

# City of Burlingame

## *Environmental Scoping for Proposed 29-Unit Apartment Building*

Item No. 6a  
Environmental Scoping

**Address:** 1128-1132 Douglas Avenue and 524 Oak Grove Avenue

**Meeting Date:** May 11, 2015

**Request:** Environmental Scoping for construction of a new five-story, 29-unit apartment building with at-grade and below-grade parking. The project includes relocating the front portion of the existing house at 1128 Douglas Avenue to 524 Oak Grove Avenue; this includes a first and second story addition to the house moved from Douglas Avenue and construction of a new detached garage.

**Applicant and Architect:** Dreiling Terrones Architecture Inc.

**APN:** 029-132-180 and -190

**Property Owner:** Zers Development Inc.

**Lot Area:** 15,492 SF (combined lots)

**General Plan:** High Density Residential

**Zoning:** R-4

Burlingame Downtown Specific Plan (R-4 Base District)

**Adjacent Development:** Multifamily and Single Family Residential

**Current Use:** 1128 Douglas Ave: Single family dwelling and 4-unit apartment building

1132 Douglas Ave: Single family dwelling

524 Oak Grove Ave: Single family dwelling

**Proposed Use:** 29-unit residential apartment building at 1128-1132 Douglas Avenue

Relocate front portion of existing single family dwelling at 1128 Douglas Avenue to 524 Oak Grove Avenue; remodel and add onto existing house to be moved.

**Allowable Use:** Multifamily, duplex, and single family residential uses at 1128-1132 Douglas Avenue

Single family residential uses at 524 Oak Grove Avenue

**Planning Commission Action:** The Planning Commission should review the proposed project for areas of potential significant environmental effects. The Commission should add any additional effects of the project that they anticipate might be potentially significant. The areas of investigation for environmental evaluation as defined by CEQA are listed on the attached sheet for your reference. This meeting is not a hearing to consider approval of the project, nor is it the time to discuss the merits of the project – it is specifically to identify the issues to be studied in the environmental review and the scope of the review.

The designs of the proposed projects at 1128-1132 Douglas Avenue and 524 Oak Grove Avenue were reviewed by the Planning Commission at a design review study meeting on March 23, 2015 (see attached March 23, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes). Also included as separate attachment are the previous staff reports for these projects.

**Environmental Scoping:** Environmental review is required for this project because the project exceeds four residential units (29 units proposed), and therefore does not qualify for an exemption from CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act). As a part of preparing the Initial Study for the environmental document for this project, staff is requesting that the Planning Commission comment on any potential environmental effects which you feel should be investigated. The City has engaged Panorama Environmental, Inc., to prepare an Environmental Impact Report for this project. Potential environmental effects identified by staff include:

- on-site circulation, parking, and impact of this project on traffic in the surrounding area;
- existing utilities which serve this site, and evaluation of the project's impact on the sewer, water and storm drainage systems;
- construction related effects during demolition and construction phases;
- visual effects associated with the proposed building;
- impact on cultural resources from relocating the front portion of the existing house at 1128 Douglas Avenue, which has been determined to be eligible for individual listing on the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 2 (Persons), to 524 Oak Grove Avenue; and
- biological resources, impact from proposed project on the existing protected size trees located at the front left corner of the lot.

The issues identified by the Commission will be incorporated into the Initial Study for the project. The standard list of items investigated in an Initial Study is attached for reference. During preliminary review Planning staff identified the following applications required for these projects:

### **1128-1132 Douglas Avenue**

- Design Review for construction of a new five-story, 29-unit apartment building with at-grade and below-grade parking (C.S. 25.29.045 and Chapter 5 of the Downtown Specific Plan);
- Conditional Use Permit for building height (56'-10" proposed where a Conditional Use Permit is required if the building exceeds 35'-0" in height; 75'-0" is the maximum allowed) (C.S. 25.29.060);
- Front Setback Variance (18'-5" proposed where 19'-11" is the minimum required based on the average front setback of the block) (C.S. 25.29.075);
- Parking Variance for driveway width (9'-0" width proposed for the driveway along the north property line where 12'-0" is the minimum required) (C.S. 25.70.025 (b) (2)); and
- Lot Combination to combine 52 feet of portion of Lot 3 Block 5 (1128 Douglas Avenue) and 50 feet of Lot 3 Block 5 (1132 Douglas Avenue), Burlingame Land Company Map No 2.

### **524 Oak Grove Avenue**

- Design Review to demolish the existing house at 524 Oak Grove Avenue and replace it with an existing house to be moved from 1128 Douglas Avenue; the project includes a first and second story addition to the house moved from Douglas Avenue and construction of a new detached garage (C.S. 25.57.010 (a) (1)); and
- Front Setback Variance to the second floor of the house (18'-0" proposed where 20'-0" is the minimum required) (C.S. 25.26.072 (a) (b) (3)).

**Project Summary:** The applicant is proposing construction of a new, five-story, 29-unit residential apartment building with at-grade and below-grade parking at 1128-1132 Douglas Avenue, zoned R-4. The proposed project includes demolishing the existing house and detached garage at 1132 Douglas Avenue and demolishing the existing four-unit apartment building at 1128 Douglas Avenue. The rear portion of the existing single family dwelling at 1128 Douglas Avenue is also proposed to be demolished, however the front half of the house is proposed to be relocated to 524 Oak Grove Avenue. This includes a first and second story addition to the house moved from Douglas Avenue and construction of a new detached garage.

The proposed apartment building would contain 29 apartment units in five floors with 12 at-grade parking spaces at the rear of the lot and 22 parking spaces in an underground garage. The project includes three studio units, 18 one-bedroom units, seven two-bedroom units and one three-bedroom unit. The average unit size proposed is 900 SF (1,250 SF average maximum unit size permitted). Staff would note that apartment projects are not required to provide common open space or private open spaces, as is required for condominium developments. However, common spaces for residents and visitors, including an enclosed entry, lobby, community room and fitness room are provided on the ground floor. In addition, balconies are provided for some of the units located at the front corners of the building.

The property at 1128 Douglas Avenue currently contains a two-story single family dwelling at the front of the site and a two-story four-unit apartment building at the rear of the site. The property at 1132 Douglas Avenue currently contains a two-story single family dwelling at the front of the site and a detached one-car garage at

the rear of the site. 1128 and 1132 Douglas Avenue are two independent lots owned by the same property owner. The site is surrounded by single family and multifamily residential buildings.

In 2008, the City of Burlingame engaged Carey & Co. to complete an inventory of historic resources for the Downtown Specific Plan Area. The purpose of this inventory was to identify properties that would qualify as historic resources for the City of Burlingame and appeared eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) or the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Carey & Co. determined that 23 structures within the Plan Area appeared to be eligible for the CRHR or the NRHP. 1128 and 1132 Douglas Avenue are included on this list.

Historic Resource Evaluations (Evaluation) were prepared for 1128 & 1132 Douglas Avenue by Page & Turnbull, Inc., dated May 14, 2013. The results of the evaluation concluded that 1128 Douglas Avenue is eligible for individual listing on the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1 (Events) for its association with early settlement patterns in the town of Burlingame. The Evaluation notes that “Because the property was one of the first residences constructed in Burlingame and exemplifies an important pattern of development in Burlingame, the property at 1128 Douglas Avenue appears to be individually significant for its association with early settlement, and is therefore eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 1 (Events).”

1128 Douglas Avenue is also eligible for individual listing on the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 2 (Persons) due to its association with James R. and Jessie N. Murphy. The Evaluation notes that “James R. Murphy was living in the Burlingame area by 1900 and serving as the town’s station master. By 1910 he was county clerk, a position he retained through to his death in 1940. His contributions to Burlingame government and civic life were varied and well documented. Jessie Murphy was also active in Burlingame government and civic life, serving as park commissioner and acting as a lifelong advocate for trees, a subject integral to Burlingame’s civic identity as the “City of Trees.” Both James and Jessie Murphy lived the majority of their lives in their house in Burlingame and raised three children there. The Murphys’ role in the development of Burlingame as well as their long association with the property meet the threshold for significance for listing in the listing in the California Register under Criterion 2 (Persons). The Historic Resource Study for 1128 Douglas Avenue is attached for review.

The results of the evaluation for 1132 Douglas Avenue concluded that it is not eligible for individual listing on the California Register of Historical Resources under any criteria. The Historic Resource Study for 1132 Douglas Avenue is attached for review.

**Off-Street Parking:** Based on the number of bedrooms per unit proposed for this project, the Zoning Code requires a total of 34 off-street parking spaces for the residents of the units (1 space for each studio and one-bedroom unit, 1.5 spaces for each two-bedroom unit and 2 spaces for each unit containing three or more bedrooms). The project includes 12 at-grade parking spaces at the rear of the lot and 22 below-grade parking spaces in an underground garage, for a total of 34 off-street parking spaces. An area for on-site deliveries is not required for apartment buildings and there is no guest parking required on-site for properties located within the Downtown Specific Plan area.

Access to the below-grade parking spaces would be via a 14'-0" wide driveway located at the south end of the lot. Access to the at-grade parking spaces at the rear of the lot would be via a 9'-0" wide driveway located at the north end of the lot. There is an 8'-0" wide ingress/egress easement located along the north side property line; an extra 1'-0" is provided for the driveway width for a total of 9'-0". However, the applicant is requesting approval of a Parking Variance for the proposed driveway width along the north side property line (9'-0" proposed where 12'-0" is the minimum required).

The Zoning Code requires that parking spaces be a minimum of 9'-0" wide x 20'-0" deep. 22 of the 34 parking spaces comply with this requirement. The remaining 12 parking spaces measure 8'-6" wide x 20'-0" deep

(code currently allows 8'-6" x 18'-0" for commercial and industrial uses). However, as a policy the Downtown Specific Plan encourages "creative approaches" to providing on-site parking. The proposed reduced parking space width meets the intent of the Downtown Specific Plan policy, and therefore a Parking Variance for parking space dimension is not required.

**Landscaping:** Proposed landscaping throughout the site is shown on the Landscape and Irrigation Plans (sheets L1.1 and L1.2). The applicant is proposing 60.1% (1,174 SF) landscaping within the front setback area where 60% (1,171 SF) is the minimum required.

An arborist report, dated August 8, 2014, was prepared by Mayne Tree Expert Company, which evaluates the existing trees on the site greater than 12 inches in diameter and provides tree protection specifications (see attached). Several smaller trees are also proposed to be removed, however they were not evaluated since they do not qualify as a protected size tree.

The proposed project includes removing four protected size trees, including a 20-inch diameter Chinese Tallow tree at the front of the site, an 18.1-inch diameter Liquid Amber tree along the right side property line, a 21.2-inch diameter Cottonwood tree at the rear of the site and a 16.3-inch diameter Apple tree along the left side property line. A tree removal permit to remove these trees was issued by the Parks Division in January 2015 contingent upon 1) the building and landscape plans being approved by the City (building permit issued for construction) and 2) that the trees would fall within the footprint of the proposed project. Several other trees on the project site are also proposed to be removed; however they are not of a protected size.

The existing Redwood tree (39-inch diameter) and Coast Live Oak tree (27.6-inch diameter), located at the front left corner of the lot, will remain and will need to be protected during construction as outlined in Mayne Tree Company's arborist report. In addition, the City Arborist notes in his memo dated December 4, 2014 that the Tree Protection Zone must be in place and confirmed by the City Arborist prior to construction and that the excavation around these trees may only be done by hand and instructed by an independent arborist report.

There are four street trees in front of the subject property, including three small Purple Leaf Plums and an 18-inch diameter Sycamore Maple tree. The three Purple Leaf Plum trees will need to be removed during construction, but will be replaced with three new street trees after construction, with a species recommended by the City Arborist. The existing Sycamore Maple tree will remain and will be protected during construction.

In accordance with the City's requirements, each lot developed with a multifamily residential use is required to provide a minimum of one 24-inch box-size minimum non-fruit trees for every 2000 SF of lot coverage. Based on the proposed project, a total of eight landscape trees are required on site. The proposed landscape plan for the project complies with the on-site reforestation requirements. There will be a total of nine trees on site, including an existing Redwood tree and Coast Live Oak trees at the front corner of the lot and seven new 24-inch box size trees, including four Magnolia "Yellow Bird" trees at the rear of the site, two Japanese Maple trees at the front, left corner of the site and a Western Redbud tree at the front of the site.

*This space intentionally left blank.*

**1128-1132 Douglas Avenue**

Lot Area: 15,492 SF

Plans date stamped: January 21, 2015

	<b>PROPOSED</b>	<b>ALLOWED/REQUIRED</b>
<b>Front (1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b> <b>(2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(3<sup>rd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(4<sup>th</sup> flr):</b> <b>(5<sup>th</sup> flr):</b>	18'-5" <sup>1</sup> 18'-5" <sup>1</sup> 18'-5" <sup>1</sup> 18'-5" <sup>1</sup> 18'-5" <sup>1</sup>	19'-11" (block average)
<b>Left Side (1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b> <b>(2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(3<sup>rd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(4<sup>th</sup> flr):</b> <b>(5<sup>th</sup> flr):</b>	7'-0" to concrete shear wall 11'-0" 11'-0" 11'-0" 11'-0"	7'-0" 8'-0" 9'-0" 10'-0" 11'-0"
<b>Right Side (1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b> <b>(2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(3<sup>rd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(4<sup>th</sup> flr):</b> <b>(5<sup>th</sup> flr):</b>	11'-0" 11'-0" 11'-0" 11'-0" 11'-0"	7'-0" 8'-0" 9'-0" 10'-0" 11'-0"
<b>Rear (1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b> <b>(2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(3<sup>rd</sup> flr):</b> <b>(4<sup>th</sup> flr):</b> <b>(5<sup>th</sup> flr):</b>	20'-5" 20'-0" 20'-0" 20'-0" 20'-0"	20'-0" 20'-0" 20'-0" 20'-0" 20'-0"
<b>Lot Coverage:</b>	7746 SF 50%	7746 SF 50%
<b>Building Height:</b>	56'-10" <sup>2</sup>	75'-0" maximum/CUP required to exceed 35'-0"
<b>Off-Street Parking:</b>	34 spaces 80% covered	34 spaces 80% must be covered  No guest parking or delivery space required
<b>Driveway Width:</b>	9'-0" for driveway along north side property line <sup>3</sup>	12'-0" required
<b>Front Setback Landscaping:</b>	60.1% 1174 SF	60% 1171 SF

<sup>1</sup> Front Setback Variance (18'-5" proposed where 19'-11" is the minimum required based on the average front setback of the block).

<sup>2</sup> Conditional Use Permit for building height (56'-10" proposed where a Conditional Use Permit is required if the building exceeds 35'-0" in height; 75'-0" is the maximum allowed).

<sup>3</sup> Parking Variance for driveway width (9'-0" width proposed for the driveway along the north property line where 12'-0" is the minimum required).

**524 Oak Grove Avenue**

**Lot Area:** 8,788 SF

**Plans Date Stamped:** December 22, 2014

	<b>PROPOSED</b>	<b>ALLOWED/REQ'D</b>
<b>SETBACKS</b>		
<b>Front (1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b>	18' to house (15' to overhang)	15'-0" <sup>1</sup>
<b>(2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b>	18'-0" <sup>2</sup>	20'-0" <sup>1</sup>
<b>Side (interior):</b>	12'-7"	7'-0"
<b>(exterior – 1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b>	10'-0" to house (7'-6" to overhang)	7'-6"
<b>(exterior – 2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b>	> 12'-0" average	12'-0" average
<b>Rear (1<sup>st</sup> flr):</b>	71'-0" to porch	15'-0"
<b>(2<sup>nd</sup> flr):</b>	77'-0"	20'-0"
<b>Lot Coverage:</b>	2448 SF 27.8%	3515 SF 40%
<b>FAR:</b>	4013 SF 0.45 FAR	4037 SF <sup>3</sup> 0.38 FAR
<b># of bedrooms:</b>	4	---
<b>Off-Street Parking:</b>	1 covered (12'-10" x 23'-5") 1 uncovered (9'-0" x 20'-0")	1 covered (10'-0" x 20'-0") 1 uncovered (10'-0" x 20'-0")
<b>Building Height:</b>	26'-8"	30'-0"
<b>DH Envelope:</b>	complies	CS 25.26.075

<sup>1</sup> Since the block average calculation excludes corner lots and the highest and lowest front setbacks, there are no parcels remaining on the block to serve as the basis for the block average. Therefore, the minimum required front setbacks to the first and second floors are 15'-0' and 20'-0", respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Front Setback Variance to the second floor of the house (18'-0" proposed where 20'-0" is the minimum required).

<sup>3</sup> (0.32 x 8788 SF) + 1100 SF + 324 SF = 4037 SF (0.46 FAR)

**Affordable (Below-Market Rate) Units:** The City's previous Inclusionary Housing Ordinance has been replaced by a Density Bonus Ordinance consistent with State Law. The Density Bonus Ordinance is discretionary, and projects are not obligated to provide affordable units unless they seek to utilize development standard incentives offered by the ordinance. The applicant has chosen not to apply any of the development standard incentives offered by the Density Bonus Ordinance and therefore is not providing any affordable units as part of the project.

Ruben Hurin  
Senior Planner

- c. Dreiling Terrones Architecture Inc., applicant and architect  
Zers Douglas LLC, property owner

Attachments:

March 23, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes  
Environmental Checklist from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines  
Notice of Public Hearing – Mailed May 1, 2015

Separate Attachments:

Planning Commission Staff Reports and Attachments from March 23, 2015 Design Review Study Meeting for  
1128-1132 Douglas Avenue and 524 Oak Grove Avenue  
Historical Resource Evaluation for 1128 Douglas Avenue, prepared by Page & Turnbull, Inc., dated May 14,  
2013  
Historical Resource Evaluation for 1132 Douglas Avenue, prepared by Page & Turnbull, Inc., dated May 15,  
2013



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, March 23, 2015

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

- c. 1128-1132 Douglas Avenue, zoned R-4 - Application for Design Review, Conditional Use Permit for building height, Front Setback Variance, Parking Variance for driveway width, Condominium Permit and Lot Merger for construction of a new five-story, 29-unit apartment building with at-grade and below-grade parking (Dreiling Terrones Architecture, Inc., applicant and architect; Jianguang Zhang, property owner) (101 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

*Commissioner Terrones was recused from this item and Item 9d.*

*Ex-Parte Communications: Commissioner Sargent met with the applicant but did not discuss the merits of the projects. Commissioner Loftis met a neighbor.*

*Visits to Property: All had visited the property.*

*Planning Manager Gardiner provided a brief overview of the staff report. He noted that the Homeowners Association of 512 Primrose Road submitted a letter at the beginning of the meeting, and the letter will be submitted to the record and included in the staff report for the environmental review scoping.*

*Questions of Staff:*

- > *How does this application relate to the application for 524 Oak Grove? (Gardiner: The applications are joined through the environmental review, and the moving of the house is a mitigation for the proposed project. The house would not be allowed to be relocated without a new project being approved. Neither project will happen without the other.)*
- > *Color renderings are often more helpful than elevation drawings. Could this be a requirement? (Gardiner: It is encouraged but not required. Having it as a requirement could be taken up at another time.)*

*Jacob Furlong represented the applicant:*

- > *Started off with the project knowing it would be a very public process. There have been two public meetings, and meetings with adjacent neighbors. Wanted to engage in process and receive comments*
- > *House at 1128 Douglas would be relocated because of its potential historic significance.*
- > *Trees to be retained, but requires variance for driveway. Driveway has a reciprocal easement with adjacent property that must be maintained.*
- > *Contemporary in style but open to the street. The entrance is oriented to the street.*

*Commission questions:*

- > *How do rear parking spaces work with the single driveway? (Furlong: It's one-way but not serving enough vehicles to be a concern. Currently operates this way with an 8-foot driveway. Would need to remove the trees if the driveway were widened.)*
- > *Front setback variance seems related to the position of a concrete shear wall. Seems hard to believe it could not be kept within the setback. (Furlong: Would result in size of units being compressed. Setbacks are based on the average for the block; neighborhood is in transition but is based on setbacks of existing structures.)*

- > Nice piece of modern architecture.
- > Thickness of floor slabs in building seems unrealistic. Thin and elegant as shown, but if chunkier will make a difference in how building looks.
- > How is traffic being mitigated? (Furlong: The proximity to downtown is significant. Within walking distance of Caltrain, grocery store, restaurants, Walgreens. These are all trip-generating items that will be reduced or eliminated.)
- > Indoor bike parking? (Furlong: Bike storage area in the garage.)
- > Site plan does not have outdoor amenities for residents. All open space is filled with parking, seems too dense for site.
- > Four-story building would work better for neighborhood. Would allow less parking and more open space.
- > All two-bedroom units share a common wall. This does not seem common these days, might expect two Master Bedrooms in some units.
- > Likes footprint of the building, but it is a block-like structure. Some articulation on the east elevation but very similar on all four sides. Would like more articulation in a "depth-ful" way - not just a balcony or one-foot inset. Site plan shows "design shape," but massing does not.
- > Will be the biggest structure within the block. Block is mostly three-story, with one four-story. (Furlong: There is a 6-story structure two doors down from City Hall.)
- > Have the shadow impacts been evaluated? (Furlong: Expects to be reviewed in the environmental review.)
- > Ceiling height of first floor seems high.
- > Concerned with narrow width of driveway.
- > The one place that density is encouraged is in the Downtown Specific Plan area.

Public comments:

Carolyn Root, 1133 Douglas Avenue, spoke on this item:

- > Lives across from the proposed development.
- > Height, density and mass not compatible with rest of block. Douglas Avenue has two-story buildings with some three-story condos.
- > Downtown Specific Plan has policies and guidelines for compatibility. Does not meet requirements as well as it could.
- > Building should make more of a statement. The project will set a tone for the entire street and influence future buildings.
- > No provision for visitor parking or drop-offs. Neighborhood has parking impacts.
- > Douglass Avenue seems to be a preferred route to reach California Drive from Downtown and El Camino Real for both cars and trucks.
- > Suggest independent parking and traffic specialist to evaluate potential impact of project.
- > A structure with less height and well managed parking and traffic mitigation will go a long way to making the development a welcome addition to the neighborhood and Burlingame.

Linda Taylor spoke on this item:

- > Lives across the street.
- > Understands need for more units, but height must fit neighborhood.
- > Proposed structure is inconsistent with neighboring buildings and neighborhood. Height and width yields a mass far beyond anything nearby.
- > Downtown Specific Plan policy 5.3.1 discusses Architectural Diversity.
- > Attention to massing of building to ensure appropriate transitions to surrounding development.
- > Residential scale of neighborhood needs to be respected, cannot support Conditional Use Permit.

John Taylor spoke on this item:

- > Lives at 1133 Douglas Avenue.
- > Nice elements of the building such as facade treatment, setbacks, mix of materials, glass-enclosed

stairwells attractive. However it would be a five-story building.

- > (Showed exhibit depicting building heights on Douglas Avenue, scaled to height and width.)

Danelle Rinks spoke on this item:

- > Lives at 1126 Douglas Avenue at the back. Has lived on street for 15 years.
- > Reiterate residents' comments on traffic and parking. Traffic has doubled while she has lived there. Douglas is used as a through-way.
- > Believes 29 units equates at least 58 people.
- > Five stories is too tall.
- > Request historical review of 1124 Douglas if it hasn't already been done.
- > Expects health risk to existing trees.
- > Sewage, water and gas lines.
- > 1225 Floribunda Avenue has been under construction since April 2014.
- > There are too many apartment buildings in Burlingame already.
- > Building will displace 10 current working families and individuals.

Clark Silva, 1133 Douglas Avenue, spoke on this item:

- > Height is not compatible with surrounding houses and buildings.
- > Units are facing City Hall and railroad. Side of building faces Douglas. The tree will cover much of the glasswork.
- > From front will just see high wall with small square windows.
- > 34 parking for 29 units are not enough spaces. 20 cars will be left on street.

Julie Serranova, 1131 Douglas Avenue, spoke on this item:

- > Not enough parking.
- > Will impact view from building across the street.
- > Does not seem typical for Burlingame.
- > Five stories too tall.

Vince Campinelli spoke on this item:

- > Neighborhood has parking issues.
- > Water and sewage system is struggling. Street was dug up last year to replace water pipes.
- > People park on Douglas Avenue to have lunch on Burlingame Avenue.

Alex Goldstein, 1121 Douglas Avenue, spoke on this item:

- > California is in a drought. By building apartments and condos, not conserving water.
- > Parking on Douglas Avenue is unconscionable - can't park own car in front of apartment.
- > Can walk to Burlingame Avenue, but can't find a parking space in downtown.
- > Assumes post office building will have same issues with more units.

Jacob Furlong spoke as the applicant:

- > Parking and traffic consultant will be retained for analysis.

Question to applicant:

- > Has stacked parking been considered? (Furlong: Has been discussed but not in this proposal. Willing to discuss it in the future.)

Chair Bandrapalli closed the public hearing.

*Commission discussion:*

- > *This is the beginning of the process.*
- > *There will be an extensive environmental analysis.*
- > *Beginning of design process - anticipate back and forth.*
- > *Look at roof deck at rear, could impact privacy for neighbors behind. At very least move to interior of roof structure.*
- > *Downtown Plan shows 3 and 4 story buildings. A four story building would be a density that would fit in.*
- > *School district projects only 150 units in the future, not 500.*
- > *Needs to know what happens to current residents. Not a lot of opportunities for affordable housing in town. Not an obligation of the project.*

*This item will return for environmental scoping at a subsequent meeting once the environmental consultant has been retained.*



# City of Burlingame

BURLINGAME CITY HALL  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010

## Meeting Minutes Planning Commission

---

Monday, March 23, 2015

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

- d. 524 Oak Grove Avenue, zoned R-1 - Application for Design Review and Front Setback Variance to demolish the existing house at 524 Oak Grove Avenue and replace it with an existing house to be moved from 1128 Douglas Avenue; the project includes a first and second story addition to the house moved from Douglas Avenue and construction of a new detached garage (Dreiling Terrones Architecture, Inc., applicant and architect; Jianguang Zhang, property owner) (57 noticed) Staff Contact: Ruben Hurin

*Ex-Parte Communications: Commissioner Sargent met with applicant but did not discuss the merits of the project.*

*Visits to Property: All had visited the property.*

*Planning Manager Gardiner provided a brief overview of the staff report.*

*Questions of Staff:*

> *When a sidewalk is torn up as part of a project, who is responsible for replacing sidewalk? (Gardiner: The applicant if it is part of the project.)*

*Jacob Furlong and Wayne Lin represented the applicant.*

- > *House was originally moved from Burlingame Avenue to its current location.*
- > *Will retain the original components but not later additions. Restore window boxes on second story.*

*Commission questions/comments:*

- > *On the front (west) elevation, what is the main entry? (Furlong: Most people will probably enter from the back porch mud room from the garage, though some will enter from Oak Grove side. Wants to engage both street faces.) On left side/front could open it up more and add wider steps to be more inviting, provide a place to perch.*
- > *New addition on East Elevation looks like it is a lot of windows.*
- > *Request to show siding pattern on elevation drawings so people will know what it will look like.*
- > *Existing house does not look very well maintained. Remove ivy from street trees. (Furlong: The owner acquired the property in its current condition but will address the maintenance.)*
- > *Exciting to see a landmark house going on that corner.*
- > *Would it be possible to push the West Elevation back to avoid needing a variance and be more consistent with the other houses on Marin? The wall appears massive. (Lin: Can't modify the existing house second floor. For the addition, brought down the roof slope in the back so the wall would not appear as massive.*
- > *Likes the glass on the addition on the back of the house. (Furlong: Intent is to capture the view of the tree in the back yard.)*
- > *Sheet 8.4 appears to have a labeling error - both elevations are labeled "North"*
- > *Likes that the addition has some differentiation from the original structure.*

*Public comments:*

*Ashley Canty, resident of 1128 Douglas, spoke on this item:*

- > Hopes to be able to acquire the house when it gets relocated to new site. Has engaged with property owner.*
- > Lived at 504 Marin previously.*

*There was no action, as environmental review is required. The application will return on the Regular Action Calendar once the environmental review is completed. Action will be coordinated with the 1128-32 Douglas Avenue application.*

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FROM APPENDIX G OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES

### **AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

**AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Have a substantial or adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
- Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any native or resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

### **CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in '15064.5?
- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?
- Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

**GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - a) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
  - b) Strong seismic ground shaking?
  - c) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
  - d) Landslides?
- Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?
- Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
- Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

- Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
- Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

- Physically divide an established community?
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

**MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- 2b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

**NOISE.** Would the project result in:

- Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

**POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

**PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
  - a) Fire protection?
  - b) Police protection?
  - c) Schools?
  - d) Parks?
  - e) Other public facilities?

**RECREATION.**

- ❑ Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- ❑ Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

- ❑ Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- ❑ Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- ❑ Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- ❑ Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- ❑ Result in inadequate emergency access?
- ❑ Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- ❑ Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

- ❑ Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- ❑ Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- ❑ Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- ❑ Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- ❑ Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- ❑ Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- ❑ Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

- ❑ Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- ❑ Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- ❑ Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?



CITY OF BURLINGAME  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CA 94010  
PH: (650) 558-7250 • FAX: (650) 696-3790  
www.burlingame.org

**Site: 1128-1132 DOUGLAS AVENUE &  
524 OAK GROVE AVENUE**

The City of Burlingame Planning Commission announces the following public hearing on **MONDAY, MAY 11, 2015 at 7:00 P.M.** in the City Hall Council Chambers, 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, CA:

Environmental Scoping for proposed construction of a new five-story 29-unit apartment building at **1128-1132 DOUGLAS AVENUE**.

The project includes moving the house at 1128 Douglas Avenue to the site at **524 OAK GROVE AVENUE** and additions to the first and second floors (the existing house at 524 Oak Grove Avenue would be demolished). APNs 029-132-180 & 029-132-190

**Mailed: May 1, 2015**

*(Please refer to other side)*

**PUBLIC HEARING  
NOTICE**

**City of Burlingame**

A copy of the application and plans for this project may be reviewed prior to the meeting at the Community Development Department at 501 Primrose Road, Burlingame, California.

If you challenge the subject application(s) in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing, described in the notice or in written correspondence delivered to the city at or prior to the public hearing.

Property owners who receive this notice are responsible for informing their tenants about this notice.

For additional information, please call (650) 558-7250. Thank you.

William Meeker  
Community Development Director

**PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE**

*(Please refer to other side)*