



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, January 13, 2020

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Senior Planner Catherine Keylon, and City Attorney Kathleen Kane.

2. ROLL CALL

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Draft November 25, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft November 25, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Chair Comaroto, to approve the minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no Public Comments.

6. STUDY ITEMS

a. 859 Cowan Road, zoned IB - Application for a Conditional Use Permit and Parking Variance for a church use in an existing building. (Andrew Chiu, applicant; The Church of Burlingame, property owner; David Fung AIA, architect) (39 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [859 Cowan Rd - Staff Report](#)

[859 Cowan Rd - Attachments](#)

[859 Cowan Rd - Plans](#)

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

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

- > Is there detail or information on the code enforcement complaint? The complaint was that cars were blocking the parking aisle. (Keylon: The complaint came in December 2018 and it is believed it was from someone visiting the building. There had been cars stacked in a tandem configuration, but the Fire Department will not allow this parking.)
- > Was this occurring on a weekend or a weekday? (Keylon: Believes it was a weekend.)

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

David Fung represented the applicant, with Andrew Chiu of The Church in Burlingame.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Was the complaint lodged on a weekend? (Fung: Not sure. It was shortly after purchasing the building. Since then, everyone has been informed that they should not park in the fire lane.)
- > Do the company vehicles parked on the site go away after work hours, or stay in the lot? (Chiu: They go away after the work hours.)
- > Is there a chance of overlap on the weekends? (Chiu: Unlikely. The meetings are only two hours.) (Fung: Even if all the members who drove overlapped between meetings, the total on average would only be 36 members. The 31 on site and 10 valet spaces would be adequate.)
- > Are the two bathrooms on each floor adequate for the occupancy? (Fung: There is a sufficient number of fixtures in the building in total, but how they are distributed between the floors is not compliant. The Building Division has addressed this in its comments.)
- > The area at the back with the AT&T equipment should be shown on the plan, as it could impact the parking and backup. (Fung: Will show it correctly on the plan.)
- > Expecting any growth in the congregation? (Chiu: With the limited room at the site does not expect expansion. Has leased out the other spaces in the building assuming it will not be needed for the church.)

Public Comments:

- > There were no public comments.

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Commission has been in support of symbiotic uses where the overlap allows greater use of the facility in the off-hours. Can see that logic. Needs to have the revisions in the plans to eliminate the valet parking on the side.
- > Variance application needs to be revisited. Does not show the exceptional circumstances. Needs to discuss the symbiotic relationship between the uses. Could be helpful for making the findings for the variance application.
- > Perhaps something in writing indicating that the other tenant vehicles will not stay on site on the weekends.
- > Conditions of approval for the variance will be important. If the use changes, it might not work. There is not a lot of street parking available, at least on weekdays.
- > If the congregation grows and tenants leave, could consider tying leases of the other spaces so that they do not all become assembly use.

As a Study Item, there is no action. The item will return at a later date on the Regular Action Calendar.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

A motion was made by Commissioner Sargent, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to approve the

Consent Calendar. Noted that Commissioner Terrones was recused from Item 7c because he owns property in the vicinity. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- a. 2225 Davis Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a 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 (Adam Bittle, applicant and architect; Jeffrey Walker & Angela Fang, property owners) (87 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [2225 Davis Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2225 Davis Dr - Attachments](#)
[2225 Davis Dr - Plans](#)

- b. 1548 Howard Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. The project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (e) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Hector Estipona, J Deal Associates, applicant and designer; Hugo Girol, property owner) (111 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1548 Howard Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1548 Howard Ave - Attachments](#)
[1548 Howard Ave - Plans](#)
[1548 Howard Ave - Historic Resources Survey](#)

- c. 1025 and 1029 Capuchino Avenue, zoned R-2 - Application for a One Year Extension for a previously approved application for a Conditional Use Permit for re-emerging lots, Design Review and front setback Variances for two new duplex residential units on two separate lots. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Ed Breur, TRG Architects, applicant and designer; Kurt Steil, property owner) (134 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit)

Attachments: [1025 and 1029 Capuchino Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1025 and 1029 Capuchino Ave - Attachments](#)
[1025 and 1029 Capuchino Ave - Plans](#)

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 110 Loma Vista Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for 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), Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines (Victor Song, applicant and property owner; Denny Han, architect) (58 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit) This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.

(Victor Song, applicant and property owner; Denny Han, architect) (58 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [110 Loma Vista Dr - Staff Report](#)

[110 Loma Vista Dr - Attachments](#)

[110 Loma Vista Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. 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.

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Denny Han represented the applicant, with property owner Victor Song.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > How big is the roof deck on the back approximately? (Han: It is the same as shown before.)(Keylon: Believes it is around 150 square feet.)*
- > Why is the plate height on the first floor 10 feet? (Han: Wanted it to feel spacious. It is the living room with no floor above it. The living room is not very big for this house, so by adding a bit more height it is intended to feel more spacious.)*
- > Was a cathedral ceiling considered for the living room? This would allow an increase in the ceiling volume without having such a high plate height. (Han: Close to maximizing the FAR and that would count towards the FAR.)*
- > This is a neighborhood of single story homes, with 8-foot plate heights. From the front the massing has improved and it looks to fit better in the neighborhood, but concerned with the right side elevation, looks flat and tall.*
- > Had skylights or a clerestory window been considered above the stairs? Could benefit from additional daylight.*
- > How tall is the front door and side lites? (Han: 8 foot door.) Is the head height also at 8 feet? (Han: Yes.) All the proportions are taller to try to make this design look graceful and proportionate within itself, which it generally does, but when you put it in that neighborhood of other houses that don't have those tall plate heights, suddenly this house looks very tall.*
- > The garage doors are tall, and there is a tall forehead. Is there a reason the roof could not be brought down over the garage and porch? (Han: Concerned it will make the upper half look taller.) Could revisit the proportions so it fits in better with the neighborhood.*
- > Concern with privacy to the neighbors from the roof deck. (Han: The roof deck is over the dining room, so if the deck was reduced in size the room below would also need to be reduced.)*

Public Comments:

- > There were no public comments.*

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > There have been great changes and it is moving in the right direction, but it needs more work. Relook at the first floor plate height, the suggestion to lower the garage plate height would lower the second floor and it would look better.*
- > The right hand second floor mass looks big and tall.*
- > The living room could have a scissor truss to keep it below 12 feet so it is not counted towards FAR.*

- > *Could move the rail on the deck in to reduce the size of the deck but not encumber the space below.*
- > *Neighborhood is predominantly single story. Needs to be careful with the scale. Needs to be sensitive to the scale of the neighborhood, the plate heights seem to tall for the surroundings.*
- > *The deck does not need to fill the entire space of the built area below.*
- > *The applicant should revisit these items.*

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to continue the item. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- b.** 228 Stanley Road, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15303 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (James Chu, Chu Design Associates, applicant and designer; 228 Stanley Road LLC, property owner) (142 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [228 Stanley Rd - Staff Report](#)

[228 Stanley Rd - Attachments](#)

[228 Stanley Rd - Plans](#)

Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item because she has a financial interest in the property.

All Commissioners had visited the project site. 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.

James Chu, Chu Design Associates, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *None.*

Public Comments:

- > *There were no public comments.*

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > *Project responds to design review criteria well.*
- > *Has added some details, likes the detail that has been added to the right side elevation.*

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Tse, to approve the Action Item. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused: 2 - Sargent, and Comaroto

- c.** 1147 Rollins Road, zoned C-2 – Application for Amendment to Conditional Use Permit to

add sales of alcoholic beverages to a mini-mart at an existing gasoline service station. This project is Categorically Exempt from review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines. (Gustavo and Gladys Greco, Gus 76, applicants and property owners) (16 noticed) Staff Contact: Kevin Gardiner

Attachments: [1147 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1147 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)

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

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

Questions of staff:

- > On the history of this, did the Planning Commission review a similar application a number of years back? (Gardiner: Yes, there was a prior request in 2011.)*
- > Did the Planning Commission recommend denial of the application at that time? (Gardiner: At that time, the Commission recommended approval but the request was denied by the City Council. The recommendation from the Police Department was different at that time; the Police Department was not recommending approval. Fast forward to 2019, having looked at the data and the various findings needing to be made for a PCN, the Police Department is recommending approval.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

John Greco, Gus 76, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > None.*

Public Comments:

- > There were no public comments.*

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Can accept the findings in the staff report that it will not be detrimental or injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity, with the conditions included.*
- > If the Police Department is in support with the suggested conditions, this application can be approved.*
- > It's probably helpful to have this commodity available, especially with all the other development going in. It will hopefully encourage people to walk to the store.*

Commissioner Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve Action Item . Mayor Brownrigg asked for a roll call vote, and the motion carried by the following vote:

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

- d. 1095 Rollins Road, zoned C-1 - Application for Mitigated Negative Declaration, General Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for Height, Density Bonus, and Vesting Tentative Map for a lot merger for a new 6-story, 150-unit residential apartment building. (The Hanover Company, Scott Youdall, applicant; SA Properties

Company L.P., property owner) (25 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1095 Rollins Rd - Staff Report](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Application](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Attachments](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Initial Study/Mitigated Neg Dec](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - MMRP](#)
[1095 Rollins Road - CEQA Errata Memo](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Response to Comments](#)
[1095 Rollins Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners had visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones reported that he had met with the applicant and architect to receive a preview. Commissioner Loftis also met with the applicant, and although he was not in attendance for the study meeting he watched the video.

Senior Planner Keylon provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

- > Do apartments have an open space requirement, as condos do? (Keylon: No, just a landscape requirement.)*
- > What findings would need to be made for changing the setbacks? (Keylon: It is a provision in the R-4 zoning regulations. When a map is being reviewed the Planning Commission and City Council, if circumstances warrant it, a map can be approved that deviates from the standards in order to allow a parcel to be developable.)*

Chair Comaroto opened the public hearing.

Scott Youdall, The Hanover Company, represented the applicant, with John Ennis, BDE Architects.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > How will the 15 below-market units be distributed? (Youdall: Will provide an affordable housing plan.) Will they be equally distributed? (Youdall: That is our assumption.)*
- > Even with the tandem and ADA spaces not included, will every unit have an independently-accessed space? (Youdall: Yes.)*
- > How does the provision of 96 bicycle parking spaces compare to other Bay Area projects? Do spaces like this get used a lot? (Youdall: Depends on the location. 96 is in excess of most of the other projects Hanover has developed in the Bay Area.)*
- > How are the electric vehicle spaces allocated, and how will the project accommodate increased demand in the future? (Youdall: Citylift provides for chargers within the stackers. Intention is to meet growing demand. System has the capacity to include chargers.)*
- > The rooftop open space facing the freeway has a single door and a wall. Why not more glass? (Youdall: It is a glass storefront wall. The plan makes it look like a solid wall but it is meant to be transparent.)*
- > How usable will the outdoor space be given it's facing an 8-lane highway? (Youdall: The occupied activity area is set back with landscaping, so is shielded.)*
- > Is there guest parking? (Youdall: The standard spaces can be available for guests. There is not a set number of spaces reserved for guests. Unlikely the stacker spaces would be available for guests.)*
- > Is the water table 7 feet below the site grade? (Youdall: 7 or 8 feet.) Helpful that the parking is modular so if one section goes out, the rest of the parking still works. (Ennis: Garage is like a boat, with water on the outside. Has built projects around the Bay Area at sea level, with one and two levels below*

grade and into the water table.)

Environmental questions:

- > Has the Anson project been incorporated into the traffic models? (Keylon: Yes it was included in the cumulative estimates.)
- > Number of trips from the restaurant seems overestimated. (Keylon: The traffic study utilized ITE figures based on potential use of the restaurant as a quality full-service restaurant. The study needs to account for the potential maximum use of the facility in the future.)
- > Traffic is a mess in the area now, with the Audi dealer service area, and people using Cadillac Way to cut through to the freeway.

Public Comments:

Mike Amaroli: Owns a property nearby. Concerned that with the narrowing of Carolan Avenue and new buildings going in, parking is becoming be more of an issue. There will not be enough parking for this size structure. Will there be permit parking? Drops off car at Audi in the morning, and there is traffic on Cadillac Way which makes it hard for Audi to do its business. Believes the Audi mechanics park on Carolan Avenue. Will the new residents be given permits to park in the neighborhood when they find out there is not enough parking in the building? (Kane: Residents or businesses would need to petition to create a permit parking area.)

Chair Comaroto closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

- > Had been generally supportive of the project previously, and wanted to see how the environmental review comes out. Environmental review has indicated that impacts can be mitigated.
- > Project has been designed to provide relief at the ground level, as well as usable open spaces distributed through the project at different floors.
- > Frontage on Rollins Road fronts onto the freeway. The rear setback fronts onto parking lots and carports. It is not looming over adjacent uses.
- > Creative project to provide housing in an area that needs it, in a location that will provide life to this area.
- > Needs to consider a day where the Broadway grade separation will be completed, and the traffic issues will be resolved.
- > The site is likely to be housing one day, but seems like there is too much program fit onto the site. Is a good-looking building and feels like a big city project, but is next to the North Park apartments which are more airy and spread out. Lot coverage standards are intended to provide light and openness.
- > If there is anywhere where there should be more density, it is next to the freeway. This site can accept this scale better than in other parts of town.
- > Skeptical over using ITE standards in the the traffic studies.
- > Concerned with construction traffic. (Kane: Parking management is reviewed as part of the building permit.)
- > While these residential projects the Planning Commission has reviewed look similar to each other, it is the nature of multifamily buildings.
- > Project sets up potential future development at a greater scale alongside the freeway.
- > Likes the design but the size and density does not seem to fit the city. While the previous zoning did not have a density limit, it had development standards that controlled the density. This project varies from those standards.
- > The North Rollins Road area is providing greater public benefits than this project does.
- > Project is fronting on a freeway, not a neighborhood.
- > For the environmental review, needs to consider if there are impacts that rise to the level of significance. If we do not see something in the analysis that warrants that, it is hard to justify having

issues with the environmental review.

- > The Bayswater project will have greater impact on a neighborhood and has a more impactful location than this location. The freeway is not an impactful location.
- > This is the right density at the right place.
- > Likes the design and material choices. Wants to support the project but is concerned with the traffic. The area will be congested but will need to follow a path to address the traffic.
- > Concern with the four-tall parking stackers and how it they will function on a day-to-day basis.
- > Good location for the housing. Easier access to the freeway. But concern with parking for visitors. People will have friends over and they will need to find parking in the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to accept findings in the staff report for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and recommend those findings go to the City Council. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Nay: 2 - Sargent, and Gaul

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to recommend to the City Council approval of the development application. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Nay: 2 - Sargent, and Gaul

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 737 Linden Avenue, zoned R-2 - Application for Design Review and Lot Split for construction of a new, two-story duplex on each new proposed lot. (James Chu, Chu Design Associates, Inc., applicant and designer; 737 Linden LLC, property owner) (77 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [737 Linden Ave - Staff Report](#)

[737 Linden Ave - Attachments](#)

[737 Linden Ave - Plans](#)

Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item for non-statutory reasons

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

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

Questions of staff:

- > *Why is there a CUP application in the packet? (Gardiner: Initially thought a CUP was needed because of there being two lots emerging. It turns out that is not to be the case, so the CUP is not required.)*

Secretary Terrones opened the public hearing.

James Chu, Chu Design Associates, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > *Can the location of air conditioning units be shown on the plans? (Chu: Yes.)*
- > *Can you also where the electrical will be coming in and the meters will be mounted? Prefer to bury*

that in the wall. The project under construction down the street has the two meters right in front of the house and it doesn't look very good. (Chu: We'll change it.)

> Could the architecture work as a single building, rather than having a dip between the units to make them look like separate units? (Chu: The owner wants it to appear as individual single family homes. In other jurisdictions, you're allowed to have two separate detached buildings be considered a duplex, but in Burlingame that's not allowed. They have to be connected.)

> Could there be consideration of an architectural style other than Spanish? There isn't a lot of basis for that in the neighborhood, it is mostly four-square homes. (Chu: Can talk to the owner.)

> Is there anything you can do with the landscape plan so that the front yard can act like a backyard to the front units, because you can't use the driveway and parking area as a backyard? (Chu: Can look at it. Front courtyards perhaps.)

> Understands the interest in differentiating the designs, but does not see rationale for Spanish.

Public Comments:

James Evans: PG&E required the electrical boxes on the project down the street. Concern with the layout of this project, that it will be too dominant with the street, with the positioning of the driveways.

Chu: The driveways are situated consistent with the houses to each side. The layout will impact the neighbors less.

Secretary Terrones closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Satisfied with the driveways, as it matches the pattern and respects the neighborhood.

> Seems to be working too hard trying to look like four different houses. But does not feel strongly about it, seems a bit fussy.

> OK with duplexes that look like duplexes. If the intent was to make it more approvable, it is not necessary. If it would be more simple to build with a more simplified approach, it could be supported.

> The area already has a number of duplexes, and can support more.

> OK with the duplex appearance, but the Spanish approach should be revisited.

> OK with four different styles, but not Spanish.

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Chair Comaroto discussed that as Chair she will be tracking attendance so commissioners can keep track more easily.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Community Development Director Gardiner mentioned that the commission may want to cancel one of its meetings in the summer to allow for vacations. There may be a need to reschedule the joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting, so canceling a meeting in the summer could be considered at the time the joint meeting is rescheduled.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:46 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 January 13, 2020. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on January 23, 2020, 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.