Hearing Date: April 8, 2013
File Number: 2013-7119


Motion 2013-7119 - Design Review for a first and second-story addition of 1,744 square feet, resulting in a 3,788 square foot home and 57.9% floor area ratio.

REPORT IN BRIEF:

Existing Site Conditions

Surrounding Land Uses

North Single-Family Residential
South Single-Family Residential
East Single-Family Residential
West Single-Family Residential

Issues Floor area ratio and architecture

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

Staff Recommendation Approve with conditions
VICINITY MAP

2013-7119
792 Henderson Ave. (APN: 213-13-006)
Design Review
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-O</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>R-O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Size (s.f.)</strong></td>
<td>6,538</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Floor Area (s.f.)</strong></td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>3,788</td>
<td>No max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Coverage (%)</strong></td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>40% max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</strong></td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>45% threshold (Threshold for Planning Commission Review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Height (ft.)</strong></td>
<td>15'-6&quot;</td>
<td>25'-3&quot;</td>
<td>30’ max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Stories</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 max.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Setbacks (First/Second Facing Property)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1st Floor</th>
<th>2nd Floor</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front:</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>25’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily side:</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>9’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>12’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Side:</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>5’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>7’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear:</td>
<td>34’</td>
<td>25’</td>
<td>20’ min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23’</td>
<td>20’ min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Spaces</th>
<th>Covered Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Starred items indicate deviations from Sunnyvale Municipal Code requirements.

**BACKGROUND:**

The existing single-story home was constructed in 1966 and is approximately 2,044 square feet in size and 31.2% floor area ratio (FAR). There are no significant planning applications related to the subject site.
DISCUSSION:

Requested Permit(s)

The applicant is requesting approval of a Design Review for a first and second-story addition of 1,744 square feet, resulting in a 3,788 square foot home and 57.9% floor area ratio. The proposed project includes a 256 square foot front addition to the first floor and 1,488 square foot addition to the second floor.

- Design Review

The Design Review is required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission since the Floor Area Ratio exceeds 45%. The Planning Commission may take into account the proposed architecture, existing neighborhood and adopted Single-Family Design Techniques. The analysis below provides information for the Planning Commission's consideration.

DESIGN REVIEW:

Architecture

The existing neighborhood is comprised of one and two-story homes, which are primarily ranch-style with simple rectilinear forms. Some of the more recently-approved homes in the neighborhood, such as the single-family homes currently under construction at the former Corn Palace site (Toll Brothers), are more contemporary in design.

Additional floor area is proposed along the front of the home on the first floor. An existing front porch will be enclosed and modified as living area. The existing shed roof over the living area will be modified into a gable roof. In addition, horizontal wood will be added as a secondary wall material from the floor to roofline with windows on both sides. No changes are proposed to the existing two-car garage.

The second floor will be generally centered over the first floor, with increased setbacks on all sides except the rear. A modest balcony is proposed along the rear elevation at a rear setback of 23 feet. All new colors, materials, and roof pitches will match the existing.

Proposed windows on the second floor range in size and shape from smaller high sill to rectangular on the front and rear elevations. Vertical windows are proposed along the right side, which extend towards the roofline in order to provide lighting to the master bedroom with a vaulted ceiling. No windows are proposed along the left side, which faces an existing two-story home. In staff's opinion, the second floor windows seem unbalanced, disproportional, and inconsistent with the other windows on nearby homes. In addition, the windows are flat against the wall and lack dimension. Staff recommends that the applicant continue to work with staff to revise the design of the second floor windows with the following direction (Attachment B):
• Windows shall be balanced and proportional along each wall elevation,
• Consider adding high sill windows along the left side, while also respecting the privacy of the adjacent neighbors,
• Windows shall be dimensional, and may include details such as wood trim, shutters, or be recessed at a minimum of one inch.

**Floor Area Ratio**

A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) greater than 45% requires review by the Planning Commission. The neighborhood contains a mix of one and two-story homes, with FARs that range significantly between approximately 25% and 61%. The applicant submitted a letter highlighting some of these homes with higher FARs (Attachment D). The most recent Design Review considered at a public hearing in 2008 was for a home at 1035 Daisy Court, located about four blocks away. The original project considered by the Planning Commission was for 62% FAR. Planning Commission approved the project with a reduced FAR of 52% because they found the home to be out of scale for the neighborhood and immediate cul-de-sac. The property owners appealed the project to City Council, who then approved a revised project with a 57% FAR.

Some of the other homes on the list include several subdivisions, such as the 51 homes being built by Toll Brothers at Timberpine with FARs up to 58% (approved in 2011) and a four-lot subdivision at the northwest corner of Henderson and Lupine with FARs up to 54% (approved in 2007). The largest home found in the neighborhood is at 1060 Lily Avenue with an FAR of 61% (approved in 1989). These homes are all within a two-block radius from the subject property.

The proposed FAR of 57.9% 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.

**Privacy**

The proposed setbacks on the second floor exceed the minimum setbacks required. The most impacted home is a two-story home along the left side; however the proposed addition will be 12 feet away from the property line. Windows on the second floor are also minimal. To further reduce privacy impacts, staff recommends that windows on the second floor along the left side be high sill if not needed for egress (Attachment B).
Solar Access
The applicant submitted a solar access and shadow analysis. According to the analysis, the proposed second story will not result in any shade impacts.

Applicable Design Guidelines and Policy Documents
As conditioned, the proposed home is consistent with the adopted Single-Family Design Techniques since the proposed design generally maintains the existing form and the streetscape character of the existing neighborhood. Staff has included findings for the Single-Family Design Techniques in Attachment A.

Development Standards
The proposed project complies with the applicable Development Standards as set forth in the Sunnyvale Municipal Code, such as lot coverage, parking, height and setbacks.

Environmental Review
A Class 1 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from California Environmental Quality Act provisions and City Guidelines. Class 1 Categorical Exemptions include minor modifications and additions to existing structures.

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

PUBLIC CONTACT
Staff has not received any comments at the time the staff report was prepared.

<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</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</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>• 46 notices mailed to property owners and residents adjacent to the project site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

Findings and General Plan Goals: Staff was able to make the required Findings based on the justifications for the Design Review and the Recommended Conditions of Approval (Attachment B). Recommended Findings and General Plan Goals are located in Attachment A.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B.
2. Approve the Design Review with modified conditions.
3. Deny the Design Review and provide direction to staff and the applicant where changes should be made.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend Alternative 1 to the Planning Commission: Approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B.

Prepared by:
Noren Caliva-Lepe
Project Planner

Reviewed by:
Gerri Caruso
Principal Planner

Attachments:

A. Recommended Findings
B. Recommended Conditions of Approval
C. Site and Architectural Plans
D. Letter from the Applicant
RECOMMENDED FINDINGS

Design Review

The proposed project is desirable in that the project's design and architecture conforms with the policies and principles of the Single Family Home Design Techniques.

<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 addition will maintain the existing neighborhood pattern and will retain the existing modest entry.</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.</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, window placement, entry features and overall massing.</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.</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6 Use high quality materials and craftsmanship</td>
<td>As conditioned by staff, architectural details and the window design on the second floor will enhance the overall appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7 Preserve mature landscaping</td>
<td>No protected trees will be removed as part of this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS
APRIL, 2013

Planning Application 2013-7119
792 Henderson Avenue
Design Review for a first and second-story addition of 1,744 square feet, resulting in a 3,788 square foot home and 57.9% floor area ratio.

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 with 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]

**PS: THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS SHALL BE MET PRIOR TO SUBMITTAL OF BUILDING PERMIT, AND/OR GRADING PERMIT.**

**PS-1. REQUIRED REVISIONS TO PROJECT PLANS:**
The applicant shall continue to work with staff to revise the design of the second floor windows with the following direction:

a. Windows shall be balanced and proportional along each wall elevation,

b. Consider adding high sill windows along the left side, while respecting the privacy of the adjacent neighbors,

c. If windows are added along the left side, the windows shall be high sill (bottom sill at least 5 feet from the floor) if not needed for egress,

d. Windows shall be dimensional, and may include details such as wood trim, shutters, or be recessed at a minimum of one inch. [COA] [PLANNING]

**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. 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-3. 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]

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:
No protected trees shall be removed as part of this permit. [SDR] [PLANNING]
FAR Justification for Gibb Residence
792 Henderson Avenue
Sunnyvale

K. Gibb 3/4/13
Summary

• The proposed plan for the Gibb residence provides a FAR of 58%*

• Many two-story homes in the neighborhood have a similar FAR

• A FAR of 58% is consistent with the new homes currently being built by Toll Brothers, just blocks away, where the FAR is 59% for 51 new homes
Area map - comparable houses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>House (Zillow)</th>
<th>Garage * (est.)</th>
<th>Lot (Zillow)</th>
<th>FAR (%)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7 (213-13)</td>
<td>784 Henderson Ave</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>41  Smaller FAR but similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/ 2.5 bath</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6210</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>appearance from street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 (213-13)</td>
<td>1053 Lily</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6784</td>
<td>43  Note large lot size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/ 2 bath</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6818</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Appears much larger from street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 (213-13)</td>
<td>760 Henderson Ave</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>47  Top heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Toll Brothers homes (213-12)</td>
<td>Timberpine (51 homes)</td>
<td>3095</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>59  Range 3085-3105 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 bed/2.5 bath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAR 58.8-59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2 (213-15)</td>
<td>1035 Daisy Court</td>
<td>3076</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>5952</td>
<td>59  Schweitzer/Yamada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 bed/ 3.5 bath</td>
<td>3076</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6099</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>144 (213-39)</td>
<td>817 Henderson Ave</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>53  May house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/ 3 bath</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6283</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>143 (213-39)</td>
<td>821 Henderson Ave</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/ 3 bath</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6199</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>142 (213-39)</td>
<td>1051 Lupine</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>6098</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/ 3 bath</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5942</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>56 (213-28)</td>
<td>818 Henderson Ave</td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6039</td>
<td>57  2008 57.9 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 bed/ 3.5 bath</td>
<td>2985</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6041</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7 (213-28)</td>
<td>1060 Lily Ave</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>5662</td>
<td>65  2905 6101 1817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/ 4 bath</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6043</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Our proposed home</td>
<td>792 Henderson Ave</td>
<td>3344</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6592</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 bed/3.5 bath</td>
<td>3344</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>6538</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>57.9% FAR, 3788 sq ft with garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area and FAR comparisons
A. Immediate neighbors on Henderson.

B. Immediate neighbors on Lily.
C. House 3 doors down on Henderson. Although the FAR is lower, this house looks larger and more top heavy.
D. Toll Brothers Homes – 59% FAR
E. 1035 Daisy Court – 59% FAR
Three homes one block away, 53, 54 and 54% FAR.

H. 1051 Lupine Drive

G. 821 Henderson Ave - corner house 54% FAR

F. 817 Henderson Ave
818 Henderson Ave – 57% FAR

1060 Lily Ave – 61-65% FAR
Our plan, demonstrating comparability to neighboring houses
Conclusions

• Ample evidence of homes in immediate neighborhood of 53-65% FAR
• 51 new homes just blocks away are 59% FAR
• We are in compliance with all other requirements and setbacks
• Our design includes additional setbacks and other features to minimize the appearance of the size of the house. It is consistent with features in the neighborhood and especially the neighboring houses
• All of this evidence justifies the 58% FAR in our plans