



City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL
501 PRIMROSE ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

Monday, May 10, 2021

6:00 PM

Online

STUDY SESSION - 6:00 p.m. - Online

To log into the Study Session, please click on the link below:

To access by computer:

Go to www.zoom.us/join

Meeting ID: 938 7077 3572

Passcode: 982151

To access by phone:

Dial 1-669-900-9128

Meeting ID: 938 7077 3572

Passcode: 982151

- a. Zoning Code Update - Code Organization and Bayfront Commercial Zoning District

Attachments: [Memorandum - Zoning Code Update - BFC](#)

[Zoning Code Organization](#)

[Draft - BFC District Regulations](#)

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 Governor's Executive Order N-33-20 issued 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 May 10, 2021 Burlingame Planning Commission meeting.

Members of the public may view the meeting by logging on to the Zoom meeting listed below. 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 May 10, 2021. 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: 938 7077 3572

Passcode: 982151

To access by phone:

Dial 1-669-900-9128

Meeting ID: 938 7077 3572

Passcode: 982151

1. CALL TO ORDER - 7:00 p.m. - Online

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m. Staff in attendance: Community Development Director Kevin Gardiner, Planning Manager Ruben Hurin, Senior Planner Erika Lewit, and Interim City Attorney Scott Spansail.

2. ROLL CALL

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

a. Rotation of Officers

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Draft April 12, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft April 12, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

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

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

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item 9a has been postponed to the May 24th, 2021 meeting. The item will be re-noticed.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS, NON-AGENDA

6. STUDY ITEMS

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

- a. 7 La Mesa Court, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review, Hillside Area Construction Permit, Special Permit, and Side Setback Variance to add a new attached garage and first floor addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1). (Judith Mattingly, Mattingly Thaler Architecture, applicant and architect; Tamara Romanek and Ben Patch, property owners) (68 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [7 La Mesa Ct - Staff Report](#)

[7 La Mesa Ct - Attachments](#)

[7 La Mesa Ct - Plans](#)

Commissioner Tse was recused from this item because she lives within 500 feet of the project site. Vice Chair Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Comaroto, to approve the Consent Calendar item. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Terrones, Gaul, Loftis, Schmid, and Larios

Recused: 1 - Tse

- b. 1120 Cortez Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a). (Una Kinsella, applicant and architect; Meredith and Blair Dunn, property owners (114 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1120 Cortez Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1120 Cortez Ave - Attachments](#)

[1120 Cortez Ave - Plans](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the Consent Calendar item. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- c. 1244 El Camino Real, zoned R-3 - Application for Design Review and Parking Variance for parking stackers for a two-story addition to add one dwelling unit and a new attached garage at the rear of an existing two-story, 4-unit building. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(2). (Dreiling Terrones Architecture, Richard Terrones, applicant and architect; World Co Holdings LLC, property owner) (192 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [1244 El Camino Real - Staff Report](#)
[1244 El Camino Real - Attachments](#)
[1244 El Camino Real - Plans](#)

Commissioner Terrones was recused from this item because his office prepared the proposed plans for the subject property. Vice Chair Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to approve the Consent Calendar item. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, Schmid, and Larios

Recused: 1 - Terrones

- d. 220 Park Road (Post Office) and below grade portion of City Parking Lot E, zoned HMU - Modifications to two Conditions of Approval to correct minor text errors for a previously approved Application for Environmental Review, Commercial Design Review, Historic Variance for Height (Title 21) and Parking, and Request for a Parking Easement (below grade under Lot E) for the redevelopment and restoration of portions of the existing Post Office building and construction of a New 6-story Office Project with Ground Floor Retail and two Levels of Underground Parking. (220 Park - Burlingame LLC, applicant; KSH Architects, architect; Burlingame Park Square LLC, property owners) (222 noticed) Staff Contact: Catherine Keylon

Attachments: [220 Park Rd - Staff Report](#)
[220 Park Rd - Attachments](#)
[220 Park Rd - Plans \(reference only\)](#)

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to approve the Consent Calendar item. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

8. REGULAR ACTION ITEMS

- a. 2411 Easton 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 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301(e)(1). (Hector Estipona, J Deal Associates, applicant and designer; Philip and Lily Law, property owners) (97 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [2411 Easton Dr - Staff Report](#)
[2411 Easton Dr - Attachments](#)
[2411 Easton Dr - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Terrones was recused from this item for non-statutory reasons.

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

Questions of staff:

> *There were no questions of staff.*

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Philip and Lily law, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *It appears that you're going to replace the front windows with an insert. Are you using the same manufacturer as the new windows, so that all the detailing on the outside would be the same? (Law: Our goal is to replace all the windows.)*

> *The plan shows there are a number of windows and the left-hand window shows a replacement on insert as opposed to a new window. I think you're going to end up with two different products there. Is the intention to replace all the windows? (Law: The intention is to replace all windows.)*

> *It appears there is a series of muntin bars and smaller lights in the upper portion of some of the front windows as well as some on the right side elevation. Is there a reason why you didn't continue that throughout? What was the reason why you went away from the muntin bars? Concern is it's a large house and there are large expanses of walls and muntin bars can be added to that. (Law: From what I could see when standing looking from the street, the affected windows that would be seen would have the muntin bars as requested and then we would keep the rest of the windows clear at this time. I walked the perimeter to try and see how much can be seen from the sides, and I didn't feel that there was much to be seen unless you were standing on the property or looking at it from an extreme angle.)*

Public Comments:

> *There were no public comments.*

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> *Approve with findings in the staff report, and FYI that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI application clarifying the notations on the plans to note that all windows which were shown to be replaced will be new windows; the notes shall identify the window material and window type for all existing and proposed windows.*

Vice-Chair Loftis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gaul, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> **that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI application clarifying the notations on the plans to note that all windows which were shown to be replaced will be new windows; the notes shall identify the window material and window type for all existing and proposed windows.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Comaroto, Tse, Gaul, Loftis, Schmid, and Larios

Recused: 1 - Terrones

- b. 1110 Bernal Avenue and 1112 Bernal Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for two, new two-story single family dwellings with detached garages, Conditional Use Permit for re-emerging lots, and Lot Combination and Tentative Parcel Map. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a). (Tim Raduenz, Designer, Form + One Design; 1110 Bernal, LLC, property owner) (117 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit

Attachments: [1110 and 1112 Bernal Ave - Staff Report](#)
[1110 and 1112 Bernal Ave - Attachments](#)
[1110 and 1112 Bernal Ave - Plans](#)

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

> *Is there a reason we look at these together as opposed to individual items on the agenda? (Lewit: Typically, we require that they apply for a tentative parcel map and separate addresses. We can look at them separately and we do that if you were to request it. So if you wanted to pull one off the projects at this time, we could certainly do that.) No. It seems that sometimes the comments just flow back and forth, and just for clarity, I wasn't sure why we did that. (Lewit: I think it's easier for the neighbors and the public to sometimes see it together and certainly for the designer and applicant to send in things as a single item. But I'm sure we can look at that in the future if you think it would be easier to separate them.)*

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One, represented the applicant with property owner Patrick Gilson.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *Can you please walk us through a little bit more on those changes on the Dutch Colonial? It looks largely the same, so I missed some of it then. (Raduenz: Coming into it, we've bumped in and out on this driveway side and recessed the stairwell side. We also changed the whole detail of the back creating these corbels, giving it more of a symmetrical outline. We weren't changing the whole concept. We were trying to keep these secret gardens on the rear and the front side. On the roof plan, we did play with the heights of the roofs to give a little bit more angulations. That was due towards making this large second story statement above the large patio doors in the rear.) Helpful actually because we ended up with the older 3D, so the screenshots here are very helpful.*

Public Comments:

> *Gavin Johns, 1980 Carmelita Avenue: I wanted to thank Pat and Tim for responding to our concerns. I still have a concern, specifically around the tree screen between our properties. Our home is actually fairly close to the fence and very close to the proposed development. Right now, I haven't seen any measured drawings. While the renderings look beautiful, I would love to see some measured drawings to make sure there's enough tree screen and plant area for some mature trees to grow. That's really it. Aside from that, it all looks beautiful and we're excited today to have a beautiful home.*

> *(Raduenz: To respond to Gavin, we can have Michael Callan do a simple 8 ½" x 11" drawing with the new fence, the proposed tree and the rough height of what we're proposing. If you're amicable to that, we can do that and hopefully just have a commission approval for that.) That sounds fine to me. (Raduenz:*

We'll add it to Michael Callan's drawings. He's the landscape architect.)

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I like the changes made. I really appreciate the flipping of the house and getting the driveway pattern properly aligned. The Dutch Colonial style is quite nice now. I like both of the houses a lot. They're going to be a very nice addition to the neighborhood.

> The house at 1110 Bernal Avenue, the Dutch Colonial style, is marginally better and I would say approvable at this point. I don't see a lot of Dutch Colonial with flat roofs like we see, but the symmetry that's been added to the rear elevation is nice. The articulation and symmetry of the two gambrel roofs on the right side elevation are better than what was there before.

> There are some additional articulation that has been made to the house at 1112 Bernal Avenue with the gable vents and detailing around the windows that adds some marginally better detail to it. The project can move forward. My only comment is because that hedge to the adjacent neighbor on Carmelita Avenue is a sensitive issue, the English Laurel hedge that's shown on the landscape plan is not shown on the architecture plan. I realized that the landscape plan would govern, but I hate to see a situation where somebody misinterpreted because that wasn't shown where a good deal and a substantial portion of the landscaping is shown on the architectural site plan. That could perhaps come back as an FYI just to make sure that the landscape hedge is going to happen and that they've done some articulation with the neighbor so it's not an issue moving forward.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Loftis, to approve the application with the following added condition:

> that prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an FYI to include an updated landscape plan and matching site plan for the project which shows landscaping along the right side property line for 1110 Bernal Avenue that is agreed upon by the owner/applicant and by the owner of 1980 Carmelita Avenue.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- c.** 22 Channing Road, 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 the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a). (Adam Bittle, Architecture Allure, applicant and architect; Gary Coover and Ayelet Konrad, property owners) (128 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [22 Channing Rd - Staff Report](#)

[22 Channing Rd - Attachments](#)

[22 Channing Rd - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Loftis was absent on the March 8th Planning Commission meeting but was able to watch the meeting videos.

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

Questions of staff:

> There were no questions of staff.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Anne Ravizza, Architecture Allure, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> On the front elevation, is the bedroom over the garage projecting over the garage door a foot or so? We lost that on the 3D drawing. (Ravizza: Correct.)

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I like the changes that have been made and I can see this project moving forward.

> I'm not sure how I feel about it. As I watched the video, most of the comments were about the stripping down and taking away of the details on the project. There was concern about the lack of clarity on the architectural style. It appears the decision was to strip it down and go modern. That's ok, but most of the concern was about taking a home that has some charm and stripping it down.

> I don't see much of a change. Even the garage doors lost the trim around it. I am not seeing where this is moving in the right direction. It was a cute Tudor style house which gave it reasoning for having a steep pitched roof and a lot of that exposed wood in the rough English texture on the stucco. This is not working for me and I cannot see it moving forward.

> I'm concerned too. I feel like it has stripped off all of the charm that goes along with it. That doesn't mean it can't be charmed in another way. The really large front elevation where the new windows are, the apex, going from the textured stucco to a smooth stucco makes it plain and makes it a big surface. I wonder about the siding over the doorway, could it be something that can go across the top in the gable end to provide a little bit more detail to it? It feels we've lost a lot with it.

> I have a lot of respect for our design review consultants. I really appreciate our process. In this instance, there is something that is still lacking in the architecture. The difficulty that I have is making the findings for design review criteria one, compatibility of the architectural style with that of the existing character of the neighborhood. As mentioned in the study meeting, I am not comfortable insisting that the house remain a Tudor style. I don't think it is within our purview. But we still have to make findings for the compatibility of the character of the architecture with that of the neighborhood. If this is going to be something contemporary, it's one thing. It feels a little bit like the Emperor's new clothes, we are being told that it is contemporary. Last time we had been told by the architect that the style is transitional and I am not sure what that means. But now we are being asked to consider this as somewhat contemporary or modern. Whereas in reality, I again see it as being stripped of any character. It needs some strength of character in terms of its modern styling and consistency around the house. Wood siding has been added to make it look like a modernization or alteration had occurred where there wasn't some design review. I'm still having difficulty with it but fully appreciate this going through the design review consulting process.

> There is another house on the corner of Hillside Drive and Vancouver Avenue that made me think about what this house is trying to do, it's a Tudor style architecture but very simple and elegant. They did a smooth stucco and the windows are very simple. It is a really pretty house. It has elements of being contemporary. I feel that it is still very traditional in its own sense. I'd like to see if the architect or the design review consultant can look at that and see what my fellow commissioners think. That house is one of my favorite homes and I feel that this house is trying to mimic that a little bit. I don't disagree that it has lost some of the details, but the home that I have just mentioned is very simple and very elegant.

> I also feel that the black and white nature and the flat elevations don't help to sell it. A lot of us are trying to get this and can see it but it is not helping to sell more charm without having some 3D representation to give us a better idea of textures and things that are being put into this.

> I also agree about the property along Hillside Drive and Vancouver Avenue. Here I have a little issue with the entrance area. There is some formality and simplicity around the large gable at the living room and then at the entrance it is very casual. Some of that simple elegance is lacking. The corner post looks

slim and non-decorative. There is something about the siding on the gable end by the entry that is just a blunt transition. I'm having trouble with the simplicity and the elegance of the larger gable. I don't mind it being a white smooth stucco, I can see that pared down elegance. It's the paring with a little bit of a more casual entrance pediment over the entry that is concerning.

> I walked through that neighborhood and tried to get a feel of the other houses. As far as the character being an issue, I didn't see that being a problem. Simplifying it doesn't take much of the appeal from the home. I very much feel comfortable with how this project is going.

> Regarding the black and white rendering, it doesn't help here. We don't see any vegetation or landscaping in front of the home. Some of those added elements can also soften the look. We don't see any exterior lighting on the front elevation. There could be some elements that can be added to the rendering, some visuals that can help us in better understanding the intent of the design.

> I know the house at Hillside Drive and Vancouver Avenue, it is generally in my neighborhood and I was in the commission when we approved that project. That is a good example of a likeness to this except that it hangs together better than this does. That house, as far as I can remember, is a simple stucco with very simple windows and not a lot of trims. It does have a quiet elegance to it. I don't think it is a great piece of architecture but it is decent. This project, to me, seems a little confused. The garage door is very plain. The wood siding and the horizontal rail is staking its claim in the modernist world, where as it is not the case for the Vancouver house. This house is almost there but just doesn't hang together very well. It feels like it needs a little bit more work to make it make sense. I don't mind that it is quiet and simple. I am a little confused by the comments on the meeting video and then seeing what appears to be changes, except that the trims have been taken away. It feels like it is almost there but it requires some orientation.

> What is troubling me is the horizontal sidings. I agree about the quiet simple elegance. I would submit that the project could work even better if it is simply smooth stucco. It is introducing of a separate personality with the horizontal siding that suddenly feels like a tract home element. It pulls from the simple quietness of a stucco building.

> I'd like to make its clear to the architect that if they have some other thoughts on the motion, it can be part of an FYI.

> If we are going to continue down the road with some of the sidings and no color for us to look at, can we consider as part of the FYI to include the materials board? If we knew what the siding look like and we thought and felt contemporary about it then maybe it can sell.

> I would like to add and see the finished approach to the entrance or pediment is addressing that whole entry area, whether the designer would like to look at a different type of railing. Also to better understand, probably form the finishes board, what is being proposed for the garage door. Is that supposed to replicate the siding we are seeing now or is it something different? I would also add the plans for exterior lighting be reflected on the revised submittal.

> I understand what is being asked for, but I would like to ask the Interim City Attorney or Director Gardiner, are we getting too far field with what we are heading here for the conditions of approval? (Spansail: We might be. With all these extra additions, it may be worth reopening the public hearing to get the applicant's thoughts on whether they want to consider all these conditions. We should either simplify or continue it to have them bring it back and respond to the comments you all have laid out. That would be the safer approach. I would be wary with adding all these conditions and providing that expectation. I would also defer to Director Gardiner if he has different thoughts.)

(Gardiner: I agree. We could reopen the public hearing to hear back from the applicant. They can either choose to continue and respond to some of these, possibly by the next meeting, or if they want a decision with all of these added to it.)

Chair Schmid reopened the public hearing.

(Ravizza: I appreciate your comments. I don't disagree with you about the siding at the entry. What we are thinking is something similar to the color palette with what is happening at the smooth stucco so as it is not standing out as a really different element but just giving it a little bit more texture. I can see stripping that element away and having it continue as a smooth plaster as well. I am happy to provide a materials board to help explain some of the color palette. The original motion sounded fair to me. If providing a materials board will be helpful, we will be happy to do that.)

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

> Simply removing a window trim doesn't clarify the project. A broad range of possible solutions has been suggested, but that one proposed solution wouldn't solve the problem.

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

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

- d. 139 Loma Vista Drive, zoned R-1 - Application for Amendment to Design Review for proposed changes to a previously approved first and second story addition to an existing single family dwelling. This project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (a). (Ha Nguyen + Designs, designer; Fang Wu, property owner) (75 noticed) Staff Contact: Michelle Markiewicz

Attachments: [139 Loma Vista Dr - Staff Report](#)

[139 Loma Vista Dr - Attachments](#)

[139 Loma Vista Dr - Plans](#)

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

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

> *There were no questions of staff.*

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Brandon Wu, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *In the letter that the applicant submitted dated April 28th, item 3 states: "Remove and rebuild the railing back to the originally approved plan." That is currently not the case. The originally approved plan had a railing that started at some height above the porch floor and the new one runs all the way to the porch floor. Which do you intend to do? Is it what's drawn or what's stated in words? (Wu: I think that's a mistake for the letter. We would like to do the handrail as proposed. The letter is not updated.)*

> *You have noted "installed wood corner board trim around all edges of the house." Does that include the stucco, or just on the second floor because it doesn't show on the drawing? (Wu: I'm confused. I was told I had to install the corner board on both siding and the stucco, but my architect told me I don't have to.) I don't believe it was on the original approval. Personally, it would look better without it on the stucco.*

> *In the approved elevation, the handrail did not carry across the front steps that lead up to the porch. On your proposed plan, that railing is shown and currently you don't have that railing built. I'm curious if your plan is to add that handrail alongside the steps or not? (Wu: For safety purposes, we're proposing the handrail on the steps.) So we should follow your proposed plan. You will then be building the handrail along the steps? (Wu: Yes.)*

> *Looking at the item where you're planning to install trim along all first floor windows and doors, there's at least one condition, which is to the left of the entry sidelight, where there doesn't appear to be enough space for you to carry out the same dimensional trim that you have currently used on the second floor. I think you're trying to propose that the same trim on the second story of the home is going to be carried out on the first floor, is that your plan? (Wu: So for the left side of the entry door, we're trying to install the trim without any gap.) Even without any gap, there isn't sufficient space from what I can see. It may seem like you may have a problem having that trim match the dimensions of the trim around the house. (Wu: What's the recommendation? Should I not install the trim?) Not necessarily. That's not what I'm saying. I*

needed to point out that there's that condition. I don't know if it means you have modified the dimensions of your casings around the windows and if that would carry out upstairs as well. I wanted you to be aware of that situation. (Wu: We should have enough space to match the trim.) (Lewit: You're correct. There's not enough space to provide matching trim around the windows that flank the door that would match the upstairs trim that's already been installed. It would either have to be a different size or be left off the first floor porch windows.) I think to the right side is okay, but it's the left of the side light that seems a situation here.

> I'm trying to visualize the second bullet point where it states "remove the black tiling along the front porch and install stucco." What color will that stucco be? (Wu: It will be matching the house color. It's a pretty light, milky white color.)

> I'm not seeing a paint color for the new trellis, is that going to be in black to match the other trims? (Wu: The trellis will be painted similar to the entry door color, dark oak.) Do you intend the columns to be white too? (Wu: Yes. Those are the existing columns, the support I can buy separately.) You got a lot of black and beige going on and it felt that the white was a departure. The door is a good looking door, but I'm not sure that the trellis being over the light garage door is going to pick that up very well. (Wu: I'm painting the garage door to match the trellis too.)

Public Comments:

> There were no public comments.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I appreciate them revisiting and taking our comments to heart. The previously proposed transom windows over the garage were not going to work. I like the fact that they've gone towards the trellis.

> Some of the other changes, they're asking for permission at this point for what's been built, like the corner boards up on the second floor that are already in place. The stucco band underneath the eave is not there, so they're asking for permission to continue the wood siding as has already been placed. I agree that the corner boards shouldn't be on the stucco. The stone that was placed is really out of place and especially since it's just a thin veneer on that front only. It's better to just have that stucco base for that front porch. So, all of that said, I can accept the changes that are being proposed and see the project move forward.

> I don't think it's in our purview to discuss the colors of houses. I don't think that we should because if he says I'm going to go with green, then we can say that wasn't the green we were thinking of. There was a discussion about some of those items but the applicant should know that we aren't going to hold him to those color schemes or what was discussed.

> Agreed. But for future reference, sometimes if a color is integral to a material like a metal roof, we discuss the colors because those are things that are not easily changed. For me the rule of thumb has been if the color can be changed easily and ready as commonly done, we don't talk about it. If they're proposing bright red roofs, that's a different thing.

> For the record the question regarding the color of stucco was only in relation to the character of the structure and how it fits well with the neighborhood. I didn't really make comments about any color schemes or preferences. I just wanted to know so I could visualize it in my head.

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

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

9. DESIGN REVIEW STUDY

- a. 2301 Easton Drive - Application for Design Review and Special Permit for an attached garage for a new, two story single family dwelling and attached garage. (Alicia Ader,

Dreiling, Terrones Architecture, applicant and architect; Bart and Carol Gaul, property owners) (83 noticed) Staff Contact: Erika Lewit - PUBLIC HEARING NOTICES SENT FOR INCORRECT ADDRESS - 2013 EASTON DRIVE WILL BE REVIEWED ON MAY 24, 2021

This item was postponed to the May 24th, 2021 meeting. The item will be re-noticed.

- b. 1349 Cabrillo Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review for a new, two-story single family dwelling and detached garage. (Tim Raduenz, Form + One, designer; Cabrillo Ave LLC, property owner) (78 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1349 Cabrillo Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1349 Cabrillo Ave - Attachments](#)

[1349 Cabrillo Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Comaroto was recused from this item.

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

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Tim Raduenz, Form + One, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> *Are you penetrating the declining height envelope? (Raduenz: No. The one in the rear is and the one at the front was pushed back to not be in the daylight plane.) Does this trigger a declining height envelope? (Raduenz: No, it was caused by the dormer.)*

> *I believe the following are drafting issues that I want to clarify. The chimney looks like it is missing on both the front and rear elevations. (Raduenz: I can put that in a low hatch.)*

> *There is an eave extension on the rear elevation at the right hand side. It was shown to extend over something, but there isn't anything over beyond the front gable. I don't believe it aligns with anything. (Raduenz: I will look at that.)*

> *I believe the left and right elevations are mislabeled. (Raduenz: That was because we did two plans and accidentally forgot to change the driveway elevation.)*

> *The kitchen window sills look like they are lower than the standard kitchen counter height. (Raduenz: Ok.)*

> *The width of the end of the front gable eave on the front elevation to the upper floor right side wall, that dimension is measuring quite a bit wider than what is showing on the rear elevation. (Raduenz: Ok, I will check the eave dimensions.)*

> *I am not understanding what is happening at the little shed dormer on the rear elevation at the upper floor where the gable dies into the top of this shed dormer. I'm not sure how that is working on the right side elevation. Something is not lining up there. (Raduenz: Ok. I will look into that dormer and make it correct.)*

> *I was looking at the dimensions on the front and rear elevations, the difference is about four inches. If you look at the floor plan where the kitchen jogs out at the powder room on the first floor, the discrepancy looks like about two feet. Can you please check the dimensions on that? (Raduenz: Ok, I will double check.)*

> *Did you take into consideration about breaking up the tall section of the house on the front elevation? We've had some houses that have been approved with a two story face at the front, even when they changed materials, I don't think they have been very successful. (Raduenz: What I am trying to do with that is maybe do a foot overhang. I am really close to the Floor Area Ratio but let me see what I can do. I can maybe take a little bit somewhere else, do an overhang and create the corbels that I am doing on the driveway side, which may help that flatness.)*

- > I had the same question regarding the chimney as my fellow commissioner had. I didn't see it on the front and rear elevations. (Raduenz: Yes, I will put those on.)
- > I appreciate your outreach to the neighbors. You mentioned on your letter to the neighbors that Michael Callan has a new landscape plan that will create more privacy, but you have a different designer that did the landscape plan. (Raduenz: Correct.) It really doesn't matter who does the landscape plan, but more importantly have an incomplete landscape plan. There is a plant list but there is nothing that is shown on the landscape plan itself. (Raduenz: I looked at it, there was a plant list but I didn't correlate them that there should be numbers next to the plants. They are actually there but printed very small.) Maybe the fonts should be made larger. (Raduenz: Yes, I will tell her to make the fonts larger.)
- > I appreciate the effort being put into the site plan. We are seeing a lot of projects with little to no landscape and a lot of hardscape. I like the project as a whole.

Public Comments:

- > Jennifer Pfaff: I appreciate the email you sent to my question about flipping the site plan but I am still not entirely happy with the answer. When you purchase a property like that with a significant tree on it, if you really understood Burlingame, you would realize we are the City of Trees. With such a tree of stature like that which is placed pretty nicely in the back, I would have hoped that like many other contractors or designers, you would have tried to work the design around that. It doesn't look that difficult. You mentioned that it is impossible to put one of those trees on a 5,000 or 6,000 square foot lot. I have a 5,000 square foot lot with two trees similar to that size, one is a redwood. I don't have a maxed out house, but I have a pretty big house. I am very disappointed that more of an effort wasn't made. With regard to the placement of the driveway, on the other Bernal house on the 1400 block, there was no pattern at all on the driveways. I think that isn't necessarily the reason. A driveway is a driveway and there are some that are not following the pattern exactly. I am very disappointed in the decision that was made here.
- > Brian Benn: Good evening, I live nearby. I've seen many houses built in a way that protect the existing trees. In this case, this magnificent coast redwood we know is in good condition. It is healthy and relatively young. These trees take 400-500 years to reach maturity. We also know that the bark of these trees is resistant to insects, fungus and fires. It has many community benefits. It contribute to shade in the neighborhood, cooling on hot days. It is a carbon sink. It captures carbon and cleans the air, it provides oxygen. There are many benefits of having a tree of this magnitude and it is one of the very few large trees, perhaps the only large tree on the block. More broadly in Burlingame, we are losing a lot of our big trees. We know in the near future that we will continue to lose our largest trees including those along El Camino Real. Even though this is obviously a tree that some might prize for its lumber, it is far more valuable alive in our community. This house can be designed around the tree, it has been done before in Burlingame. It would really be to the benefit of both the current and future generations in our community to do that, make our community much much nicer. I hope you will do everything possible to protect and preserve this wonderful tree. Thank you.
- > F: I am a neighbor on the block. I only live a few doors away and have not received any outreach from the developer, contractor or anyone regarding anything about this project, which I am rather disappointed in. Secondly, as you are well aware, we are on the block where the Our Lady of Angels school is. The traffic pattern is extraordinary. The school has worked diligently to get a good traffic pattern and it is working well for the neighbors and the school. I would like to make sure that the contractor, the developer and workers all respect that traffic pattern by not parking on the block during school days. The teachers take up all the parking and they will get here after construction starts. Have the developer schedule deliveries for off-peak traffic time. That means when the kids come in the school in the morning or when they are being picked up in the afternoon. The traffic will back up all the way to Easton around the corner. Having a big truck dropping off rafters is going to create a complete mess. That needs to be taken into consideration that the properties located directly across the street from the main access gate for the school for drop off and pick up traffic. Those are the two things I would like to get across. No outreach and the traffic patterns on the block need to be addressed.
- > Raduenz: Is it possible to respond to the public comments? We have drawings of the house both left and right. Correct, we can do it the other way, but there are always issues. The neighbor next door wanted the garage to be on the other side because of the general design of that block, which makes sense. That's kind of the M.O. of the Planning Commission and Planning Division. I have made two designs, I

want them to understand that I don't do this in haste. You can talk to the owners, they have the first set that went out to the neighbors. I just want to make it clear that I care about my projects. On the outreach, we only outreach to the neighbors that are connected to the house. I'm sorry Mr. F that you didn't get outreached but normally it should just concern the people that are connected to the lot, but you do get noticed from the city. But I do send a letter out to everyone that is connected to the property. We'll work with the commission in which ever way you think we need to place the driveway. The way we presented it was the way the owners wanted it and the two neighbors to the left and right of the property.

> The arborist report says that the tree is in the best condition on the site, he even outlines a tree protection plan. In looking at the site plan, before, you were even putting a tree in the middle of the backyard again. To me, it is funny that you are getting rid of that tree. I think that everybody on the commission will wholeheartedly agree that if you want to save the tree and put the garage and driveway on the right hand side, I am all for it. It was just seem like a foregone conclusion with you and the developer that the tree would be removed. (Raduenz: No, in the beginning we actually had the tree being saved. It was after the outreach to the two neighbors that are impacted and they have brought up the street pattern. Also, this property is going to be sold and they don't want the liability of having a tree or limb falling, it's happened. Again, there are two options. Just flip the site plan that is all we need. As the commissioner had earlier brought up, I had my elevation labels mixed up because that was our first design, to keep the tree. We have gotten some negative feedback from the neighbors, the owners were indifferent about it and does not want the liability for the tree.

> If you were to flip it the other way, is there a down side? (Raduenz: Just the street pattern. Again, I am not forcing the issue here. There are two ways to do it and this is the way we'd like to do it. If we are forced to do it the other way, then we have to. When people complain that it is the only tree left, we should be doing this to every house that has a tree.)

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> This is a really nice project, very well articulated, very attractive and somehow very compact. It feels like a very compact house, which I like. I don't mind that you call it a farm house if you have to. It's contemporary and truly transitional.

> On the tree issue, I have a little different take on this. I know that we are the City of Trees and that is fantastic, but there are some trees that don't make sense. The eucalyptus trees should never have been planted. They are very dangerous, very hard to maintain and we have some crashed in our backyard. They don't belong here. A few years ago I helped a project get entitlement nearby and I heard arborist after arborist come in front of the city council and say that redwood trees are not native to this particular climate. They are coastal trees, they collect fog from the air and it drips down. They can gather 500 gallons of fog from the air and drips down to its very shallow root structure. I understand that they are beautiful trees but they don't belong in this environment. It would behoove us to do a little bit of research about this. True, they are fantastic and beautiful. But to put one in your backyard and live with it for 40 - 60 years, that thing will absolutely be out of control. They drink an enormous amount of water. If you don't water them, they will turn brown and die. So what you are buying when you put a redwood tree in your backyard, is watering for many many years because it cannot collect fog in this environment. They don't belong here. We would be better off having a native oak tree in the backyard. If this was an oak tree, I will push back as well. But to push back on a tree that shouldn't be there, is just a mistake.

> I agree that the architecture is well composed. I also agree about the comments on that element on the front elevation just as one piece. In looking at it, the issue that I have is that it feels a little top-heavy. In architecture you have an order of top to bottom. Part of the issue that is happening here is because that element is almost split in half. Whereas if it had a base down low at a third or up higher about two-thirds, it might work a little bit better, I am not suggesting that. Rather than do a pop-out of the second floor and put the corbels underneath, energy might have been better spent in doing a bay window or a pop-out on the lower floor which can have an awning roof over the top and can help to create an element that have the two-thirds feel along the bottom. It can give that base a little bit of a substance so that element wouldn't feel top heavy.

-
- > In regards to the tree, I don't disagree in terms of the sentiment that the redwood trees don't belong in this environment. If we see landscape plans that are proposing new redwood trees, I would absolutely recommend something different for all of those reasons. In this case, we have one that is there. It is a huge thing and in good health. It is in the early portion of its life. If it could be here it will be here long after we are all gone. To just take it out because of some nervousness, it is the wrong tree to be nervous about. These are not the trees that drop massive limbs. I will stop short of insisting that it remains, but I would encourage that it be considered as just a thing that will last hundreds, if not thousands, of years.
- > I really like the look and feel of the home. It fits in the neighborhood. I also agree about the compactness, but some of the architectural features give it a repetitive rhythm. Something from the rendition makes it look a little too repetitive. It doesn't really feel in line with the rest of the neighborhood. Otherwise, I love the project. In regards to the tree, it also plays into the character of the neighborhood. A lot of people have a sense of belonging. I would recommend for the architect to think about doing further outreach and discussing more of that with the owner and the rest of the neighbors.
- > Overall, this is a good project. I agree there is a certain amount of repetitiveness which lends itself to a little bit of a lack of detail. Maybe if you played with some of the windows, it might help out. It was a good point about expanding the front element, something needs to be done there.
- > In digging about the tree just a little bit more, I know that the house is going to be sold, so it is a developer that is doing this project and they want to maximize the square footage. But an attached garage eats out some of your square footage. But it solves the problem of having the garage at the back and you can put the driveway on either side. If you work with the tree you can make it into something that is a really nice element for the backyard. If you have the patio open up to it and use the tree as an architectural or landscape element because it is already there. I agree that redwood trees typically don't belong in residential neighborhoods. They make a mess. But it is a tree that is in really good shape and it is part of the small grove that is still there. So I would encourage the designer to look again at this design and see if you can make something work around it.
- > Regarding the point that the front and rear two story elevations are flat, the recommendation of a potential pop out or roof element on the bottom floor could actually hit right in that sweet spot to give that wall some relief, so I would encourage that. Otherwise, it is a good project and would love to see it move forward.
- > I agree with the idea of building upon the front face and add some articulation to improve the design of the front elevation. I too was very impressed with the compactness of the floor plan. There are so many bedrooms that fit tightly on the floor plan but does not feel small. Other than correcting the drafting items that were mentioned earlier, the house looks very nice.
- > The current house is such that the driveway is on the right. The neighbor to the left, though would probably appreciate a driveway on the left side of the property, currently experiences and understands the streetscape here where the house is up against the left side of the property. I feel that this tree, though may not be indigenous to this particular part of our city, is in great shape. The arborist took a lot of care to write a very thorough report about the tree and its condition, how to protect it during construction and going forward. It looks really good and is obviously healthy with a condition rating of 80. I would appreciate trying to keep or retain the tree on the property and flip the driveway to the right hand side. If it is a detached garage the applicant would prefer, then have the garage on the right hand side of the property. I too would like to see that the tree is preserved on this property.
- > I appreciate that others like the tree. Looking online, it says a single redwood tree can transpire as much as 500 gallons a day, I suspect that is a very big redwood tree that does that. Five hundred gallons is as much as you might use on an hour long shower. Think about what you are proposing here. What happens when they no longer want to water this tree? We are about to enter another drought, what happens when they no longer want to water it? It would take about 250 gallons of water a day to keep this tree for turning brown. It is in great shape now, yes, but it won't always be in great shape. So I just ask you to consider this. I understand that everybody loves redwood trees, but it's highly likely that in a few years this tree will not be in the greater of shape.
- > I understand those statistics, but I am not comfortable then because by that criteria, we should be cutting down all redwood trees that are not in coastal range or anywhere they cannot collect water.
- > By that standard, then we would have to chop down all the trees. If it is a new project and they were thinking of installing a redwood tree, then that's the moment we can intervene. When you have a great tree like this, we should consider being adamant one way or another. I think more outreach needs to be done.
-

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Tse, to place on the item on the Regular Action Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused: 1 - Comaroto

- c. 1209 Cabrillo Avenue, 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. (Patrick Donato, Levy Art & Architecture, applicant and architect; Sohan and Sandhya Talwalker, property owners) (112 noticed) Staff Contact: 'Amelia Kolokihakaufisi

Attachments: [1209 Cabrillo Ave - Staff Report](#)

[1209 Cabrillo Ave - Attachments](#)

[1209 Cabrillo Ave - Plans](#)

All Commissioners have visited the project site. Commissioner Gaul had a discussion with the neighbor at 1225 Cabrillo Avenue

Senior Planner Lewit provided an overview of the staff report.

Questions of staff:

> There were no questions of staff.

Chair Schmid opened the public hearing.

Ross Levy and Patrick Donato, Levy Art & Architecture, represented the applicant.

Commission Questions/Comments:

> As you've developed the design, do you have design sketches on the side to show how the pieces are going to come together? There's a number of elements that come together in a single line format on the elevations. For example, there's a number of windows shown with a single line and there's not a frame, and the sliding doors have two simple lines and there's not a sash indicated. Have you looked at it in a secondary layer offline to know this is going to work and come together as planned? (Levy: We have some pretty clear ideas about how we're detailing this. Rain screen is the operative word, we see it as trim. I'm aware of trim and casing as a phenomenon. These are things that can be introduced if it feels like there's an element that is missing.)

> I'm not looking to add trim and I get the clean lines of what you appear to be going for in terms of modern look. I'm looking more on the internal of trims like the frame of a window and sash. For example, on the north elevation, you've got the combination clerestory and window light which is folded glazing that comes across that eave. It's shown with a single line at the roof where it intersects with the roof and a single line where it bends and single lines so it almost makes it look like a frameless glazing. (Levy: That's the intention.)

> Somehow what you're calling the reveal at the roof line comes in horizontally and meets that glazing on that elevation. If there's a reveal there, there's a pocket or a void that's going to get toughed with something. So that single line of that folded glazing is going to abut on its jam side to that reveal in just a single line? (Levy: I think that this frameless glass detail is doable. It would have to sit in the plane of the reveal. There's a deeper intention. We can talk about representation and what might actually happen here, but from my stand-point, one thing I wanted to do was give light into the stairwell. We talked about this in the past with an observation about large windows on the sides of buildings. So we took ours and migrated it uphill so there's no longer privacy issues, but there's still natural light coming into the stair. You are correct about detailing, we can talk about that separately.)

- > There is the clerestory window at the stairwell and the glazing comes up to the underside of the roof. I appreciate the metrics you provided but I look at the glazing and there's no header or the header is in the back of the glazing, at that point of which the roof comes down and the glazing hits to the underside of that roof? (Donato: I feel pretty confident that we can execute these details to achieve the spirit of what we have done on the drawings. At this point, I just said it's schematic. I would consider it that it may divert slightly, but we're going to do everything we can to make it achieve the diagram we're trying to achieve.) (Levy: I will say that the particular ceiling above that particular set of stairs, we've talked about wanting it to feel elevated so there's an intention to bring the glass as far up as we can and to bring the structure inward. We've done this before.)
- > Can you tell me more about the roof materials? (Levy: We're still calling it a standing seam roof because our clients prefer to have a certain amount of durability and fire resistance. We're interested in a solar roof. There will be the solar aspect to this house and there are some integrated systems now and solar tiles that we're compelled by. There's the performance aspect and there's this Planning Commission aspect of it and I don't know how this commission feels about that. Either this house is intended to be a net zero or a better house and the reason for the one-car garage is because the client anticipates one car with all electric and a more contemporary lifestyle and we're trying to make a great yard space.)
- > Maybe the next version of this addresses those questions of the solar. Because when I look at houses like this, I'm looking for the drainage, how is the water getting off things and how are we doing things that traditional houses still have to do? Once you start putting in the integrated drainage, where is it going? Particularly, as I look at the arbor trellis towards the back, I'm wondering, where's the water going? It's going to hit on the roof down below probably, but then where does it go from there? Those are some things that could be discussed the next time around.
- > I appreciate what you have done on the siding. It has been a game-changer for me in looking at this. I appreciate where you're going and my questions are more about how to make it go forward.
- > The front arbor, I understand, but the back arbor looks like it is floating. How does that end up getting structurally held up? (Levy: There will be cantilever beams that is supported on the in-board side and those will exist at the band of the outward ridge line about a foot from the bottom to stabilize those tails as well.) (Donato: There's a suggestion of that in the drawing if you look closely.)
- > From the schematics, and just from my perception in viewing the schematics, I feel the house is encroaching on the sidewalk or literally right on the sidewalk. When you walk that neighborhood, you notice that all the houses have a little bit of a front yard. I feel that's going to stick out and the neighborhood is going to lose character, so I'm wondering if that's just a perceptual thing I'm imagining by looking at this schematic because it looks like it's on the sidewalk. (Donato: It is. However, it's a distortion due to the rendering ability, but if you look at the plans, you can see the setback is commensurate with the neighbors.)
- > The back floating arbor says wood gable arbor. The front calls out no material. Is that meant to be the same thing? Is it meant to be wood gable? I worry that it looks like it could be tube steel, but since the other one is wood, I'm trying to figure out whether these two are related? (Levy: They are related and they're meant to be the same.)
- > Have you had a chance to see the letter from the neighbors on the left-hand side with some of their current thoughts? (Levy: I had a conference call with them on Friday morning and I believe that letter was the basis of that call.) When this comes back to Action, if you can have a response to their comments or concerns like the pool equipment, screening hedge and things like that. Sounds like they're appreciative of the location of the pool which is great. (Levy: We gave them a shading study and they were asking the low roof adjacent to their roof so we gave them a shading study last Friday.)

Public Comments:

- > Comments from Steve and Jane: We're the neighbor in the small old Spanish revival house to the east and we wrote the letter. They were very kind to meet with us and go over everything and we appreciate that and the Talwalkers have been excellent neighbors and we're very pleased that they've been willing to work with us. We had four areas that we were concerned about, the privacy hedge, I think they agreed to that. The equipment area noise, I don't know if they're going to move that or if there's another way to make sure that's not excessive. We've heard some of the pool equipment in the neighbor's yard and it's in the garage. So we know there are noise issues with that. We also have a shade tree in our backyard, but now

that they have moved the ADU and the pool, it will probably be fine. We want assurances on that. There's this roof overhang, we're very blessed right now to have a driveway between us and their two-story house. Now there's this artificial roof overhang which is covering where the garbage cans are. They sent us a study of sun and shade because we were concerned about it impacting our living room area. We're still concerned. I guess we're spoiled because we've had nothing there for 30 years that we've lived here. And I don't know if there's a way to make that opaque roof or something less intrusive. It's really more decorative than functional because it's not part of the garage per se from what we can read in the schematic plans. Also want to note that the off-street uncovered parking doesn't look like it lines up in terms of where the doors are for the garage. I think it's going to need to be adjacent to the arbor at the front. But that's a detail that can probably be worked out later. So thank you for letting us speak and we're very excited that the Talwalkers are going to stay in our neighborhood and we look forward to having them as continuing neighbors.

Chair Schmid closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion/Direction:

> I really appreciate that you went back and re-thought it. My first impression is it's not as nearly as aggressively incompatible with the neighborhood as it was the first time. Maybe incompatible around the fringes and I'll come back to that. The site plan is much improved. Disengaging the ADU and spinning the pool helped a lot and it means you don't have the 101 foot long wall for one thing. What's really helpful for me is to look at this on metric because it gives you a sense that the sides of the building are pretty articulated and they live in the same family as the buildings around it. They're doing the same things and it's much improved than it was.

> I'm uncomfortable about the design review criteria and making the findings for compatibility of the architecture style with that of the existing character of the neighborhood. I think it has improved a lot, but I'm uneasy about this because of that finding. It depends on how you interpret the word "style." On the face of it, style brings to mind Tudor or Craftsman or those things. It's hard to say whether we consider this compatible or not. The average person walking down the street will turn to us in a few years and say, "what were you guys thinking?" This feels like we're about to unleash something on the neighborhoods of Burlingame that we will regret enormously. With that said, it's a good project. I wish this weren't such a tight neighborhood. If this were somewhere where the lots were a lot wider than this, then it's a lot easier to see this stuff fitting. But the houses are chopped down the block and they're all pretty tight.

> It took me a little while to warm up to this. Architecturally, it stands pretty well, but in some ways, it reminds me of a house that would fit well in the Eichler Highlands in San Mateo. When I walked the block today, the problem that I had with it fitting in the neighborhood is that most of that block has been rebuilt in traditional style homes. It's one thing if we had a few that we knew were going to get torn down and it was a transition block, but that block is almost done. Almost every house has been rebuilt. So, I'm struggling with this house fitting in. I like modern architecture. Compositionally, I think the house is pretty good. I wish we heard more from some of the neighbors about the style of it. But that didn't come about. I'm not 100% comfortable with approving this project or having it go forward with this style of design.

> The project has vastly improved and the site plan is a big improvement. In terms of the style, I'm comfortable with the contemporary or modern style. As I've said before, if something has good residential scale and a good residential feel to it, then modern or contemporary can work. This doesn't look like a chapel anymore or a commercial building. It looks like a house. We're not approving it tonight, so it can go through some reiteration or refinement. I want to be comfortable with the detailing to make sure it's going to work and it sounds like the architect can do that to make it work. I would ask they revisit the drawings to make sure the lines are representing what's really going to happen in terms of zero line or single line abutments of materials, et cetera.

> The project is trying really hard and forcing some things that are almost an over articulation. The pop up of the stairwell on the right-hand side is creating a complexity that could be simplified. I understand that they're trying to get light in there, but there are other ways to do that. The ironic thing for me is when I look at the ADU, we're not commenting on the character or in terms of its entitlement, but it has a quiet and understated elegance to it. The house has a little bit of over complication. So, with that said, it could

be made to work with another pass at some of the issues that we have talked about.

> I'd like to see more of a response with a little bit more detail to the neighbors. In looking at that roof overhang on the left-hand side as a particular item, it's a single story item. It's an eave line. It's four feet from the property line, so it would be hard for us to make them do away with that and eliminate the cover over the utility area, which would be a good thing.

> If it's going to be a standing metal seam roof, it's going to add character to the roof we're not seeing yet. I'm comfortable with this moving forward to action. I'm okay with the style because this has good scale and good massing. What they're asking for are basic entitlements of design review and the special permit for the attached garage.

> I'm having a really hard time with this style of home in this particular area. I'm not against contemporary homes. I feel that it's a lot better than it was, but it doesn't quite fit the neighborhood especially that particular block. I'm not worried so much about the attached garage. I can see approving the attached garage so that doesn't bother me so much. The backyard is lovely. I think that fits fine. There needs to be another pass on this house and we need to have some more detail especially the type of roof and some of the other features that have been raised.

> I want to thank the applicant for really listening to us over the course of these meetings and in working with us in trying to improve upon the original design of the home and to try to fit into the neighborhood. I see the elements that they've adapted to the design. The angled roof lines, some of the locations of the windows and all this articulation around the various roof forms.

> As has been raised, there is some complication with the roof that can still be simplified and still achieve the objective of letting in daylight along the front. It's making sense as we move towards the back. I'm not certain about that high sloping deep eave that's stretching up high to the sky. I feel that wants to calm down a little bit and settle in with the backyard more and relate itself more to the ADU. It's the closest form to the ADU which is more diminutive in size and scale, maybe take a look at that.

> I really appreciate the rearrangement of the backyard. Initially I voiced my concern about the swimming pool being along the left side of the property, and this makes much more sense to have the ADU structure along the backside and the swimming pool in between the home and ADU, effectively removing that really long, deep wall that we saw on the right-hand side.

> There have been many improvements. I can see this style of home here on this street. Not ideally, but this can work in how it's developing and how it's starting to relate more to the neighborhood while also holding true to its modern forms. Looking at sheet A4.4 which is the rear yard perspective as seen through the ADU, it looks like a very spacious neighborhood, lots of sky and open air and such. I don't know if we necessarily have such a big open view back in that part of the property. It looks idealist here and very attractive, but I would just suggest that maybe the architect looked a little bit more at how these forms are relating overall to the neighbors side to side and overall to the neighborhood. But otherwise, I do appreciate all the effort and this is coming along nicely.

> I appreciate all the effort. I do think it's much better than it was on the site the way it's organized. The forms look more residential than they did before. But there's a lot to be said in the details. As this goes into this next step, it's going to take a lot more detail to figure out what is affordable for the client and being able to execute at this high level of design. Making it work so later down the stream, the approved design is going to align with where we end up.

> The materials are important, particularly the standing seam metal roof. The color on the roof is going to be important because we're going to see a lot of it. So bringing the materials forth and adding that richness to the drawings is going to help us in this next round.

> We want to make projects successful and moving forward. We don't want to obstruct them, so I hope our advice and guidance will help in that process in being able to make this project go forward.

> I would hope that the design team would go back and try to calm things down a little bit. The points that have been made that there's a whole lot going on and things can be simpler are good.

Commissioner Terrones made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schmid, to place on the item on the Regular Action Calendar when plans have been revised as directed. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

10. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

There were no Commissioner's Reports.

11. DIRECTOR REPORTS

At the May 3rd City Council meeting, there was a follow up item on the town square design which was reviewed at the Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting last month. The Council confirmed the direction to go forward with "The Grove" alternative. "The Curve" did have its fans and there was a good discussion there, but ultimately, "The Grove" design is the direction that things will move forward on. There will be further discussions on the particular elements and specifically the water features to be worked out, but we do have a framework going forward that will allow that project to keep moving along as well.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Notice: An action by the Planning Commission is appealable to the City Council within 10 days of the Planning Commission's action on May 10, 2021. If the Planning Commission's action has not been appealed or called up for review by the Council by 5:00 p.m. on May 20, 2021, 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.