



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, August 24, 2020

7:00 PM

Online

On March 17, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings telephonically or by other electronic means. Pursuant to the Shelter-in-Place Order issued by the San Mateo County Health Officer on March 16, 2020 (which was then extended on March 31, 2020, April 29, 2020, May 15, 2020, and May 29, 2020), the statewide Shelter-in-Place Order issued by the Governor in Executive Order N-33-20 on March 19, 2020, and the CDC's social distancing guidelines which discourage large public gatherings, the Council Chambers will not be open to the public for the August 24, 2020 Burlingame Planning Commission meeting.

Members of the public may view the meeting by logging on to the Zoom meeting listed on the next page. Additionally, the meeting will be streamed live on YouTube and uploaded to the City's website after the meeting.

Members of the public may provide written comments by email to publiccomment@burlingame.org.

Emailed comments should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting, or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda or is on the consent agenda. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the three minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words. To ensure your comment is received and read to the Planning Commission for the appropriate agenda item, please submit your email no later than 5:00 p.m. on August 24, 2020. The City will make every effort to read emails received after that time, but cannot guarantee such emails will read into the record. Any emails received after the 5:00 p.m. deadline which are not read into the record will be provided to the Planning Commission after the meeting.

To Join the Zoom Meeting:

To access by computer:

Go to www.zoom.us/join

Meeting ID: 849 6762 9867

Passcode: 141032

To access by phone:

Dial 1-669-900-6833

Meeting ID: 849 6762 9867

Passcode: 141032

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:09 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Chair Tse, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

a. Draft August 10, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft August 10, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

There were no Public Comments, Non-Agenda.

6. STUDY ITEMS

There were no Study Items.

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner Loftis noted that the two items on the Consent Calendar were on the August 10th meeting. He was absent from that meeting, but visited both of the sites and watched the videos.

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

Aye: 7 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

a. 137 Costa Rica Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a remodel and two-story addition to the rear of an existing two-story single family dwelling with a detached garage (to remain). This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a)). (Adam Bittle, Architecture Allure, applicant and architect; Tehan and Subodh Gupta, property owners) (126 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [137 Costa Rica Ave - Staff Report](#)
[137 Costa Rica Ave - Attachments](#)
[137 Costa Rica Ave - Historic Resource Evaluation](#)
[137 Costa Rica Ave - Plans](#)

b. 912 Morrell Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines. (Jesse Geurse, Geurse Conceptual Design, designer; Hao Tien and Tzu

Chun Wu, property owners) (135 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [912 Morrell Ave - Staff Report](#)

[912 Morrell Ave - Attachments](#)

[912 Morrell Ave - Plans](#)

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 772 Walnut Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Special Permit, and Side Setback Variance for a new attached garage to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 15301(a) of the CEQA Guidelines.(Jessica Sin, applicant and designer; Vivek and Pooja Shah, property owners) (256 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [772 Walnut Ave - Staff Report](#)

[772 Walnut Ave - Attachments](#)

[772 Walnut Ave - Plans](#)

Commissioner Gaul is recused because of a business relationship with the property owner.

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Tse spoke to the homeowner this afternoon regarding the project. Commissioner Terrones also had a conversation with the homeowner during a visit to the property to get a closer look and tour the project area. Commissioner Gaul is recused because of a business relationship with the property owner.

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

Questions of staff:

> *The existing setback is 11 inches, but the left side of the garage seems to have been built at an angle. Is the 11 inches the dimension closest to the fence and then there are portions of the garage that are further away from the fence? (Gardiner: Typically we express the setback as the closest point, so you'll see the 11 inches is that point closest to the front of the property line. That setback increases as the building goes further back. So 11 inches is the shortest part of the setback or the closest it gets to the property line.)*

> *In reading the proposed clarification that we received in terms of the dimensions, that 11 inch dimension is not correct. Believe it's 1'-6" at the front of the garage and then it widens out as it moves towards the rear.*

> *Remember seeing that it seemed like the rear part of the garage is closer to the property line than the front of the garage. (Gardiner: We can ask a clarification when it's time for the architect to speak. Apologize not getting those changes reflected in my presentation.)*

Chair Tse opened the public hearing.

Jessica Sin, represented the applicant with property owners Vivek and Pooja Shah.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *The left corner of the garage is widening, getting closer to the property line, is that the correct? Is the front left corner of the garage not staying in its existing location, but actually moving closer to the fence? (Sin: That's correct.) And the resulting dimension from the fence is going to be 1'-6" from the fence? (Sin: From the property line to the corner of the garage.) That will be the final location, so currently saw a dimension somewhere that said 2'-8". (Sin: Yes, that was the dimension that was not correct. It's actually*

3'-1".) So the current location is 3'-1" from the property line, and you're going to move it closer so it becomes 1'-6"? (Sin: Correct.)

> Did you look at any options that didn't require a variance? It looks like there's a lot of space on that side yard there. (Sin: It was our understanding that we needed to do the variance because the existing garage already sat inside the setback line, and anything we needed to do to reconstruct the garage would require a variance.)

> Could move the garage into a different location, for example further forward. From the street view, it looks like you could put an even wider garage there and meet the setback requirements or move it further back for example. (Sin: The idea was to keep the pattern of the garage towards the rear of the property, like it is for the rest of the street. As you can see in the drawing, there's a parking space that is uncovered in front of it. Would you be proposing it in that location and pushing this pro-posed parking space further forward?) Just asking if you looked at any other option that went beyond putting it back in the same place, but larger. (Shah: We did. So the one thought was that many Burlingame homes have the garage in the rear of the lot. It didn't really suit given our structure, the existing layout of the house, the way the yard and everything is all completed, that didn't seem functional and it would be really inefficient use of space. We thought about moving it forward, but we figured it would be more efficient and simple to come in with just redoing the existing structure without a major shift in the position. Also the way the house it setup, there's an AC condenser unit and wiring that's by the front, so that may interfere. Then there's a mud room that attaches to the garage, so we explored both of those options at a very high level, but we thought and hope that this was the easiest and simplest way to do it. It works functionally with hopefully not much trouble.)

Public Comments:

> Sent via e-mail by Christopher David Dingle and Dina Anne Dingle, 7744 Walnut Avenue: We are Christopher and Dina, trustees of the Dingle Living Trust and owner of record of 7744 Walnut Avenue, the property north of and adjacent to the applicant property. We have resided at this address continuously since May 1996. In the matter of the current application for design review, special permit and site setback variance, we oppose any reduction of the regulatory setback requirement. Reduction of setback defeats the intent of the regulation and permanently encroaches upon the enjoyment of our property. It must be noted at the time of the applicant's purchase of the property an attached garage existed at sufficient dimension to accommodate an automobile. The applicants consciously elected to build features that reduce the area available for a garage. We request that the commission deny the application.

Chair Tse closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> In looking at the plans and looking at the various different options, had a similar thought about pushing the garage forward. But the problem with that solution is there's a bump out on the playroom on that side of the driveway that would probably cause the garage to have to shift in order to maneuver into it. Secondly, the garage structure in that location would effectively cut off windows to the adjacent bathroom and kitchen areas on that side of the house. So in looking at what's being requested, can understand the special permit requests for the attached garage. It fits with the pattern along that side of the street with the abundance of attached garages.

> From a design standpoint the architecture is similar to what's existing, the cladding and the finishes would be similar to what's existing there. So it comes down to the variance. In terms of the possible locations for garage and in the spirit of trying to create a garage that gets cars off of the street particularly in that neighborhood, we've had various applications that have come before us over the years and various neighbors that reminded us that it's a narrow street, difficult to park, and encouraged us to do anything we could to support getting cars off the street. So along those lines, can find support for the variance based on the conditions, the angle of the house as it sits on the property as being fairly unique, and reconstruction in the location of the existing that unbalance ends up creating less width towards that front corner, but greater width for maintaining that side of the garage in the future which is looked at when garages are close to a property line, so can support the application the way it's presented.

- > Can't support the application because the applicant is asking us to approve a worsening of an existing condition. This condition is one that I live with and it's a never-ending source of trouble for me. I have a neighbor's garage, six inches from the property line right in the middle of my property line along our joint property line. It was an accommodation back in the 70s to some special condition, and it should have never happened. Don't think it's fair when you have a backyard the size of this backyard to ask the commission to make special accommodations and the neighbors to live with the situation that we create by giving special accommodation into the future, so can't support the project.
- > Appreciate their effort to get cars off the street, and that's generally something that we should work to support and see no problem with the special permit for the attached garage. We approved one in the house next to this not that long ago, so there's definitely precedent for that in this neighborhood. On a practical level, having difficulty approving the plans because the plans themselves need to be clear, but that's more of an administrative issue. Also have trouble making findings for the variance, particularly about the uniqueness of the lot because this lot is a large lot. There needs to be more study of what other options there are, either moving the garage forward or moving it back. The bar for finding something unique about the lot that would support the variance request is really high, don't think it has been met yet, so can't support the way the application is written now.
- > Can't support the variance at this time and place. What we need is to do more study and see if the garage could move forward or backwards as other commissioners have discussed. It is a tight street and can totally appreciate the neighbors wanting to get the cars off the street, but we need to have a little bit more study on this item before moving forward.
- > Appreciate the effort to use the garage. Also live on a busy street and struggle with the cars. Would probably be more supportive if the neighbor wasn't speaking up and being opposed as well. Would like to see a little more study on how you might modify the mud room to get some width and or push the garage a little further back so you're not encroaching on that setback because you're also adding in the ADU as well. More study would be good.
- > Can support the special permit for the attached garage that currently exists but can't see supporting the side setback variance. One of the reasons is that garage is serving a number of functions, there's storage and waste receptacles in there, and concerned that once you park in that garage it will be more difficult to get some of the other functions that are happening in the garage out to the locations that it need to be, whether it's pulling out the garbage cans or getting access to items stored in the garage.
- > When meeting with the homeowner, he gave an approximate dimension of the current garage door opening and don't see it on the plans. Seeing a 9'-10" dimension somewhere in the garage, but the garage opening right now appears to be over nine feet wide. That seems to be ample for a car to be able to park inside, maybe you can't open your side doors to 90 degrees, but you can park in there if you wanted to and still be able to get in and out of the garage. My own garage is narrower than that, and am able to park my car inside and open doors with an SUV and any car that we have had. So for those reasons, can't support it. But do appreciate the approach to try to use off street parking. The driveway is long. You can certainly park on the driveway. It may not be perfect, but it works for their needs of having covered parking and access to the house.

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

Aye: 5 - Sargent, Comaroto, Tse, Loftis, and Schmid

Nay: 1 - Terrones

Recused: 1 - Gaul

- b.** 1509 El Camino Real, zoned R-3 - Application for Amendment to Condominium Permit to add common open space on the roof of the building (condominium project is currently under construction). (Pat Fellowes, applicant; 1509 El Camino LLC, property owner) (113 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

Attachments: [1509 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)
[1509 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)
[1509 El Camino Real - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have 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.

City Attorney Kane: Noted for the record, Commissioner Schmid lives relatively nearby or owns a property nearby to this subject project, however, that property is well outside of the 500 foot radius. Given the nature of this application, the approval or not of rooftop space would not have any foreseeable economic effect on a property owned by Commissioner Schmid, so therefore he's allowed to continue in this. We wanted to make a record on that.

Chair Tse opened the public hearing.

Pat Fellowes, 1509 LLC, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > Is it correct to presume that the previously planned barbecue with the covered trellis and the raised garden planters along the right side of the building will still happen on the ground level? (Fellowes: The ground level will be built per plan, but probably not with that. Probably just put that area into landscaping. One change that came regards the vegetable garden there. The state agency made me put bioswales in that area and across the back of the building and up the other side of the building. So if vegetables grow in the bioswales, we'll plant them. The bioswales takes precedent now.)*
- > So neither the raised planter nor the trellis area will be built? (Fellowes: The trellis area with the barbecue would be overkill. Don't see anybody using that if they can go to the roof. Would envision putting flowers and plants in that area.)*
- > Was the rooftop deck considered in the earlier versions of the plan? It seemed like we talked about it before the project was finally approved. (Fellowes: It was stamped on the plan, on the roof that we were coming back for a future roof garden. That verbiage was on the plan at the time.) Re-member we discussed it. (Fellowes: At that point, the reason we took it off is we went around for ten years on this building. And every time we came up, it was the same old thing over and over and over again. I think everyone got tired of it, so we took the roof deck off to deal with it later.)*
- > On the 1226 El Camino Real building, looking at some of your rooftop images for that project, it looks like the roof garden is designed where there are various alcoves or sections of that roof area so people can gather in small groups and have individual gatherings and a little bit of an intimate nature. In your current plans, there are seating areas and an outdoor kitchen. Is there thought or plans around sectioning off portions of the roof deck to prevent and incentivize people to have a giant July 4th party on the entire roof where the whole building is invited? (Fellowes: The other building was more configured where the elevator and roof deck came up and it cut the building up naturally. I could make some kind of screening around those, maybe with flower pots. This is a different deck. On the other building, we have had some of the residents, one or two of them got married up there and the police department said there was no issue with that. It doesn't have to be a crowding of people on the roof. There are cameras in front and the back of the roof as well so we can see what's going on up there. But I've never seen the roof overcrowded. Most I've seen on the other place was probably 18 to 20 people max.)*
- > This is a very large roof deck, 4,000 square feet, and this is bound to be an assembly space. Do you have some sense of what the occupant load factor is for this? Is it 15 square feet per person? (Fellowes: I don't remember what it was, but that was calculated in the beginning because I figured out with some of the factors we had around our building for that ten years, that was the issue they would come up with, stairs aren't big enough. The building has all been counted for that. The roof deck is also being specified from a structural standpoint.) If it's 15 square feet per person, it's 266 people. It used to be the old*

building code, the stairs wouldn't have been wide enough and that changed a few years ago. Wanted to make sure your architect felt confident that these numbers work for the project that were shown? (Fellowes: If everything goes well, we'll be going to the building department, and I can assure you they'll be checking that out.) Would like to make sure once it gets passed us, it doesn't have to come back to us changed. (Fellowes: I take your point. I've been doing this for 50 years now. We already counted the fire considerations and they are where they should be.)

Public Comments:

> Comment sent via e-mail by Nina While: It was quite a surprise to receive the notice of an applicant for an amendment to the condominium permit for 1509 El Camino Real to add common open space on the roof of the building. Prior to approval for this project, the developer met with neighbors to discuss our concerns with the plans for 1509 El Camino Real. A number of alterations were made to accommodate our concerns so Mr. Fellowes could move the project forward without further opposition from the neighbors. One of the alterations to the plans that Mr. Fellowes agreed to was to eliminate the use of common open space on the roof. The objections by the neighbors included noise, nighttime lights and impact on the turtle animals in the area, and surrounding trees. We negotiated with Mr. Fellowes in good faith. I therefore respectfully request this application for amendment be denied.

> Comment sent via e-mail by Don Mitchell and Yen Ma: We live at 1512 Balboa Avenue behind the property at an angle. The homes behind the property are quiet in the evening and night. This design which includes a firepit and seating for 20 people may encourage parties, noise and music late into the evening. The owner mentioned adding wifi to encourage this use. They mentioned not having a place to go outdoors, and the building is within walking distance to Ray Park and Village Park. I would like restrictions on the amount of people, the times of use and the use of music, tv, et cetera. I believe a roof garden was discussed before at the Planning Commission and please go back and review those discussions and the guidance given. Thank you.

Chair Tse closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> Somewhat concerned about the size of this and the number of people who can be up here. Thinking about what we've been doing with open spaces up in the air in residential neighborhoods, we've been limiting them to one hundred square feet and as you understand it, this is 11 units. If you said, you're trying to limit the use of for any unit to some small group of people, then one might naturally try to say to equate it to 11 times and this is four times that size.

> It seems there's the potential for something going on here with regard to noise and privacy, despite the fact there were no complaints in other locations. Drove by and looked up at the building from Balboa Avenue the other day, it seems pretty close. Understood it is 45 feet from that property line to the nearest occupiable space on the upper level, but 45 feet is not very far if things are noisy. So very uneasy about the size of this, and the potential for things not to go well in that neighborhood.

> We've made a precedence of not having these big balconies off single-family homes and this particular roof deck is too large for the area. Worried about the light and the noise for the neighbors. Can see possibly doing something much smaller, and moving it forward and away from the back of the property a little bit. It seems there's a bathroom up there. Maybe not having a restroom up there where people can instead go to their own properties and go to the restroom might be an option. Not sure but that's something to take note of.

> A question of staff: There was not an environmental impact report on this project. Was the rooftop deck studied? If not, is it possible to still study it? (Gardiner: There was an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, and can't recall if it included the roof deck or not. We can look into whether it's a significant enough change to the project to warrant amending that report. But don't recall offhand whether the deck itself was or possibility if the deck was considered.)

> Looked at the 1226 El Camino Real video and this would be a beautiful amenity for this project. It would be an incredible benefit for the owners of the condominiums. Concerned that the benefit and amenity not be at the expense of the neighbors, and so we've had a lot of discomfort as a commission

about these kind of spaces. It would be nice if we could have some kind of objective study of it. Subjectively, it makes me very uncomfortable.

> Agree with other commissioners, having sat through all of the various hearings for this project before. The context is different though not physically far from 1226 El Camino Real. That project is in the midst of a different type of neighborhood. This project had a sensitive context, particularly with the single-family residences that were very concerned about this project. Can't comfortably just say okay, now we've gotten past all those things and now this is okay. There might be some re-crafting of the design to make it less of a possible intrusion. But can't comfortably say that 4,000 square feet of assembly space on that roof would not have an impact on the adjacent neighbors at this point.

> Would encourage the applicant to not eliminate the ground level outdoor space because people would use it, and it would split this up a little bit. So the demand wouldn't be wholly on the roof. Like the idea, but the roof deck is a little bit too large.

> Agree that the deck might be a little large, but maybe that gives opportunity for designing in a little bit more up there with barriers or maybe landscaping that would push noise forward towards El Camino Real rather than backwards toward Balboa Avenue. We have a basic furniture layout there, but not a lot more detail that is saying if you put in some landscaping it would help mitigate that noise going backwards. The barbecue area on the ground floor has just as much opportunity for abuse of noise as you would have on the roof. So, there's maybe some ways to design that in, and be able to make that a little bit more palatable for the neighbors. Wasn't a part of the previous discussions so can't say they're wrong, and would hate to change that dialogue.

Kane: Through the chair, before you go to a vote on that, let's check with the applicant and make sure they are open to a continuance in the potential redesign or that they don't rather have a decision to-night.

Chair Tse: Can the applicant please chime in here.

(Fellowes: A couple of things before we get to that. We have a homeowners association and it has rules and regulations that so many people can be on the roof. In regards to putting in a barbecue down on the ground, it's going to be noisier than if it's on the roof.)

Kane: There's a motion on the table right now to continue this to allow you to have a further dialogue with the commission about what design might work here. The reason I ask the chair to allow this is to see if you're open to doing that or do you want finality tonight to allow you to have something to appeal to the City Council. If you wanted to do that, then you could ask for a final decision, yea or nay, or continue the conversation. Are you open to the continuance? (Fellowes: We'll do the continuance.)

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

Aye: 7 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

c. 1766 El Camino Real, zoned NBMU:

a. Application for Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration, Design Review, and Conditional Use Permit for mechanical parking stackers for a new seven-story, mixed-use building with retail, office and 60 residential units with below grade parking (Certosa Inc. applicant and property owner; William J. Higgins, FAIA, Smith Group, architect) (84 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

b. Application for Zoning Code Amendment to Amend Office Parking Regulations in the NBMU Zone. Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1766 El Camino Real - Staff Report - Item 8c \(a\)](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Attachments - Item 8c \(a\)](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Plans](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration](#)
[Appendix A - Transportation Impact Analysis](#)
[Appendix B - Supporting AQ and GHG Emissions I](#)
[Appendix C - Trees To Be Removed](#)
[Appendix D - DPR Forms](#)
[Appendix E - Native American Outreach](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - CEQA comments - Response to Comments Memorandum](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Staff Report - Item 8c \(b\)](#)
[1766 El Camino Real - Attachments - Item 8c \(b\)](#)

All Commissioners have 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 Tse opened the public hearing.

Bill Higgins, Smith Group, represented the applicant with property owner Mario Muzzi.

Commission Questions/Comments:

- > What material are you planning to use for the horizontal and vertical fin construction? (Higgins: The horizontal slab edges turning the corner would be the continuation of a post-tension slab or it could be pre-cast. But that probably lends itself more efficiently to a concrete slab edge. We have not had a structural engineer do the structural calculation on the grand canopy yet. I would prefer it to be an aluminum metal clad system to tie it into the rest of the curtain wall system.)*
- > What is the eave material of that pedestrian corner? (Higgins: The underside of a concrete slab edge ground smooth and painted we would be looking at introducing light fixtures, down lights into that slab.)*

Public Comments:

- > Mark Cate: I'm a resident of Burlingame. First of all, I know Smith Group very well and I applaud them. It's a great building and great architecture. It's a beautiful building. However, it's in the wrong place at the wrong time. Challenging both the Negative Declaration and the planning application. Addressing those issues, the density of this project, if not doubles, quadruples what's going on this corner now. It's a two-story or maybe a one-story building that has offices and now we're going to add many, many features to it. The massing of the building on this corner is too much. The comments by the architect on this place, you referenced the health care center across the street, but looking across the street, it's a bus stop in front of a parking garage in front of a hospital which is further down the street. This thing would stick out extremely, obnoxiously on this corner. The third item I'd like to raise is the fact that we're adding 60 units of residential and the density of that residential on this acreage, it's troubling, if not objectionable. If you have not been down this road, it's a one-way street that goes from south to north, and it's very cumbersome and complicated. I run and walk and drive this area everyday of the week, and it's very challenging for the people that live there. To add this amount of density, this amount of traffic, would be very challenging. I have not studied the traffic report, but I would challenge that as how that's going to be handled. The fact that you're adding additional retail to a spot that probably cannot support retail is very troubling to me. I don't think 60 units, if it does get approved, can support that. I don't see it as a*

destination spot since you have retail across the street struggling right now. The last item I want to add and it's problematic is the parking. You have two skilled nursing facilities, one on the north side of Trousdale Drive and one on California Drive next to the town home project, both of those facilities park on the lots that are going to be used by this facility. And you're now eliminating that parking, so those people that go to work there have to park somewhere, and that's going to further congest this neighborhood and make it less desirable and less inhabitable for the people that are already there. That includes the residents to the south, the occupants of the townhomes and the people that work at those skilled nursing centers. And those are my brief, but concise comments.

> Jadene Wong, 1755 California Drive: I am one of the owners of the townhomes which is adjacent to that panhandle. I wasn't at the prior two meetings, but when I learned about this project and reviewed some of the plans, my concerns are that, as the prior person said, this is quite a large building, and really changes the whole atmosphere. I know we're the only townhomes, we're the only residences here, but this is my home and these are our homes and I feel such a large building will impact the environment. It will impact the view and it will impact the light and the sun goes down in that direction, and it will be significantly darker in that area to have a 7-story building so close to our homes. And also to speak to the density, the people, and the parking. We've already had to limit our parking because of the bicycles on the street here. We have very limited parking. So often our guests have to go down the street, around the corner. So this will further impact the parking and I feel like this is a building that's probably better suited to a more downtown area where there are more people walking around. It feels like a city-type of a building, and not in this area which is kind of a combination of residential. There are medical buildings, but it seems more like an urban building and doesn't seem to belong in this neighborhood.

Chair Tse closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> To address the comments made by a couple of public speakers, this is an area that we identified as a high density area when the General Plan was revised in the last two years. A little bit surprised that folks see this as a spot where this shouldn't be happening because several of us who were involved in that thought in fact this is exactly the kind of thing that ought to be happening in this spot. So we have a difference of opinion here. Will it change the neighborhood? Yes, that's the point.

> The design team has done a good job of taking care of basic fundamental urban design issues. This frontage road is a bizarre thing to have in that location anyway. But there's nothing we can do about it. So it's something that probably shouldn't be there that can't be undone. And it has to do with El Camino Real being a state road. We're putting a building on a small road that perhaps this building really belongs sitting directly on El Camino Real, but that's not a possibility. The building does a good job of anchoring the corner as it should, anchoring the corner on the small road and a slightly larger road. It has good basic urban design structure, it's well articulated. It's much more compelling than the slightly arched front first version of it was because that seemed sort of frivolous and meaningless in that situation before. So it's a good solid building.

> Still don't buy the so-called grand canopy. As architecture trying to speak to the building on the other side of the street, it's talking to the most frivolous part of that medical center building. Don't think you gain anything from that, but it's not a deal killer. The fins are not doing anything. They seem frivolous like the flying pieces across the street. Someone asked a question about the slab edges, the horizontal fins, would urge you not to consider making that an extension of the concrete slab. You'll get no thermal break there. You'll have all sorts of waterproofing issues if you do that. That's probably going to be metal as well or something like that. I's a very nice building. It's a good solid you are been design with a few frivolous pieces.

> Having gone through the several year-long process of the update to the General Plan and looking at various locations where we need to encourage and allow for increased densities, can find support for this application. Can accept the findings, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the other entitlements and we previously vetted the amendments to the office parking regulations, looked at different numbers that might work, and we crafted that to the point where it's ready to move forward to the City Council as well.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Loftis, to recommend to the

City Council approval of the applications. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Sargent, Comaroto, Terrones, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, and Schmid

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 1249 Laguna Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (Jerry Deal, J Deal Associates, applicant and designer; Andrew and Andrea Hutchison, property owners) (131) noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [1249 Laguna Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1249 Laguna Avenue - Attachments](#)
[1249 Laguna Ave - Plans](#)

Commissioner Comaroto was recused since she owns a property within 500 feet of this property.

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones made a clarification that his business is in the vicinity but they do not own the property.

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

There were no questions of staff.

Chair Tse opened the public hearing.

Jerry Deal, J Deal Associates, represented the applicant with the property owners Andrew and Andrea Hutchison.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *Have you or the property owners had a chance to talk to the adjacent neighbor at 1243 Laguna Avenue about the removal of the existing and the construction of a new garage? It looks like there are existing overgrown landscape. (Deal: I personally have not. If the owner is there, he could address that.) (Hutchison: Yes, they're in favor of it. The vines on the side of the garage are overgrown onto theirs. We had to trim down a tree that was behind our garage, that crept over and bothered the house on the Paloma Avenue side and the vines go to the neighbor at 1245 Laguna Avenue.) You'll have to work through the logistics of taking down the garage and what fencing gets temporarily put, but it seems like you're in communication with them.*

> *Is the cedar mill HardiePlank siding you're proposing the one with the raised grain on it? (Deal: Yes.) To be frank, been vocal about fiber cement sidings in that they can look fake. Is there a reason for that one or not? (Deal: The raised part gives a little bit of a shadow line. Not a lot, but it gives character to the board as opposed to a flat board.)*

There were no public comments.

Chair Tse closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *This is a nice project. It fits in well with the neighborhood. Can make the findings for the design review and this would be a good candidate for the consent calendar.*

> *It is a good looking project and appreciate that the drawings really did a great job of answering all questions, it was clear and easy to read.*

> Agree in terms of the massing, the character and the detailing. Had the same question regarding the HardiePlank siding. Had an opportunity to look at that material closely recently, and that cedar mill material looks fake. Would encourage you to talk closely with the homeowners and make sure they fully understand what they're getting. Can't hard and fast refuse or deny the project because of that, but would just want to make sure the homeowners understand what they're getting in terms of that look.

> From the get go has been opposed to this type of fiber cement siding. We approved a number of projects with Hardie siding, but would encourage you to find a home that has been built with that so the property owner sees what they're getting. See if you can find some houses where this stuff has been put on. The misnomer about it is it's maintenance-free, but it really is not. There's a project on Cappuccino Avenue that has Hardie siding that we approved four or five years ago, and now the seams are coming open and you can see all the patch marks, the putty marks and where it has been touched up or was touched up because it was a pre-painted project. Not impressed with the product, but will not stop the project at this point.

(Deal: Just wanted to reiterate that we're willing to look at a different siding. Hopefully I don't have to go back with an fyi.)

> Regarding the motion, the applicant that he asked about changing the siding without having to bring it back as an fyi. It could back for consideration on the Consent Calendar with a different siding if they choose to go that route.

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

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

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

Community Development Director Gardiner reported that the City Council adopted the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) code amendments at its August 17th meeting, so the new regulations will go into effect.

The City Council also adopted the building electrification "Reach Codes" that will require reductions in the use of natural gas in new buildings going forward. The Reach Codes will only apply to new projects that have not yet submitted applications for planning or building permits. The codes still need to be reviewed by State agencies before they become effective.

The City Council also had a discussion of the weekend street closure programs on Burlingame Avenue and Broadway, and trying to accommodate personal services such as hair salons, barbers and nail salons. The outcome is that Burlingame Avenue will switch to parklets rather than a full street closure, and personal services will be allowed to request parklets. The Broadway street closure will continue as is.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 p.m.

Notice: Any individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact Ruben Hurin, Planning Manager, by 10:00 a.m. on Monday, August 24, 2020 at rhurin@burlingame.org or (650) 558-7256. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for inspection via www.burlingame.org/planningcommission/agenda or by emailing the Planning Manager at rhurin@burlingame.org. If you are unable to obtain information via the City's website or through email, contact the Planning Manager at 650-558-7256.

An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on August 24, 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 September 3, 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 \$1,075.00, which includes noticing costs.