

**From:** Momoko Ishijima  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 2:10 PM  
**To:** Guia Sharma; Janelle Resuello; Joey Mariano; Andrew Miner; Noren Caliva-Lepe  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Project: 21-0676 Comments  
**Attachments:** [664mckinley.pdf](#)

Neighbor comment letter on my project for Study Session tonight. Please forward to the Commissioners.

Mamo

---

**From:** Robert & Marisol Ruiz [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 12, 2021 2:08 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommission AP <[PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** Momoko Ishijima <[mlshijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:mlshijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Proposed Project: 21-0676 Comments

ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Hello All:  
I am re-sending my comments for everyone's convenience.

Regards,  
-Robert Ruiz  
Sunnyvale Resident

Robert Ruiz



Sunnyvale, CA 94086

May 16, 2021

MOMO ISHIJIMA

Senior Planner

Community Development Department

City of Sunnyvale

### **Summary**

The plan for two homes on the proposed properties has several issues that prevent it from being acceptable, including its lack of achieving an architectural style that is compatible with the existing neighborhood. The existing neighborhood contains a mix of architectural styles ranging from 1920's bungalows to 1990's contemporary style home, whereas the proposed homes are very emphatically modern. (Note: the proposed project should be considered in context of the adjacent property proposed homes.) Window sizing, material use, and roof lines are extremely different compared to other neighborhood homes.

The neighborhood outreach meeting held on May 5 was much appreciated, but also inadequate as one-half of the meeting consisted of the applicants setting up their connections.

The list of issues is below.

#### **2.2.1. Reinforce prevailing neighborhood home orientation and entry patterns**

The home on the current property faces W McKinley; one proposed home is oriented to Waverly. Exacerbating this orientation is that the southwest (duplex) residence across from the proposed Lot B entry is oriented towards McKinley. This arrangement will have the proposed home facing the side of a house, which would create an incohesive look.

#### **2.2.2. Respect the scale, bulk and character of homes in the adjacent neighborhood**

The proposed project is effectively too large. The data for the project 2009-0672 shows an average FAR of 25% of nearby home and the proposed Lot A home is approximately 56.9% (Note: awaiting data from city staff on FAR values of adjacent homes). The home located across the street (693 W McKinley) is 52% FAR. The proposed 606 and 608 W McKinley homes' FAR are 52% and 54%, respectively. The Lot A home FAR should be no greater than 54%.

#### **3.1.PK-2. Limit paving in front setbacks for vehicles and walkways**

The proposed driveway and patio appear to be more than 25%. Applicant should specify use of modular pavers or other techniques to add scale and texture to the paving.

#### **3.4 Design second floors to complement first floor forms and minimize their visual impact**

The modern style does not lend itself to minimize the visual impact of the second floor.

### **3.4.SF-11. Relate second floor elements to first floor masses**

The large, second floor window on each home practically dominates the second floor as it looks like a oversize framed window. The window will be irregular compared to the proposed 608 W McKinley and create a jagged look on the 600 W McKinley block

### **3.4 SF-12. Avoid too many visually competing building elements on front façade**

The modern style does not lend itself to minimize the visually competing building elements on front façade.

### **3.4.SF-14. Second floor decks and balconies should be well integrated into the overall design of the home**

The proposed Lot B home has a balcony projected over the garage and ‘stands out’ as opposed to appearing integrated.

### **3.5 Relate roofs to those on nearby homes.**

The modern style of the proposed home has a roof that is unlike any in the neighborhood and is unrelatable.

### **3.6.PV-4. Second floor balconies and decks should be used only when they do not intrude on the privacy of adjacent neighbors**

The balcony on Lot B would have a view of the bedrooms of the home across the street (693 W McKinley). While the window associated with the second floor is acceptable, the balcony would encourage its resident to spend time staring the home across the street and significantly reduce the privacy for bedrooms of residents of 693 W McKinley.

### **3.7 Use materials that are compatible with the neighborhood**

The neighborhood consists of homes of both primarily wood and primarily stucco. No homes have a large mix of both materials as with the proposed homes.

### **3.8 Match window types and proportions to those in the neighborhood**

The small square windows on the first floor do no match the neighborhood.

### **Other**

The applicants claimed that nearby house at 221 Waverly is modern style. While it has a few minor elements for a modern style (one metal post, translucent garage door, and one hanging roof plane), it is more similar to a ranch-style homes in the neighborhood (single story, stuck, simple 2-plane roof line, roof eaves, one simple window, etc)

### **Vision Triangle**

The proposed driveway on Lot B appears to encroach the 40' vision triangle. A car parked on the driveway would potentially block critical view of W McKinley, which is a narrow street with several small accidents in the intersection of the 600 block.

**Questions**

1. What is the FAR of the second stories of the proposed homes?
2. What is the FAR of the nearby homes?
3. What homes in the neighborhood are modern style?