Ave - Proposed Project Analysis](#)
[1543 Cypress Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the property. Commissioner Terrones reported that he had had an ex parte email exchange with the project designer.

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

Christian Ruffat, Residential Design Solutions, represented the applicant.

Applicant Questions:

> *Ruffat: Since we are maintaining the existing windows and reusing them, is there an allowance or leeway regarding existing windows that might be damaged, such as by termites, or dry rot, or not tempered glass? (Gardiner: If a window is being replaced like for like, provided it looks like the ones that's being replaced it can be reviewed by staff. If the replacement is substantially different than what is being replaced it would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.) (Kane: You would need to document that there is substantial deterioration.)*

> *Ruffat: If there is an existing true divided lite single pane window, would need to be replaced by a*

single-pane true divided light window? (Kane: Yes, if it's considered part of the architectural integrity of the building, it would need to be comparable not just in the design but also the kind of construction.)

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > The proposed front elevation shows that the windows in the front dormer are to remain or be repaired, but they show six lites as opposed to the existing eight lites. Is that a drafting error? (Ruffat: Yes.)*
- > Has a builder been selected for the project? (Ruffat: Yes.) It's incumbent on the builder to understand what is being proposed. Concerned a builder would come onto the project that might not be familiar with the various items being re-used. (Ruffat: Will let the builder be aware of the criteria being used on this project.)*

Public Comments:

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > The revisions that have been made since time are an improvement.*
- > The commitment to retain existing features and materials helps to mitigate the issues of impact.*
- > The project has taken additional steps from the Page & Turnbull report such as retaining the existing front window with its muntin patterns, reusing the existing front door, and relocating existing windows, etc.*
- > Glad to see keeping they are keeping the existing porte coche and garage.*

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

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

Absent: 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- b.** 132 Elm Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for declining height envelope for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage, and Special Permits and Conditional Use Permits for new accessory structures. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (John Stewart, Stewart Associates, applicant and architect; Cyndi and Bob Gilson, property owners) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [132 Elm Ave - Staff Report](#)
[132 Elm Ave - Attachments](#)
[132 Elm Ave - Plans](#)

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

Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

There were no questions of staff.

Vice Chair Kelly opened the public hearing.

John Stewart, Stewart Associates, represented the applicant, with property owner Bob Gilson.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> Are the front windows on the side with the light wells those that the neighbor is concerned with? (Stewart: Yes.)

Public Comments:

Neighbor: The concern is with just the one window at the front of the house on the side that looks directly over our yard. The hedge would not cover the second story.

Commission question: Would you be willing to work with them on the landscaping in that area? (Neighbor: Absolutely, yes. That's why we indicated in the letter that we had a dialogue, and this came up at the last minute. The owner and architect have been very cooperative.)

Vice Chair Kelly closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Appreciates the changes. May be subtle, but the change to the plate height is noticeable and worthwhile.
- > Does not have issues with the confluence of CUPs and special permits. They are all related.
- > Encouraged that they have been working with the neighbor. However cannot condition a mitigation on a neighboring property.
- > This neighborhood can support the plate height.

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

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

Absent: 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- c. 1319 Capuchino Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review 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 15303 (a). (James Chu, Chu Design Associates, Inc., applicant and designer; Patrick Gilson, property owner) (119 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

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

[1319 Capuchino Ave - Attachments](#)

[1319 Capuchino Ave - Plans](#)

This item was continued due to lack of quorum.

- d. 1166 Howard Avenue, zoned BAC - Application for Conditional Use Permit for a full service food establishment. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Dorothy Feng, applicant; 3E Design, designer; 1166 Howard Properties LLC, property owner) (71 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [1166 Howard Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1166 Howard Ave - Attachments](#)
[1166 Howard 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.

There were no questions of staff:

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Dorothy Feng, Mints & Honey, represented the applicant. She indicated that she will work with the neighboring property owner over concerns with the location of the trash enclosure and its proximity to the neighboring lemon tree.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Any changes to the exterior other than the trash enclosure? (Feng: No, just paint.)*
- > *Where the sinks are outside of the water closets, is there any plan to have some type of a door or anything to hide the area from diners? You could add a return to the sink wall just to shield the area a little bit. (Feng: We want to have the sinks outside the bathrooms. We are very family-oriented, and from experience we have a lot of little kids coming to our restaurant and they just need to wash their hands. It's convenient to have the sinks outside. Can consider extending the wall and move the doorway a little bit.)*

Public Comments:

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > *It is an appropriate use for the space. Can work out the trash enclosure issue with the adjacent landlord.*
- > *Mint & Honey in San Carlos is popular. Will be an asset to Burlingame.*
- > *Staff can follow up on the trash enclosure matter.*

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

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

Absent: 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1704 Davis Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing one-story single family dwelling with an attached garage. (Una Kinsella, applicant and architect; Jerry and Barbara Maley, property owners) (79 noticed) Staff contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1704 Davis Dr - Staff Report](#)
[1704 Davis Dr - Attachments](#)
[1704 Davis Dr - Plans](#)

Commissioner Terrones was recused because he has a business relationship with the designer.

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

Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

> *Can a door swing into the garage or storage area, or does it need to swing out? The depth of the garage is 20 feet. (Gardiner: Although it looks like a two-car garage, it will be configured as a one-car garage to meet the dimensional requirements.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Barbara Maley represented the applicant, with architect Una Kinsella.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *None.*

Public Comments:

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > *It's a pretty straightforward remodel. It is an improvement from the previous approval.*
- > *The garage has been tied in well.*
- > *The front looks really nice and uniform, doesn't look overpowering for the neighborhood.*

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

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

Absent: 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

Recused: 1 - Terrones

- b.** 1325 Balboa Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Designs, Inc., applicant and designer; 1325 Balboa, LLC, property owner)(88 noticed)
Staff Contact: Fahteen Khan

Attachments: [1325 Balboa Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1325 Balboa Ave - Attachments](#)
[1325 Balboa 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.

There were no questions of staff:

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Jesse Guerse, Guerse Conceptual Designs, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Why is the second floor plate height 9-feet? (Guerse: The 9 foot height is on the left side of the residence. Eight foot plate heights are on the right. That was just to get some articulation on the roofline.)
- > Any consideration of retaining the architectural style of the existing house? (Guerse: Owner wanted something different, farm house style. Also designed to be harmonious with the neighboring house to the left.)
- > Consider more narrow width for battens? 24-inch looks like battens over plywood. 16-inch can work. (Guerse: Can consider it.)
- > Which are the protected trees being removed? (Guerse: Trees in the back are in poor condition.)
- > Is the tree in front also being removed? (Guerse: Yes.)

Public Comments: None.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Will work in harmony with neighboring house.
- > Unfortunate to lose the existing house, but the replacement has a similar charm and scale. Works with others on the block.
- > Helps with the streetscape on that side of the street.

Commissioner Tse made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

Discussion:

- > Should indicate a shade or tone for the color of the roof.
- > Does not see it fitting into the neighborhood. Not sure if it's the width of the battens.
- > Feels very vertical. Not sure it fits into the neighborhood.
- > Would have like to have honored the design of the existing house in the new house.
- > Design guidelines encourage fitting into the neighborhood. This is an existing eclectic neighborhood with a mix of one, 1 1/2 and two story houses.
- > Commission has encouraged applicants not to propose "cookie-cutter" designs. This is an urban interpretation of a farm house.
- > House is nicely designed, massing is nice. Good use of materials.
- > OK with farm house style. Hard to design, tends to accentuate the vertical. Left side front gable pushed out and taller makes it feel taller. Would hope the applicant would look at that again.

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

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

Absent: 2 - Gaul, and Loftis

- c. 128 Lorton Avenue, zoned R-4 Incentive District Subarea - Application for Environmental Scoping, Design Review, Condominium Permit and Density Bonus Concessions and Waivers/Modifications for a new 5-story, 19-unit residential condominium building with at-grade parking. (Chris Grant, The Pacific Companies, applicant; Architects Orange, architect; Thomas Cady, property owner) (203 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [128 Lorton Ave - Staff Report](#)
[128 Lorton Ave - Attachments](#)
[128 Lorton Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the property. Commissioner Terrones indicated that he had met with the applicant and with the property owner several weeks ago. Commissioner Comaroto indicated she had had a conversation with the property owner several months ago. Commissioner Sargent indicated he had met with the property owner.

Community Development Director Gardiner provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

- > *How many parking spaces are required per code? (Gardiner: 24.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Chris Grant, The Pacific Companies, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Supportive of adding housing units with the need for housing, and this is a good context for additional density.*
- > *Which are the moderate income units? (Grant: First floor 2-bedroom, and second floor 1-bedroom.)*
- > *Will there be a gate at the garage entry? (Grant: Either a gate or security mechanism to secure the garage at night.) The gate will be an important part of the street frontage so should be designed accordingly.*
- > *Not sure there is enough room for the accessible parking stall. There is not enough room for the loading area. (Grant: Needs to be studied further.)*
- > *The green screen will be alongside the garage? (Grant: Intent is to discourage tagging, and can eliminate the need for mechanical ventilation. Will provide a complement to the walkway along the side of the parking garage.)*
- > *Has the color and manufacturer of the vinyl windows been decided? (Grant: Will be using the same windows that were used in a San Diego project called Vici Condominiums. Color has not yet determined but can provide further details.) Should provide a cut sheet.*
- > *Where would the bike storage be in each unit? (Grant: Will provide a plate with a wall hook inside each unit. There is a finite amount of space on the ground floor. It would be owner discretionary whether to install the hooks.)*
- > *Since there is a reduction in parking, needs to accommodate other uses such as bicycles. (Grant: Can consider that.)*
- > *Would encourage space for bike storage. Outdoor area at the rear may be in shade much of the time. Not sure it will be utilized.*
- > *What is open area on the rear elevation? (Grant: Opens to the garage. Will provide a screening treatment.)*
- > *Bathroom windows on the plans don't appear on the elevations. (Grant: Still working on that.)*
- > *Is there a significance to the particular pattern of the decorative pre-cast panel? (Grant: Nothing specific.)*

- > Would like to consider a treatment to integrate with the paseo next door alongside the parking garage. (Grant: Could add a bench if it would fit.) Main point is to unify the paving materials.
- > Why does the screening on the roof need to be at the edge? (Grant: Does not need to be pushed out to the edge. Could pull it in.) Pulling it in would reduce the apparent height of the building.
- > What is GFRC? (Grant: Gypsum fiber reinforced concrete - it is a cast concrete material, very durable, can be cast into intricate shapes and colors, holds up well.)
- > Number of concessions and waivers seems large compared to number of affordable units. (Grant: Only needs to provide 10% of the units as affordable to earn a concession.)
- > Concern with the waiver for the side setbacks, creates a canyon. Did you look at other options that would not need so many waivers? (Grant: Width of the property is difficult, would need to configure to have access from a property line, facing sideways. Needs the full width to accommodate the parking spaces.)
- > Narrow setback and height will have an impact on the neighboring property.
- > Needs to have adequate justification for waivers; needs to have more in terms of community benefit.
- > Seems like asking for a lot for relatively few units. (Grant: Had originally submitted with 20% affordable units, should reconsider.)
- > Having a hard time justifying why the waivers are required. If can grant more concessions than waivers would make it easier to justify. Would like to see more affordable units.
- > Fundamental challenge is the 50-foot wide lot.
- > Wants to see the housing but it is a heavy lift to get there.
- > Was there consideration for another floor given that the height could be taller? (Grant: Would impact parking dynamic. Right now it is just under 1:1, thought it would be a stretch to have a lower ratio. Thought five floors over a podium would be hard.) If the building were taller, might be possible to have more generous setbacks.
- > Would like to see more detail in the design of the front area.

Public Comments: None.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion:

- > Would like to see some revisiting of the concessions and waivers. Would like better affordability.
- > Lobby is not resolved, could impact the parking and other details.
- > Appreciates the commitment to housing, but wants to see reworking of the program and entitlements.
- > Asking quite a bit, but not delivering much for the community in return. Design is a block. Would benefit from more generous setbacks, which would benefit the community and the residents. Would like to see the scale reduced and more detail on the overall program.
- > This is a market-rate condo project, needs thoughtful design. Would like more attention to the outdoor space.
- > Could consider roof open space.
- > Lowest decks next to lowest units would be dark and exposed, facing a tunnel.
- > When looking at a project that needs lots of exceptions/waivers, it implies the project is too big for the site.
- > Would like more detail on the windows. Hesitant to accept vinyl except under special circumstances.

There was no action, as the application will return on the Regular Action Calendar once the environmental review has been completed.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Community Development Director Gardiner noted that there will be a groundbreaking for the Village at

Burlingame affordable housing development and parking structure on October 22nd at 4:00 p.m.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:04 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 October 15, 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 October 25, 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.