



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

- b. 1335 Balboa Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (James, Chu, applicant and designer; Igor and Andrea Cerc, property owners) (92 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

All Commissioners had visited the project site. 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.

James Chu and Igor and Andrea Cerc, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Garage roof on the left elevation of the garage is not consistent with roof plan, please correct. (Chu: Will correct.)*
- > On the right side elevation, over the entry to the mud room, is there any consideration for weather protection since it's a side entry? (Chu: We talked about adding a shed roof, will discuss with homeowners.)*
- > Location of the dining room french doors appears to be incorrectly shown on the rear elevation, in plan they look like they're centered on that wall. (Chu: Will correct the rear elevation.)*
- > Appears that there is a porch railing missing at the front entry wall of the house, looks like you could squeeze right there and fall into the plants. (Chu: There should be some kind of guardrail.)*

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Don't have an issue with contemporary designs in traditional neighborhoods. However, am concerned regarding the elements of this design and how that contemporary architecture is applied in this case. Concern is that the front entry element is very bulky in terms of the fascia and how you're detailing the front porch. Doesn't have a residential feel to it; ask myself does it feel residential? Does it still look like a house? Does it behave itself in a traditional neighborhood? Some homes look commercial and look like a medical office or dental office, and this has parts and pieces of a commercial look. The front gable is quiet and subdued and think it works well, but looking at that front porch and the area above, it looks like some kind of square, modern piece has been shoved into that corner and added, looks like an addition or something that was done to a traditional house as opposed to hanging together as all traditional design. Think there needs to be revisiting of the front porch element to make it feel a little more residential. Doesn't necessarily have to be residential, but it has to have a better scale to the parts and pieces. Think*

that the rear elevation is working a little bit better in terms of breaking down the scale of the heavier fascia.

> Left side of house is flat and bulky and that's where that contemporary architecture starts to breakdown because now it's starting to look like flat walls that are trying to say it's contemporary and therefore, it can be blank. Think there's additional articulation along the right side elevation and the front entry element. Think it needs an additional pass at getting that contemporary or modern look. Has good scale in terms of the massing, but think the articulation needs another pass.

> Have voiced my uneasiness about the mushiness in the contemporary design, sometimes it works, but in my opinion it hasn't been successful.

> Had the same reaction to the front entry design, found it very strange especially because the second floor element is stacked directly on top flush with the first floor wall.

> Concerned with the two story element at the front of the house, it's a tall two-story bay that's not articulated very much, and it's very sheer. Can think of one instance of a house that was built recently in the past year where that tall singular front bay is very aggressive. Think it needs some more articulation.

> Concerned with the two-story window element at the stairway along the right side of house. Understand that the neighbors maybe accepting it of now, but there may be new neighbors in the future who are not, think it needs to be rethought because it's not just the current situation, it's all future situations.

> Standing seam metal roof may be acceptable in this instance, it's not nearly as pronounced as in other houses we've seen.

> There may be a solution for all these things, and maybe a combination of contemporary and traditional styles will work here, but don't think this one does yet.

> Proportion of tall fascia capping the flat roof areas is not connecting well with the gable roof areas, should consider a better way to connect them. One of the interesting things about modern design is the kind of interplay of modules and material elements, just as the staircase is separated from the window wall on the right elevation; would imagine that the second story front room is likewise set aside, setback from the entry portico that wraps around the right elevation. Think it's the big cap on these fairly modern elements of the home that take away the modernism element from it, tries to make it a transitional or traditional, think some further development may be needed.

> Struggling with the bedroom above the entry and how the roof line penetrates the gabled roofs on either side, but not in any kind of interesting fashion. Looks like it's squeezed in the middle, it's not making a statement for itself. There is probably another round of design development needed for the exterior.

> Overall like the feel of this house as a modern or contemporary home, however am concerned with the two-story sheer wall on the front of the house, it is stark, think it can be broken up.

> Like modern elements such as the taller windows and window element in the stairwell, gives it that element of a modern home. Need to keep in mind that neighbors can look into house, can be mitigated with landscaping.

> Like combination of flat and sloped roofs, works well on this contemporary and traditional home.

Commissioner Sargent made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar when the plans have been revised as directed.

Discussion of motion:

> Window in stairwell is concerning, may want to consider frosting the glass to mitigate privacy issues discussed earlier.

> Would be wise to obscure glass one way or another; if it's going to be obscured, it needs to be permanently obscured.

> Would like to make sure that the lighting on the exterior of the house complies with code requirements so that the light does not extend beyond property line.

> Regarding the glass in the stairwell, don't agree with the comment about obscuring it, it's going to be ten feet away from the property line and it can be mitigated with landscaping.

> The entire window system does not necessarily need to be obscured, for example certain sections can be obscured; gradient glass can also be used to create breaks in the glass.

> Think window element is a nice design feature and like that the stairs are separated from the

wall, so there are creative ways to take a look at obscuring the window panes.

> As a general principle, am uncomfortable with obscuring glass. Think there are a lot of other ways to create privacy, obscuring would diminish the impact of the window and think obscuring it diminishes from the project.

> Need to ask ourselves if we are prepared to continue to allow large windows facing neighbors; have had this discussion on other projects and had the applicant go back and revise the window size because of its proximity to the neighbors. Worried that we'll be setting a precedent. In this instance, it may or may not work; raising the issue because we've had this conversation before.

> Like the window element; live by a large window that looks into my bedroom, window is frosted and helps to reduce impact. Perhaps shades can be used, do worry that it is going to impact a neighbor in the future. Should revisit this window element and see if there are other options or material that could work.

> Like window as an architectural element if the house was on a large, open lot, however don't think it's the responsible thing to do.

> Seem to recall that there have been some instances in which we allowed taller windows like this, particularly in stairwells. Look at what spaces are we looking at and from; what I appreciate with this detail is it's in a transitional space, it's a stairwell and it's not a standing area or a master bedroom or any bedroom overlooking another yard. The landing is recessed away from the window, so if somebody is on that intermediate landing, there is some distance from the window. Also look at it from the standpoint of projects that we've had in the past where we've had large transitional landings, it adds for a different facade.

> Concerned with a particular architecture where the window extends side to side on the wall and making the entire wall a window; if it were a more slender window, it could make that element substantive and make it feel more residential. As proposed, it's looking more commercial, but don't have an issue with a visible vision glass at that location because it is a transitional space in the stairwell.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Kelly



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT • 501 PRIMROSE ROAD • BURLINGAME, CA 94010
p: 650.558.7250 • f: 650.696.3790 • www.burlingame.org

APPLICATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Type of application:

☒ Design Review ☐ Variance ☐ Parcel #: 026-022-060
☐ Conditional Use Permit ☐ Special Permit ☐ Zoning / Other: _____

PROJECT ADDRESS: 1335 BALBOA AVE

APPLICANT

Name: CHU DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.
Address: 55 W. 43RD AVE.
City/State/Zip: SAN MATEO, CA 94403
Phone: 650-345-9286 x104
E-mail: james@chudesign.com

PROPERTY OWNER

Name: IGOR & ANDREA CERC
Address: 1335 BALBOA AVE
City/State/Zip: BURLINGAME CA 94011
Phone: [REDACTED]
E-mail: [REDACTED]

ARCHITECT/DESIGNER

Name: JAMES/CHU DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC.
Address: 55 W. 43RD AVE.
City/State/Zip: SAN MATEO, CA 94403
Phone: 650-345-9286 x104
E-mail: james@chudesign.com
Burlingame Business License #: 22684

RECEIVED

SEP 6 2019

CITY OF BURLINGAME
CDD-PLANNING DIV.

Authorization to Reproduce Project Plans:

I hereby grant the City of Burlingame the authority to reproduce upon request and/or post plans submitted with this application on the City's website as part of the Planning approval process and waive any claims against the City arising out of or related to such action. JC (Initials of Architect/Designer)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: DEMO EXISTING SINGLE STORY RESIDENCE AND ATTACHED GARAGE.
REBUILD NEW TWO STORY RESIDENCE AND TWO CAR DETACHED GARAGE.

AFFIDAVIT/SIGNATURE: I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the information given herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Applicant's signature: James [REDACTED]

Digitally signed by James Chu
DN: cn=James Chu, o=Chu Design Associates, Inc., email=james@chudesign.com, c=US
Date: 2019.09.05 10:10:49 -0700

Date: SEPT 5, 2019

I am aware of the proposed application and intend to submit this application to the Planning Commission.

Property owner's signature: [REDACTED]

Date: SEPT 5, 2019

Date submitted: SEPT 5, 2019

RESOLUTION APPROVING CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION AND DESIGN REVIEW

RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame that:

WHEREAS, a Categorical Exemption has been prepared and application has been made for Design Review for a new two story single family dwelling with a detached garage at 1335 Balboa Avenue, Zoned R-1, Andrea and Igor Cerc, property owners, APN: 026-022-060;

WHEREAS, said matters were heard by the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame on November 25, 2019, at which time it reviewed and considered the staff report and all other written materials and testimony presented at said hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is RESOLVED and DETERMINED by this Planning Commission that:

1. On the basis of the Initial Study and the documents submitted and reviewed, and comments received and addressed by this Commission, it is hereby found that there is no substantial evidence that the project set forth above will have a significant effect on the environment, and categorical exemption, per CEQA Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that construction of a limited number of new, small facilities or structures including one single family residence or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone is exempt from environmental review, is hereby approved.
2. Said Design Review is approved subject to the conditions set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto. Findings for such Design Review are set forth in the staff report, minutes, and recording of said meeting.
3. It is further directed that a certified copy of this resolution be recorded in the official records of the County of San Mateo.

Chairman

I, _____, Secretary of the Planning Commission of the City of Burlingame, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission held on the 25th day of November, 2019 by the following vote:

Secretary

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption and Design Review
1335 Balboa Avenue
Effective **December 5, 2019**

Page 1

1. that the project shall be built as shown on the plans submitted to the Planning Division date stamped November 12, 2019, sheets A.1 through A.6, L1.1, and Boundary and Topographic Survey;
2. 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);
3. that any changes to the size or envelope of the basement, first or second floors, or garage, which would include adding or enlarging a dormer(s), shall require an amendment to this permit;
4. 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;
5. 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;
6. 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;
7. 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;
8. 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;
9. that the project shall meet all the requirements of the California Building and Uniform Fire Codes, in effect at time of building permit submittal, 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:

10. 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

EXHIBIT "A"

Conditions of Approval for Categorical Exemption and Design Review
1335 Balboa Avenue
Effective **December 5, 2019**

professional, that demonstrates that the project falls at or below the maximum approved floor area ratio for the property;

11. 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;
12. 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;
13. 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; and
14. 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.



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

Site: 1335 BALBOA AVENUE

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following public hearing on **MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2019 at 7:00 P.M.** in the City Hall Council Chambers, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA:

Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage at
1335 BALBOA AVENUE zoned R-1. APN 026.022.060

**PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE**

Mailed: November 15, 2019

(Please refer to other side)

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

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

(Please refer to other side)

