



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

Monday, October 11, 2021

7:00 PM

Telepresence Meeting: City Web Stream |
Comcast Channel 15 | AT&T Channel 99

Special Meeting: Study Session - Canceled | Public Hearing - 7:00 PM

TELECONFERENCE NOTICE

STUDY SESSION CANCELED

7 P.M. PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to Government Code Subdivision 54953 (e), the meeting was conducted telephonically; pursuant to state law, the City Council is scheduled to make the necessary findings on October 26, 2021.

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

ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Chair Daniel Howard
Vice Chair Martin Pyne
Commissioner Sue Harrison
Commissioner John Howe
Commissioner Ken Rheaume
Absent: 1 - Commissioner Carol Weiss

Commissioner Weiss' absence is excused.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Vice Chair Pyne seconded the motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Chair Howard
Vice Chair Pyne
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Howe
Commissioner Rheume

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Weiss

1. [21-0961](#) Approve Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of September 27, 2021

2. [21-0960](#) **Proposed Project:**
DESIGN REVIEW to allow a 796 square foot first floor addition to an existing one-story home, resulting in 4,452 square feet (3,784 square feet living area and 668 square feet garage) and 28% floor area ratio (FAR).
Location: 1258 Cranberry Avenue (APN: 202-32-046)
File #: 2021-7159
Zoning: R-1 (Low Density Residential)
Applicant / Owner: OPQ Design (applicant) / Sheryl L Sun Trustee & et al. (owner)
Environmental Review: A Class 1 Exemption relieves this project from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions.
Project Planner: Kelly Cha, Associate Planner,
kcha@sunnyvale.ca.gov

This decision, as it applies to Agenda Item 2, is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council by 5:00 PM on Tuesday, October 26, 2021.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

3. [21-0957](#) **Proposed Project:**
DESIGN REVIEW to construct a 471 square foot first floor addition to an existing one-story single-family home, resulting in 1,946 square feet (1,442 square feet living area and 504 square feet garage) and 33% FAR. The project includes a new second story 845 square foot Accessory Dwelling Unit resulting in a total floor area of 2,791 square feet and 47% FAR including the ADU.

VARIANCE to allow a 4 foot second floor setback where a minimum of 7 feet is required to accommodate an exterior stair

and landing for the proposed ADU.

Location: 1279 Palamos Ave. (104-27-082)

File #: 2020-7286

Zoning: R-0

Applicant / Owner: JER Design Group (Applicant) / Nathan Iglesias (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 with a slide presentation.

Vice Chair Pyne noted that mention of specifications for the second-floor wall plate height was not included in Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2. Associate Planner Hom confirmed that a correction to Attachment 4 should be made to include this item as Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.d.

Vice Chair Pyne stated that several houses in the same neighborhood of the proposed project had sloped roofs that were much steeper than the 2.5":12" pitch roof ratio outlined in Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.c. Associate Planner Hom explained that one home in particular was approved in the late 1990s and predated the City's current Single Family Home Design Techniques.

Commissioner Rheume requested clarification on staff's recommendation for the proposed project's roof pitch ratio. Associate Planner Hom stated that the recommendation entails a reduction of the slope of the pitch of the roof above the first-floor addition to maintain consistency with the rest of the proposed project's roof pitches.

Commissioner Harrison questioned whether the raised roof section on the second floor is being recommended by staff. Associate Planner Hom advised that staff is supporting the inclusion of a raised roof over the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) entry as it provides weather protection, but the Commissioners may make the decision to exclude this element from the proposed project's design. Commissioner Harrison then initiated a discussion on whether the roof covering increases the proposed project's Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Associate Planner Hom explained that FAR would increase if the roof covering was over a stairway rather than a porch since porches are generally not considered in the FAR.

Commissioner Harrison asked whether a roof pitch of 4":12" is depicted in Alternative Concepts 1 and 2 in the staff presentation. Associate Planner Hom

confirmed that while it is, staff recommends a shallow roof pitch to match the predominant design within the neighborhood and to avoid conflict with the pitch of the proposed project's existing roof located toward the back of the first-floor addition.

Commissioner Harrison asked about the discrepancy between the roof pitch ratio in the original concept of the proposed project's design versus the design depicted in Alternative Concepts 1 and 2 in the staff presentation. Associate Planner Hom assured her that the applicant may address this difference.

Commissioner Harrison and Associate Planner Hom deliberated upon slides in the staff presentation that correlated to Recommended Conditions of Approval PS-2.a and PS-2.b. Associate Planner Hom stated that painting the front porch columns to match the color of the horizontal siding would be acceptable, however, staff recommends that the front porch columns be clad with horizontal siding instead.

Commissioner Harrison confirmed with Associate Planner Hom that the residences surrounding the proposed project which possess a greater percentage of first-floor to second-floor ratio were approved prior to the enactment of the City's Single Family Home Design Techniques. Assistant Planner Hom added that, according to the FAR study outlined in Attachment 6, there are no homes in the neighborhood with more than a 35% first-floor to second-floor ratio.

Chair Howard opened the Public Hearing.

Nathan Iglesias, property owner, presented the project including additional images and information.

Commissioner Rheume asked whether Mr. Iglesias had a desire to match the proposed project's existing roof pitch ratio. Jose Rama, Architect at JER Design Group, answered that they did, but they are willing to change the roof pitch to a 4":12" ratio as well. Commissioner Rheume disclosed his concern about the roofs of the proposed project not possessing a uniform roof pitch ratio.

There were no public speakers for this agenda item.

Mr. Iglesias continued to present the project including additional images and information.

Commissioner Harrison confirmed with Mr. Iglesias that he is accepting of Recommended Conditions of Approval PS-2.a and PS-2.b.

Commissioner Rheaume asked about whether Mr. Iglesias is accepting of staff's recommendation to reduce the second-floor wall plate height to eight feet. Mr. Iglesias and Mr. Rama advised that they were unaware of this staff recommendation. Mr. Rama also stated that a minimum plate height of eight feet and six inches is needed to accommodate a more elaborate entrance to the ADU. Associate Planner Hom explained the reason for staff's recommendation of an eight-foot second-floor wall plate height.

Commissioner Rheaume asked which element the applicant desired more: a roof pitch ratio of 4":12" or a second-floor wall plate height of eight feet and six inches. Mr. Rama answered that he prefers the latter.

When prompted by Commissioner Harrison, Associate Planner Hom confirmed that the current Single Family Home Design Techniques were enacted in 2003. Commissioner Harrison asked when the residential projects with a roof pitch ratio of 4":12", which were depicted in Mr. Iglesias' presentation, were approved. Mr. Iglesias stated that they were approved in either 2010 or in the years that followed. Assistant Director Andrew Miner added that, upon review of the proposed project's neighborhood, a taller two-story residential building is not common. Therefore, staff is recommending certain design techniques, such as lowering the second-floor wall plate height to eight feet, to maintain the proposed project's design consistency with the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Howe confirmed with Associate Planner Hom that the noticing requirement is 300 feet from the proposed project, the proposed project was noticed ten days prior to the hearing, and staff did not receive any public comments on the proposed project once it was noticed.

Commissioner Rheaume confirmed with Associate Planner Hom that staff is recommending a uniform roof pitch ratio throughout the proposed project. This means that a uniform roof pitch ratio of either 2.5":12" or 4":12" will be permitted.

Commissioner Rheaume confirmed with Mr. Iglesias that he is willing to reroof his entire house to accommodate a uniform roof pitch ratio of 4":12" if that ratio is approved by the Planning Commission.

Chair Howard closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Howe moved and Commissioner Harrison seconded the motion to approve Alternative 2 – Approve the Design Review and Variance with modified Recommended Conditions of Approval in Attachment 4.

The modified Recommended Conditions of Approval are as follows:

- 1.) Modify Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.b to read as follows: “The front porch columns shall be painted to match the color of the horizontal siding to provide visual interest and identifiable front entry.”
- 2.) Modify Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.c to read as follows: “The roof form shall utilize a 4:12 pitch roof on the new and existing roof.”
- 3.) Note that Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.d must be added and should read as follows: “Second floor wall plate shall be limited to 8 feet 6 inches.”
- 4.) Note that Recommended Condition of Approval PS-2.e must be added and should read as follows: “Incorporate wrapped porch and balcony element with contemporary open iron horizontal railings as depicted in Alternative Concept 1 in Applicant’s Project Description Letter and as presented to Planning Commission with no changes to the roof eaves projections above the wrapped porch and balcony.”

Commissioner Howe stated that, in his opinion, the applicant’s design requests are reasonable, the ADU adds housing to the area and is permissible by state law, and the proposed project blends in with the other homes in the neighborhood (as exhibited by examples presented by Mr. Iglesias). He added that since no public comments were received for the proposed project during the noticing period, the proposed project must be acceptable to the neighborhood. Commissioner Howe confirmed that he can make the findings and requested that the other Commissioners approve the proposed project.

Commissioner Harrison revealed that, in her opinion, the design technique that reduces the proposed project’s massing the most is the broader porch with the see-through horizontal railing. She spoke in favor of an ADU that requires little maintenance in the future, so she supports a roof pitch ratio of 4”:12” that allows usage of a variety of materials choices and painting the front porch columns to

match the horizontal siding. She prefers a second-floor wall plate height of eight feet and six inches to accommodate a secondary roof over the porch. Lastly, Commissioner Harrison advised that she can make the findings that the proposed project is within the City's design criteria and the state's ADU criteria.

Associate Planner Hom received clarification from the Commissioners that the motion is in favor of Alternative Concept 1 in the staff presentation which features an open railing.

Commissioner Rheume voiced his support of the motion and mentioned that he hopes his fellow Commissioners will support it as well. He also commended the applicant for his passion for the proposed project, noted the proposed project's quality design, and thanked staff for recommended changes to the proposed project as they created a better design.

Vice Chair Pyne confirmed with staff that Alternative Concept 1 does not require any additional variances than the one previously requested in the staff report. He then spoke in overall agreement with the motion and echoed comments made by the Commissioners who spoke before him.

Chair Howard stated his support of the motion and noted that the proposed project's design is in harmony with the surrounding homes.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Chair Howard
Vice Chair Pyne
Commissioner Harrison
Commissioner Howe
Commissioner Rheume

No: 0

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Weiss

This decision is final unless appealed or called up for review by the City Council by 5:00 PM on Tuesday, October 26, 2021.

STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES

INFORMATION ONLY REPORTS/ITEMS

4. [21-0962](#) Planning Commission Proposed Study Issues, Calendar Year: 2022
(Information Only)

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

None.

-Staff Comments

Assistant Director Miner announced that on October 6, 2021, the City Council held a meeting with the Santa Clara Valley Water District Board of Directors to discuss the value of water in light of the current drought we are experiencing. He directed the Commissioners' to a presentation and handout that is available on the City's website and assured that action is being taken to assist with water conservation (i.e., potential revision of the City's Landscape Ordinance, low-flow fixtures enforced by the City's Reach Codes, and seeking opportunities for net zero water usage in Moffett Park).

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Howard adjourned the meeting at 8:23 PM.