



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, June 22, 2020

7:00 PM

Online

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Staff in attendance: Planning Manager Ruben Hurin and City Attorney Kathleen Kane.*

### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 6 - Sargent, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

**Absent** 1 - Comaroto

### 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

#### a. Draft April 27, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft April 27, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

#### b. Draft May 11, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft May 11, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

**Chair Tse made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the April 27, 2020 and May 11, 2020 minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Sargent, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

**Absent:** 1 - Comaroto

#### c. Draft May 26, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Draft May 26, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

*Commissioner Terrones was recused from this item because he did not attend the May 26, 2020 meeting.*

**Chair Tse made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to approve the May 26, 2020 minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Sargent, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

**Absent:** 1 - Comaroto

**Abstain:** 1 - Terrones

### 4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

*There were no changes to the agenda.*

## 5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

*There were no Public Comments.*

## 6. STUDY ITEMS

*There were no Study Items.*

## 7. CONSENT CALENDAR

*There were no Consent Calendar Items.*

## 8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 523 Francisco Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Conditional Use Permits to convert storage space in an existing detached accessory structure to a recreation room and home office use and for glazed openings within 10 feet of property line. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(e)). (Brooks McDonald, applicant and designer; Abhishek Sharma, property owner) (108 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

**Attachments:** [523 Francisco Dr - Staff Report](#)

[523 Francisco Dr - Attachments](#)

[523 Francisco Dr - Plans](#)

*All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones noted that he accessed the rear yard to review the area of the application, but did not discuss the project.*

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Questions of staff:*

> *Was the structure built with the current ownership or past ownership? (Hurin: Staff does not have that information. Perhaps the applicant can respond to that question.)*

> *Is there something in the building or planning code that states structures under 120 square feet don't need permits? (Hurin: Correct. A building permit is not required for structures that are 120 square feet or less and that don't contain any electrical, or if it's used as a storage shed. In this case, there is electrical in the structure, the structure contains windows, and they're proposing to change the use to a recreation room/ home office. Therefore, a conditional use permit is required. Building permits, for example, would be required for the electrical work and to install windows.)*

*Chair Tse opened the public hearing.*

*Glen Evans, represented the applicant.*

*Commission Questions/Comments:*

> *How was the structure built? Does it have a permanent concrete foundation or is it on piers? (Evans: It was built on a concrete foundation, believe it's a slab foundation.)*

> *Do you know if there have been any comments or any interactions with the neighbors regarding the structure? (Evans: Never, not since we moved in and bought the house in April of 2014. As previously mentioned, we sold it in December 2019 and the neighbors on the closer side of the structure, if you are*

facing the house on the right never said anything. We had a fence dispute at one time with the neighbors to the rear, but we resolved that. There were some old issues I inherited when I bought the house, and we ended up cleaning that up and putting the fence in the right place. They saw it and never said anything either.)

> Just to be clear, you built it and it had the utilities that it has now? (Evans: Yes. We confirmed that the electrical was deep enough in the ground, we had someone inspect that. Everything was checked as far as I know with the City and the Planning Division.)

*Public Comments:*

> There were no public comments.

*Chair Tse closed the public hearing.*

*Commission Discussion/Direction:*

> It sounds like this is somewhat administrative between the prior owner and current owner as a part of the sale of the house. If it was operating as such previously and there haven't been any complaints by the neighbors, the first order of a conditional use permit is whether or not it would be detrimental to neighboring properties. No other neighbors are coming forward and it doesn't sound like there's been any complaints. In visiting the property, it looks like it's a well-built structure and nicely set in the rear yard. It has a gorgeous tree in front of it, so it's a nice setting. Don't see any reason why the project shouldn't move forward with approval.

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

**Aye:** 6 - Sargent, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

**Absent:** 1 - Comaroto

## 9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 887 Mitten Road, zoned I/I - Application for Commercial Design Review for changes to the facade of an existing commercial building, Conditional Use Permit for floor area ratio, and Parking Variance. (D. Michael Kastrop, AIA, The Kastrop Group, Inc. Architects, applicant and architect; Steve Porter, property owner) (27 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

**Attachments:** [887 Mitten Rd - Staff Report](#)

[887 Mitten Rd - Attachments](#)

[887 Mitten Rd - Plans](#)

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

*Planning Manager Hurin provided an overview of the staff report.*

*Questions of staff:*

> To clarify, the use is not being intensified even though there's a technical increase to FAR, and that's primarily due to the fact that most of the second floor ceiling height is over 12 feet which gets counted twice towards the FAR? (Hurin: That's correct. In terms of parking, it's actually not being intensified. The current uses on this site are more intense. The site actually meets the parking requirement. Staff looked at the proposed uses in the building which require 31 spaces and 31 spaces are

being proposed. In terms of the FAR, much of that on the second floor is because of the open space within the building.)

> We have an FAR of 1.49 versus the 0.75 that's allowed but it's because the second floor volume, not that it's another floor of useable space, it has to be counted twice? (Hurin: That's correct. If you took away that additional 12,500 square feet of floor area due to the open ceiling area, the FAR drops down to 0.9 so it's just slightly over the 0.75.)

> Understand the height is dictated by FAA, do we know what that height is or is it subjective? (Hurin: It depends on where in Burlingame you are. For example, on the bayfront, believe it's 141 feet above sea level. It can accommodate about a 10 or 11-story building. This is clearly under that.)

Chair Tse opened the public hearing.

Mike Kastrop, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> What is the existing height of the building that's there now, do we know? (Kastrop: It's 21'-6" based on the drawings.)

> Please clarify what are called "ceramic panels" at the facade, which is rendered in white on your drawings. By ceramic panels, do you mean tiles or they are ceramic coated metal panels reminiscent of Richard Meyer architecture? (Kastrop: Exactly. Ceramic coated metal panels.)

> If this move forward, would like to see if we can get copies of the colored elevations. It's going to be a handsome building and positive that it will be an improvement over what's existing in the area. It is hard to read with the black and white drawings as presented. Please provide plans in color when this comes back for action.

> Was at the rear of the building and noticed you have windows scheduled for the back of the building as well. How close are you to the property line at the rear? (Kastrop: We're ten feet away from the property line.)

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Tse closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Like what is shown on the colored rendering. It seems like an organized building and it's well-articulated. It's a handsome project and highly legible.

> The existing building is dated, it's looking rather tired. Appreciate the fact that the owners are willing to make this investment. It's a handsome design.

> Provide plans in color when this application returns for action.

**Chair Tse made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Terrones, to place the item on the Regular Action Calendar. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Sargent, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

**Absent:** 1 - Comaroto

## 10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

## 11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

*Planning Manager Hurin noted that on June 15, 2020 the City Council reviewed the Reach Code and provided direction to scale it back. In particular, they directed that single family homes shall continue to be allowed to have natural gas cooking, fireplaces, and fire pits. Also, that restaurants should be allowed to have natural gas for cooking without requesting a waiver or exception.*

*The Council further directed that the ordinance be split into three pieces (single family residential, multifamily, and commercial) to allow portions that are ready to be adopted to be adopted, and allow more controversial items to move at their own pace.*

- a. 717 Neuchatel Avenue - FYI for review of requested changes to a previously approved Design Review project.

**Attachments:** [717 Neuchatel Ave - Memorandum and Attachments](#)

[717 Neuchatel Ave - Plans](#)

*Accepted.*

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

*Meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m*

*An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on June 22, 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 July 2, 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 \$1,045.00, which includes noticing costs.*