



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes

Zoning Administrator Hearing

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

3:00 PM

West Conference Room, City Hall, 456 W.
Olive Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086

CALL TO ORDER

Ryan Kuchenig, Zoning Administrator, called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Proposed Project:

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to allow a 7,200-square foot billiard center with snack bar and beer sales, installation of associated site improvements and a parking adjustment to the minimum parking ratio.

Location: 946 W. El Camino Real (APN: 201-19-028)

File #: 2019-7022

Zoning: General Business with the Precise Plan for the El Camino Real Combining District (C-2/ECR)

Applicant / Owner: Silicon Valley Billiards (applicant)/Sunnyvale Commercial Bldg LLC (owner)

Environmental Review: Class 3, Section 15303 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions.

Project Planner: Cindy Hom, 408-730-7411, Chom@sunnyvale.ca.gov

This item was continued to the Zoning Administrator Hearing of May 29, 2019.

Proposed Project:

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT: to allow a 360 square foot single-story addition to an existing duplex, resulting in 2,486 gross square feet and 28.7% FAR (floor area ratio).

Location: 1087 Greco Avenue (APN: 211-22-005)

File #: 2018-7918

Zoning: R-3/PD (Medium Density Residential)

Applicant / Owner: Sunnyvale Construction Co./Alicia L. Inafuku Trustee

Environmental Review: Class 1 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions.

Project Planner: Noren Caliva-Lepe, 408-730-7659, ncaliva-lepe@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Mr. Kuchenig inquired with Noren Caliva-Lepe, project planner, if there were comments or changes to the staff report.

Ms. Caliva-Lepe stated the single-story addition was at the back of the house and project complies with all development standards. A Special Development Permit is required because it is within a planned development.

Mr. Kuchenig opened the hearing to the applicants.

Alison Inafuku, applicant, stated she will speak on behalf of her mother and owner of the property, Alicia Inafuku. Ms. Inafuku stated her parents have owned the property since the 70's and have always wanted to improve the property but didn't have the means to do so until now. Her mother would like to make the addition more comfortable and improve the structure as well as the facade. This will greatly enhance the neighborhood.

Mr. Kuchenig inquired with the applicant if she has read the Conditions of Approval.

Ms. Inafuku stated she has read the conditions and had no further questions.

Seeing no members of the public in attendance, Mr. Kuchenig closed the hearing to the public.

ACTION: Approved subject to the Findings and Conditions of Approval located in the staff report.

SUBJECT

Proposed Project:

VARIANCE: to allow a 6-foot high fence within the driveway vision triangles.

Location: 1345 Eleanor Way (APN: 313-01-048)

File #: 2018-7881

Zoning: R-1 (Low Density Residential)

Applicant / Owner: Patrick Banks (applicant / owner)

Environmental Review: A Class 3 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Project Planner: Momoko Ishijima, (408) 730-7532,
mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Mr. Kuchenig inquired with Momoko Ishijima, project planner, if there were any comments or changes to the staff report.

Ms. Ishijima stated there were no changes and stated she has worked with the applicant for several months in preparation of this hearing.

Mr. Kuchenig inquired if the Department of Public Works Traffic Division's opinion is that the fence did not obstruct the corner vision triangle but was concerned about the driveway vision triangle.

Ms. Ishijima confirmed the statement.

Mr. Kuchenig inquired if the fence is close to the front property line.

Ms. Ishijima stated the fence is closer to the neighbor's driveway than it is to the applicant's driveway.

Mr. Kuchenig opened the hearing to the applicant.

Patrick Banks, applicant and owner, stated he didn't know of the height requirement when he built the fence. He took into consideration the neighbors and left them room, so they can have access and had enough space to see when backing out of their driveway. He received letters both neighbors in support of the fence, which stated they had plenty of vision.

Mr. Kuchenig inquired if the fence is set back from the property line.

Mr. Banks stated the property line is ten feet from the curb and the fence is another 10 feet from the property line.

Mr. Kuchenig stated staff is concerned about the 10 foot driveway vision triangle. This is measured from the corner of the driveway, 10 feet in each direction.

Mr. Banks stated the fence is really close; however, his neighbor has lots of room when backing up since he has to clear the fence by a foot or two.

Mr. Kuchenig stated there are three findings staff must make and staff was able to make one of the findings in that the lot is an unusual shape; however, the other two findings were difficult to make.

Mr. Banks stated that the lot indeed is unique, as there is 225 feet of frontage.

Mr. Kuchenig stated the fact that there are no sidewalks make the situation more difficult from a safety standpoint. Staff was not able to find any record where this type of request for a vision triangle was granted. Mr. Kuchenig stated changes to the fence could be made to meet the standards and be outside the vision triangle or altered to meet the requirement.

Mr. Banks inquired if staff is talking about the fence that is closest to Wolfe Road.

Mr. Kuchenig stated he was referring to the fence on the vision triangle and the fence that encroaches the neighbor's driveway.

Mr. Banks stated the fence is wrought iron with posts.

Mr. Kuchenig stated the open design is recommended however there are still considerations to be made on the open design as far as the height requirements; including reducing the fence to 4.5 feet high.

Mr. Kuchenig confirmed with Mr. Banks that he was able to read the Conditions of Approval.

Seeing no members of the audience in attendance, Mr. Kuchenig closed the public hearing.

ACTION: Denied the Variance for the existing fence, due to the inability to make two of the three required findings, and that the fence would create unsafe conditions at the affected driveways.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kuchenig adjourned the hearing at 3: 20 p.m.