



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes

Zoning Administrator Hearing

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

3:00 PM

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

CALL TO ORDER

Michelle King, Zoning Administrator, called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[20-0354](#)

Proposed Project:

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to allow a 1,470-square foot first floor and 1,640 square foot second floor addition to an existing auto dealership building, resulting in 35,461 square feet gross floor area with 30.6% lot coverage.

Location: 898 West El Camino Real (APN: 201-19-034)

File #: 2019-7248

Zoning: C-2/ECR (Highway Business with El Camino Real Precise Plan combining district)

Applicant / Owner: Price-Simms Inc dba Toyota Sunnyvale (Applicant)/ Price-Simms RE LLC (Owner)

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

Project Planner: Aastha Vashist, Associate Planner,
avashist@sunnyvale.ca.gov <<mailto:avashist@sunnyvale.ca.gov>>, (408)
-730-7458

Ms. King inquired with Aastha Vashist, project planner, if there were any additions or comments on the staff report.

Ms. Vashist stated there were no additions to the report or comments from the public.

Ms. King opened the hearing to the applicants and asked if they had read the Conditions of Approval and had any comments or questions.

Christian Oakes, applicant, stated he had no concerns.

Seeing no members of the public present, Ms. King closed the hearing to the public.

ACTION: Approved subject to the findings and conditions of approval located in the staff report.

[20-0355](#)

Proposed Project:

Related applications on a 15,574-square foot site:

Tentative Map to subdivide one parcel into two lots,

Variance to allow reduced lot widths and tandem covered parking spaces, and

Design Review to construct two new two-story single-family homes, resulting in 45% floor area ratio (3,578 square feet and 3,427 square feet in size).

Location: 1136 Northumberland Drive (APN: 198-38-018)

File #: 2019-7603

Zoning: R-0 (Low Density Residential)

Applicant / Owner: 1136 Northumberland LLC

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

Project Planner: Aastha Vashist, Associate Planner,
avashist@sunnyvale.ca.gov, (408)-730-7458

Ms. King inquired with Aastha Vashist, project planner, if there were any additions or comments on the staff report.

Ms. Vashist stated there were no additions to the report and no public comments.

Ms. King opened the hearing to the applicant and asked if they had any comments or questions.

Samir Sharma, applicant, stated that a public outreach meeting had been held to inform neighbors about the proposed project. He stated that plans, renderings, materials, etc. had been shared and received positive feedback. In regards to the removal of second floor balconies in PS-1 of the Conditions of Approval, Mr. Sharma stated that no one at the outreach meeting objected to them. He stated that a side barrier recommended for 5ft had been increased to 6ft. He stated that he had pictures of surrounding vegetation and the area. He didn't feel that any neighbor privacy issues were being broken. Mr. Sharma asked Ms. King to reconsider the removal of the balconies and remove PS-1 item B from the Conditions of Approval.

Ms. King inquired with Staff if this was a standard condition or one designed for this project specifically.

Ms Vashist stated that the balcony and minimum required setback are 20 feet and the project is right at the minimum. She further stated that the property line is shared with 4 other homes, rear yards facing. Ms Vashist stated that the surrounding neighborhood is mostly single story and there was concern for potential privacy impacts especially with the neighbors with rear yards facing.

Ms. King inquired with Mr. Sharma if the balconies had been displayed at the outreach meeting.

Mr. Sharma stated that they had been. He stated that questions had been asked where the balconies would be placed. Mr. Sharma stated there is a two story house behind the property.

Ms. King inquired if there is a balcony on this structure. Mr. Sharma stated he couldn't remember.

Mr. Sharma stated that this wasn't the first time they had built two story homes in Sunnyvale with balconies. He stated he was aware of the concerns and restrictions. He stated if neighbors had expressed concerns at the outreach, he would have reconsidered. Mr. Sharma stated no concerns or objections were raised.

Ms. King stated she understood the applicants position and offered a choice. She stated she could continue the hearing for two weeks to give her an opportunity to visit the site and make a determination. Otherwise, she would approve the project, as it stood, with the Conditions of Approval as written.

Mr. Sharma said he had photos and a video for Ms. King to look at.

Ms. King stated she would prefer to be on site, in person, to make the determination.

Ms. King asked if the building plans were already prepared. Mr. Sharma stated they were.

Mr. Sharma asked Ms. King if her determination would affect the placement of the houses or if one house might have a balcony and the other not. He inquired if her decision would be if both or neither of the houses could have balconies.

Ms. King stated her decision would not affect the placement of the houses, but

would determine if balconies on both the houses would be possible or not.

Mr. Sharma inquired about Ms. King's experience with hearings concerning second floor balconies.

Ms. King stated that two story homes overlooking single story homes, even when allowed, is the number one concern for people attend Zoning Adimistration meetings. She stated it would be prudent if she came out and looked at the site before making a decision. Ms. King said neighbors reading the staff report about no balconies and then seeing buildings being built with balconies would be a concern if she had not been on site to make a full determination.

Mr. Sharma asked if an amendment could be made at a later date.

Ms. King stated that the applicant could accept the conditons as is and then submit an MPP for modification at a later date, but she didn't think it would save time.

Ms. Vashist stated that a notification would have to be sent out to neighbors because of an alteration to the second floors in that case.

Mr. Sharma stated he was aware of the process. He stated he would accept the Conditions of Approval as written.

Ms. King closed the hearing to the public.

ACTION: Approved subject to the findings and conditions of approval located in the staff report.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. King adjourned the hearing at 3:11 p.m.