



DATE: October 18, 2017

AGENDA ITEM # 2

**TO:** Design Review Commission

**FROM:** Zachary Dahl, Planning Services Manager – Current Planning

**SUBJECT:** 16-SC-22 – 425 Harrington Court

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve design review application 16-SC-22 subject to the listed findings and conditions

---

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This is a design review application for a new two-story house with a basement. The project includes 2,368 square feet on the first story, 1,116 square feet on the second story and a 1,975 square-foot basement. This application was previously reviewed by the Design Review Commission on November 2, 2016. The following table summarizes the project's technical details:

<b>GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:</b>	Single-Family, Residential
<b>ZONING:</b>	R1-10
<b>PARCEL SIZE:</b>	9,965 square feet
<b>MATERIALS:</b>	Concrete tile roof, smooth finish stucco and Hardie board horizontal siding, stone veneer, vinyl windows, and wood trim details

	Existing	Proposed	Allowed/Required
<b>COVERAGE:</b>	2,360 square feet	2,677 square feet	2,990 square feet
<b>FLOOR AREA:</b>			
First floor	2,294 square feet	2,368 square feet	
Second floor	-	1,116 square feet	
Total	2,294 square feet	3,484 square feet	3,487 square feet
<b>SETBACKS:</b>			
Front	31.1 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Rear	23.4 feet	25.2 feet	25 feet
Right side (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> )	10.1 feet	14.5 feet/27.9 feet	10 feet/17.5 feet
Left side (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> )	12 feet	11.8 feet/20 feet	10 feet/17.5 feet
<b>HEIGHT:</b>	14.3 feet	26.2 feet	27 feet

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Neighborhood Context**

The subject property is located at the end of Harrington Court, which is a cul-de-sac street off of Campbell Avenue. The Harrington Court neighborhood is considered a Consistent Character Neighborhood as defined in the City's Residential Design Guidelines. The houses in this neighborhood are a primarily one-story houses that are lower in scale, utilize rustic exterior materials and have increased or stepped front yard setbacks with prominent two-car garages. The landscaping along Harrington Court is mature but varied and there is a distinct street tree pattern with mature zelkova trees lining the street at the back of curb.

### **Prior Consideration**

On November 2, 2016, the Design Review Commission held a public meeting to consider the proposed new two-story house. Two neighbors provided public comments and raised concerns about the project. Two letters were also submitted that raised concerns about the project (Attachment D). Following public comments and commissioner discussion, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the application with the following direction:

1. Reduce the bulk and mass of the new house;
2. Improve rear elevations to reduce privacy impacts;
3. Improve the driveway layout and consider adding additional on-site parking;
4. Reach out to the neighbors to better understand their concerns; and
5. Consider improving the 3D rendering and providing a rear elevation rendering.

The Commission's meeting minutes and agenda report are attached for reference (Attachments B and C).

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Design Changes**

In response to the direction provided by the Design Review Commission, the applicant made a variety of design changes to the proposed two-story house. The footprint of the second story has been reduced and reoriented, which results in a reduction in the structure's bulk and mass as viewed from the street and adjacent properties. The large rear facing windows and balcony off of the master bedroom have been eliminated and the layout of the driveway has been improved to allow for two cars to park on-site in front of the garage. The 3D renderings have been updated, including a view from the rear, and the applicant has conducted additional outreach to the adjacent neighbors. A cover letter from the applicant that outlines the changes, along with updated 3D renderings and a materials board, are included in Attachment A.

Overall, the architectural design of the house is similar to the previous design, but the layout of the house and its placement on the property has been completely reworked to simplify the massing of the second story, create a stronger alignment with the left side property line and reduce direct views from the second story toward the rear properties to the north.

To better understand the design revisions and compare the current elevations with those that were originally proposed, the November 2, 2016 building elevations are included in Attachment E.

### **Privacy and Landscaping**

The second story on the left side elevation of the house includes six smaller bedroom and bathroom windows with sill heights of four feet, six inches and a side setback of 20 feet. Due to the pie-shaped lots on the cul-de-sac, the adjacent house to the left has a very larger front yard setback and all of the left side facing windows are orientated toward this lot's front yard space. In addition, an evergreen screening hedge is proposed along the left side property line. Therefore, due to the small size of the second story windows on the left side, the limited views toward the adjacent property's rear yard and the new evergreen screening, there are not any unreasonable privacy impacts.

The second story on the right side elevation of the house includes five smaller bedroom and closet windows with sill heights of four feet, six inches and a setback of at least 28 feet to the right side property line. Due to the angle of this elevation, which is more oriented toward the rear, the second story windows have very limited views toward the property on the right. With regard to the views toward the rear from this elevation, these smaller windows have a setback of at least 30 feet and there is ample existing evergreen screening along this portion of the rear property line. Overall, the proposed windows on the right side second story elevation not create any unreasonable privacy impacts.

The project site includes a large mature zelkova tree along the street frontage and numerous smaller trees and mature screening species along the rear property line. With the exception of a smaller holly tree (No. 374), the project will be preserving all existing trees. The project plans include a detailed landscape plan, which shows proposed landscaping and hardscape features for the full site. Since the project will be maintaining most of the existing trees and installing new trees and front yard landscaping and hardscape, it does meet the City's landscaping regulations and street tree guidelines. The project includes a new house and more than 500 square feet of new landscape area, so it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

This project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act because it involves the construction of a single-family dwelling in a residential zone.

### **PUBLIC CONTACT**

A public meeting notice was posted on the property and mailed to 14 nearby property owners on Harrington Court, La Prenda Road and Covington Road.

Cc: Jun Zheng, Applicant  
Li Yao and Yu He, Property Owners  
Leo Li, Architect

Attachments:

- A. Applicant Cover Letter, 3D Renderings and Materials Board
- B. Design Review Commission Meeting Minutes, November 2, 2016
- C. Design Review Commission Agenda Report, November 2, 2016
- D. Past Public Correspondence
- E. Original Project Elevations (A-3 and A-3.1)



## FINDINGS

16-SC-22 – 425 Harrington Court

With regard to the new two-story house, the Design Review Commission finds the following in accordance with Section 14.76.050 of the Municipal Code:

- a. The proposed new house complies with all provision of this chapter;
- b. The height, elevations, and placement on the site of the proposed new house, when considered with reference to the nature and location of residential structures on adjacent lots, will avoid unreasonable interference with views and privacy and will consider the topographic and geologic constraints imposed by particular building site conditions;
- c. The natural landscape will be preserved insofar as practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal; grade changes shall be minimized and will be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed areas;
- d. The orientation of the proposed new house in relation to the immediate neighborhood will minimize the perception of excessive bulk and mass;
- e. General architectural considerations, including the character, size, scale, and quality of the design, the architectural relationship with the site and other buildings, building materials, and similar elements have been incorporated in order to insure the compatibility of the development with its design concept and the character of adjacent buildings; and
- f. The proposed new house has been designed to follow the natural contours of the site with minimal grading, minimum impervious cover, and maximum erosion protection.

## CONDITIONS

16-SC-22 – 425 Harrington Court

### **GENERAL**

**1. Approved Plans**

This approval is based on the plans received on September 27, 2017 and the written application materials provided by the applicant, except as may be modified by these conditions.

**2. Protected Trees**

Tree No. 377 (zelkova) and all new and existing evergreen trees along the side and rear property lines are protected under this application and cannot be removed without a tree removal permit from the Community Development Director.

**3. Encroachment Permit**

Obtain an encroach permit issued from the Engineering Division prior to doing any work within the public street right-of-way.

**4. New Fireplaces**

Only gas fireplaces, pellet fueled wood heaters or EPA certified wood-burning appliances may be installed in all new construction pursuant to Chapter 12.64 of the Municipal Code.

**5. Fire Sprinklers**

Fire sprinklers shall be required pursuant to Section 12.10 of the Municipal Code.

**6. Underground Utilities**

Any new utility service drops shall be located underground from the nearest convenient existing pole pursuant to Chapter 12.68 of the Municipal Code.

**7. Landscaping**

The project is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations pursuant to Chapter 12.36 of the Municipal Code.

**8. Indemnity and Hold Harmless**

The applicant/owner agrees to indemnify, defend, protect, and hold the City harmless from all costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by the City or held to be the liability of the City in connection with the City's defense of its actions in any proceedings brought in any State or Federal Court, challenging any of the City's action with respect to the applicant's project.

### **PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING OR DEMOLITION PERMIT**

**9. Tree Protection**

Tree protection fencing shall be installed around the dripline of Tree No. 377 (zelkova) and all existing trees along the rear property line, as shown on the site plan. Tree protection fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five feet in height with posts driven into the ground and shall not be removed until all building construction has been completed unless approved by the Planning Division.

## **PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT SUBMITTAL**

### **10. Conditions of Approval**

Incorporate the conditions of approval into the title page of the plans.

### **11. Tree Protection Note**

On the grading plan and/or the site plan, show all tree protection fencing and add the following note: "All tree protection fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five feet in height with posts driven into the ground."

### **12. Water Efficient Landscape Plan**

Provide a landscape documentation package prepared by a licensed landscape professional showing how the project complies with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations.

### **13. Green Building Standards**

Provide verification that the house will comply with the California Green Building Standards pursuant to Section 12.26 of the Municipal Code and provide a signature from the project's Qualified Green Building Professional Designer/Architect and property owner.

### **14. Underground Utility Location**

Show the location of underground utilities pursuant to Section 12.68 of the Municipal Code. Underground utility trenches shall avoid the drip-lines of all protected trees unless approved by the project arborist and the Planning Division.

### **15. Air Conditioner Sound Rating**

Show the location of any air conditioning units on the site plan and the manufacturer's specifications showing the sound rating for each unit.

### **16. Storm Water Management**

Show how the project is in compliance with the New Development and Construction Best Management Practices and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention program, as adopted by the City for the purposes of preventing storm water pollution (i.e. downspouts directed to landscaped areas, minimize directly connected impervious areas, etc.).

## **PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION**

### **17. Landscaping Installation**

All landscaping and trees shall be maintained and/or installed as shown on the approved plans and as required by the Planning Division.

### **18. Green Building Verification**

Submit verification that the house was built in compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance (Section 12.26 of the Municipal Code).

### **19. Water Efficient Landscaping Verification**

Provide a landscape Certificate of Completion verifying that the landscaping and irrigation were installed per the approved landscape documentation package.



## Cover Letter To the Design Review Committee

### Project at 425 Harrington Court



Based on the direction from the DRC meeting held on Nov. 2nd 2016, the architect re-design the project totally to address all the comments as below:

- Reduce the bulk and mass of the new house
- Eliminate the open to below space on the second floor
- Change the width and length proportion of the second floor so the house looks smaller
- Improve rear elevation to reduce privacy impacts
- adjust the floor plan so master bedroom face to front yard
- eliminate master bedroom big windows and balcony towards rear yard
- walking in closet with no window or clear storey and bathroom with smaller window towards rear yard
- adjust the orientation of The Whole house so the house is away from rear yard neighbors

- Improve the driveway layout and consider adding additional on-site parking
- rotate the entire building to improve the driveway layout
- decrease six bedrooms to four bedrooms to avoid possible parking issue
  
- Reach out to the neighbors to better understand their concerns
- architect had several meetings with rear yard neighbors Ms. Joan Ysprague, Ms. Susan Mensinger and Mr. Sebastian Konthakto to communicate with them the new design
- owners had meeting with rear yard neighbor Joan while they were here during the summer
- owner visited the neighbors of Harrington Ct. while she was here during the summer
  
- Considering improving the 3D rendering and providing a rear elevation rendering
- the architect improved the 3D rendering
- the architect took picture from backyard of Joan and made 3D rendering showing the difference between new house and existing house











FRONT ELEVATION



# 1ST FLOOR PLAN

2,348 SF.

$1,919 + 429 (\text{GARAGE}) = 2,348 \text{ SF.}$



# 2ND FLOOR PLAN

1,116 SF

TOTAL = 3,464 SF.



View from  
back yard  
neighbor  
now





view from  
back yard  
after house  
is built without  
trees





View from  
back yard  
after house  
is built.







# MATERIALS BOARD

L. YAO AND Y. HE RESIDENCE  
425 HARRINGTON COURT  
LOS ALTOS, CA



GARAGE DOOR



CHIMNEY CAP/ SMOOTH SCUCCO/ JAMES HARDIE SIDING



WINDOW TRIM



CONCRETE TILE ROOF

# ATTACHMENT B

## MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS, HELD ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2016 BEGINNING AT 7:00 P.M. AT LOS ALTOS CITY HALL, ONE NORTH SAN ANTONIO ROAD, LOS ALTOS, CALIFORNIA

### ESTABLISH QUORUM

PRESENT: Chair Moison, Vice-Chair Glew and Commissioners Harding, Kirik and Zoufonoun

STAFF: Planning Services Manager Dahl and Assistant Planner Gallegos

### PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

### ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION/ACTION

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Design Review Commission Minutes

Approve minutes of the regular meeting of October 19, 2016.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Zoufonoun, seconded by Commissioner Harding, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the October 19, 2016 regular meeting with a correction to update the date in the title.

#### DISCUSSION

2. 15-SC-50 – S. Chang – 318 S. Clark Avenue

Design Review Modification to an approved new two-story house. The modification would increase the project's roof pitch from 4:12 to 5:12. *Project Planner: Gallegos*

Assistant Planner Gallegos presented the staff report, recommending approval of the project with a condition that the first and second story roof pitches match. Project architect Chris Spaulding presented the application and requested that the Commission allow different roof pitches on the first and second stories.

Public Comment

Dale Kneebone spoke in support of the roof modification.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Harding, seconded by Commissioner Zoufonoun, the Commission the Commission unanimously approved design review application 15-SC-50 per the staff report findings and conditions.

3. 16-SC-37 – L. and J. Smith – 1360 Montclair Way

Design review for a two-story addition to an existing one-story house and a new second living unit. The project includes the construction of 645 square feet on the first story, 671 square feet on the second story, and a new integrated 439 square-foot second living unit in the basement. This application was continued from the October 19, 2016 Design Review Commission meeting. *Project Planner: Gallegos*



Assistant Planner Gallegos presented the staff report, recommending approval of the project. Project architect Malika Junaid and property owner Lund Smith presented the application.

Public Comment

None.

Action: Upon a motion by Chair Moison, seconded by Commissioner Harding, the Commission unanimously approved design review application 16-SC-37 per the staff report findings and conditions.

4. **16-SC-22 – L. Yao and Y. He – 425 Harrington Court**

Design review for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,339 square feet on the first story and 1,145 square feet on the second story. *Project Planner: Dahl*

Planning Services Manager Dahl presented the staff report, recommending approval of the project. Property owner Li Yao and project architect Leo Li presented the application.

Public Comment

Residents and neighbors Susan Mensinger and Sebastian Konthak spoke in opposition to the project with concerns about privacy impacts. Unincorporated Los Altos resident and friend of the applicant Henry Zeng spoke in support of the project. The Chair acknowledged receipt of a neighborhood petition with 10 signatures from nearby property owners who objected to the project.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Kirik, seconded by Commissioner Harding, the Commission unanimously continued design review application 16-SC-22, with the following direction:

- Reduce the bulk and mass of the new house;
- Improve rear elevations to reduce privacy impacts;
- Improve the driveway layout and consider adding additional on-site parking;
- Reach out to the neighbors to better understand their concerns; and
- Consider improving the 3D rendering and providing a rear elevation rendering.

5. **16-SC-41 – B. Oreizy – 1832 Fallen Leaf Lane**

Design review for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,255 square feet on the first story and 1,029 square feet on the second story. *Project Planner: Gallegos*

Assistant Planner Gallegos presented the staff report, recommending approval of the project. Project architect Bahi Oreizy presented the application.

Public Comment

Residents and neighbors John Graves and Joanne Schwartz spoke in opposition to the project due to privacy impacts.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Kirik, seconded by Commissioner Harding, the Commission unanimously approved design review application 16-SC-41 per the staff report findings and conditions, with the following additional conditions:

- Install an evergreen specimen tree (update #3), 24-inch box minimum in size in the left rear corner of the property; and
- Get feedback from the neighbor on the best location - optional.



# ATTACHMENT C

AGENDA ITEM # 4

**TO:** Design Review Commission  
**FROM:** Zachary Dahl, Current Planning Services Manager  
**SUBJECT:** 16-SC-22 – 425 Harrington Court

## RECOMMENDATION:

Approve design review application 16-SC-22 subject to the listed findings and conditions

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a design review application for a new two-story house with a basement. The project includes 2,324 square feet on the first story, 1,145 square feet on the second story and a 2,068 square-foot basement. The following table summarizes the project's technical details:

<b>GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:</b>	Single-Family, Residential
<b>ZONING:</b>	R1-10
<b>PARCEL SIZE:</b>	9,965 square feet
<b>MATERIALS:</b>	Concrete tile roof, smooth finish stucco and Hardie board horizontal siding, stone veneer, vinyl windows, and wood trim details

	Existing	Proposed	Allowed/Required
<b>COVERAGE:</b>	2,360 square feet	2,972 square feet	2,990 square feet
<b>FLOOR AREA:</b>			
First floor	2,294 square feet	2,334 square feet	
Second floor	N/A	1,145 square feet	
Total	2,294 square feet	3,479 square feet	3,487 square feet
<b>SETBACKS:</b>			
Front	31.1 feet	26.5 feet	25 feet
Rear	23.4 feet	26.2 feet	25 feet
Right side (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> )	10.1 feet	10.8 feet/23.7 feet	10 feet/17.5 feet
Left side (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> )	12 feet	11 feet/19.8 feet	10 feet/17.5 feet
<b>HEIGHT:</b>	16 feet	26.8 feet	27 feet

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Neighborhood Context**

The subject property is located at the end of Harrington Court, which is a cul-de-sac street off of Campbell Avenue. The Harrington Court neighborhood is considered a Consistent Character Neighborhood as defined in the City's Residential Design Guidelines. The houses in this neighborhood are a primarily one-story houses that are lower in scale, utilize rustic exterior materials and have increased or stepped front yard setbacks with prominent two-car garages. The landscaping along Harrington Court is mature but varied and there is a distinct street tree pattern with mature zelkova trees lining the street at the back of curb.

### **Zoning Compliance**

The Harrington Court neighborhood was originally created by of the Morinan Subdivision (Tract 1803), which was recorded in September of 1956. As part of the subdivision, building setback lines of 25, 30, 40 or 50 feet were established along the front of each parcel. For the subject property, the map set a building setback line of 40 feet. However, the City's zoning regulations, which were originally enacted in 1958, established uniform setbacks for the R1-10 District and are considered to supersede building setback lines and other conditions and covenants established by individual subdivisions. So for this project, the required front yard setback is 25 feet per the Zoning Code, not 40 feet as shown on the original subdivision map. However, the public notification for this project included all parcels created by this subdivision to ensure that all property owners are aware of the project and the building setback line.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Design Review**

According to the Design Guidelines, in Consistent Character Neighborhoods, good neighbor design has design elements, materials and scale found within the neighborhood and sizes that are not significantly larger than other homes in the neighborhood. The emphasis should be on designs that "fit in" and lessen abrupt changes.

The project uses a Transitional style of architecture that incorporates a steeper pitched roof, large eave overhangs and lower scale elements. The front elevation includes a forward placed two-car garage with a wood carriage style door, an understated front entry on the right side and a lower scale second story that is tucked within the first story roof form. The stone veneer on the first story and the horizontal siding on the second story are appropriately placed to create a visual balance to the front elevation and reduce the perception of excessive bulk and mass. The lower wall plates of nine feet on the first story and eight feet on the second story plus the larger eave overhangs result in a lower scale as viewed from the street.

The project is incorporating high quality materials, such as concrete tile roofing, smooth stucco siding and stone veneer, which are integral to the architectural design of the house. Overall, while this new house will be the largest in the neighborhood, the design and materials are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the project has an appropriate relationship in terms of bulk, mass and scale.



## **Privacy**

The project is proposing a finish floor elevation of 200.75 for the first story, which ranges from eight inches above grade on the left side to 15 inches above grade on the right side. There is an existing six-foot fence with lattice along the left side property line and a fence that ranges from five to six feet in height along the right side property line; both of which appear in reasonable condition. Since the project has a relatively low finish floor elevation, the first story wall plates are only nine feet tall and there is existing fencing, there are not any privacy issues on the first story side elevations.

The second story on the right side elevation of the house does not include any side facing windows. The second story on the left side elevation, which is angled and faces toward both the left side and rear property lines, includes two small bathroom windows with five-foot sill heights. Due to the small size and limited number of windows on the second story side elevations, there are not any unreasonable privacy impacts.

The rear elevation includes three small bathroom windows, a large window over the tub in the master bedroom, a large egress window in Bedroom #2 and a sliding glass door with a shallow (two-foot depth) balcony. The bathroom windows do not create any unreasonable privacy impacts since they are considered passive use. The shallow balcony is considered passive use due to its small size and shallow depth, and the bedroom window and sliding glass door are required to meet bedroom existing requirements, however, all three elements could create privacy impacts with views toward the adjacent properties along the rear property lines. There are multiple smaller evergreen trees (junipers and Italian cypress) along the rear property lines that provide privacy screening. In order to ensure that privacy screening is provided along all portions of the rear property lines, staff has added a condition (No. 2) that requires additional privacy screening trees be planted along the rear property lines to ensure full screening. With this condition and the existing evergreen screening trees, the project will be maintaining a reasonable level of privacy.

## **Trees and Landscaping**

The project site includes a large mature zelkova tree along the street frontage and numerous smaller trees and mature screening species along the rear property line. A tree inventory and assessment, prepared by Monarch Consulting Arborists, is included in Attachment D. With the exception of a smaller holly tree (No. 374), the project will be preserving all existing trees. The project plans include a detailed landscape plan (Sheet L-2), which shows proposed landscaping and hardscape features for the full site.

Since the project will be maintaining most of the existing trees and installing new trees and front yard landscaping and hardscape, it does meet the City's landscaping regulations and street tree guidelines. The project includes a new house and more than 500 square feet of new landscape area, so it is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

## **PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE**

Staff received a public comment letter from the neighbor to the rear of the project at 448 La Prenda Road (Attachment E). The letter raises concerns about the size and scale of the new two-story house and notes that a one-story house would be more appropriate on this lot.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

This project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act because it involves the construction of a single-family dwelling in a residential zone.

## **PUBLIC CONTACT**

A public meeting notice was posted on the property and mailed to 14 nearby property owners on Harrington Court, La Prenda Road and Covington Road.

Cc: Jun Zheng, Applicant  
Li Yao and Yu He, Owners  
Leo Li, Architect

### Attachments:

- A. Application
- B. Neighborhood Compatibility Worksheet
- C. Area, Vicinity and Public Notification Maps
- D. Tree Inventory and Assessment
- E. Public Correspondence

## FINDINGS

16-SC-22 – 425 Harrington Court

With regard to the new two-story house, the Design Review Commission finds the following in accordance with Section 14.76.050 of the Municipal Code:

- a. The proposed new house complies with all provision of this chapter;
- b. The height, elevations, and placement on the site of the proposed new house, when considered with reference to the nature and location of residential structures on adjacent lots, will avoid unreasonable interference with views and privacy and will consider the topographic and geologic constraints imposed by particular building site conditions;
- c. The natural landscape will be preserved insofar as practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal; grade changes shall be minimized and will be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed areas;
- d. The orientation of the proposed new house in relation to the immediate neighborhood will minimize the perception of excessive bulk and mass;
- e. General architectural considerations, including the character, size, scale, and quality of the design, the architectural relationship with the site and other buildings, building materials, and similar elements have been incorporated in order to insure the compatibility of the development with its design concept and the character of adjacent buildings; and
- f. The proposed new house has been designed to follow the natural contours of the site with minimal grading, minimum impervious cover, and maximum erosion protection.

## CONDITIONS

16-SC-22 – 425 Harrington Court

### **GENERAL**

**1. Approved Plans**

This approval is based on the plans received on October 13, 2016 and the written application materials provided by the applicant, except as may be modified by these conditions.

**2. Privacy Screening Trees**

Update the landscape plan to include additional evergreen screening trees (24-inch box size) to fill in the open areas along the rear property line.

**3. Protected Trees**

Tree No. 377 (zelkova) and all existing and proposed evergreen trees along the rear property line are protected under this application and cannot be removed without a tree removal permit from the Community Development Director.

**4. Encroachment Permit**

Obtain an encroach permit issued from the Engineering Division prior to doing any work within the public street right-of-way.

**5. New Fireplaces**

Only gas fireplaces, pellet fueled wood heaters or EPA certified wood-burning appliances may be installed in all new construction pursuant to Chapter 12.64 of the Municipal Code.

**6. Fire Sprinklers**

Fire sprinklers shall be required pursuant to Section 12.10 of the Municipal Code.

**7. Underground Utilities**

Any new utility service drops shall be located underground from the nearest convenient existing pole pursuant to Chapter 12.68 of the Municipal Code.

**8. Landscaping**

The project is subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations pursuant to Chapter 12.36 of the Municipal Code.

**9. Indemnity and Hold Harmless**

The applicant/owner agrees to indemnify, defend, protect, and hold the City harmless from all costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by the City or held to be the liability of the City in connection with the City's defense of its actions in any proceedings brought in any State or Federal Court, challenging any of the City's action with respect to the applicant's project.

### **PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING OR DEMOLITION PERMIT**

**10. Tree Protection**

Tree protection fencing shall be installed around the dripline of Tree No. 377 (zelkova) and all existing trees along the rear property line, as shown on the site plan. Tree protection fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five feet in height with posts driven into the ground and shall not be removed until all building construction has been completed unless approved by the Planning Division.

## **PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT SUBMITTAL**

### **11. Conditions of Approval**

Incorporate the conditions of approval into the title page of the plans.

### **12. Tree Protection Note**

On the grading plan and/or the site plan, show all tree protection fencing and add the following note: "All tree protection fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five feet in height with posts driven into the ground."

### **13. Water Efficient Landscape Plan**

Provide a landscape documentation package prepared by a licensed landscape professional showing how the project complies with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations.

### **14. Green Building Standards**

Provide verification that the house will comply with the California Green Building Standards pursuant to Section 12.26 of the Municipal Code and provide a signature from the project's Qualified Green Building Professional Designer/Architect and property owner.

### **15. Underground Utility Location**

Show the location of underground utilities pursuant to Section 12.68 of the Municipal Code. Underground utility trenches shall avoid the drip-lines of all protected trees unless approved by the project arborist and the Planning Division.

### **16. Air Conditioner Sound Rating**

Show the location of any air conditioning units on the site plan and the manufacturer's specifications showing the sound rating for each unit.

### **17. Storm Water Management**

Show how the project is in compliance with the New Development and Construction Best Management Practices and Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention program, as adopted by the City for the purposes of preventing storm water pollution (i.e. downspouts directed to landscaped areas, minimize directly connected impervious areas, etc.).

## **PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION**

### **18. Landscaping Installation**

All landscaping and trees shall be maintained and/or installed as shown on the approved plans and as required by the Planning Division.

### **19. Green Building Verification**

Submit verification that the house was built in compliance with the City's Green Building Ordinance (Section 12.26 of the Municipal Code).

### **20. Water Efficient Landscaping Verification**

Provide a landscape Certificate of Completion verifying that the landscaping and irrigation were installed per the approved landscape documentation package.







# ATTACHMENT A

## CITY OF LOS ALTOS GENERAL APPLICATION

Type of Review Requested: (Check all boxes that apply)

Permit #

1107211

<input type="checkbox"/>	One-Story Design Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	Commercial/Multi-Family	<input type="checkbox"/>	Environmental Review
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Two-Story Design Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sign Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rezoning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Variance	<input type="checkbox"/>	Use Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	R1-S Overlay
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lot Line Adjustment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tenant Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	General Plan/Code Amendment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tentative Map/Division of Land	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sidewalk Display Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appeal
<input type="checkbox"/>	Historical Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	Preliminary Project Review	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:

Project Address/Location: 425 Harrington Ct. Los Altos, CA 94022

Project Proposal/Use: RESIDENCE Current Use of Property: RESIDENCE

Assessor Parcel Number(s): 189-49-021 Site Area: 9,965 ±

New Sq. Ft.: 3,484.2 Altered/Rebuilt Sq. Ft.: Existing Sq. Ft. to Remain:

Total Existing Sq. Ft.: 1,814 + 450 (GARAGE) Total Proposed Sq. Ft. (including basement): 5,552.6

Is the site fully accessible for City Staff inspection? Yes

Applicant's Name: Li Yao/Yu He c/o Jun Zhang

Telephone No.: 408-348-6885 Email Address: junzhangzeng@gmail.com

Mailing Address: 11675 putter way

City/State/Zip Code: Los Altos, CA 94022

Property Owner's Name: Li Yao/Yu He

Telephone No.: Email Address:

Mailing Address: 938 Clark Ave. #15

City/State/Zip Code: Menlo View, CA 94040

Architect/Designer's Name: LEO LI

Telephone No.: 408 657 9928 Email Address: LELDESIGNGROUP@GMAIL.COM

Mailing Address: 21701 STEVENS CREEK BLVD #32

City/State/Zip Code: CUPERTINO, CA 95015

\* If your project includes complete or partial demolition of an existing residence or commercial building, a demolition permit must be issued and finalized prior to obtaining your building permit. Please contact the Building Division for a demolition package. \*

(continued on back)





# ATTACHMENT B

City of Los Altos

Planning Division

(650) 947-2750

[Planning@losaltosca.gov](mailto:Planning@losaltosca.gov)

## NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY WORKSHEET

In order for your design review application for single-family residential remodel/addition or new construction to be successful, it is important that you consider your property, the neighborhood's special characteristics that surround that property and the compatibility of your proposal with that neighborhood. **The purpose is to help you understand your neighborhood before you begin the design process with your architect/designer/builder or begin any formal process with the City of Los Altos.** *Please note that this worksheet must be submitted with your 1<sup>st</sup> application.*

The Residential Design Guidelines encourage neighborhood compatibility without necessarily forsaking individual taste. Various factors contribute to a design that is considered compatible with a surrounding neighborhood. The factors that City officials will be considering in your design could include, but are not limited to: design theme, scale, bulk, size, roof line, lot coverage, slope of lot, setbacks, daylight plane, one or two-story, exterior materials, landscaping et cetera.

It will be helpful to have a site plan to use in conjunction with this worksheet. Your site plan should accurately depict your property boundaries. The best source for this is the legal description in your deed.

Photographs of your property and its relationship to your neighborhood (see below) will be a necessary part of your first submittal. Taking photographs before you start your project will allow you to see and appreciate that your property could be within an area that has a strong neighborhood pattern. The photographs should be taken from across the street with a standard 35mm camera and organized by address, one row for each side of the street. Photographs should also be taken of the properties on either side and behind your property from on your property.

This worksheet/check list is meant to help *you* as well as to help the City planners and Planning Commission understand your proposal. Reasonable guesses to your answers are acceptable. The City is not looking for precise measurements on this worksheet.

Project Address 425 Harrington Court, Los Altos

Scope of Project: Addition or Remodel \_\_\_\_\_ or New Home New

Age of existing home if this project is to be an addition or remodel? \_\_\_\_\_

Is the existing house listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory? No

Address: 425 Harrington Court, Los Altos  
Date: 04/08/2016

## What constitutes your neighborhood?

There is no clear answer to this question. For the purpose of this worksheet, consider first your street, the two contiguous homes on either side of, and directly behind, your property and the five to six homes directly across the street (eight to nine homes). At the minimum, these are the houses that you should photograph. If there is any question in your mind about your neighborhood boundaries, consider a radius of approximately 200 to 300 feet around your property and consider that your neighborhood.

### Streetscape

#### 1. Typical neighborhood lot size\*:

Lot area: 9,965 +/- square feet  
Lot dimensions: Length 104' +/- feet  
Width 85' +/- feet

If your lot is significantly different than those in your neighborhood, then note its: area \_\_\_\_\_, length \_\_\_\_\_, and width \_\_\_\_\_.

#### 2. Setback of homes to front property line: (Pgs. 8-11 Design Guidelines)

Existing front setback if home is a remodel? \_\_\_\_\_  
What % of the front facing walls of the neighborhood homes are at the front setback 25' -50'  
Existing front setback for house on left 52' +/- ft./on right 25' +/- ft.  
Do the front setbacks of adjacent houses line up? No

#### 3. Garage Location Pattern: (Pg. 19 Design Guidelines)

Indicate the relationship of garage locations in your neighborhood\* only on your street (count for each type)  
Garage facing front projecting from front of house face 10  
Garage facing front recessed from front of house face \_\_\_\_  
Garage in back yard 1  
Garage facing the side \_\_\_\_  
Number of 1-car garages \_\_\_\_; 2-car garages 10; 3-car garages \_\_\_\_

**4. Single or Two-Story Homes:**

What % of the homes in your neighborhood\* are:

One-story 70%

Two-story 30%

**5. Roof heights and shapes:**

Is the overall height of house ridgelines generally the same in your neighborhood\*? Yes

Are there mostly hip X, gable style X, or other style      roofs\*?

Do the roof forms appear simple      or complex     ?

Do the houses share generally the same eave height No?

**6. Exterior Materials:** (*Pg. 22 Design Guidelines*)

What siding materials are frequently used in your neighborhood\*?

X wood shingle X stucco      board & batten      clapboard

     tile      stone      brick      combination of one or more materials

(if so, describe)     

What roofing materials (wood shake/shingle, asphalt shingle, flat tile, rounded tile, cement tile, slate) are consistently (about 80%) used?

Shingle and tile roof

If no consistency then explain:     

**7. Architectural Style:** (*Appendix C, Design Guidelines*)

Does your neighborhood\* have a consistent identifiable architectural style?

☐ YES ☒ NO

Type? X Ranch      Shingle      Tudor X Mediterranean/Spanish

X Contemporary      Colonial      Bungalow      Other

Address: 425 Harrington Court, Los Altos  
Date: 04/08/2016

**8. Lot Slope:** (*Pg. 25 Design Guidelines*)

Does your property have a noticeable slope? No

What is the direction of your slope? (relative to the street)

To street

Is your slope higher \_\_\_\_\_ lower \_\_\_\_\_ same x in relationship to the neighboring properties? Is there a noticeable difference in grade between your property/house and the one across the street or directly behind?

**9. Landscaping:**

Are there any frequently used or typical landscaping features on your street (i.e. big trees, front lawns, sidewalks, curbs, landscape to street edge, etc.)?

Trees, front lawns, sidewalk and landscape to street edge

How visible are your house and other houses from the street or back neighbor's property?

Not very easy to see from the street and back neighbors since the group of the big trees.

Are there any major existing landscaping features on your property and how is the unimproved public right-of-way developed in front of your property (gravel, dirt, asphalt, landscape)?

Landscape

**10. Width of Street:**

What is the width of the roadway paving on your street in feet? 50'

Is there a parking area on the street or in the shoulder area? Yes

Is the shoulder area (unimproved public right-of-way) paved, unpaved, gravel, landscaped, and/or defined with a curb/gutter? Paved

**11. What characteristics make this neighborhood\* cohesive?**

Such as roof material and type (hip, gable, flat), siding (board and batten, cement plaster, horizontal wood, brick), deep front yard setbacks, horizontal feel, landscape approach etc.:

Hip and gable roofs with stucco and siding wall materials.

---

---

---

---

**General Study**

- A. Have major visible streetscape changes occurred in your neighborhood?  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- B. Do you think that most (~ 80%) of the homes were originally built at the same time?  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- C. Do the lots in your neighborhood appear to be the same size?  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- D. Do the lot widths appear to be consistent in the neighborhood?  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- E. Are the front setbacks of homes on your street consistent (~80% within 5 feet)?  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- F. Do you have active CCR's in your neighborhood? (*p.36 Building Guide*)  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- G. Do the houses appear to be of similar size as viewed from the street?  
☐ YES ☒ NO
- H. Does the new exterior remodel or new construction design you are planning relate in most ways to the prevailing style(s) in your existing neighborhood?  
☒ YES ☐ NO

Address: 425 Harrington Court, Los Altos  
Date: 04/08/2016


### Summary Table

Please use this table to summarize the characteristics of the houses in your immediate neighborhood (two homes on either side, directly behind and the five to six homes directly across the street).

Address	Front setback	Rear setback	Garage location	One or two stories	Height	Materials	Architecture (simple or complex)
445 Harrington Ct.	22' +/-	25' +/-	Right	One	17'+/-	Stucco,siding	Simple
405 Harrington Ct.	52' +/-	27' +/-	Left	One	17'+/-	Stucco,siding	Complex
440 La Prenda Rd.	25' +/-	25' +/-	Right	One	18'+/-	Stucco,siding	Simple
448 La Prenda Rd.	25' +/-	25' +/-	Right	One	17'+/-	Stucco	Complex
400 Harrington Ct.	50' +/-	25' +/-	Left	Two	24'+/-	Stucco,siding	Simple
420 Harrington Ct.	40' +/-	25' +/-	Left	One	17'+/-	Stucco	Complex
465 Harrington Ct.	25' +/-	40' +/-	Right	One	17'+/-	Stucco,siding	Simple
440 Harrington Ct.	30' +/-	40' +/-	Left	One	17'+/-	Stucco,siding	Simple
460 Harrington Ct.	30' +/-	25' +/-	Left	One	16'+/-	Stucco,brick	Complex
480 Harrington Ct.	15' +/-	30' +/-	Left	Two	28'+/-	Stucco,brick	Simple



# AREA MAP



CITY OF LOS ALTOS

**APPLICATION:** 16-SC-22  
**APPLICANT:** L. Yao and Y. He  
**SITE ADDRESS:** 425 Harrington Court



Not to Scale

# VICINITY MAP



SCALE 1 : 6,000




CITY OF LOS ALTOS

**APPLICATION:** 16-SC-22  
**APPLICANT:** L. Yao and Y. He  
**SITE ADDRESS:** 425 Harrington Court

# 425 Harrington Court Notification Map



SCALE 1 : 1,500





**Tree Inventory, Assessment,  
and  
Protection**

**425 Harrington Court  
Los Altos, CA 94024**

**Prepared for:**

**Jun Zhang**

**August 24, 2016**

**Prepared By:**

**Richard Gessner**

***ASCA - Registered Consulting Arborist ® #496***

***ISA - Board Certified Master Arborist® WE-4341B***

***ISA - Tree Risk Assessor Qualified***


***CA - Qualified Applicators License #104230***



**Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC**

P.O. Box 1010  
Felton, CA 95018  
831. 331. 8982

© Copyright Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC, 2016



## Table of Contents

<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background.....	1
Assignment.....	1
Limits of the assignment .....	1
Purpose and use of the report .....	2
<b>Observations .....</b>	<b>2</b>
Trees and Site.....	2
Plans.....	2
Tree Inventory .....	3
Condition Rating .....	4
Suitability for Preservation .....	5
Influence Level.....	6
Tree Protection .....	7
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Post-Construction Phase .....	9
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Glossary of Terms.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix A: Tree Inventory and Protection Map.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Appendix B: Tree Inventory and Disposition Table.....</b>	<b>13</b>
B1: Tree Inventory and Assessment .....	13
B2: Tree Disposition Table .....	15
<b>Appendix C: Photographs .....</b>	<b>18</b>
C1: Zelkova 378.....	18
C2: Zelkova 377.....	19
C3: Deodar Cedar 376.....	20
C4: Monterey Pine 375 .....	21
C5: Holly 374 .....	22
C6: Tree 373, 372 and 371 .....	23
C7: Tree 370 through 355.....	24



<b>Appendix D: Tree protection specifications.....</b>	<b>25</b>
11.08.120 - Tree protection during construction. ....	25
Pre-Construction Meeting with the Project Arborist .....	25
Tree Protection Zones and Fence Specifications .....	25
Monitoring .....	26
Restrictions Within the Tree Protection Zone .....	26
Root Pruning.....	26
Boring or Tunneling.....	26
Timing .....	26
Tree Pruning and Removal Operations .....	27
Tree Protection Signs .....	27
<b>Appendix E: Tree Protection Signs .....</b>	<b>28</b>
E1: English.....	28
E2: Spanish .....	29
<b>Qualifications, Assumptions, and Limiting Conditions .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Certification of Performance .....</b>	<b>31</b>





## Summary

The property is located at the end of Harrington Court and the inventory contains 24 trees comprised of 7 different species. The site contains one tree protected by the city ordinance which is zelkova (*Zelkova serratta*) #377 in the public right-of-way. The other three protected trees are on the adjacent site which are zelkova #378, deodar cedar (*Cedrus deodara*) #376, and Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*) #375. Nine trees are in good condition, ten fair, and five are in poor shape. No trees have good suitability for preservation while four have fair suitability for retention. The remaining 20 trees have poor suitability for preservation. Only one tree will be highly affected by the project which is holly #374 in the footprint of the proposed structure. The remaining trees will not be influenced by the plan. Tree protection fence should be placed around zelkova #377 at the existing driveway edge and around the drip line (Appendix A). The existing neighbor fence will be sufficient enough protection near deodar cedar #376 and new temporary or permanent fence should be established near Monterey pine #375 once the garage is demolished.

## Introduction

### Background

Jun Zhang asked me to assess the site, trees, proposed footprint plan, and to provide a report with my findings and recommendations to help satisfy the City of Los Altos planning requirements.

### Assignment

1. Provide an arborist's report that includes an assessment of the trees within the project area. The assessment is to include the species, size (trunk diameter), condition (health and structure), and suitability for preservation ratings.
2. Provide tree protection guidelines and influence ratings for those affected by the project.

### Limits of the assignment

1. No tree risk assessments were performed.
2. The information in this report is limited to the condition of the trees during my inspection on August 22, 2016.
3. The plans reviewed for this assignment were as follows: Site plan A-0 dated March 11, 2016 provided by LEL Design.





## Purpose and use of the report

The report is intended to identify all the trees within the plan area that could be affected by a project. The report is to be used by the property owners, their agents, and the City of Los Altos as a reference for existing tree conditions to help satisfy planning requirements.

## Observations

### Trees and Site

The property is located at the end of the court and contains one zelkova (*Zelkova serrata*) #377 to the north of the driveway and another (#378) on the opposite side on the adjacent site. This is the only tree protected by the City of Los Altos town ordinance on the site. On the adjacent site near the driveway is a deodar cedar #376 (*Cedrus deodara*) along with a large Monterey pine #375 (*Pinus radiata*) next to the garage. The garage has no setback from the property boundary and the pine tree cannot be accessed for the site. Within the back yard are four holly (*Ilex aquifolium*), seven Hollywood junipers (*Juniperus chinensis* 'Torulosa'), eight Italian cypress (*Cupressus sempervirens*), and one double trunk coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*). None of the trees in the backyard have trunk diameters greater than eleven inches (34.54 inches in circumference). The two zelkova are in the public right-of-way while the deodar cedar and Monterey pine are on the adjacent sites. All four are protected by the City of Los Altos ordinance with trunks larger than 15 inches in diameter. The zelkova #378 and deodar cedar #376 have sparse crowns. Zelkova #377 in front of the site has been topped and its crown has been reduced arbitrarily to a uniform height (Appendix C).

### Plans

- The proposed driveway and walkway have been moved away from the property boundary and subsequently farther from adjacent trees #378 and #376.
- The new garage is also moved ten feet from the property boundary to honor the side setback and is now farther from pine tree #379.
- The new primary structure is largely located within the footprint of the old residence.
- Holly tree #374 is in the footprint of the new structure.
- The remaining trees #355 through #375 will not be affected by the proposed site plan however it is likely these trees could be removed with a new landscape plan.



## Tree Inventory

The City of Los Altos Tree Ordinance Chapter 11.08 states protection criteria as the following:

1. Any tree that is 48-inches (four feet) or greater in circumference when measured at 48-inches above the ground.
2. Any tree designated by the Historical Commission as a Heritage Tree or any tree under official consideration for a Heritage Tree designation. (All Canary Island Palm trees on Rinconada Court are designated as Heritage Trees.)
3. Any tree which was required to be either saved or planted in conjunction with a development review approval (i.e. new two-story house).
4. Any tree located within a public right-of-way.
5. Any tree located on property zoned other than single-family residential.

The tree inventory contains all trees on the property with trunk diameters greater than four inches and those on adjacent sites with crowns overhanging the boundary or within close proximity.

The site contains one tree protected by the city ordinance which is zelkova #377 in the public right-of-way. The other three protected trees are on the adjacent site which are as follows: zelkova #378, deodar cedar #376, and Monterey pine #375. The inventory contains 24 trees comprised of 7 different species with Hollywood juniper and Italian cypress accounting for 62 percent of all trees.

Chart 1: Species Distribution




## Condition Rating

A tree's condition is a determination of its overall health and structure based on five aspects: Roots, trunk, scaffold branches, twigs, and foliage. The assessment considered both the health and structure of the trees for a combined condition rating. The crown, trunk, trunk flare, and above ground roots were inspected from the ground.

- Exceptional = Good health and structure with significant size, location or quality.
- Good = No apparent problems, good structure and health.
- Fair = Minor problems, at least one structural defect or health concern, problems can be mitigated through cultural practices such as pruning or a plant health care program.
- Poor = Major problems with multiple structural defects or declining health, not a good candidate for retention.
- Dead/Unstable = Extreme problems, irreversible decline, failing structure, or dead.

Nine trees are in good condition which are mostly the Hollywood junipers and Italian cypress. Ten trees are in fair condition including the zelkova #377. Five trees are in poor shape including zelkova #378 and deodar cedar #376 on the adjacent site. Zelkova #377 has been topped but appears to have good vigor. Zelkova #378 has poor vigor with dead branch ends likely due to poor root function and bark sloughing off the trunk. Deodar cedar #376 has a sparse crown and is declining.

The chart below lists the quantity of trees and their condition rating for each category (Chart 2).




## Suitability for Preservation

A tree's suitability for preservation is determined based on its health, structure, age, species characteristics, and longevity using a scale of good, fair, or poor. The following list defines the rating scale:

- Good = Trees with good health, structural stability and longevity.
- Fair = Trees with fair health and/or structural defects that may be mitigated through treatment. These trees require more intense management and monitoring, and may have shorter life spans than those in the good category.
- Poor = Trees in poor health with significant structural defects that cannot be mitigated and will continue to decline regardless of treatment. The species or individual may possess characteristics that are incompatible or undesirable in landscape settings or unsuited for the intended use of the site.

No trees have good suitability for preservation. Four trees have fair suitability including trees #377, #374, #373 and #372. The remaining 20 trees have poor suitability for preservation primarily because they are not planted as part of a planned landscape and are growing too close to each other.

The chart below lists the quantity of trees and their suitability rating for each category (Chart 3)






## Influence Level

Influence level defines how a tree may be influenced by construction activity and proximity to the tree, and is described as low, moderate, or high. The following scale defines the impact rating:

- Low = The construction activity will have little influence on the tree.
- Moderate = The construction may cause future health or structural problems, and steps must be taken to protect the tree to reduce future problems.
- High = Tree structure and health will be compromised and removal is recommended, or other actions must be taken for the tree to remain. The tree is located in the building envelope.

Only one tree will be highly affected by the project which is holly #374 in the footprint of the proposed structure. The remaining trees will not be affected by the project and the driveway and garage are both to be located farther from the adjacent protected trees than the existing infrastructure.

The chart below lists the quantity of trees and their influence rating for each category (Chart 4).





## Tree Protection

Tree protection focuses on protecting trees from damage to the roots, trunk, or scaffold branches from heavy equipment (Appendix D).

The tree protection zone (TPZ) is the defined area in which certain activities are prohibited to minimize potential injury to the tree. The TPZ can be determined by a formula based on species tolerance, tree age, and diameter at breast height (DBH) (Matheny, N. and Clark, J. 1998) or as the drip line in some instances. The City of Los Altos requires fence be installed no closer to the trunk than the drip line. Fence should be placed around zelkova #377 at the existing driveway edge and around the drip line. The existing neighbor fence will be sufficient enough protection near deodar cedar #376 and new fence should be established near Monterey pine #375 once the garage is demolished. Trees 373 through 355 can be protected by placing a fence along the back boundary of the site parallel to the neighbor fence.

Preventing mechanical damage to the main stems from equipment or hand tools can be accomplished by wrapping the main stem with straw wattle (Figure 2). The wattle will create a porous barrier around the trunk and prevent damage to the bark and vascular tissues underneath.




Figure 1: Tree protection distances




Figure 2: Trunk protection with straw wattle



## Conclusion

The property is located at the end of Harrington Court and the existing structure is to be demolished and rebuilt. The inventory contains 24 trees comprised of 7 different species with Hollywood juniper and Italian cypress accounting for 62 percent of all trees. The site contains one tree protected by the city ordinance which is zelkova #377 in the public right-of-way. The other three protected trees are on the adjacent site which are zelkova #378, deodar cedar #376, and Monterey pine #375.

Nine trees are in good condition which are mostly the Hollywood junipers and Italian cypress. Ten trees are in fair condition including the zelkova #377. Five trees are in poor shape including zelkova #378 and deodar cedar #376 on the adjacent site.

No trees have good suitability for preservation while four trees have fair suitability including trees #377, #374, #373 and #372. The remaining 20 trees have poor suitability for preservation because they are not planted as part of a planned landscape and are growing too close to each other.

Only one tree will be highly affected by the project which is holly #374 in the footprint of the proposed structure. The remaining trees will not be affected by the project and the driveway and garage are both to be located farther from the adjacent protected trees than the existing infrastructure.

The City of Los Altos requires fence be installed no closer to the trunk than the drip line. Fence should be placed around zelkova #377 at the existing driveway edge and around the drip line. The existing neighbor fence will be sufficient enough protection near deodar cedar #376 and new temporary or permanent fence should be established near Monterey pine #375 once the garage is demolished.



## Recommendations

1. Place all the tree locations and numbers on the plans.
2. Place tree protection fence locations on all the plans. Fence to be around protected zelkova tree #377. Fence can be established along the back of the site to protect trees #373 though #355 if required by approval.
3. Obtain all necessary permits from the City of Los Altos prior to removing or significantly altering any trees.
4. Provide a copy of the entire plan set to the project arborist prior to submittal.
5. Provide a copy of this report to all contractors and project managers, including the architect, civil engineer, and landscape designer or architect. It is the responsibility of the owner to ensure all parties are familiar with this document.
6. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the project arborist or landscape architect to verify tree protection is in place, with the correct materials, and at the proper distances.
7. Arrange for the project arborist to monitor and document initial grading activity and no grading is to occur within any tree protection zone including utility hook-ups.

## Post-Construction Phase

1. Monitor the health and structure of all trees for any changes in condition.
2. Perform any other mitigation measures to help ensure long term survival.



## Bibliography

- American National Standard for Tree Care Operations: Tree, Shrub and Other Woody Plant Management : Standard Practices (Management of Trees and Shrubs During Site Planning, Site Development, and Construction)(Part 5). Londonderry, NH: Secretariat, Tree Care Industry Association, 2012. Print.
- Clark, James R., and Nelda P. Matheny. A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas. Bedminster, PA: International Society Of Arboriculture, 1993.
- ISA. *Glossary of Arboricultural Terms*. Champaign: International Society of Arboriculture, 2011. Print.
- Matheny, Nelda P. Trees and development: A technical guide to preservation of trees during land development. Bedminster, PA: International Society of Arboriculture, 1998.
- Smiley, E. Thomas, Fraedrich, Bruce R., and Hendrickson, Neil. *Tree Risk Management*. 2nd ed. Charlotte, NC: Bartlett Tree Research Laboratories, 2007



## Glossary of Terms

**Defect:** An imperfection, weakness, or lack of something necessary. In trees defects are injuries, growth patterns, decay, or other conditions that reduce the tree's structural strength.

**Diameter at breast height (DBH):** Measures at 1.4 meters (4.5 feet) above ground in the United States, Australia (arboriculture), New Zealand, and when using the Guide for Plant Appraisal, 9th edition; at 1.3 meters (4.3 feet) above ground in Australia (forestry), Canada, the European Union, and in UK forestry; and at 1.5 meters (5 feet) above ground in UK arboriculture.

**Drip Line:** Imaginary line defined by the branch spread or a single plant or group of plants.

**Mechanical damage:** Physical damage caused by outside forces such as cutting, chopping or any mechanized device that may strike the tree trunk, roots or branches.

**Scaffold branches:** Permanent or structural branches that form the scaffold architecture or structure of a tree.

**Straw wattle:** also known as straw worms, bio-logs, straw noodles, or straw tubes are man made cylinders of compressed, weed free straw (wheat or rice), 8 to 12 inches in diameter and 20 to 25 feet long. They are encased in jute, nylon, or other photo degradable materials, and have an average weight of 35 pounds.

**Tree Protection Zone (TPZ):** Defined area within which certain activities are prohibited or restricted to prevent or minimize potential injury to designated trees, especially during construction or development.

**Tree Risk Assessment:** Process of evaluating what unexpected things could happen, how likely it is, and what the likely outcomes are. In tree management, the systematic process to determine the level of risk posed by a tree, tree part, or group of trees.

**Trunk:** Stem of a tree.


**Volunteer:** A tree, not planted by human hands, that begins to grow on residential or commercial property. Unlike trees that are brought in and installed on property, volunteer trees usually spring up on their own from seeds placed onto the ground by natural causes or accidental transport by people. Normally, volunteer trees are considered weeds and removed, but many desirable and attractive specimens have gone on to become permanent residents on many public and private grounds.

This Glossary of terms was adapted from the Glossary of Arboricultural Terms (ISA, 2011)





## Appendix A: Tree Inventory and Protection Map



## Appendix B: Tree Inventory and Disposition Table

### B1: Tree Inventory and Assessment

Table 1: Tree Inventory and Assessment

Tree Species	Number	Trunk Diameter	~ Height	~ Crown Diameter	Condition	Suitability	Influence Level
Zelkova ( <i>Zelkova serrata</i> )	378	20	30	30	Poor	Poor	Low
Zelkova ( <i>Zelkova serrata</i> )	377	24	30	35	Poor	Fair	Low
Deodar cedar ( <i>Cedrus deodara</i> )	376	24	65	40	Poor	Poor	Low
Monterey pine ( <i>Pinus radiata</i> )	375	36	45	45	Fair	Poor	Low
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	374	7	15	0	Good	Fair	Low
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	373	10	20	20	Fair	Fair	Low
Coast live oak ( <i>Quercus agrifolia</i> )	372	9	20	20	Fair	Fair	Low
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	371	6	8	8	Poor	Poor	Low
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	370	6	10	8	Poor	Poor	Low
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	369	6	10	10	Fair	Poor	Low
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	368	9	25	10	Fair	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	367	8	40	15	Good	Poor	Low



Tree Species	Number	Trunk Diameter	~ Height	~ Crown Diameter	Condition	Suitability	Influence Level
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	366	7	25	10	Fair	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	365	9	40	10	Good	Poor	Low
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	364	9	25	15	Fair	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	363	7	40	10	Good	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	362	4	40	10	Good	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	361	10	40	10	Good	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	360	4	40	10	Good	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	359	8	40	15	Good	Poor	Low
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	358	8	25	15	Fair	Poor	Low
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	357	7	40	10	Good	Poor	Low
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	356	4	20	10	Fair	Poor	Low



Tree Species	Number	Trunk Diameter	~ Height	~ Crown Diameter	Condition	Suitability	Influence Level
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	355	11	25	15	Fair	Poor	Low

## B2: Tree Disposition Table

Table 1: Tree Disposition Table

Tree Species	Number	Trunk Diameter	~ Height	~ Crown Diameter	Protected	Remove or Retain	On Adjacent Site
Zelkova ( <i>Zelkova serrata</i> )	378	20	30	30	Yes	Retain	Yes
Zelkova ( <i>Zelkova serrata</i> )	377	24	30	35	Yes	Retain	No
Deodar cedar ( <i>Cedrus deodara</i> )	376	24	65	40	Yes	Retain	Yes
Monterey pine ( <i>Pinus radiata</i> )	375	36	45	45	Yes	Retain	Yes
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	374	7	15	0	No	Remove	No
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	373	10	20	20	No	Retain	No
Coast live oak ( <i>Quercus agrifolia</i> )	372	9	20	20	No	Retain	No
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	371	6	8	8	No	Retain	No
Holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> )	370	6	10	8	No	Retain	No



Tree Species	Number	Trunk Diameter	~ Height	~ Crown Diameter	Protected	Remove or Retain	On Adjacent Site
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	369	6	10	10	No	Retain	No
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	368	9	25	10	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	367	8	40	15	No	Retain	No
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	366	7	25	10	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	365	9	40	10	No	Retain	No
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	364	9	25	15	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	363	7	40	10	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	362	4	40	10	No	Retain	No





Tree Species	Number	Trunk Diameter	~ Height	~ Crown Diameter	Protected	Remove or Retain	On Adjacent Site
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	361	10	40	10	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	360	4	40	10	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	359	8	40	15	No	Retain	No
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	358	8	25	15	No	Retain	No
Italian cypress ( <i>Cupressus sempervirens</i> )	357	7	40	10	No	Retain	No
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	356	4	20	10	No	Retain	No
Hollywood juniper ( <i>Juniperus chinensis</i> 'Torulosa')	355	11	25	15	No	Retain	No



## Appendix C: Photographs

### C1: Zelkova 378





**C2: Zelkova 377**





**C3: Deodar Cedar 376**





# **C4: Monterey Pine 375**



**C5: Holly 374**





**C6: Tree 373, 372 and 371**



**C7: Tree 370 through 355**





## Appendix D: Tree protection specifications

### 11.08.120 - Tree protection during construction.

Protected trees designated for preservation shall be protected during development of a property by compliance with the following, which may be modified by the planning director:

- A. Protective fencing shall be installed no closer to the trunk than the dripline, and far enough from the trunk to protect the integrity of the tree. The fence shall be a minimum of four feet in height and shall be set securely in place. The fence shall be of a sturdy but open material (i.e., chainlink), to allow visibility to the trunk for inspections and safety. There shall be no storage of any kind within the protective fencing.
- B. The existing grade level around a tree shall normally be maintained out to the dripline of the tree. Alternate grade levels may be approved by the planning director.
- C. Drain wells shall be installed whenever impervious surfaces will be placed over the root system of a tree (the root system generally extends to the outermost edges of the branches).
- D. Trees that have been damaged by construction shall be repaired in accordance with accepted arboriculture methods.
- E. No signs, wires, or any other object shall be attached to the tree.

(Ord. 07-314 § 2 (part); prior code § 10.2.26513)

### Pre-Construction Meeting with the Project Arborist

Tree protection locations should be marked before any fencing contractor arrives.

Prior to beginning work, all contractors involved with the project should attend a pre construction meeting with the project arborist to review the tree protection guidelines. Access routes, storage areas, and work procedures will be discussed.

### Tree Protection Zones and Fence Specifications

Tree protection fence should be established prior to the arrival of construction equipment or materials on site. Fence should be comprised of six-foot high chain link fence mounted on eight-foot tall, 1 7/8-inch diameter galvanized posts, driven 24 inches into the ground and spaced no more than 10 feet apart. Once established, the fence must remain undisturbed and be maintained throughout the construction process until final inspection.

The fence should be maintained throughout the site during the construction period and should be inspected periodically for damage and proper functions. Fence should be repaired, as necessary, to provide a physical barrier from construction activities.



## **Monitoring**

Any trenching, construction or demolition that is expected to damage or encounter tree roots should be monitored by the project arborist or a qualified ISA Certified Arborist and should be documented.

The site should be evaluated by the project arborist or a qualified ISA Certified Arborist after construction is complete, and any necessary remedial work that needs to be performed should be noted.

## **Restrictions Within the Tree Protection Zone**

No storage of construction materials, debris, or excess soil will be allowed within the Tree Protection Zone. Spoils from the trenching shall not be placed within the tree protection zone either temporarily or permanently. Construction personnel and equipment shall be routed outside the tree protection zones.

## **Root Pruning**

Root pruning shall be supervised by the project arborist. When roots over two inches in diameter are encountered they should be pruned by hand with loppers, handsaw, reciprocating saw, or chain saw rather than left crushed or torn. Roots should be cut beyond sinker roots or outside root branch junctions and be supervised by the project arborist. When completed, exposed roots should be kept moist with burlap or backfilled within one hour.

## **Boring or Tunneling**

Boring machines should be set up outside the drip line or established Tree Protection Zone. Boring may also be performed by digging a trench on both sides of the tree until roots one inch in diameter are encountered and then hand dug or excavated with an Air Spade® or similar air or water excavation tool. Bore holes should be adjacent to the trunk and never go directly under the main stem to avoid oblique (heart) roots. Bore holes should be a minimum of three feet deep.

## **Timing**

If the construction is to occur during the summer months supplemental watering and bark beetle treatments should be applied to help ensure survival during and after construction.



## **Tree Pruning and Removal Operations**

All tree pruning or removals should be performed by a qualified arborist with a C-61/D-49 California Contractors License. Tree pruning should be specified in writing according to ANSI A-300A pruning standards and adhere to ANSI Z133.1 safety standards. Trees that need to be removed or pruned should be identified in the pre-construction walk through.

## **Tree Protection Signs**

All sections of fencing should be clearly marked with signs stating that all areas within the fencing are Tree Protection Zones and that disturbance is prohibited. Text on the signs should be in both English and Spanish (Appendix E).



## Appendix E: Tree Protection Signs

### E1: English

# WARNING Tree Protection Zone

This Fence Shall not be moved without  
approval. Only authorized personnel  
may enter this area!

Project Arborist





**E2: Spanish**

**CUIDADO**  
**Zona De Arbol Pretejido**  
**Esta cerca no sera removida sin**  
**aprobacion. Solo personal autorizado**  
**entrara en esta area!**

Project Arborist



## Qualifications, Assumptions, and Limiting Conditions

Any legal description provided to the consultant is assumed to be correct. Any titles or ownership of properties are assumed to be good and marketable. All property is appraised or evaluated as though free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.

All property is presumed to be in conformance with applicable codes, ordinances, statutes, or other regulations.

Care has been taken to obtain information from reliable sources. However, the consultant cannot be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.

The consultant shall not be required to give testimony or attend meetings, hearings, conferences, mediations, arbitration, or trials by reason of this report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made, including payment of an additional fee for such services.

This report and any appraisal value expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant, and the consultant's fee is not contingent upon the reporting of a specified appraisal value, a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event.

Sketches, drawings, and photographs in this report are intended for use as visual aids, are not necessarily to scale, and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or surveys. The reproduction of information generated by architects, engineers, or other consultants on any sketches, drawings, or photographs is only for coordination and ease of reference. Inclusion of said information with any drawings or other documents does not constitute a representation as to the sufficiency or accuracy of said information.

Unless otherwise expressed: a) this report covers only examined items and their condition at the time of inspection; and b) the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing, or coring. There is no warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that structural problems or deficiencies of plants or property may not arise in the future.



## Certification of Performance

I Richard Gessner, Certify:

That I have personally inspected the tree(s) and/or the property referred to in this report, and have stated my findings accurately. The extent of the evaluation and/or appraisal is stated in the attached report and Terms of Assignment;

That I have no current or prospective interest in the vegetation or the property that is the subject of this report, and I have no personal interest or bias with respect to the parties involved;

That the analysis, opinions and conclusions stated herein are my own;

That my analysis, opinions, and conclusions were developed and this report has been prepared according to commonly accepted Arboricultural practices;

That no one provided significant professional assistance to the consultant, except as indicated within the report.

That my compensation is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined conclusion that favors the cause of the client or any other party, nor upon the results of the assessment, the attainment of stipulated results, or the occurrence of any other subsequent events;

I further certify that I am a Registered Consulting Arborist® with the American Society of Consulting Arborists, and that I acknowledge, accept and adhere to the ASCA Standards of Professional Practice. I am an International Society of Arboriculture Board Certified Master Arborist®. I have been involved with the practice of Arboriculture and the care and study of trees since 1998.

Richard J. Gessner



ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist® #496  
ISA Board Certified Master Arborist® WE-4341B  
ISA Tree Risk Assessor Qualified



### Copyright


© Copyright 2016, Monarch Consulting Arborists LLC. Other than specific exception granted for copies made by the client for the express uses stated in this report, no parts of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, recording, or otherwise without the express, written permission of the author.



# ATTACHMENT E

October 24, 2016

Zachary Dahl, AICP  
Planning Services Manager  
Community Development Department  
One North San Antonio Road  
Los Altos, California 94022-3087



Dear Mr. Dahl:

I am a 56 year resident residing at 448 La Prenda Road. I received your letter regarding a proposed building project located at 425 Harrington Court. This project included 2,339 sq. ft. on the first story and 1,145 sq. ft. on the second story.

This past Monday I reviewed the plans at the Community Development Dept. Needless to say, I was stunned and disappointed that this proposed home will come close to my back fence destroying my view of the beautiful black mountains and also will do away with the privacy I've enjoyed in my backyard for the past 56 years. I cannot understand why the new owners would consider building such a huge home on a piece of Property that isn't that spacious. This proposed plan will also affect the property of my neighbor at 440 La Prenda Rd. as well. I totally object to the Design Review Commissioners allowing oversized homes on 1/3 and 1/4 acre lots in a community that has had single story homes for years.

I was told when I write this letter I should speak to the provisions contained in the Zoning Code. I feel items 2, 4 and 5 have been violated. The community of Los Altos is sorely losing its charm of being a village that has successfully preserved its rural roots, maintaining spacious lot sizes having single-story homes placed on lot sizes that are compatible. New property owners aren't aware of our past history and our legacy. Nowadays, who seemingly benefits? New residents want big homes on small lots, contractors and realtors want huge earnings to benefit their pocketbooks. What are we coming to?

I am now a widow and I've enjoyed my present home and quiet surroundings. If you pass this project, it will be a great disappointment to me. Also, I'm hoping other nearby neighbors will agree.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Joan Sprague'.


Joan Sprague





November 1, 2016

Zachary Dahl, AICP  
Community Development Department  
One North San Antonio Road  
Los Altos, CA 94022-3087



Re: Design Review Application for 425 Harrington Court

Dear Design Review Commission and Mr. Zachary Dahl:

This letter is in response to the design review application submitted by L. Yao and Y whereby the building of a two-story house is proposed at 425 Harrington Court.

We are the property owners at 440 La Prenda Road which shares the back fence with 425 Harrington Court. We have serious privacy concerns about this building as it will not only tower above our one-story home, but it will also have several large windows and a balcony facing our yard, living room and master bedroom.

We are currently designing a one-story home with a basement. While we were advised that a two-story home would be cheaper to build, we decided to preserve the integrity and charm of the neighborhood and build a basement instead of a second story. We understand that our neighbors at 466 La Prenda Road did the same (by building a one-story with basement). We are disappointed that the property owners desire to build a two-story house. Based on a review of the plans with our architect, we suggest the following changes to protect our privacy:

1. Move the egress window for bedroom #2 to the side and build a small window facing our yard (starting at 5-6ft high) so that property owners cannot see directly into our home and yard.
2. a) Swap the locations of the master bath and master bedroom and place the bedroom egress window to the side, with a small high window in the bedroom at the rear (facing our home and yard) ---or---  
b) Replace the balcony with a high window (starting at 5-6ft high) that allows for less views down into our home and yard).
3. Plant additional trees along the back fence for privacy.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,


S. Kanthak

Vida Kanthak

Sebastian and Vida Kanthak

October 24, 2016

Zachary Dahl, AICP  
Planning Services Manager  
Community Development Department  
One North San Antonio Road  
Los Altos, California 94022-3087



Dear Mr. Dahl:

I am a 56 year resident residing at 448 La Prenda Road. I received your letter regarding a proposed building project located at 425 Harrington Court. This project included 2,339 sq. ft. on the first story and 1,145 sq. ft. on the second story.

This past Monday I reviewed the plans at the Community Development Dept. Needless to say, I was stunned and disappointed that this proposed home will come close to my back fence destroying my view of the beautiful black mountains and also will do away with the privacy I've enjoy in my backyard for the past 56 years. I cannot understand why the new owners would consider building such a huge home on a piece of Property that isn't that spacious. This proposed plan will also affects the property of my neighbor at 440 La Prenda Rd. as well. I totally object to the Design Review Commissioners allowing oversized homes on 1/3 and 1/4 acre lots in a community that has had single story homes for years.

I was told when I write this letter I should speak to the provisions contained in the Zoning Code. I feel items 2, 4 and 5 have been violated. The community of Los Altos is sorely losing its charm of being a village that has successfully preserved its rural roots, maintaining spacious lot sizes having single-story homes placed on lot sizes that are compatible. New property owners aren't aware of our past history and our legacy. Nowadays, who seemingly benefits? New residents want big homes on small lots, contractors and realtors want huge earnings to benefit their pocketbooks. What are we coming to?

I am now a widow and I've enjoyed my present home and quiet surroundings. If you pass this project, it will be a great disappoint to me. Also, I'm hoping other nearby neighbors will agree.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Joan Sprague".


Joan Sprague

A handwritten note on a teal-colored rectangular piece of paper. The text is written in dark ink and reads: "Dear Mr. Dahl  
Here is a list of  
people opposed to the  
425 Harrington Ct.  
Building Project.  
Mr. Sebastian Kanthak  
will bring more names  
before the Nov. 2nd  
meeting. Thanks  
Joan Sprague".

Dear Mr. Dahl  
Here is a list of  
people opposed to the  
425 Harrington Ct.  
Building Project.  
Mr. Sebastian Kanthak  
will bring more names  
before the Nov. 2nd  
meeting. Thanks  
Joan Sprague




# Petition



This petition concerns neighborhood opposition to the building plans for a 2-story home proposed at 425 Harrington Court, Los Altos, CA. Note the attached letter written by Joan Sprague who addresses issues related to the City of Los Altos Zoning Code, Section 14.76.050 regarding 2-story residential designs.

	Date	Name	Address	Printed Name	Signature
1.	10/26	Margaret F. Issa	494 La Prenda	MARGARET F. ISSA	Margaret F. Issa
2.	10/27	Carolyn + Tim LeBaron	433 La Prenda	Carolyn LeBaron	C. LeBaron
3.	10/26	Patricia Rice	734 La Prenda Rd	PATRICIA RICE	Patricia Rice
4.	10/26	Chris Beaulieu	766 La Prenda Rd	CHRIS BEAULIEU	Chris Beaulieu
5.	10/26	Behzad Nouban	441 La Prenda Rd	Behzad Nouban	Behzad Nouban
6.	10/27	Steven Teglio	479 La Prenda	STEVEN TEGLIO	Steven Teglio
7.	10/27	Mary Jo Lomax	493 La Prenda	Mary Jo Lomax	Mary Jo Lomax
8.	10/27	SAM KLEPPER	726 CAMBER AV	SAM KLEPPER	Sam Klepper
9.	10/27	Susan mensinger	446 La Prenda	Susan mensinger	Susan mensinger
10.	10/28	CHAN Anne	432 La Prenda	Chan Anne	Anne Chan
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					





- ELEVATION NOTES:
- 1 ROOF: CONC. TILE ROOF
  - 2 STUCCO WALL FINISH
  - 3 CUSTOM SOLID CORE DOORS
  - 4 DOUBLE GLAZED WINDOWS (TYP.)
  - 5 STUCCO TRIM (TYP.)
  - 6 STUCCO SILL (TYP.)
  - 7 STONE VENEER
  - 8 SKYLIGHT
  - 9 DAYLIGHT PLANE
  - 10 ADDRESS PLATE
  - 11 WOOD SIDING FINISH



PROPOSED BUILDING  
ELEVATIONS


PROPOSED RESIDENCE  
425 HARRINGTON CT.  
LOS ALTOS, CA 94024  
TEL: 408 348-6895

Date: 03/11/16  
Scale: AS-SHOWN  
Drawn: L  
Job:  
Sheet:  
A-3  
7 of 10 Sheets

PROPOSED BUILDING  
ELEVATIONS

PROPOSED RESIDENCE  
425 HARRINGTON CT.  
LOS ALTOS, CA 94024  
TEL: 408.948.6885

Date: 03/11/16  
Scale: AS-SHOWN  
Drawn: L  
Job:  
Sheet:  
A-3.1  
8 OF 10 Sheets



6 PROPOSED PARCIAL LEFT ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"  
(WEST)



4 PROPOSED RIGHT ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"  
(EAST)

- ELEVATION NOTES:
- 1 ROOF, CONC. TILE ROOF
  - 2 STUCCO WALL FINISH
  - 3 CUSTOM SOLID CORE DOORS
  - 4 DOUBLE GLAZED WINDOWS (TYP.)
  - 5 STUCCO TRIM (TYP.)
  - 6 STUCCO HILL (TYP.)
  - 7 STONE VENEER
  - 8 SKYLIGHT
  - 9 DAYLIGHT PLANE
  - 10 ADDRESS PLATE
  - 11 WOOD SIDING FINISH



3 PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION  
SCALE: 1/4"=1'-0"  
(NORTH)