

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JULY 25, 2011

FILE #: 2011-7372
Location: 582 Carlisle Way (APN: 309-18-039)
Proposed Project: Design Review to allow the remodel of an existing one story home including the addition of a new second story resulting in a 2,982 square foot home and a 57% Floor Area Ratio.
Environmental Review: Categorically Exempt Class 1
Staff Contact: Shaunn Mendrin, 408-730-7429
smendrin@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us

Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Comm. Sulser disclosed that he and Comm. Kolchack met briefly with the applicant on their site visit. Comm. Sulser commented about architectural critiquing and discussed with staff the entry element of the project. Comm. Sulser clarified with staff that the proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is 57%.

Chair Hendricks asked staff about the location of the power line and whether it would be too close to the second-story addition. Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, explained that typically there is a powerline easement and the addition has to stay outside of the easement.

Chair Hendricks opened the public hearing.

Nandan Oza, applicant, commented about his family and what they are trying to achieve with the remodel. He discussed the proposed design, said they have included green construction, and discussed other homes in the neighborhood. He said they worked to design a home that is newer, more contemporary looking, yet not too large or imposing. He said they made modifications based on staff input and are hoping the Commission will approve the project.

Comm. Dohadwala asked the applicant about the front elevation and the windows expressing concern about cohesiveness. Mr. Oza's contractor, Rick Meyer, explained the use of the proposed windows and other design elements. Mr. Mendrin referred to condition PS-1.a which requires the first floor windows to be consistent.

Vice Chair Larsson asked Mr. Meyer about the second floor, the roof, and the massing related to the roof. Mr. Meyer said that the entire roof in the back will be covered with solar photovoltaic equipment and discussed how that affected the roof design.

Martin Landzaat, a neighbor and Sunnyvale resident, said he strongly disagrees with the Planning Division's findings that the proposed remodel conforms with the design principles. He said homes in the neighborhood are ranch style, and what is being proposed is unlike anything in the neighborhood. He discussed his concerns about the design, lot size, and the balcony.

Mr. Oza said that the adjacent neighbors support the project, and that he does not think the balcony will present noise issues. He said they would take other design concerns under advisement.

Chair Hendricks closed the public hearing.

Comm. Chang asked staff about privacy issues with staff saying that no neighbors expressed any concerns prior to the hearing.

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

Comm. Sulser said the FAR on this project is high; however there are two houses in the neighborhood with a similar FAR. He said he thinks the design is attractive, and tries to give some design leeway to applicants. He said he was able to make findings.

Comm. Travis said he agrees with Comm. Sulser and that after his site visit he was more comfortable with the FAR. He said when it comes to the style of a home that it is up to the applicant to decide. He said he thinks this is an attractive looking home.

Vice Chair Larsson said he would not be supporting the motion as he is concerned about the massing and roof compared to the neighborhood. He said he does not feel the proposed design is compatible with the other homes on the block.

Chair Hendricks said he would be supporting the motion as he can make the findings. He said he does not think this is inconsistent with the neighborhood. He said that 57% FAR seems high; however scaling it down would not change much visually.

ACTION: Comm. Sulser made a motion on 2011-7372 to approve the Design Review with the conditions in Attachment B. Comm. Travis seconded. Motion carried 6-1, with Vice Chair Larsson dissenting.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This action is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than August 9, 2011.