



# City of Sunnyvale

## Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

---

Monday, February 24, 2020

7:00 PM

Council Chambers, City Hall, 456 W. Olive  
Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086

---

**Study Session Canceled | Public Hearing - 7:00 PM**

### **STUDY SESSION CANCELED**

### **7:00 PM PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Howard called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers.

#### **SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Chair Howard led the salute to the flag.

#### **ROLL CALL**

**Present:** 7 - Chair Daniel Howard  
Commissioner John Howe  
Commissioner Sue Harrison  
Commissioner Ken Olevson  
Commissioner Ken Rheaume  
Vice Chair David Simons  
Commissioner Carol Weiss

#### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

#### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Rheaume seconded the motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 7 -** Chair Howard  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheume  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Weiss

**No: 0**

1. [20-0322](#) Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of January 27, 2020

**PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS**

3. [20-0263](#) **Proposed Project:** Related applications on a 40.5 acre site:  
**MAJOR MOFFETT PARK SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**PERMIT:** Two new five-story R&D office buildings of 1,041,890 square feet resulting in 60 percent Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The existing 710,381 square feet of office & manufacturing buildings will be demolished.  
**TENTATIVE MAP:** Merge ten existing parcels and create two new parcels.  
**Location:** 360 W. Caribbean Drive (APNs: 110-26-020, 021, 022, 023, 025, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031)  
**File #:** 2017-8042  
**Zoning:** Moffett Park Industrial (MP-I) & Moffett Park Transit Oriented Development (MP-TOD)  
**Applicant / Owner:** Google LLC (applicant) / Google Inc. (owner)  
**Environmental Review:** Transportation Environmental Impact Report and Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program  
**Project Planners:** Michelle King, (408) 730-7463, mking@sunnyvale.ca.gov and Shaunn Mendrin, (408) 730-7431, smendrin@sunnyvale.ca.gov

The Commissioners unanimously agreed to consider Agenda Item 2 at the end of the meeting in the interest of those in the audience.

Commissioner Rheume recused himself due to a financial conflict of interest.

Principal Planner Shaunn Mendrin presented the staff report and noted minor modifications to the Recommended Conditions of Approval. Alex Jewell, representing consultant Kimley-Horn, presented the environmental review portion of the staff report.

Commissioner Howe commented on the importance of the accessibility of the 18 on-site parking spaces that would be dedicated to the Bay Trail. He cited the Juniper Networks project's parking that successfully encourages public transportation and the Yahoo project's dedicated Bay Trail parking that is inaccessible and under-used. Assistant Director Andrew Miner suggested that Commissioner Howe ask Google to clarify the intent of the parking spaces.

Chair Howard appreciated Commissioner Howe's Bay Trail parking concerns.

Commissioner Harrison asked if this is the largest parking deviation ever requested. Assistant Director Miner stated that it is one of the largest but that there is a robust bus program planned, adding that the trend is to request parking deviations with the argument that more people are using public transportation. Commissioner Harrison asked what part of the proposed project is considered the front yard. Assistant Director Miner answered that the proposed project has 3 front yards which is why staff approves of the generator's proposed location.

Vice Chair Simons commented on the difficulty of controlling parking issues that arise after a project has been approved and asked staff to consider appropriate signage and stenciling for the proposed project's dedicated Bay Trail parking to ensure its accessibility and usefulness. He also asked what flood requirements the generator meets.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Michelle Kaufmann with Google, Linus Saavedra with Bjarke Ingels Group and Chi-Tsai Liu with OLIN Landscape Architecture presented images and information about the proposed project.

Commissioner Howe asked Josh Mello, representing Google, for his thoughts on how the Commission can ensure that the 18 on-site parking spaces are accessible to the Bay Trail. Mr. Mello recommended any condition allow Google and staff to determine the exact location but specify that the parking should have direct pedestrian access to the Bay Trail entrance points. Commissioner Howe confirmed with Mr. Mello that Google does not plan to require identification to park at the property and that they are amenable to updating the Commission on the Bay Trail parking plans after they have been finalized.

Vice Chair Simons stated his concern for the site's long-term landscaping and a potential slower growth rate for the 36-inch box trees and larger. Ms. Liu stated that the larger-sized trees are needed to clear pedestrian and vehicle traffic and Ms. Kaufmann added that the site would be a mix of smaller, faster growing trees and larger, slower growing trees. Vice Chair Simons stressed the importance of Google's attention to the size of the trees planted and how they are planted to secure their longevity. Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Ms. Kaufmann that the generator placement is in the 100-year floodplain. He also stated his opinion that a Study Session would be an adequate forum for Google to share the finalized Bay Trail parking plans.

Commissioner Howe clarified that Google's report on the final Bay Trail parking is voluntary and is independent of any future decisions. He agreed that a Study Session would be appropriate. Assistant Director Miner stated that staff can inform the Commission or a Study Session can be held if there is more significant information to share.

Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Ms. Kaufmann and Mr. Saavedra that the buildings would have diamond patterns of two sizes and that the diamonds would be made of the same material as the sample that was submitted for the Commission's review. Ms. Kaufmann and Mr. Saavedra added that the material type, its transitional element, and the large area that the material would cover would sufficiently mask flaws that might occur to it over time.

Chair Howard clarified the sizes and scales of the two diamond patterns with Ms. Kaufmann and Mr. Saavedra. Ms. Kaufmann further remarked that the shades would block the sun for those inside the building but at the same time allow them to see outside the building.

Commissioner Harrison asked Google to explain the Santa Clara Valley Water District's (SCVWD) timeline for improving the Bay's West Channel in relation to the proposed project's timeline. Joe Howard, representing H. T. Harvey & Associates, responded that SCVWD's project is at least a year away from completion. Commissioner Harrison also asked what would happen in the event of a major flood. Peter McDonnell, representing Sares Regis, answered that the Channel would perform as it currently does as improvements would begin in 2021 but would not be completed until 2022. Mr. McDonnell added that construction would take place around the Channel during 2021.

Commissioner Weiss asked Google about the large parking deviation when an approximate 8,000 more daily trips are expected. Ms. Kaufmann stated that the purpose is to reduce the number of single vehicles and promote alternative methods of transportation, adding that Google is also investing in the future of transportation. Commissioner Weiss confirmed with Ms. Kaufmann that carpools and vanpools would be given priority parking. Commissioner Weiss also asked about the effect of reduced parking at other Google campuses and if Google regularly promotes telecommuting and flexible work schedules. Mr. Mello stated that less than half of the employees at Google's Sunnyvale campuses drive to work alone and approximately 12 percent telecommute.

Daryl Winslow, Sunnyvale resident, expressed her concern for the expected increase in traffic to the site and her interest in how Google will address it.

Mr. Mello and Ms. Kaufmann presented additional information about the proposed project.

Vice Chair Simons commented that Light Rail is under-used because it is slow and not a mode of transportation priority. He asked Mr. Mello if Google can give incentives to those who use Light Rail. Mr. Mello responded that Google's Sunnyvale campuses have a higher public transportation ridership rate than the Mountain View campus because of Light Rail and that Google regularly meets with Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to discuss speed and frequency for the bus and Light Rail systems. Vice Chair Simons further remarked that it would benefit Google to analyze the potential maximum throughput of people if VTA changes take place and observed that VTA and the City will require support to improve Light Rail's functionality.

Chair Howard stated that transit quality influences the chosen mode of transportation which then either increases or decreases the number of cars on the road.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Vice Chair Simons seconded the motion for Alternative 1- Adopt a resolution certifying the Transportation EIR, adopting the Statements of Overriding Consideration, and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as contained in Attachments 4 and 5 of the report; and Alternative 3 - Approve the Major Moffett Park Special Development Permit as

indicated in the Site and Architectural Plans in Attachment 6 of the report and Tentative Map in Attachment 7 of the report, Findings of Approval in Attachment 8 of the report and Conditions of Approval in Attachment 9 of the report with the following changes:

1. Accept the revised Recommended Conditions of Approval PS-7, BP-19, EP-7 and PF-3 that staff submitted to the Commission prior to the hearing.

2. Modify Recommended Condition of Approval PF-3 to read as follows:

Bay Trail Parking Agreement:

Prior to occupancy of the first office building, the developer shall enter into a parking agreement with the City permitting public parking restricted to weekday evenings (5:00 p.m. to sunset) and weekends for public access to the Bay Trail.

a. The public parking area shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA-compliant). Prior to final occupancy, the property owner shall provide an ADA compliance report to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

b. Public parking for Bay Trail use shall be provided at the 200 W. Caribbean site or in a location that has immediate access to the Bay Trail and shall grant pedestrian access to the crosswalk across Caribbean Drive at the new Caribbean Drive intersection west of the Channel. The project shall allow a minimum of 18 on-site parking spaces for public use for access to the Bay Trail. The final location (or alternative meeting the intent of the MPSP and this condition) shall be approved by the Director of Public Works in consultation with the Director of Community Development.

c. The property owner shall be responsible for enforcement. Appropriate signs and parking space stenciling shall be installed and included in the parking management plan, subject to review and approval by the Director of Community Development.

[COA] [Planning/Public Works]

Commissioner Howe stated that it is a good proposed project that would result in positive community benefits and that Google's willingness to provide the community benefits has been outstanding. He added that he can make the findings, accepts the Statements of Overriding Consideration as part of the motion and hopes the motion passes.

Vice Chair Simons stated that he can make the findings and supports the Statements of Overriding Consideration. He complimented Google for incorporating the Commission's input early in the process and stated that he is pleased overall with the landscaping plans. He added his support for the motion and stressed the value of public review of landscaping plans and landscaping that ensures long-term

success and usefulness.

Commissioner Harrison stated that she will support the motion and that she appreciates the architecture and the repeated materials and how they would be used. She also recognized the large scale of the proposed project that provides office space, contributes to the community benefit, and supports the activities around it such as biodiversity. She also stated her appreciation for the on-site parking dedicated for Bay Trail use and the naturalization of the West Channel, which is her favorite aspect of the proposed project.

Commissioner Weiss stated that it has been a pleasure to work with Google in the Study Sessions and that their responsiveness, explanations, innovative approach and attempts to try new things are appreciated. She stated that the buildings are beautiful and would enhance Sunnyvale's image and stated her belief that people would enjoy working there. She encouraged the Commissioners to support the motion.

Commissioner Olevson acknowledged Google's communication during the Study Session and their willingness to incorporate the Commission's suggestions into the proposed project. He added that this type of collaboration is integral to improving Sunnyvale. He stated that he met with Google for an update and that he does not have any concerns since the Study Session or that meeting. Commissioner Olevson stated that he likes the unique design and the buildings' step-down transition to the Bay that would improve the experience for those on the Bay Trail. He further remarked that he will support the motion and noted that it is a great project that he is looking forward to seeing constructed.

Chair Howard stated that he will support the proposed project and can make the findings. He noted Google's constructive engagement with the public throughout the process and stated that the buildings are beautiful, adding that it will be interesting to watch the site take shape and view it from the Bay Trail. Chair Howard commended Google for the low rate of Sunnyvale employees who drive to work alone and encouraged Google to further reduce that number. He commented that though it can be frustrating at times, people should engage more in the public process to advocate for bicycle networks and improved transit services to advance the progress already made.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes:** 6 - Chair Howard  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Olevson  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Weiss

**No:** 0

**Recused:** 1 - Commissioner Rheaume

Assistant Director Miner stated that this recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at the Tuesday, March 17, 2020 meeting. He also encouraged the public to get involved with the Moffett Park Specific Plan that staff is currently updating and that will be presented soon at a Study Session.

4. [20-0299](#) **Proposed Project:**  
**DESIGN REVIEW** to construct a new two-story single-family home, resulting in a total floor area of 4,578 square feet (4,087 square feet living area and 491 square feet garage) and 52% floor area ratio (FAR).  
**Location:** 1561 Barton Drive (APN: 320-03-035)  
**File #:** 2019-7127  
**Zoning:** Low Density Residential (R-1)  
**Applicant / Owner:** LU Constructions and Design / Rama Krishna Chitta Trustee & et al  
**Environmental Review:** A Class 3 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions.  
**Project Planner:** Shila Bagley, (408) 730-7456, sbagley@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Associate Planner Shila Bagley presented the staff report.

Commissioner Harrison asked staff to explain the difference between a deviation from the Sunnyvale Municipal Code and the thresholds for the Commission's review of a single-family home. Principal Planner Noren Caliva-Lepe responded that the Commission must review any proposed project that exceeds 3,600 square feet or 45 percent Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and that there is no maximum FAR. She further explained that a deviation is when a proposed project does to not meet a defined development standard. Commissioner Harrison confirmed with Associate Planner Bagley and Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe that the proposed project is below the 35 percent maximum second floor to first floor ratio and that the applicant has not



requested any variances or deviations. Commissioner Harrison asked how a proposed project is compared to surrounding properties on the square footage and FAR spectrums. Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe responded that staff compares proposed projects with surrounding properties to understand the character of a neighborhood but that there is no requirement that a proposed project have an FAR or total square footage that falls within the neighborhood's average.

Commissioner Rheume confirmed with Associate Planner Bagley and Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe that the City arborist conducted a site inspection and confirmed the private arborist report's conclusions. Commissioner Rheume asked staff how the neighbors' privacy has been addressed. Associate Planner Bagley stated that a Recommended Condition of Approval would require the applicant to submit a revised landscape plan that protects the neighbors' privacy and avoids the nearby power lines. Associate Planner Bagley added that the overhead power lines are located just beyond the property line. Commissioner Rheume asked about the swimming pool. Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe stated that the pool is not discretionary or part of the proposed project and because it is conceptual and the backyard is large, there is enough room to require replacement trees for privacy screening.

Vice Chair Simons stated his concern for the neighbors' privacy because the second story is located directly at the back of the house and asked if staff considered relocating it slightly forward. Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe stated that staff typically work with applicants so that second floors are towards the back to reduce a home's bulk and mass from the streetscape. She stated that staff believes that removing the balcony addresses any privacy concerns. Vice Chair Simons commented on the option of a Juliet balcony, stated his interest in confirming the window treatment style and agreed with the City arborist that Liquid Amber trees do not react well to trimming.

Chair Howard confirmed with Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe that the Commission and staff evaluate proposed projects based on the development standards and the single-family home design guidelines. He also confirmed that the Commission must review the proposed project to determine if it meets the design guidelines since it already meets the development standards.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Rama Chitta, homeowner, presented images and information about the proposed

project.

Commissioner Weiss asked Mr. Chitta if he considered extending his home out instead of building a second floor. Mr. Chitta responded that he explored the possibility but that his family's lifestyle necessitates a second story. Commissioner Weiss asked Mr. Chitta if he would be amenable to removing the balcony. Mr. Chitta confirmed that he can remove it and mentioned his openness to a Juliet balcony and his preference to directly address privacy concerns. Commissioner Weiss confirmed with Mr. Chitta that the swimming pool would not be directly under the power lines. Mr. Chitta answered for Commissioner Weiss that his home would be energy efficient with insulation, solar panels and tankless water heaters. Assistant Director Miner clarified with Commissioner Weiss that single-family homes are not required to be all electric.

Commissioner Rheume asked about the types of windows planned for the proposed project. Designer Nadia Pichko stated that only the windows on the front facade would be arched with exterior grids. Commissioner Rheume stated his opinion that a better quality design would apply Mediterranean architecture throughout. He confirmed with Ms. Pichko that there would be four arched windows, an arched door and one top attic window planned for the front facade. Ms. Pichko added that the pool would be closer to the house and the power lines are just beyond the property line. She further remarked that the conceptual landscaping plan proposes 15 replacement trees along the sides and back of the property with trees chosen based on PG&E requirements and in consultation with a landscape architect and arborist.

Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Ms. Pichko and Mr. Chitta that the garage door and front door would be custom made to match and that they are agreeable to a condition that requires them to match. He also confirmed with them that the stone veneer would wrap around the entire perimeter of the house. Vice Chair Simons stated his concern for the loss of the larger trees on the property and asked if they are amenable to using at least two shade-producing replacement trees. Ms. Pichko stated that the left side of the front yard is a potential location for a large tree. Vice Chair Simons asked about the possibility of pushing the second story slightly forward to eliminate solar shading and improve privacy issues. Ms. Pichko stated that it is feasible with small alterations to the interior.

Chair Howard confirmed with Ms. Pichko that the first floor cannot be expanded without exceeding the maximum lot coverage of 40 percent. He also made

recommendations for parts of the interior design.

John Ratkovich, Sunnyvale resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed project that he believes would negatively impact neighbors' quality of life and set a precedent for larger homes in the neighborhood.

Jay Welshofer, Sunnyvale resident, stated his respect for the proposed project and his concern that it would impact the character of the neighborhood.

PJ Jamkhandi, Sunnyvale resident, presented images and spoke in opposition to the proposed project, stating that it would be the largest home in the neighborhood, create privacy issues, block his views and increase the risk of fire.

Andrew Lamanque, Sunnyvale resident, spoke in opposition to the proposed project with concerns about its square footage, FAR and incompatibility with the neighborhood.

Daryl Winslow, Sunnyvale resident, presented images and spoke in opposition to the proposed project, stating that it would be inconsistent with the neighborhood and negatively impact the neighbors and has been evaluated based on incorrect information.

Rohith Mohan, Sunnyvale resident, noted concerns about the proposed project's lack of greenery and potential construction noise. He commented that concerned neighbors have submitted written comments.

Mr. Chitta presented additional images and information about the proposed project.

Assistant Director Miner stated that staff was handed written public comments to share with the Commissioners that the audience can also view if interested.

Commissioner Rheaume asked Mr. Chitta to rank his balcony preferences from the options available. Mr. Chitta responded that he would prefer a balcony with a solid parapet, then a Juliet balcony, then just a window.

Chair Howard confirmed with Mr. Chitta that the window in the walk-in closet is to achieve balance on that side of the home and Chair Howard suggested the use of obscured glass for that window. Mr. Chitta answered that it is a possibility and emphasized his goal of respecting his neighbors' privacy.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Vice Chair Simons moved and Chair Howard seconded the motion to begin an Informal Consideration discussion period.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 7 -** Chair Howard  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheaume  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Weiss

**No: 0**

The Commissioners informally discussed the proposed project among themselves and with staff and by general consensus agreed to end the Informal Consideration period.

MOTION: Vice Chair Simons moved and Commissioner Olevson seconded the motion for Alternative 2 - Approve the Design Review with the following modified conditions:

1. Lower stone veneer must wrap around the perimeter of the house as depicted in the renderings.
2. Arched windows on the front facade must be of the same quality as the non-arched windows on the rest of the house as depicted in the renderings.
3. Garage door must match the style and quality of the front door as the applicant confirmed during the public hearing.
4. Two of the replacement trees planned for the front yard must be native, large at maturity and shade producing.
5. Applicant and staff must explore the relocation of the second story 4-8 feet closer to the front of the house, with staff making the final decision.
6. Applicant and staff must work together to either remove or obscure the rear closet window, with staff making the final decision.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Commissioner Olevson offered a friendly amendment to revise Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2 to state that the final exterior building materials and color scheme are subject to the Community Development Director's review and approval. Vice Chair Simons accepted the friendly amendment.

Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Commissioner Harrison that the motion does not propose any modifications to the balcony. He recognized that the proposed project is on a large lot and that the applicant has done everything necessary to minimize the bulk of the home. He further remarked that the proposed project is located in a great neighborhood and that people would be pleased with its detail and design. He emphasized the importance of landscaping and the significant impact the absence of it would have on the neighborhood, adding that he will support the motion.

Commissioner Olevson stated his preference to remove Recommended Condition of Approval PS-1 but recognizes that the applicant is agreeable to it. He commented that he understands the need to care for extended family, that the proposed project is a good design, and that despite the large size, the proposed project meets all the applicable zoning and design requirements. He added that he will support the motion.

Commissioner Rheume acknowledged the staff and applicant's work on the proposed project. He commended the applicant for exercising the right to expand the property while at the same time doing everything possible to respect the neighborhood and the neighbors' concerns. He further remarked that the proposed project is a quality design, that he can make the findings and that he will support the motion.

Commissioner Harrison stated that she will support the motion because there are no deviations requested, the proposed project meets the single-family home design guidelines and because there is no other reason to deny it.

Commissioner Weiss stated that she cannot make the findings and that the proposed project is not consistent with the scale, character and bulk of homes in the adjacent neighborhood and that the design does not respect the immediate neighbors. She added that this particular neighborhood is not appropriate for a two-story home and that the proposed project would set a precedent for the neighborhood.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Chair Howard offered a friendly amendment to specify that the balcony is acceptable as currently designed if the second story is pushed forward by 4-8 feet. The applicant and staff must work together and the balcony must not protrude beyond the first floor. Vice Chair Simons and Commissioner Olevson accepted the friendly amendment.

Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe confirmed with Chair Howard and Vice Chair Simons that the friendly amendment accepts the balcony as designed as long as the second story is pushed forward by 4-8 feet.

Chair Howard stated that he will support the motion.

The motion carried by the following vote:

- Yes: 5 -** Chair Howard  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheaume  
Vice Chair Simons
- No: 2 -** Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Weiss

Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe stated that this decision is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council within 15 days.

5. [20-0334](#)

**Proposed Project:**

**DESIGN REVIEW** to allow a first and second-story addition of 1,200 square feet to an existing one-story single-family home, resulting in 3,367 square feet (2,908 square feet living area and 459 square feet garage) and 53% floor area ratio (FAR).

**Location:** 884 Tartarian Way (201-33-005)

**File #:** 2018-8009

**Zoning:** Low Density Residential (R-0)

**Applicant / Owner:** Richard Haro Drafting and Planning / John Kwong and Katrina A Pagonis

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

**Project Planner:** Cindy Hom, (408) 730-7411, [chom@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:chom@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

Associate Planner Cindy Hom presented the staff report.

Commissioner Weiss asked staff if the proposed project meets the required 20-foot rear setback. Associate Planner Hom stated that the second story must have a 20-foot rear setback and that the proposed project meets the requirement.

Commissioner Rheume asked why staff recommends lowering the courtyard wall. Associate Planner Hom and Principal Planner Noren Caliva-Lepe stated that the wall appears too prominent and presented an image of a nearby home that that uses a shorter stone. Commissioner Rheume commented that Prairie-style architecture uses stone columns and asked if there would be any landscaping in front of the stone. Commissioner Rheume confirmed with Associate Planner Hom that staff recommends lowering the stone only on the courtyard wall.

Commissioner Harrison asked if the purpose of lowering the courtyard wall is to provide consistency with the typical home for that neighborhood. Associate Planner Hom and Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe stated that there is an existing 6-foot courtyard wall and that lowering it with the stone the applicant proposes would soften its prominent appearance.

Assistant Director Andrew Miner added that typical Prairie architecture does not wrap stone around the perimeter of a building at the same height. He stated that using the stone at varying heights would provide relief, be more consistent with other homes in the neighborhood and improve the proposed project's design.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Richard Haro, representing applicant Richard Haro Drafting and Planning, and Katrina Pagonis, homeowner, presented images and information about the proposed project.

Vice Chair Simons confirmed with Mr. Haro that all the windows in the front would match and that the window trims that are set up against the stone veneer would project forward farther than the stone veneer. Vice Chair Simons asked Mr. Haro if he would be amenable to applying a consistent style to the front door, garage door and entry gate door. Mr. Haro stated that they will work with staff to select a consistent style for the doors and noted that the homeowners have worked hard to help produce the current design. Vice Chair Simons also confirmed with Mr. Haro that there would be a doorbell located on the courtyard door which he stated is important for emergency purposes.

Commissioner Rheume confirmed with Mr. Haro that Swiss Coffee would be the window trim color and Malibu Beige would be the body color.

Nika Wynn, Sunnyvale resident, stated her concern that her view would be blocked by the proposed project and her hope that her Oak tree would not be affected.

Ms. Pagonis presented additional information about the proposed project.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Howe confirmed with Associate Planner Hom and Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe that the courtyard wall is proposed at 6 feet in height and staff recommends that it be lowered to 4-feet 6-inches. Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe stated that the issue is with the thickness of the proposed stone for the courtyard wall in addition to the application of it along the base of the home. Assistant Director Miner stated that it is possible to add 1-foot 6-inches of stucco to the top of the wall if it is important to maintain the height. Commissioner Howe confirmed with Assistant Director Miner that the courtyard wall door could remain as proposed.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Vice Chair Simons seconded the motion for Alternative 2 - Approve the Design Review with the following modified condition:

1. Modify Recommended Condition of Approval PS-3 to allow the applicant to add 1-foot 6-inches of stucco on top of the 4-foot 6-inch stone courtyard wall.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Vice Chair Simons offered a friendly amendment to specify that the applicant and staff must work together to ensure coordinating styles for the front door, garage door and entry gate door. Additionally, the window trims that are set up against the stone veneer should project forward farther than the stone veneer. Commissioner Howe accepted the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Howe stated that he understands the mass issue with the courtyard wall but that the homeowners have a good reason for the height in striving to keep their children safe. He added his opinion that the proposed project fits in with the neighborhood and that the homeowners have a right to expand their second story. He further remarked that he can make the findings and urged the Commissioners to approve the proposed project.

Vice Chair Simons stated that the motion supports a more consistent design that he



is more comfortable with and acknowledged all the effort dedicated to the proposed project. He added that elements of a proposed project that are overlooked are often noticeable to neighbors and the Commissioners. He stated that he will support the motion.

Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe confirmed with Commissioner Howe that the applicant has the option to keep the stone that wraps around the house at a height of 6 feet.

Commissioner Rheume stated that he can make the findings and will support the motion. He commented that he understands the argument for a 6-foot wall based on the way other homes in the neighborhood look and that landscaping in front of the stone could help reduce its bulkiness. He stated his belief that adding stucco to the top of the stone wall is a good option and that lowering the courtyard wall would have negatively affected the courtyard door. He added that the proposed project would be a pleasant addition to the neighborhood and urged the Commissioners to support the motion.

Commissioner Olevson noted that he thought the proposed project was very large when he first reviewed it and then realized that the courtyard aspect is similar to Eichler homes. He noted that the proposed changes to the courtyard wall would significantly improve the design and minimize the appearance of the home from the street, adding that he will support the motion and can make the findings.

Commissioner Harrison stated that she will support the motion because the proposed project meets the City's established design guidelines and there are no issues that would prevent it from being approved.

Chair Howard posed the possibility of lowering the stone at the base of the home to 4-feet 6-inches to match the height of the stone portion of the courtyard wall for aesthetic purposes.

Commissioner Howe confirmed with Chair Howard that the intent of the motion is for the applicant and staff to work together so that there is flexibility to lower the height of the stone that wraps around the house.

Chair Howard stated that he will support the motion and summarized it.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 7 -** Chair Howard  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheaume  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Weiss

**No: 0**

Principal Planner Caliva-Lepe stated that this decision is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council within 15 days.

6.        [20-0265](#)        **Proposed Project:**  
                                 **DESIGN REVIEW:** to allow a first story addition of 585 square feet to the rear of an existing two-story single-family home resulting in 3,838 square feet (3,331 square feet living area and 507 square feet garage and 42% floor area ratio.  
**Location:** 1398 Bedford Avenue (APN: 320-29-013)  
**File #:** 2019-7360  
**Zoning:** Low Density Residential (R-1)  
**Applicant / Owner:** Nick Bui for IP Architecture (applicant) / Long and Thuy Nga Lu (owner)  
**Environmental Review:** A Class 3 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions.  
**Project Planner:** Cindy Hom, (408) 730-7411, chom@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Associate Planner Cindy Hom presented the staff report.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Nick Bui, applicant representing IP Architecture, presented information about the proposed project.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion for Alternative 1 - Approve the Design Review with the Conditions of Approval in Attachment 4.

Commissioner Howe stated that the proposed project is a simple addition that meets

all the applicable requirements and that he can make the findings.

Commissioner Harrison agreed with Commissioner Howe's comments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes:** 7 - Chair Howard  
Commissioner Howe  
Commissioner Harrison  
Commissioner Olevson  
Commissioner Rheaume  
Vice Chair Simons  
Commissioner Weiss

**No:** 0

Chair Howard stated that this decision is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council within 15 days.

**2. [20-0302](#) Update to the Selection and Ranking of Potential 2020 Study Issues**

The Commissioners made updates to the selection and ranking of potential 2020 study issues.

**STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES**

**NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS**

**-Commissioner Comments**

Commissioner Harrison asked for an update on the modular build of the hotel on El Camino Real across from City Hall. Assistant Director Miner stated that the project is still in the building permit phase and he will inform the Commissioners when construction begins so that they can watch the process if interested.

**-Staff Comments**

Assistant Director Andrew Miner stated that Commissioner Howe and Chair Howard's terms expire this year and that they are eligible to reapply. He stated that applications are on the City's website for members of the public interested in applying, applications are due by 5:00 PM on April 30, 2020 and interviews and appointments will take place in mid-May 2020.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Howard adjourned the meeting at 11:14 PM.