

CD/PLG-Ruben Hurin

From: Neel N. Mehta [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2020 10:29 AM
To: COUNCIL-Emily Beach; COUNCIL-Ann Keighran; COUNCIL-Michael Brownrigg; COUNCIL-Donna Colson; COUNCIL-Ricardo Ortiz; MGR-Lisa Goldman; CD/PLG-Kevin Gardiner; CD/PLG-Ruben Hurin; kkane@burlingame.com
Cc: Shreya Shah
Subject: Follow up on 3/2/20 City Council Meeting

Dear Planning and Community Development Directors, City Manager, City Attorney and City Council Members,

I am a Burlingame resident who attended the City Council meeting on 3/2/20 and appreciate the public comment period on the newly proposed ADU laws. As an owner of one of Burlingame's Eichlers in the Mills Estate neighborhood, I wanted to provide follow-up concerns and suggestions on the discussion:

1. I recommend **against** requiring two pitches on an ADU roof, which was the initial suggestion in yesterday's meeting. As you know, there are a great many housing styles in Burlingame and requiring a dual-pitch on an ADU on our style of house would be in stark contrast to the low-slow roof and deep eaves that Eichler architecture is known for. As brought up during both staff and public comments at Monday's Council meeting, as a homeowner, I would like to see the ADU regulations be flexible enough to allow us to build complimentary to our home's architecture, instead of being prescribed a style that contrasts with it.
2. For sustainability considerations, a single slope is more advantageous for solar panels. And as Councilwoman Colson and the Architect raised, better for green roofs, too.
3. For good neighbor considerations, there is an advantage to having a single-slope on downside hill properties like mine. We can use the slope to our advantage in NOT obstructing our neighbor's views. A dual-pitched roof would be much harder to blend into the hillside setting in our instance.
4. I suggest there be further consideration of how to interpret the State's 16' height limit. I don't want a proliferation of 16' flat roof boxes either, but it seems like there should be a middle ground between what is proposed (9' top plate and requiring 2 slopes), and the big box effect. It may make sense to adapt regulations similar to San Mateo's. In that city, just one pitch is allowed and the 16' height applies to the top of the roof. You could still prevent the "big tall box" effect by setting the main level top plate to 9', perhaps to just one end of the structure or a certain percentage of the structure to allow a shed roof/sleeping loft situation. Burlingame's currently proposed regulation would prevent any sort of sleeping loft and force us to build a larger, more sprawled footprint if we just want to accommodate an extra mattress. The idea of a sleeping loft is very appealing to me because it means we can build an ADU on a smaller footprint by having some flexibility to go upwards.
5. Minimizing hardscape is a concern of mine being on a hillside property. I think having the flexibility in the regulations to allow us to go "up" (within reason) instead of "out" would be very appealing. Most of us homeowners value our landscape and greenery. I believe most would want the flexibility to build a smart solution for their property, without being forced to prescribe to a dual-pitched, low and sprawling ADU.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I truly appreciate your openness to the participation of residents in this process.

Thank you,