



# MILLBRAE PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT MINUTES

September 17, 2018

Millbrae Council Chambers – 621 Magnolia Ave., Millbrae, CA 94030

REGULAR MEETING: 7:00 p.m.

1. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

2. **ROLL CALL:** Present: Chair Davis, Vice-Chair Fung and Commissioners Joh, Quigg, Wong. Deputy Director Madalena, Senior Planner Fielding and Assistant Planner Roberson.

3. **AGENDA REVIEW:** None

4. **MINUTES:**

7/16/18 Minutes: To be brought back to next Planning Commission for correct version for approval.

8/20/18 Draft Minutes: Commissioner Quigg moved to approve August 20, 2018 minutes, seconded by Joh. Approved 4-0-1.

8/6/18 Draft Minutes: Commissioner Joh moved to approve the August 6, 2018 minutes with corrections, seconded by Fung. Approved 4-0-1.

5. **PUBLIC COMMUNICATION:**

Woody Manser: Has lived at 379 Minorca Way for 35 years and is member of Millbrae Tomorrow. Back in 2004 was opposed to selling city assets to mitigate city financial shortfalls. Is opposed to selling Schultz Park property to fund the building of the Community Center. Development of Schultz Park will cause increased traffic, loss of trees and the access to the park is too narrow. Would prefer the park be reopened to public for park use. Selling property is not way to raise city funds.

6. **OLD BUSINESS:** None.

7. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a. **1180 FERNWOOD DRIVE:** DESIGN REVIEW to allow for the demolition and construction of a new single-story residence in a Single-Family Residential (R-1) Zoning District. (Public Hearing)

Assistant Planner Roberson presented Staff Report.

**Commission Questions, Comments and Discussion:** Commissioner Wong: Did not see any public notice signs at the property. Staff confirmed that public noticing was completed at the site. Often the wind blows the signs down or they are removed by residents.

**Applicant Presentation:** Architect summarized the scope of work and design of the proposed project. The rear area is the main part of the addition, desired large living room open space, expand out in front, keep general roof forms, stucco and wall material the same but add columns to give the exterior more interest. Larger sliding glass doors in the back. Larger home but more definition in the exterior elements and more character in the residence. Available to answer questions.

Commissioner Fung asked the applicant what is the percentage of demolition, noted that the scale of the plans appeared to be incorrect and discussed the non-conforming garage and required square footage, concerns about the deck or patio shown on plans and lack of clarity on the proposed site plan and the landscaping. Fung requested more information on material of front door, garage door and windows.

Applicant stated that the demolition was approximately 50% of home. The scale on the plans was labeled incorrectly, was supposed to be ¼ scale not 1/8 scale. The 3D renderings were completed for the project but not included in the Planning

Commission packet. Staff explained how garage area and dimensions are analyzed on the plans and clarified that the area on the plans is a concrete patio, not a porch. The applicant did not apply for landscape work so this level of detail was not provided.

Commissioner Wong requested clarification on the project zoning and occupancy, sections, elevations and that applicant consider design of the building so that the mass is less boxy. Wong stated the mass of the building is boxy, very rectangular, is there a possibility to add more architectural elements so less boxy, gables, so not touching roofline. Staff addressed the question about the occupancy and zoning responding that the R3 on cover page represented the occupancy, not the zoning. The applicant stated that from one elevation the design appears boxy but there are other design features on elevations. Wong stated his comments are to improve design for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Fung stated that the sections don't seem to match and would like to see 3D renderings. The applicant stated that the sections were submitted a few months ago, and a revision was submitted but rendering is an old rendering. This is not the same elevation, front door is not in the right place, and living room is located differently. Owner wanted to change the design. The applicant stated that the 3D renderings can be provided.

Commissioner Davis: 3D rendering shows the general look and feel is there although in different locations on the 3D rendering. As drawn the design is lovely, will be vast improvement over what is there. It is 3 1/2 bathrooms, not 3, so front page needs to be corrected.

**Public Comment:** None

**Commissioner Discussion:**

Commissioners Quigg, Fung and Joh discussed the need for clarity, accuracy and more detail on the plans, materials and landscaping for the proposed project. Commissioners recommended that the project be continued so that the applicant can address these issues and accurate plans can be brought back and reviewed for approval.

*Commissioner Fung motioned, seconded by Quigg, to continue the item to October 15, 2018 with plan details and corrections. Approved 5-0. Chair Davis advised applicant of the 10 day appeal period.*

- b. **110 WILLOW AVENUE:** DESIGN REVIEW to allow the construction of a two-story rear horizontal addition of a residence in the Duplex (R-2) Zoning District. (Continued from August 20, 2018 PC Hearing)

Senior Planner Fielding presented Staff Report.

**Commission Questions and Comments:**

Commissioner Quigg discussed the project objective and why and 2<sup>nd</sup> Unit or Accessory Dwelling Unit was not considered. Commissioners discussed their impression of the massing and view impacts based on the story poles, the design of the two-story horizontal addition and the impact to the side view from the house at 380 Chadbourne Avenue and impacts to light and privacy to 111 Lewis Avenue and 310 Chadbourne Avenue. Commissioners asked how far the horizontal two-story addition is from the properties located to the rear of the subject property.

**Applicant:** Applicant stated the goal of the project is to enlarge the house for family not create a second unit. They are meeting all of the required development standards for single family. They could have applied for a second unit and would have had a larger two-story horizontal addition but did not. They reached out to the neighbors early in design process and already have reduced their design to attempt to address neighbor concerns regarding views, privacy and light.

**Public Comment:**

Linda Flynn (380 Chadbourne): Expressed concerns that the two-story horizontal addition will block her view of the San Bruno mountains from the side of her house from the dining room, living rooms and bathroom. Suggest adding second story directly above existing house and redesign design.

Michael Lim (111 Lewis Ave.): Concerned about privacy and loss of light from the two-story horizontal addition impacting his backyard. Saw the revised plan with the proposed trees to screen the rear property and believes the trees are too tall and would block out his light. Would like the tree species to be smaller in height to reduce loss of light. Also would like to ensure water run-off from addition is directed away from his property.

Morissa Gleidenhause (310 Chadbourne Ave.): Concerned with loss of light to her backyard due to the proposed two-story horizontal addition. To reduce loss of light would like project to go up in height rather than horizontal two-story addition.

**Commissioner Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the story poles, the impacts to the view and privacy of 380 Chadbourne Ave. and the impacts to privacy and light on 111 Lewis Avenue and 310 Chadbourne Avenue located at the rear of the property.

Commissioner Fung commented 1. The neighbors at 111 Lewis and 310 Chadbourne were over 60 ft away from the subject property. Their claim of impacts on light and air is minimal. 2. The view impact claimed by 380 Chadbourne is not considered a view that was intended to be protected under the Millbrae planning code. The view claimed is not a distant view to the SFO or water view from a principle room. 3. The current proposed development is an extension to a single family residence, which fits into the existing planning ordinance and neighborhood character. The applicant could have applied for a 2 unit building with 88% FAR, with no setback on either side under current R2 zoning development standard. Therefore the neighboring opponents should not question the intent of the applicant as "proposing a monstrous house".

Commissioners asked if the applicant would be willing to compromise with the neighbor at 380 Chadbourne Avenue. Suggest consider requesting a setback exception on the north elevation, shift the two-story addition northwards, and shorten the rear depth of the two story horizontal addition, in order to preserve some of the San Bruno mountain view from 380 Chadbourne Avenue. Applicant agreed to discuss with the property owners at 380 Chadbourne Avenue. After a discussion held outside during the meeting the applicant and property owner at 380 Chadbourne Avenue agreed to a redesign of the two-story horizontal addition to minimize loss of view and will bring the design to a future Planning Commission hearing to be determined.

*Commissioner Fung motioned, seconded by Wong, to continue the project to a future Planning Commission date so applicant can redesign 2<sup>nd</sup> floor to minimize 380 Chadbourne Avenue's view loss, Passed by 5-0. Chair Davis advised applicant of the 10 day appeal period.*

- c. **408 JUANITA AVENUE:** DESIGN REVIEW to allow the demolition of a two-story, split-legal residence and the construction of a new two-story , split-level residence and a SETBACK EXCEPTION to allow less than the minimum required second floor setbacks located in the Single-Family Residential (R-1) Zoning District. (Public Hearing)

Senior Planner Fielding presented Staff Report.

**Applicant:** Jeffrey Wong presented the project. Available for questions.

**Commission Questions and Comments:**

Commissioners discussed the bulk and massing of the proposed rear horizontal two-story addition, the parking requirements and whether the proposed design fits in with the houses in the neighborhood. Staff stated that the lot is large and narrow therefore the applicant is requesting a setback exception for the second floor. Although it appears large, the house from the front will appear very similar, as the front is single-story and become two-story as the lot slopes downward from the front. Commissioners like the design although some felt that the size of the house was large for the neighborhood and should be reduced in mass. Commissioners would have like to have seen more neighbor support as no neighbors submitted neighbor consultation forms in support. Staff noted that the adjacent neighbor at 412 Juanita Ave. had concerns about replacing her fence and dust from construction and the neighbor at 404 Juanita Ave. is a new owner who the applicant attempted to contact but did not respond.

**Public Comment:**

Zifu Zhao (404 Juanita Ave.) Opposed to the project at 408 Juanita Avenue because believes the rear two-story horizontal addition is too massive with the second story, adjacent to his house not having a setback and would impact his privacy. Would like to see a setback. Also concerned about drainage into his property. Staff noted that the drainage issues is addressed in the civil plans and drainage will be directed away from all adjacent properties.

**Commission Discussion:**

Commissioners discussed the bulk and massing of the proposed project and whether the project fit in with the neighborhood. There was general agreement that the design was good but perhaps the massing could be reduced at the rear second-story by adding a setback on the elevation facing 404 Juanita Avenue. This would also address the neighbors' (404 Juanita Ave.) concerns about privacy. The applicant agreed to redesign the two-story horizontal addition and add a second story setback on the elevation facing 404 Juanita Avenue in order to reduce the massing and minimize privacy impacts to the neighbor at 404 Juanita Avenue.

*Commissioner Joh motioned, seconded by Quigg, to continue project to November 5, 2018 Planning Commission hearing for applicant to redesign to reduce upper floor mass and increase the setback on the 404 Juanita Ave. side. Passed by 5-0. Chair Davis advised applicant of the 10 day appeal period.*

8. **NEW BUSINESS:** None.

9. **STAFF UPDATES:** Deputy Director Madalena provided update on Community Development Department staff changes include two new additions, City Manager hired project manager to work on two TOD's, and new Interim Development Director Brad Misner on a part time basis. Madalena is the Deputy Director at this time. Administrative staff member resigned. A new person will be using active list or otherwise will be issuing a new call for new administrative person

Joh: Status on Special Meeting? Madalena apologized that the meeting had to be rescheduled due to public noticing requirement. Do not have a reschedule date but the applicant is pushing to have the Study Session come back to Planning Commission on October 1, 2018. Fung: Any reason why the meeting cannot be scheduled as part of regular meeting? Madalena: Main reason is more time needed to complete action items, business and study session.

10. **COMMISSION COMMENTS:** Joh thanked staff for the more comprehensive minutes.

11. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Commissioner Joh announced a shredding party at company parking lot from 10 AM to 1 PM Saturday, October 13, 2018, in San Mateo. Joh will send out notices.

12. **ADJOURNMENT:** 11:00 pm