

DATE: October 4, 2017
AGENDA ITEM \# 3

TO: Design Review Commission
FROM: Zachary Dahl, Planning Services Manger - Current Planning
SUBJECT: 17-SC-13 - 1289 Eureka Avenue

## RECOMMENDATION:

Approve design review application 17-SC-13 subject to the listed findings and conditions

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a design review application for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,390 square feet on the first-story and 1,051 square feet on the second-story. This application was previously reviewed by the Design Review Commission on July 19, 2017. The following table summarizes the project's technical details:

## General Plan Designation: <br> Zoning: <br> Parcel Size: <br> MATERIALS:

Single-Family, Residential
R1-10
10,003 square feet
Spanish tile roof, smooth finish stucco, wood windows and doors, stone window trim and details and black wrought iron metal railing

## Proposed

2,648 square feet

## Allowed/Required

3,001 square feet

2,390 square feet 1,051 square feet
3,441 square feet 3,501 square feet
35.3 feet $\quad 25$ feet
39.2 feet $\quad 25$ feet
16.6 feet/20.7 feet
13.7 feet/ 13.7 feet
10.8 feet/ 16.7 feet
25.1 feet
6.8 feet/ 11.8 feet $^{1}$

27 feet

[^0]
## BACKGROUND

## Neighborhood Character

The subject property is located in a Consistent Character Neighborhood, as defined in the City's Residential Design Guidelines. The property is located on Eureka Avenue, a long cul-de-sac street, at the corner with Grant Road. Stanwirth Court, Thorpe Court and Eureka Court are three small cul-desacs off of Eureka Avenue that are part of the larger cul-de-sac and comprise the neighborhood. The neighborhood consists of all single-story houses, with the exception of one two-story on Thorpe Court, with simple massing, lower eave lines, consistent setbacks, and rustic materials. Eureka Avenue is a wider street with curb and gutter, and varying landscaping and no district street tree pattern.

The property has frontage on Grant Road, which is a wide street with residential properties obscured by mature landscaping and a large church property to the rear of the subject lot. However, based on the orientation of the lot and its relationship to the other houses on Eureka Avenue, the site is considered to be part of the Eureka Avenue neighborhood context.

## Prior Consideration

On July 19, 2017, the Design Review Commission held a public meeting to consider the proposed new two-story house. Three residents provided public comments and raised concerns about the project. Two letters were also submitted that raised concerns about the project (Attachment E). Following public comments and commissioner discussion, the Commission voted unanimously to continue the application with the following direction:

1. Reduce the bulk and scale of the entry, circular staircase, and rear covered porch.
2. Break up the massing of the two-story wall heights with integral architectural elements.
3. Simplify the window design and reduce the vertical emphasis of the arched windows.
4. Simplify the roof forms.
5. Provide additional landscape screening in the interior side yard.

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

## 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. Changes include relocation of the garage to face Eureka Avenue, reduction in height of the front entry and rear covered porch, relocation of the stairwell, reduction of the second story bulk and mass, simplification of the window design and roof forms, and a reduction in the size of the second story balcony. A revised landscape plan with additional evergreen screening trees along the interior side property line was also provided. A cover letter from
the applicant, along with updated 3D renderings and a materials board, is included in Attachment A, and supplemental landscape information is included in Attachment B.

The applicant made a number of meaningful changes to the proposed design to improve neighborhood compatibility, address privacy concerns along the interior side property line and reduce the appearance of excessive bulk and mass. The height of the house was reduced by approximately one-foot, the size of the second story was reduced by 87 square feet and the size of the front facing balcony was reduced from 200 square feet to 60 square feet. The front entry was reduced in height and expanded in width to create a more proportional element and the rear covered porch was reduced in height and better integrated into the overall design. In addition, the shape of the windows was simplified, with most of the arched windows removed, to create a more cohesive design.

To better understand the design revisions and compare the current elevations with those that were originally proposed, the July 19, 2017 building elevations are included in Attachment F.

## Privacy and Landscaping

The project is located on a corner lot with only the left (interior) side of the house adjacent to a residential property. The revised design includes a second story layout that provides a greater side yard setback for the rear portion of the second story. The front half of the second story still has a side yard setback of 16.7 feet, but the rear half of the second story now has a side yard setback of over 30 feet. The interior side elevation of the second story does include a number of small and medium sized windows, including three small windows in the hallway, two smaller windows in the master bathroom and two medium sized windows in the master bedroom. Due to their smaller size, sill height of at least 4.5 feet and passive use of the spaces that they are located, the hallway and bathroom windows do not create any unreasonable privacy impacts. However, the two medium sized windows in the master bedroom could create an unreasonable privacy impact, and they are not required to meet ingress/egress requirements, so staff has included a condition (No. 2) that requires these two windows be revised with a sill height of at least 4.5 feet above the finished floor.

The project also includes two smaller balconies, one at the front of the house over the garage and one at the rear of the house adjacent to Grant Road. The front facing balcony is approximately 60 square feet in size and has views of the street to the front and views of the adjacent property's front yard and roof. The rear facing balcony is approximately 55 square feet in size, but has a depth of only three feet, eight inches and has an interior side yard setback of 30 feet. Due to the sizes and placements of both balconies, they do not appear to create any unreasonable privacy impacts.

The updated landscaping plan includes new evergreen trees along the interior side property line to provide additional privacy screening. Supplemental landscape information to clarify the landscape plan is included in Attachment B. 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.

Overall, it appears that the design changes address the Commission's direction from the July 17, 2017 meeting and staff recommends approval of the project
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## 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 15 nearby property owners on Eureka Avenue, Grant Road, Grant Court, Stanwirth Court, and Miravalle Avenue.

## PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

Staff received one comment letter from a nearby property owner raising concerns about the development of a two-story house. This letter, along with the previous public correspondence received before the July 19, 2017 Design Review Commission meeting are included in Attachment E.

Cc: Hanna Smolich, Applicant and Architect
Diane Sun, Property Owner
Attachments:
A. Applicant Cover Letter, 3D Renderings and Material Board
B. Landscape Material Details
C. Design Review Commission Meeting Minutes, July 19, 2017
D. Design Review Commission Agenda Report, July 19, 2017
E. Public Correspondence
F. Original Project Elevations (A-3.0 and A-3.1)

## FINDINGS

17-SC-13 - 1289 Eureka Avenue
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 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

## 17-SC-13 - 1289 Eureka Avenue

## GENERAL

1. Approved Plans

This approval is based on the plans received on September 18, 2017 and the written application materials provided by the applicant, except as may be modified by these conditions.
2. Master Bedroom Windows

The two side facing windows in the master bedroom shall be revised to have a sill height of at least 4.5 feet above the finish floor.
3. Protected Trees

The new trees and evergreen trees along the side 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 all existing trees 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.
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## 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

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.


## To: Design Review Commission

From: SC Design Group
Subject: 17-SC-13-1289 Eureka Avenue

After the last DRC Meeting on July 19, 2017 our staff considered all recommendations from DRC and City of Los Altos Planning Division staff and completely redesigned the new single-family house. The following actions have been done:

1. The entryway to garage has been moved to Eureka Ave from Grand Rd.
2. The bulk and scale of the entry and rear covered porch has been reduced.
3. The stairs has been removed from the front.
4. All two-story wall heights have been broken up.
5. Window design has been simplified and vertical emphasis of the arched windows has been reduced.
6. The roof forms have been simplified.
7. The front terrace on the second floor has been changed to small balcony.
8. Additional landscape screening in the interior side and exterior yard has been provided.

We hope that the new submitted design will be approved by DRC and will be liked by neighbors.



COLOR: Madera Blend

Smooth Stucco
PAINT: A-100 Exterior Acrylic Latex COLOR: SW 7541 Grecian Ivory


Iron Railings


Seel Garage Door COLOR: Brown


Doors \& Windows: Jeld-Wen Custom Wood Swinging patio Door COLOR: Dark Chocolate

Jeld-Wen Custom Wood All Panel Exterior Double Door COLOR: Dark Brown Wood

Tile Finished Concrete Steps


Stone Windows \& Doors Trim

## ATTACHMENT B

SEP 182017
CITY OF LOS ALTOS
PLANNING

# DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED TREES AND EVERGREEN SCREENING SPECIES 

PROPOSED<br>NEW RESIDENCE PROJECT AT<br>1289 EUREKA AVE.<br>LOS ALTOS ,CA

NO. 1


Name: LAGERSTROEMIA X HYBRID
Common Name: Crape Myrtle
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The common crape myrtle grows to a height of $15-25$ ' and a spread of 6-15' at maturity.

Average Rate Of Growth: This shrub grows at a fast rate, with height increases of more than 24 " per year

NO. 2


Name: QUERCUS RUBRA
Common Name: Red Oak
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The red oak grows to a height of 60-75' and a spread of around 45' at maturity.
Average Rate Of Growth: This tree grows at a fast rate, with height increases of more than 24 " per year.

NO. 3


Name: PITTOSPORUM TENUIFOLIUM
Common Name: Crape Myrtle
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The privet grows to a height of 8-12' and a spread of 4-6' at maturity.
Average Rate Of Growth: This shrub grows at a fast rate, with height increases
of more than 24 " per year

NO. 4


Name: CUPRESSOCYPARIS LEYLANDII
Common Name: Leyland Cypress
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The Leyland cypress grows to a height of 60-70' and a spread of 15-25' at maturity.

Average Rate Of Growth: This tree grows at a fast rate, with height increases of more than 24 " per year.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS, HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2017 BEGINNING AT 7:00 P.M. AT LOS ALTOS CITY HALL, ONE NORTH SAN ANTONIO ROAD, LOS ALTOS, CALIFORNIA

## ESTABLISH QUORUM

PRESENT: Chair Glew, Vice-Chair Harding and Commissioner Kirik
ABSENT: Commissioners Moison and Zoufonoun
STAFF: Associate Planners Davis and 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 June 14, 2017.
Action: Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Harding, seconded by Commissioner Kirik, the Commission approved the minutes of the June 14, 2017 Regular Meeting as written. The motion passed by the following vote: AYES: Glew, Harding, and Kirik; NOES: None; ABSENT: Moison and Zoufonoun; ABSTAIN: None. (3-0)

## DISCUSSION

2. $\quad \mathbf{1 7 - S C}-07-$ D. and M. McKinley - 667 Rosita Avenue

Design review for a second story addition to an existing two-story house and a new detached second living unit. The project includes an addition to the main house of 154 square feet and a new 795 square-foot second living unit. THIS PROJECT WAS CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 31, 2017 MEETING. Project Planner: Davis

Associate Planner Davis presented the staff report, recommending approval of the project. Project applicants/property owners Dan and Melissa McKinley presented the project.

## Public Comment

Neighbor Jack Giebler spoke regarding the second living unit and character of the neighborhood, said that he would like to see an acoustical engineer report for the placement of the air conditioner, and questioned why the low income requirement for the second living unit was removed.

Neighbor Marlene Belstock spoke in support of the project.
Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Kirik, seconded by Vice-Chair Harding, the Commission approved design review application 17-SC-07 per the staff report findings and the conditions. The motion passed by the following vote: AYES: Glew, Harding, and Kirik; NOES: None; ABSENT: Moison and Zoufonoun; ABSTAIN: None. (3-0)

## 3. $\mathbf{1 7 - S C}-13$ - SC Design Group - 1289 Eureka Avenue

Design review for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,360 square feet on the firststory and 1,138 square feet on the second-story. Project Planner: Davis

Associate Planner Davis presented the staff report, recommending continuance of the project. Project manager Georgiy Novitskiy said that he tried to revise the plans based on staff's comments and reduced bulk. Property owner Diane Sun presented the project and stated that the design was consistent with a varied neighborhood context.

## Public Comment

Neighbor Laurel Iverson summarized the letter she submitted.
Neighbor Marvin Schwartz said he has lived on his property since 1968 and stated his concerns over the new two-story house.

Neighbor Henry Chen stated his opposition to the project because it would change the character of the neighborhood.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Kirik, seconded by Vice-Chair Harding, the Commission continued design review application 17-SC-13 per the staff report, subject to the listed recommended direction. The motion passed by the following vote: AYES: Glew, Harding, and Kirik; NOES: None; ABSENT: Moison and Zoufonoun; ABSTAIN: None. (3-0)

## 4. $\mathbf{1 7 - S C}-16$ - RH Associates - 571 Gabilan Street

Design review for a new two-story house. The project includes 1,818 square feet on the firststory and 1,052 square feet on the second-story. Project Planner: Davis

Associate Planner Davis presented the staff report, recommending approval of the project.
Project architect Daryl Harris presented the project in which he respectfully disagreed with staff and said he would like to keep the 10 -foot plate height, that the landscaping provides a buffer, and there is a detached garage on the adjacent lot. Property owner Amal Khan stated that the neighbors were in favor of the design, especially on the left side.

## Public Comment

None.
Action: Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Harding, seconded by Commissioner Kirik, the Commission approved design review application 17-SC-16 per the staff report findings and conditions, with the following change:

- Remove condition No. 2.

The motion passed by the following vote: AYES: Glew, Harding, and Kirik; NOES: None;
ABSENT: Moison and Zoufonoun; ABSTAIN: None. (3-0)

## 5. $\mathbf{1 7 - S C}-20$ and $17-\mathrm{H}-02$ - G. Evard, Architect -25 Maynard Court

Design review for the alteration of a historic resource property. The project includes a new attached arbor to the main structure, replacement of a sliding door with a larger sliding door along the east elevation of the main structure, and a new 641 square-foot accessory structure. Project Planner: Gallegos


DATE: July 19, 2017
AGENDA ITEM \# 3

TO: Design Review Commission
FROM: Sierra Davis, Associate Planner
SUBJECT: 17-SC-13 - 1289 Eureka Avenue

## RECOMMENDATION:

Continue design review application 17-SC-13 subject to the listed recommended direction

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a design review application for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,360 square feet on the first-story and 1,138 square feet on the second-story. The following table summarizes the project's technical details:

General Plan Designation:
Zoning:
Parcel Size:
Materials:

Single-Family, Residential
R1-10
10,003 square feet
Spanish tile roof, smooth and rough stucco, wood casement windows, wood door, metal details

## Existing

## Coverage:

## Floor Area:

First floor
Second floor

SETBACKS:

| Front | 64 feet | 40 feet | 25 feet |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rear | 61 feet | 38.5 feet | 25 feet |
| Exterior side $\left(1^{\text {st }} / 2^{\text {nd }}\right)$ | 42 feet $/ \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 16 feet $/ 18$ feet | 13.66 feet |
| Interior side $\left(1^{\text {st }} / 2^{\text {dd }}\right)$ | 5.5 feet $/ \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 11 feet/16 feet | 6.83 feet $/ 11.83$ feet |
| Height: | 12.5 feet | 26 feet | 27 feet |

## Proposed

2,561 square feet

2,360 square feet
1,138 square feet
3,498 square feet
3,501 square feet

25 feet
25 feet
13.66 feet
6.83 feet $/ 11.83$ feet

27 feet

## BACKGROUND

## Neighborhood Context

The subject property is located in a Consistent Character Neighborhood, as defined in the City's Residential Design Guidelines. The property is located on Eureka Avenue at the corner of Grant Road. The subject property is at the entrance to the cul-du-sac with low scale, single-story houses with simple massing, horizontal eave lines, consistent setbacks, and rustic materials. Eureka Avenue is a standard width street with curb and gutter and varying mature landscaping. The broader neighborhood context includes Grant Road, which is a wide street with residential properties obscured by mature landscaping and a large church property to the rear of the subject lot.

## 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 structure uses a contemporary Mediterranean inspired design style, which includes more complex roof forms and large scale architectural elements. The house is setback approximately 36 feet from Eureka Road to utilize the interior side yard exception for narrow lots. The minimum width of side yards on narrow lots is ten percent of the average lot width for any portion of a structure which is one story in height, with an the additional second story setback of five feet if a 35 -foot front yard setback is provided. Although the house may utilize reduced interior and exterior side yard setbacks, the massing of the house respects the standard 10 -foot interior side yard setback and 20 -foot exterior side yard setback. The proposed exterior side yard setback includes a portion of the wall with a 16 foot side yard setback where 13 feet, eight inches is required.

The proposed design includes wall plate heights that relate well to the existing low scale neighborhood context with nine feet on the first story and eight feet, six inches on the second story. The design incorporates larger scaled architectural elements on all elevations. The front entry and circular staircase to the right of the entry have a 13 -foot eave height, with an overall height of approximately 15 to 17 feet. These new large scaled elements are visible from both Eureka Avenue and Grant Road and are significantly out of scale with the neighborhood context, as the existing houses have an overall height of approximately 13 to 15 feet.

The left side of the front elevation includes a flat, 10 -foot tall wall with a large second story terrace located adjacent to the master bedroom. The size and scale of the architectural elements on the front and exterior side yards are emphasized by the modest plate heights of nine feet on the first story and eight feet, six inches on the second story. These plate lower heights relate well to the scale of the existing houses as they would be an incremental change in scale in the neighborhood context. The larger architectural elements, however, should be reduced in size and scale to be more proportional to
the proposed low plate heights and scale of existing houses. In addition, the two-story tall walls should be avoided to reduce the bulk of the design.

The left rear corner of the house has a covered patio with an eave height of 10 feet. This element maintains an 11-foot side yard setback and is located adjacent to the existing house. Two crape myrtles trees are proposed in the interior side yard, which will help to break up the massing of taller plate heights. A third tree should be added adjacent to the covered patio to further mitigate the height and bulk of this architectural element.

Staff previously provided comments to the applicant during the initial review process regarding the two-story wall heights, larger scaled entry, circular staircase, rear covered porch, and chimney as these elements were substantially out of scale with the existing neighborhood. These elements contributed to a design that did not minimize the perception of excessive bulk and the required design review findings could not be made. In response to staff's comments the applicant revised the plans to reduce the height the entry and circular stairwell by two to three feet, omitted the bulky second story balcony roof, reduced the eave height of the rear covered porch by four feet, reduced the height of the chimney by approximately three and a half feet, and provided higher sill heights in the interior side yard for privacy.

Although the applicant revised the plans to reduce scale of the house, the overall massing and architectural forms remain substantially the same. The architectural elements, two-story height walls with truncated eaves, predominantly vertical arched windows and heavy materials, such as the barrel tile roof, emphasize the bulky design and large scale of the house that would result in an abrupt change in the neighborhood context. Based on the proposed design within the consistent character neighborhood staff is still unable to make the following required design review findings:

1. The orientation of the proposed new house in relation to the immediate neighborhood will NOT minimize the perception of excessive bulk and mass.
2. 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 NOT been incorporated in order to insure the compatibility of the development with its design concept and the character of adjacent buildings.

## Privacy

The project is located on a corner lot with only the left side of the house adjacent to a residential property. The design is sensitive to the privacy of the adjacent property with four windows with sill heights greater than four feet, six inches. Sill heights that are greater than four feet, six inches would make it difficult to view out and down into the adjacent yard; therefore, the windows would not result in an unreasonable privacy impact.

The project includes a large terrace at the front of the house. The balcony has views of the street to the front and views of the adjacent property's front yard and roof. Balconies located on the front of houses do not create an unreasonable privacy concern, since the view is of a more public area.

## Landscaping

The project includes a comprehensive landscaping plan for the property including eight new trees and various shrubs. The three trees at the corner in the public right-of-way will be maintained and the three existing tree on are proposed for removal. The two bay trees in the rear yard will be removed and one tree is proposed in the rear yard as a replacement. The third tree needs to be removed because it is located in the footprint of the proposed house. Since the project is a new house and includes at least 500 square feet of new landscaping the project is subject to the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance. The landscaping plan meets the planning application requirement of providing hardscape locations, front and exterior yard landscaping, street trees, and privacy screening trees.

## ALTERNATIVES

Overall, as discussed above and outlined in the required design review findings staff is unable to make positive findings and cannot recommend approval of this project. However, should the Commission vote to approve the project, the action should include positive design review findings and standard conditions of approval related to tree protection, grading and drainage, green building, fire sprinklers, undergrounding utilities, and Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance compliance.

## 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 15 nearby property owners on Eureka Avenue, Grant Road, Grant Court, Stanwirth Court, Giffin Road and Miravalle Avenue.

Cc: Diane Sun, Property Owner
Hanna Smolich, SC Design Group, Architect
Attachments:
A. Application
B. Neighborhood Compatibility Worksheet
C. Area, Vicinity and Public Notification Maps
D. Material Board
E. Landscape Material Details

## FINDINGS

## 17-SC-13 - 1289 Eureka Avenue

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 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 NOT 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 NOT 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.

## RECOMMENDED DIRECTION

17-SC-13 - 1289 Eureka Avenue

1. Reduce the bulk and scale of the entry, circular staircase, and rear covered porch.
2. Break up the massing of the two-story wall heights with integral architectural elements.
3. Simplify the window design and reduce the vertical emphasis of the arched windows.
4. Simplify the roof forms.
5. Provide additional landscape screening in the interior side yard.

## CITY OF LOS ALTOS

GENERAL APPLICATION

Type of Review Requested: (Check all boxes that apply) "amati 107639

|  | One-Story Design Review | Commercial/Multi-Family | Environmental Review |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\checkmark$ | Two-Story Design Review | Sign Permit | Rezoning |  |
|  | Variance | Use Permit | R1-S Overlay |  |
|  | Lot Line Adjustment |  | Tenant Improvement | General Plan/Code Amendment |
|  | Tentative Map/Division of Land |  | Sidewalk Display Permit | Appeal |
|  | Historical Review | Preliminary Project Review | Other: |  |

Project Address/Location: 1289 Eureka Ave, Los Altos
Project Proposal/Use: Single-Family House $\qquad$ Current Use of Property: Single-Family House
Assessor Parcel Numbers): $193-34-030$ Site Area: 10,003 SQ. FT.

New Sq. Ft.: 3,495 Altered/Rebuilt Sq. Ft.: $\qquad$ Existing Sq. Ft. to Remain: $\qquad$
Total Existing Sq. Ft.: $\qquad$ Total Proposed Sq. Ft. (including basement): 3,495

Is the site fully accessible for City Staff inspection?
Applicant's Name: SC Design Group HANNA SMOLCH
Telephone No.: 408.865.0577 Email Address: hanna@scdesigngroup.com
Mailing Address: 20370 Town Center Ln. \#139
City/State/Zip Code: Cupertino, CA 95014
$\square$
Architect/Designer's Name: Susan Chen

City/State/Zip Code: Cupertino, CA 95014

[^1]

ATTACHMENT B
City of Los Altos
Planning Division
(650) 947-2750

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 $1^{s t}$ 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 35 mm 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 1289 EURekA Ave, LOS Altos
Scope of Project: Addition or Remodel $\qquad$ or New Home
Age of existing home if this project is to be an addition or remodel? $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ Is the existing house listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory? No

## 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: 10 '100 square feet
Lot dimensions: Length 147 feet
Width 67 feet
If your lot is significantly different than those in your neighborhood, then note its: area _ _ _ length _ _ _ and
width $\qquad$ .
2. Setback of homes to front property line: (Pgs. 8-11 Design Guidelines)

Existing front setback if home is a remodel? $\qquad$
What $\%$ of the front facing walls of the neighborhood homes are at the front setback $50 \%$
Existing front setback for house on left _ 29 ft./on right
$\qquad$ ft .
Do the front setbacks of adjacent houses line up? Yes

## 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 .5
Garage facing front recessed from front of house face _ 7
Garage in back yard -
Garage facing the side 2 .
Number of 1-car garages__; 2-car garages $\underline{\mathcal{B}}$; 3-car garages $\qquad$

## 4. Single or Two-Story Homes:

What \% of the homes in your neighborhood* are:
One-story 50
Two-story 50
5. Roof heights and shapes:

Is the overall height of house ridgelines generally the same in your neighborhood*? Yes
Are there mostly hip 4 , gable style 4 , or other style - roofs*?
Do the roof forms appear simple 8 or complex $\qquad$ Do the houses share generally the same eave height Yes ?
6. Exterior Materials: (Pg. 22 Design Guidelines)

What siding materials are frequently used in your neighborhood*?
1 wood shingle 2 stucco _ board \& batten 4 clapboard _ tile __ stone _ brick 1 combination of one or more materials (if so, describe) stuceo + borfed (GCRMAN style) Tudor

What roofing materials (wood shake/shingle, asphalt shingle, flat tile, rounded tile, cement tile, slate) are consistently (about $80 \%$ ) used? asphalt shingle
If no consistency then explain:

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

Does your neighborhood* have a consistent identifiable architectural style? - YES ${ }^{-}$NO

Type? _ Ranch 1 Shingle 1 Tudor 1 Mediterranean/Spanish 5 Contemporary _Colonial _ Bungalow __Other

Address: 1289 EurekA Ave, LOS Altos
Date: $3 / 7 / 2017$
8. Lot Slope: (Pg. 25 Design Guidelines)

Does your property have a noticeable slope? $\qquad$ No

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

Is your slope higher $\qquad$ lower $\qquad$ same $\qquad$ 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.)? No

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

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)?
DiRt is GoINa to te Remodel to IAWN.

## 10. Width of Street:

What is the width of the roadway paving on your street in feet? Cirant $\mathrm{Rd}-40 \mathrm{Fl}$. Is there a parking area on the street or in the shoulder area? CleAnt Rd-No 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.:
Deep frout yard setpacks.

## General Study

A. Have major visible streetscape changes occurred in your neighborhood? $\square$ YES $\square \mathrm{NO}$
B. Do you think that most ( $\sim 80 \%$ ) of the homes were originally built at the same time? $\square$ YES NO
C. Do the lots in your neighborhood appear to be the same size?

$$
\square \text { YES } \square \text { NO }
$$

D. Do the lot widths appear to be consistent in the neighborhood?

$$
\square \text { YES NO }
$$

E. Are the front setbacks of homes on your street consistent ( $\sim 80 \%$ within 5 feet)? $\square$ YES $\square$ NO
F. Do you have active CCR's in your neighborhood? (p. 36 Building Guide) $\square$ YES NO
G. Do the houses appear to be of similar size as viewed from the street? $\square$ YES $\quad$ 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?


## 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 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rear } \\ & \text { setback } \end{aligned}$ | Garage location | One or two stories | Height | Materials | Architecture (simple or complex) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1281 EUREKA AVE. | 2913" | $25^{1} 7^{\prime \prime}$ | Front projectiva | 1 | $12^{1}$ | CIAPGOARC, shingle | simple |
| 1273 EUREKA AVE. | $30^{\prime} 4^{4}$ | $25^{\prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FRONT } \\ & \text { PROJECTINA } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | $12^{\prime}$ | clapboapd. shingle | simple |
| 1265 EUREKA AVE. | $30^{\prime} 9^{\prime \prime}$ | $27^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FRONT } \\ & \text { PROJECINA } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | $12^{\prime}$ | clap boafd, swingle | 87 mple |
| 1260 StANWIRCh ct. | $27^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ | $32^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ | FRONT protectina | 7 | $12^{\prime}$ | stucco. Rouncled tice | simple. |
| 1391 GRANE Ct. | $35^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ | $18^{\prime} / 1^{\prime \prime}$ | SIDE | 2 | $22^{\prime}$ | stucco, boatd, stingle | complex |
| 1385 GRANI Rd. | $57^{\prime}$ | $44^{\prime} 9^{\prime \prime}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FRONT } \\ & \text { RECESSED } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | $20^{\prime}$ | stucco. shingle | simple |
| 1365 GRANL Rd. | $36^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ | $25^{\prime} 2^{\prime \prime}$ | SIDE | 2 | $24^{\prime}$ | shimgle, stingle. | simble |
| 1305 hiravalle tve. | $27^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ | $25^{\prime} 6^{4}$ | frout | 2 | $20^{\prime}$ | sbucco, shingle. | simple. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



1279 Eureka Ave., Los Altos


1277 Eureka Ave., Los Altos


1190 Eureka Ave., Los Altos


1281 Stanwirth Ct., Los Altos


1365 Grant Rd., Los Altos


1305 Miravalle Rd., Los Altos


## ATTACHMENT C

## AREA MAP



## CITY OF LOS ALTOS

APPLICATION: 17-SC-13
APPLICANT: SC Design Group/ D. Sun
SITE ADDRESS: 1289 Eureka Avenue

## VICINITY MAP



## CITY OF LOS ALTOS

APPLICATION: 17-SC-13
APPLICANT: SC Design Group/ D. Sun
SITE ADDRESS: 1289 Eureka Avenue

## 1289 Eureka Avenue Notification Map






## ATTACHMENT E

# DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED TREES AND EVERGREEN SCREENING SPECIES 

PROPOSED<br>NEW RESIDENCE PROJECT AT<br>1289 EUREKA AVE.<br>LOS ALTOS ,CA

NO. 1


Name: LAGERSTROEMIA X HYBRID
Common Name: Crape Myrtle
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The common crape myrtle grows to a height of $15-25$ ' and a spread of 6-15' at maturity.

Average Rate Of Growth: This shrub grows at a fast rate, with height increases of more than 24 " per year

NO. 2


Name: QUERCUS RUBRA
Common Name: Red Oak
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The red oak grows to a height of 60-75' and a spread of around 45' at maturity. Average Rate Of Growth: This tree grows at a fast rate, with height increases of more than 24 " per year.

NO. 3


Name: PITTOSPORUM TENUIFOLIUM
Common Name: Crape Myrtle
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The privet grows to a height of $8-12$ ' and a spread of $4-6$ ' at maturity.
Average Rate Of Growth: This shrub grows at a fast rate, with height increases
of more than 24 " per year

NO. 4


Name: CUPRESSOCYPARIS LEYLANDII
Common Name: Leyland Cypress
Anticipated Height And Spread At Maturity:
The Leyland cypress grows to a height of 60-70' and a spread of 15-25' at maturity.
Average Rate Of Growth: This tree grows at a fast rate, with height increases of more than 24" per year.

## Zach Dahl

From:
Kenneth Lee [ipmlee@yahoo.com](mailto:ipmlee@yahoo.com)
Sent: Sunday, September 24, 2017 9:32 AM
To: Planning Service; Zach Dahl
Cc:
Kenneth Lee; Ann Lee
Subject: Comments on 1289 Eureka Avenue

September 24, 2017
Dear Mr. Dahl and Members of the Los Altos Design Review Commission, My name is Kenneth Lee. My wife and I are owners of 1273 Eureka Avenue, a single-family home which is two doors down from 1289 Eureka Avenue.

We would like to express our strong objections to the planned addition of a second floor to 1289 Eureka Avenue. Our rationale are as follows:

1) We believe the addition of a second floor to the subject property would be intrusive to the neighborhood and invade the privacy of neighboring properties.

The neighborhood on Eureka Avenue consists of 27 homes, all of which (with exception of one home on Thorpe Ct with very low profile second story add-on having no windows overlooking neighbors and mature trees for privacy) are ranch style one story homes. Large two story homes do not blend into the low-slung ranch style aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Furthermore, the neighboring properties to 1289 Eureka all contain pools. Adding on a second story would reduce the neighbors' privacy (including my home) as it would be very easy for someone on the second floor to look into the neighboring pools.
2) With lack of mature trees for cover, a second floor add-on at 1289 Eureka would make it inconvenient for neighboring properties to open windows and window shades. Again, there would be a significant reduction of privacy.

Please email me or call me at 650-383-8540 with any questions.

Regards,
Kenneth and Ann Lee

To: Design Review Commission Meeting 7-18-17
From: Laurel Iverson, resident at 1209 Eureka Avenue Regarding: 1289 Eureka Avenue new construction


As you consider the application for a new two-story home at 1289 Eureka Avenue, I hope you will consider the following:

1. The applicant's definition of 'the neighborhood', while perhaps technically correct, is not an accurate representation of 'the neighborhood'.
a. The applicant lists homes across Grant Rd. to be 'in the neighborhood', which they are not.
b. Grant Rd. is a major traffic artery and dividing line between neighborhoods.
c. The Eureka Avenue Block Action Team (BAT \#43) does NOT include any homes on the 'other' side of Grant Road.
2. The applicant lists several two-story homes in the 'neighborhood', but all the homes they site are on the 'other' side of Grant Road.
a. There is only one two-story home in the Eureka Ave neighborhood which is an addition done to an original home. (see photo \#1).
b. The two-story homes used for comparison in the application are on Grant Road, largely blocked from view by mature trees, as sited in the staff report. The proposed home at 1289 Eureka will not be blocked by any tall or mature landscaping. (see photos \#2, \#3, \#4)
3. The proposed home is not in keeping with the style of the neighboring homes.
a. 18 of the 26 homes in the Eureka Avenue neighborhood were built by the same builder in the same year(s), 1961. They all feature wood clapboard siding and stone or brick facing the street, with wood shake or now composite shingled roofs. There is no Spanish tile roofing on these homes.
b. The bulk is too much for the neighborhood, not in keeping with the minimal profiles of the other homes.
4. Should a two-story home be allowed at 1289 Eureka, l'd like to request the following:
a. Less bulk
b. Style of home to be closer to the ranch style of existing homes
c. Tall trees and bushy shrubs to be put on the side of the home, outside the fence, along Grant Road, to screen the home and make the entrance to the neighborhood more attractive.
d. Also would like to suggest a DG pathway or something similar along the Grant Road side of the house to make walking along Grant Road a bit easier - right now it is unevenly rocky and weedy (I'm assuming this side area along Grant is the property of 1289 Eureka - perhaps it belongs to the City?) (see photo \#4).

Thank you very much for your service to our community and for considering these comments.

Respectfully,

Laurel Iverson


Photo \#2:


Photo \#3:


Photo \#4:


## Sierra Davis

```
From:
Gary Loebner <svfiduciary@sbcglobal.net>
Sent:
Tuesday, July 18, 2017 9:13 AM
Sierra Davis
Owner Comments Regarding 17-SC-13 1289 Eureka Avenue
```

July 18, 2017

Design Review Commission
\% Ms. Sierra Davis
Associate Planner
Planning Division, City of Los Altos


I am both a Los Altos resident and as Trustee of the Lance W. Williams Trust which has a $50 \%$ interest in 1281 Eureka Avenue, I am an owner of the residential property most directly impacted by this project.

My primary concern is the extent to which this proposed new two-story residence will impact the privacy and enjoyment of the backyard and pool area of 1281 Eureka. On behalf of myself and the current owners, as well as future residents I would like to make the following comments and requests for plan modifications prior to approval by the city:

1. I absolutely support the addition of additional Crepe Myrtle trees along the left side of the property to provide maximum screening. I believe more than one additional tree would be appropriate and because these trees are fairly slow growing would also request that the size of the initial plantings be increased from 15 gallons.
2. There appear to be four windows in the second-story Master Bedroom Suite on the common property line side of the house. The two windows towards the rear of the structure are in the bathroom area. In the spirit of maximizing the privacy of the residents of both properties I believe it would be beneficial if something less than completely transparent glass was utilized.
3. The plans also reflect a fireplace along the side wall of the first-story family family room with a chimney looming well over the roof line on the same common property line. Given that new wood burning fireplaces are no longer permitted, and that direct-venting systems are available, this chimney structure is not needed. In the spirit of minimizing the bulk and complexity of the structure visible from 1281, and admittedly my subjective aesthetic, I request that the chimney be eliminated. I suspect that this would also have the added benefit of reducing the total cost of the project.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Gary E. Loebner
Trustee
Lance W. Williams Trust

GARY E. LOEBNER MBA, CCF, NCG, CLPF \#10
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ When a two-story house on a narrow lot has a front yard setback of at least 35 feet, the additional 7.5 feet required for the second story side yard setback is reduced to five feet (Zoning Code Section 14.06.080.E.2).

[^1]:    * If your project includes complete or partial demolition of an existing residence or commercial building, a demolition permit must be issued and finaled prior to obtaining your building permit. Please contact the Building Division for a demolition package. *

