

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2010**

**2009-0752:** Design Review for a first floor addition of approximately 230 square feet and a new second floor of approximately 729 square feet for a total Floor Area Ratio of 47% for a site located at **395 Balsam Avenue**. (APN: 204-20-026) SM

**Shaunn Mendrin**, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He said this application meets the City development standards and staff recommends approval of the Design Review subject to the conditions in Attachment B.

**Comm. Hungerford** referred to the project data table on page 3 of the report and asked about the Gross Floor Area (GFA) ratio "Required/Permitted" column. Staff clarified that the column on the table should reflect that any GFA in excess of 2,340 square feet triggers the need for Planning Commission review and that more than 2,340 can be allowed.

**Comm. McKenna** said the proposed project is an Eichler home and asked why it is not subject to the Eichler Design Guidelines. Ms. Ryan said that the Eichler Design Guidelines designate certain Eichler neighborhoods where the integrity of the Eichler style is still in tact and these neighborhoods are subject to the guidelines. Ms. Ryan said about 1100 homes in the City are subject to the Eichler guidelines. She said the neighborhood that this home is in is not one of the designated Eichler neighborhoods and is not subject to the Eichler guidelines.

**Chair Chang opened the public hearing.**

**Ralph Saviano**, with Via Builders, Inc. representing the homeowners, discussed the project process and the applicant's goals. He said they worked with the City and came up with the proposed design which fits the City requirements and said he is available to answer questions.

**Arthur Schwartz**, a Sunnyvale resident, spoke in opposition of the project. He said that he did not see other two story houses in the neighborhood and that the majority of the houses are flat roofed. He said his concern is that the design of this house is not in character with the neighborhood and that it is unfortunate for this family as that they have not had room to expand.

**Bret Flesner**, a Sunnyvale resident, commented about the standards being applied to this house. He said he is okay with the second floor, but said the contemporary look is out of context for this neighborhood. He commented that he

does not think staff uses or applies the same standards the same way for different projects.

**Mr. Saviano** said the staff report indicates other two story homes in the neighborhood. He said to say the proposed house does not conform to other homes in the neighborhood would be accurate and that could be said about any other house in the neighborhood too. He said this is an eclectic neighborhood and they tried to include commonality with the homes in the neighborhood by including elements from some of the other homes in their design.

**Chair Chang closed the public hearing.**

**Comm. Rowe** discussed the substandard size lots in this neighborhood and that staff felt this was a reasonable request to provide additional living space.

**Comm. Sulser moved for Alternative 1 to approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B. Comm. Rowe seconded the motion.**

**Comm. Sulser** said the Commission is reviewing the design tonight due to the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) proposed being over 45%. He said the proposed project does not have too much bulk and mass and that the FAR is just barely over the threshold that triggers Planning Commission review.

**Comm. Rowe** said there are not a lot of two story houses in this area, however there are some. She said there are not a lot of Eichler design houses with flat roofs left in this area and a lot of the Eichlers have been changed in this neighborhood. She said she looked at the design for a long time and that she thinks this is a house that works on this substandard sized lot and gives them reasonable additional living space.

**ACTION: Comm. Sulser made a motion on 2009-0752 to approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B. Comm. Rowe seconded. Motion carried, 7-0.**

**APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to City Council no later than January 26, 2010.**