SUBJECT: 2013-7319 - Discussion and possible action on an appeal by the adjacent neighbor of a decision of the Planning Commission approving a Design Review application for an addition to the first story and a new second story on a single-family home resulting in 2,768 square feet and 49.7% floor area ratio (FAR) located at 663 Toyon Avenue in an R-0 Zoning District (APN: 213-10-031).

REPORT IN BRIEF:

Applicant/Owner: Bo Design/Jagdeep & Besaint Sahni

Existing Site Conditions: Single-family residence

Surrounding Land Uses:
- North: Single-family residence
- South: Single-family residence
- East: Single-family residence
- West: Single-family residence

Issues: Floor Area Ratio

Environmental Status: A Class 1 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from California Environmental Quality Act provisions and City Guidelines.

Planning Commission Action: Approved the Design Review with recommended conditions.

Staff Recommendation: Deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Planning Commission approving the Design Review.
**Project Description:**
The applicant is proposing to add to the first story and to add a new second story to an existing single-story home resulting in a total of 2,768 square feet and 49.7% Floor Area Ratio (FAR). A Design Review is required for construction of a new or remodeled single-family home to evaluate compliance with development standards and with the Single Family Home Design Techniques. Planning Commission review is required for Design Review applications exceeding 45% FAR or 3,600 square feet.

**BACKGROUND:**
This proposal was considered by the Planning Commission at a public hearing on July 8, 2013, with a staff recommendation of approval. An email was received opposing the development just prior to the hearing. The Planning Commission approved the project by a 7 to 0 vote. The adjacent neighbor who wrote the original opposing email filed an appeal on July 22, 2013.

**Previous Actions on the Site**
The existing single-story home was constructed in 1963. There are no previous planning permit records for this site.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Development Standards**
The proposed project complies with all applicable development regulations as set forth in the Sunnyvale Municipal Code.

**Applicable Design Guidelines and Policy Documents**
The Single Family Home Design Techniques provide detailed guidelines for the design of new homes and additions in single-family residential neighborhoods. Staff has found that the house, as proposed, meets all design techniques and would fit into other Sunnyvale neighborhoods where two-story homes are more present (See Attachment A).

**Privacy**
The project includes an approximately 72 square foot second-floor balcony element located on the rear elevation behind the master bedroom. The balcony is approximately 17’-6” away from the right side property line and 25’ away from the rear property line. There will also be two windows located on the right side of the second story and two windows in the front. Based on setbacks and location, the proposed balcony and windows are not expected to have privacy impacts on adjacent neighbors.

**Floor Area Ratio**
A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) greater than 45% is a code threshold that requires a Design Review to be conducted by the Planning Commission.

The surrounding neighborhood is composed of mainly single-story homes with FARs generally around 30%. There is a multi-unit structure located at 675
Vinemaple Avenue, approximately 190 feet away from the project, with an FAR of approximately 45%. There are also several homes built at 36% FAR within a quarter-mile radius from the project site (Attachment F). The applicants request for 49.7% FAR is comparable with other homes found in the neighborhood and is consistent with established precedent in the neighborhood. The proposed design uses similar architectural forms, varied setbacks and increased second floor setbacks that help to reduce the bulk and mass of the home. The proposed plate heights on both floors are 8 feet, which also help to reduce visual massing.

**Second Floor Area**

Design Technique 3.4.A states: “The area of the second floor should not exceed the common standard of the neighborhood. For new second stories in predominantly one-story neighborhoods, the second floor area should not exceed 35% of the first floor area (including garage area).” The Design Techniques note that for the purposes of assessing neighborhood character and scale, the “neighborhood” is defined as both block faces within the same and immediately adjacent blocks.

The neighborhood for this site is composed of single-story homes with the exception of four two-story homes, within 300 feet of the project site, built prior to the adoption of the Design Techniques. The proposed project includes a smaller second floor area of 686 square feet, which is approximately 33% of the 2,082 square-foot first floor area. As a result, staff finds the project compliant with the Design Techniques related to second floor area.

**Environmental Review**

A Class 1 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from California Environmental Quality Act provisions and City Guidelines in that the project is an addition to an existing single family home in an existing residential neighborhood and only minor modifications and additions to the existing structure will occur.

**Appellant’s Appeal:** On July 22, 2013 a neighbor submitted an appeal request and raised the following issues that are related to the Design Review (Attachment I, Appeal Letter):

- They feel the distance between their house and the proposed development is too close.
- Their privacy will be affected by the windows on the second story facing their property and the proposed balcony in the rear.

The appellant has also discussed some other issues in the appeal letter which staff considers irrelevant to the Design Review.
**Staff's Discussion on the Appeal:** Staff supports the Planning Commission decision approving the Design Review. The Single Family Design Techniques state that second floor additions should be set in on the front, sides and rear. This has been accomplished by the proposed design as it meets current R-0 Zoning District requirements (Attachment D, Project Data Table). Privacy issues were analyzed in relation to the proposed rear balcony on the second story. Staff finds that privacy to the appellant’s property (to the right of the applicant’s house) would not be significantly impacted by the second story balcony. This is due to the location of the rear balcony as it is situated towards the left side of the second story and in the middle of the entire parcel. The ability to view the appellant’s house would be difficult to accomplish while standing on the balcony. There is the potential to see into a portion of the appellant’s rear yard, however, that is the nature with any two-story development whether it is through a window or standing on a balcony. Staff does not consider the view excessive.

Although there are two windows facing the appellant’s property staff finds that these would not significantly impact the appellant’s privacy. One window is located within the master bathroom. The second window is located in the stairwell, an area which is not typically used for idling. Since the appeal, the applicant has worked with staff to identify changes to the proposed design to better address the privacy concerns expressed by the appellant. The applicant proposes to use a translucent window in the bathroom and to increase the sill height of the hallway window in order to reduce its size. These windows would still use a similar form as the rest of the house and neighborhood thereby meeting the requirements of the Single Family Design Techniques.

The neighbor’s concerns regarding the distance between the two buildings are addressed through the setback requirements. The appellant stated in their appeal that the newly built homes in the previous Corn Palace location are approximately 30 feet away from each other which is a better distance than what is proposed with her neighbor. After speaking with the project planner and reviewing the plans for the project located on the land formerly part of the Corn Palace site, it can be determined that the newly built homes follow the R-0 Zoning District setback requirements in the same respect as the proposed plans. The houses in the Corn Palace location use nearly minimum R-0 setbacks and are not 30 feet apart side-by-side. On average they are between 12 feet to 16 feet apart from each other.
FISCAL IMPACT

No fiscal impacts other than normal fees and taxes are expected.

PUBLIC CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice of Public Hearing</th>
<th>Staff Report</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Published in the Sun newspaper (original PC hearing)</td>
<td>- Posted on the City of Sunnyvale's Web site</td>
<td>- Posted on the City's official notice bulletin board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Posted on the site (both hearings)</td>
<td>- Provided at the Reference Section of the City of Sunnyvale's Public Library</td>
<td>- Posted on the City of Sunnyvale's Web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 60 notices mailed to property owners and residents adjacent to the project site (both hearings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of the date of staff report preparation, staff has not received any letters or public comments regarding this project other than the appellant’s (Attachment H).

CONCLUSION

Staff is recommending that the City Council uphold the Planning Commission approval of the Design Review because the Findings (Attachment A) were made.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Deny the appeal and uphold the decision of the Planning Commission to approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B.
2. Grant the appeal and approve the Design Review with modified conditions.
3. Grant the appeal and deny the Design Review.
RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1 to deny the Appeal and Uphold the decision of the Planning Commission to approve the Design Review.

Reviewed by:

Hanson Hom, Director, Community Development
Prepared by: Elise Lieberman, Assistant Planner
Reviewed by: Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer

Approved by:

Gary M. Luebbers

Attachments:
A. Recommended Findings
B. Recommended Conditions of Approval
C. Vicinity Map
D. Project Data Table
E. Site and Architectural Plans
F. Information on Two-Story Homes in Surrounding Area
G. Approved Minutes of Planning Commission Hearing on July 8, 2013
H. Letter from the Appellant from the Planning Commission Hearing on July 8, 2013
I. Appeal Request, submitted July 22, 2013
J. Information from the Applicant, submitted August 4, 2013
RECOMMENDED FINDING

Design Review

Finding: The proposed project is desirable in that the project’s design and architecture conforms to the policies and principles of the Single Family Home Design Techniques. [Finding not made]

Staff is not able to make this finding as indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Design Principle</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Reinforce prevailing neighborhood home orientation and entry patterns</td>
<td>The proposed addition’s entry would continue to face the street similar to the pattern in the existing neighborhood. A more formal entry feature would be introduced which is compliant with the Design Technique Guidelines for height and formal entry feature. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Respect the scale, bulk and character of homes in the adjacent neighborhood.</td>
<td>The addition has been designed to reduce the apparent scale and bulk through increased setbacks and modest plate heights. The proposed home is within the allowable height of 30 feet. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 Design homes to respect their immediate neighbors</td>
<td>The proposed structure has been designed to respect the scale of the adjacent homes through the treatment of the second floor, entry features and overall massing. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4 Minimize the visual impacts of parking.</td>
<td>The project does not propose any modifications to the layout of the parking for the site. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5 Respect the predominant materials and character of front yard landscaping.</td>
<td>The exterior materials are similar to those found in the neighborhood and applied in a manner consistent with the architecture. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6 Use high quality materials and craftsmanship</td>
<td>The proposed design includes high quality stucco and stone wall materials. These materials are consistent with the Design Techniques and the surrounding neighborhood. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7 Preserve mature landscaping</td>
<td>No protected trees will be removed as part of this project. <strong>Finding Met</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS
AUGUST 27, 2013

Planning Application 2013-7319
663 Toyon Avenue
Design Review for a first and second-story addition resulting in 2,768 square feet and 49.7% Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

The following Conditions of Approval [COA] and Standard Development Requirements [SDR] apply to the project referenced above. The COAs are specific conditions applicable to the proposed project. The SDRs are items which are codified or adopted by resolution and have been included for ease of reference, they may not be appealed or changed. The COAs and SDRs are grouped under specific headings that relate to the timing of required compliance. Additional language within a condition may further define the timing of required compliance. Applicable mitigation measures are noted with “Mitigation Measure” and placed in the applicable phase of the project.

In addition to complying with all applicable City, County, State and Federal Statutes, Codes, Ordinances, Resolutions and Regulations, Permittee expressly accepts and agrees to comply with the following Conditions of Approval and Standard Development Requirements of this Permit:

GC: THE FOLLOWING GENERAL CONDITIONS AND STANDARD DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS SHALL APPLY TO THE APPROVED PROJECT.

GC-1. CONFORMANCE WITH APPROVED PLANNING APPLICATION:
All building permit drawings and subsequent construction and operation shall substantially conform to the approved planning application, including: drawings/plans, materials samples, building colors, and other items submitted as part of the approved application. Any proposed amendments to the approved plans or Conditions of Approval are subject to review and approval by the City. The Director of Community Development shall determine whether revisions are considered major or minor. Minor changes are subject to review and approval by the Director of Community Development. Major changes are subject to review at a public hearing. [COA] [PLANNING]

GC-2. PERMIT EXPIRATION:
The permit shall be null and void two years from the date of approval by the final review authority at a public hearing if the approval is not exercised, unless a written request for an extension is received prior
to expiration date and is approved by the Director of Community Development. [SDR] [PLANNING]

GC-3. TITLE 25:
Provisions of Title 25 of the California Administrative Code shall be satisfied with dependence on mechanical ventilation. [SDR] [BUILDING]

BP: THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE ADDRESSED ON THE CONSTRUCTION PLANS SUBMITTED FOR ANY DEMOLITION PERMIT, BUILDING PERMIT, GRADING PERMIT, AND/OR ENCROACHMENT PERMIT AND SHALL BE MET PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF SAID PERMIT(S).

BP-1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
Final plans shall include all Conditions of Approval included as part of the approved application starting on sheet 2 of the plans. [COA] [PLANNING]

BP-2. RESPONSE TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
A written response indicating how each condition has or will be addressed shall accompany the building permit set of plans. [COA] [PLANNING]

BP-3. BLUEPRINT FOR A CLEAN BAY:
The building permit plans shall include a “Blueprint for a Clean Bay” on one full sized sheet of the plans. [SDR] [PLANNING]

BP-4. TREE PROTECTION PLAN:
Prior to issuance of a Demolition Permit, a Grading Permit or a Building Permit, whichever occurs first, obtain approval of a tree protection plan from the Director of Community Development. Two copies are required to be submitted for review. The tree protection plan shall include measures noted in Title 19 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code and at a minimum:

a) An inventory shall be taken of all existing trees on the plan including the valuation of all ‘protected trees’ by a certified arborist, using the latest version of the “Guide for Plant Appraisal” published by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).

b) All existing (non-orchard) trees on the plans, showing size and varieties, and clearly specify which are to be retained.

c) Provide fencing around the drip line of the trees that are to be saved and ensure that no construction debris or equipment is
stored within the fenced area during the course of demolition and construction.

d) The tree protection plan shall be installed prior to issuance of any Building or Grading Permits, subject to the on-site inspection and approval by the City Arborist and shall be maintained in place during the duration of construction and shall be added to any subsequent building permit plans. [COA] [PLANNING/CITY ARBORIST]

BP-5. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES:
The project shall comply with the following source control measures as outlined in the BMP Guidance Manual and SMC 12.60.220. Best management practices shall be identified on the building permit set of plans and shall be subject to review and approval by the Director of Public Works:

a) Storm drain stenciling. The stencil is available from the City's Environmental Division Public Outreach Program, which may be reached by calling (408) 730-7738.

b) Landscaping that minimizes irrigation and runoff, promotes surface infiltration where possible, minimizes the use of pesticides and fertilizers, and incorporates appropriate sustainable landscaping practices and programs such as Bay-Friendly Landscaping.

c) Appropriate covers, drains, and storage precautions for outdoor material storage areas, loading docks, repair/maintenance bays, and fueling areas.

d) Covered trash, food waste, and compactor enclosures.

e) Plumbing of the following discharges to the sanitary sewer, subject to the local sanitary sewer agency’s authority and standards:
   i) Discharges from indoor floor mat/equipment/hood filter wash racks or covered outdoor wash racks for restaurants.
   ii) Dumpster drips from covered trash and food compactor enclosures.
   iii) Discharges from outdoor covered wash areas for vehicles, equipment, and accessories.
   iv) Swimming pool water, spa/hot tub, water feature and fountain discharges if discharge to onsite vegetated areas is not a feasible option.
   v) Fire sprinkler test water, if discharge to onsite vegetated areas is not a feasible option. [SDR] [PLANNING]
BP-6. WINDOWS:
The window in the master bathroom shall use a translucent glass to reduce the ability to see out, but still maintain use of the window. The window located in the hallway will be reduced in size by increasing the height of the window sill.

DC: THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE COMPLIED WITH AT ALL TIMES DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE PROJECT.

DC-1. BLUEPRINT FOR A CLEAN BAY:
The project shall be in compliance with stormwater best management practices for general construction activity until the project is completed and either final occupancy has been granted. [SDR] [PLANNING]

DC-2. TREE PROTECTION:
All tree protection shall be maintained, as indicated in the tree protection plan, until construction has been completed and the installation of landscaping has begun. [COA] [PLANNING]
# PROJECT DATA TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
<th>REQUIRED/PERMITTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Plan</strong></td>
<td>Residential Low Density</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Residential Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning District</strong></td>
<td>R-0</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>R-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Size (s.f.)</strong></td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Floor Area (s.f.)</strong></td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,768</td>
<td>No max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Coverage (%)</strong></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>40% max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>45% threshold (Threshold for Planning Commission Review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height (ft.)</strong></td>
<td>15'-9&quot;</td>
<td>23'-10&quot;</td>
<td>max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Stories</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks (First/Second Facing Property)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (ft.)</td>
<td>20'-5&quot;</td>
<td>20'-5&quot; / 40'-2&quot;</td>
<td>20’ min./25’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Side (ft.)</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'-6&quot; / 24’</td>
<td>4’ / 7’ per side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Side (ft.)</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>5'-6&quot; / 7'-9&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Sides</td>
<td>11’</td>
<td>11’ / 31'-9”</td>
<td>11’ / 17’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (ft.)</td>
<td>25'-9”</td>
<td>25'-9” / 27'-9”</td>
<td>20’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>4 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>2 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

★ Starred items indicate deviations from Sunnyvale Municipal Code requirements.
EXISTING SITE PLAN

PROPOSED SITE PLAN

LEGEND:
- New 2nd Floor
- New Addition
- Property Line
- Building Envelope Limit

DRAWING INDEX:
A1 Existing Sheet No. & Title Page
A2 Existing Floor Plan & Elevations
A3 Proposed Floor Plan
A4 Proposed Elevations
A5 Cross-Section
A6 Elevations

SCOPE OF WORK:
1. Addition at rear left side of the house to have 6 new EAVC, heating, and air conditioning units.
2. Addition at rear to have a new master bedroom, master bath, and hobby area.
3. Remodeling of existing kitchen to have a new pharmacy, laundry, and wine cellar.

PROJECT DATA:
- Project Location: 800 N. Main Ave.
- Location: Madera, CA
- Size: 25,000 sf
- Number of Stories: 2
- Number of Floors: 2
- Number of Bedrooms: 4
- Number of Bathrooms: 3
- Code Editions:
  - California Building: 2010 Edition
  - California Mechanical: 2010 Edition
  - California Plumbing: 2010 Edition
  - California Electrical: 2010 Edition
  - California Energy: 2010 Edition

AREAS CALCULATION:
- Existing Lot Area: 16,750 sf
- Existing Building Area: 6,100 sf
- Covered Area: 2,700 sf
- Uncovered Area: 3,400 sf
- Total Covered Building Area: 9,500 sf
- Front Covered Porch: 12.50 ft
- Lot Area: 16,750 sf
- Floor Area Ratio: 0.45
- Coverage: 0.53

EXISTING SITE PLAN

PROPOSED SITE PLAN

ATTACHMENT E Page 1 of 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Land Area (County)</th>
<th>Building Sq.Ft. (County)</th>
<th>Garage Sq.Ft. (County)</th>
<th>FAR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>647 Torreya</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648 Torreya</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 Torreya</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660 Torreya</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687 Torreya</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688 Torreya</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635 Toyon</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636 Toyon</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>647 Toyon</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648 Toyon</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>659 Toyon</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660 Toyon</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664 Toyon</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668 Toyon</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684 Toyon</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691 Toyon</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692 Toyon</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elise Lieberman, Assistant Planner, gave the staff report.

Comm. Melton asked if the Conditions of Approval require that the existing colors match the redesign. Ms. Lieberman responded that the plans show they match, but she will add this requirement to the Conditions of Approval.

Comm. Kolchak and staff discussed the balcony with respect to existing or planned trees.

Chair Larsson opened the public hearing, and with no presenters or speakers, closed it.

Comm. Hendricks moved for Alternative 1, to approve the Design Review Permit with attached conditions. Comm. Melton seconded the motion.

Comm. Hendricks said he would have been willing to approve the project on the consent calendar and that the main issue in the email communication is privacy. He said that the placement of the balcony and the location of the windows on the side will not provide a direct view and that all setback requirements are met. He said he can make the findings in Attachment C.

Comm. Melton said he appreciated the concern in the email communication from a member of the public and expressed the view that the staff had done a good job in addressing those concerns. He said could make the findings.

Comm. Olevson said he will be supporting the motion and noted that the neighborhood is well-kept and that the project is consistent with design guidelines. He can make the findings.

Comm. Kolchak said he supports the motion and that his main concern was the balcony, but with the location of the balcony and the setbacks he does not feel privacy will be a major issue.

Vice Chair Dohadwala said she supports the motion and can make the findings.
Chair Larsson said he can make the findings and that the project is within design guidelines.

|---|

| APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than July 23, 2013. |
Attachment H
Hello Ms. Elise Lieberman,
I've received the proposal adding floor area/story on our next neighborhood. I've "refused" to agree on this proposal because we're the next neighborhood:
Our address is the next door and our "privacy" will be invaded.
Aside from the constructioning/bothering of our privacy while it will be constructed.
This man named Jagdeep Sahni is not cooperative and uncourteous to us eversince.
Their gardeners blows most of their leaves on our site.
And I can see he likes to pry on the people in the neighborhood especially on our property.
Please do not approve this proposal for the big disturbances of our privacy especially, if he will be on the top, he will have more chances to pry on my property and me myself/ourselves that includes my husband. I hope for your kind consideration...

Mrs. Mary Horton
659 Toyon Avenue
Sunnyvale CA 94086
(408)260-2863
Attachment I
July 15, 2013

City of Sunnyvale
456 W Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale CA 94086
Council Committee/Committee In-Charge

Re: Petition to Void and/or Modify Project Proposal File# 2013-7319/663 Toyon Avenue, Sunnyvale CA
As was proposed by Mr. Jagdeep Sahni, Owner of Said Property

Dear Sir/Madam:

We did not appear on the public hearing on July 8, 2013, because we’re naïve to this kind of arrangement or set-up aside from not feeling well ourselves. I thought an email will be enough. I’ve tried to email the Planning Commission in particular Ms. Elise Lieberman about my protests to this proposal, all she told me is that the Planning Commission read my email but they still approve this proposal to add another story to the applicant’s property next door Mr. Jagdeep Sahni. And I keep on emailing the Planning/Planning Commission but it seems like they’re ignoring my plea and keep on receiving replies “only” from Ms. Elise Lieberman in particular whom I think is the coordinator of this particular project/proposal. She did not really let me know what are my options “only” the very last part of the week, after I’ve been emailing the departments here and there. And according to Ms. Lieberman we still have the option to file a petition to the Council Committee if we pay the petition fee and submit a letter why we wanted to do this within 15 days of the first public notice and yet she says there’s no guarantee for our plea to be granted after all our troubles. Note that she only let me know this option on Thursday at 3:56pm the 11th, when I’ve been emailing them since Monday at about 7pm the 8th.

My husband and myself truly believe that this adding of a top structure to the property of Mr. Jagdeep Sahni will be an intrusion/invasion of our privacy. If you look closely at the drawings and exhibits, the structure is very much veered on our side and the large windows too and the veranda (porch) too at the back. And there’s only like ten feet apart between our properties.

I’ve been looking almost all over these nearby places that have two story houses and some of them don’t have windows at all, and some of them have small windows only on the very top, and also no verandas (porch). And the houses near the corn palace are like 30 feet away from each other. Unlike our properties here along Toyon Avenue that the houses are like only ten feet apart from each other. If the other neighbors are not really complaining it’s because they’re not really being the next door that will be affected by this second story structure proposal of Mr. Sahni. Our privacy will be greatly invaded/intruded during the construction and after the construction. There could be really an ulterior motive from Mr. Sahni in having the structure veered only on our side of the property. Personally speaking I am quite afraid of him and the prying, so I had the fences extended up to six feet tall between our properties and still seeking legal counsel’s opinions. Also there are “no” other second story houses along Toyon Avenue except the new Toyon Avenue where the Corn Palace was before. It will also probably devalue our property when it’s time to sell it because people don’t want to be near this kind of higher structure around or near them.

And also I’ve been seeing different faces, old and young people in the property of Mr. Sahni from time to time. I believe he will have some of his rooms and have some of his rooms being rented out to help him with his financial obligations. If he will bring in more people in this area, this area will become noisier, busier, crowder too. I am being disturbed from time to time of screaming children/people that I know are not the children of Mr. Sahni playing and running in his backyard.

In this connection, we are pleading you to void this project proposal of Mr. Jagdeep Sahni. Otherwise, have the structure added sidewise and not upwise, and/or away from our side of the house, at least ten feet away or more from the corner of his house, his house is like 40 feet long or more looking through Google’s satellite maps. Also, there should be no windows on our side of the property and no veranda (porch) too. We beg for your kind consideration. We’ve been here much much longer than Mr. Sahni was in his place. We thank you sir.

For:  
Mr. & Mrs. Roger/Mary Horton
659 Toyon Ave, Sunnyvale CA 94086

PS: I/we presume that Mr. Sahni had been planning this proposal for several months up to more than a year. And you have given us a piece of card which does not even have a proof of delivery. I receive it about one week before the public hearing date and kinda late for me/us to do our research on the matter, we were caught offguard that involves our precious privacy from our property. It’s kinda late for us to realize that he’s like targeting our territory by aiming his project right upon our property and noses. I think that you should have at least given us a month or more much better to research the matter properly and a proof of mail as well for humanitarian reasons sake. Justice and equality for all should be the motif of the City of Sunnyvale for all it’s residents.
Additional Notes:

There's a big electric transformer at the back yard that may blow up or emanates some kind of danger, adding more people to live here will be hazardous to neighboring people, prone to more hazards, more accidents, more traffic and a narrow escape or help to arrive to the 2nd story and within two properties (ten/eleven feet away).

There's a big historical pine tree right at the back of property 663 Toyon Avenue, Sunnyvale CA, does it mean that the owner had to tore down this historical tree to give way to his two story house proposal?

Had talked to the back adjacent neighbor of said disputed property, that neighbor (Mike) had written several complaint letters to the City about his objections to said project, but the City of Sunnyvale did not replied to his complaints. He thinks that the City only cares about adding to it's revenues generating from taxes, etc. He's been there for more than fifteen years. Also he had tried to collect some money to the dispute owner for his part of fences repair/expenses in the past but that dispute owner give him a lot of alibis and Mike ended up having to pay all the repair expenses. Had also talked to the next neighbor (Jonathan) and he also do not like this idea having two story houses beside his house. He says that he complained before about the two-story houses being built by the Corn Palace but to no avail to his complaints to the City. He's been there for more than ten years.

This property at start of Torreya (next street) had no windows, no porch on the side that faces the neighbor (Figure 2).
### TREES COVERING SIDE AND BACK FENCES FOR PRIVACY

#### ALL SETBACKS EXCEED REQUIREMENTS (per ATTACHMENT B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Required/Permitted</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'-5&quot;</td>
<td>EXISTING/EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>40'-2&quot;</td>
<td>EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Side</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>EXISTING/EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>24'</td>
<td>EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Side</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>5'-6&quot;</td>
<td>EXISTING/EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>7'-9&quot;</td>
<td>EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Sides</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>EXISTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>31'-9&quot;</td>
<td>EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>25'-9&quot;</td>
<td>EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>27'-9&quot;</td>
<td>EXCEEDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>