

### **From 9/27/21 (Kims to Neighbors):**

Hello Everyone,

We hope you've been well!

Grace and I just wanted to provide you with an update on where things are at and share the latest set of plans with you before we submit them to the City for the 2nd round of comments.

We had quite a bit of concern that was raised by a couple neighbors on the N Avalon side, so it took us a while to redesign the 2nd floor plan as well as the exterior facade.

Attached are the latest set of plans that we're planning on submitting to the City ideally by the middle of this week as long as there aren't any significant complaints from the neighbors.

If you have any questions after reviewing the latest plans, please feel free to reach out to us!

Thank you for your support!

Brian & Grace

### **From 9/28/21 (Kolstads to Kims):**

Hi Brian and Grace,

Thank you for the note and the opportunity to review your plans prior to their submittal. We appreciate you addressing many of our concerns. It looks like you ended up with a much more attractive home with a much better layout at the same time. It seems that going back to the drawing board was fruitful!

We do have some continued concerns about your project that we will outline here:

- The house that was already very tall, got even taller to within 1 inch of the maximum allowable size. This is fine, but you are already building to the maximum in every other dimension. BTW, on sheet 10 the height is called out at 26'6". On sheet 11 it is also called out as 26'6" but the building height line is shown deceptively higher in one portion. We suggest your draftsman take another look at your plans before the city review to get the dimensions correct as the same error exists on page 12.
- Your JADU went from 496 sqft and a home of 4014 sqft (total 4510), to a JADU of 803 sqft and home of 4023 sqft (total 4826), while the floor area is within hundredths of the allowable size (4841 sqft). You are so close, you even had to remove the rear shed to stay under. Your family of 6 will clearly need more than the 4 bedrooms upstairs. This is clearly not a JADU as no family with 4 kids would design a house with 4 bedrooms.

The allowance for a JADU is to allow for an additional residence on a property. It is not to skirt around the rules and add 800 sqft more than the current coverage rules allow. It is clear that the plan is to simply remove the wall separating the home and the JADU and add the 2 bedrooms to your home for your children to use after your final inspection, while you could have just designed a house that meets the rules to begin with. I am sure this will come up in the public hearing.

The Los Altos feeling has been defined by trees and a low density housing due to its lot coverage and setback rules and we would like to keep it that way. We are very concerned about the precedent that is being attempted to be set. We feel strongly that it will erode the feeling of Los Altos if it is allowed.

We would be happy to discuss further in person if you like.

Thank you,  
Chris and Kristen

**From 9/30/21 (Kims to Kolstads):**

Hi Chris,

Thank you for your email and for voicing your concerns to us. To be honest, we were a little taken aback by the accusations you made in your email.

We would like to maintain a good neighbor relationship with you and your family, so we're going to assume that you had good intentions and the tone just came off harsher over email. We've been immersed in all the details of this house construction and sometimes we forget that everyone else may not know our thought process and the background or reasons behind what's being done. On that note, we would like to try to explain some of the facts so that you can get a better understanding of where we are coming from.

To start off, we promise you that we are in no way trying to skirt around any rules. There was no plan to remove a wall after the final inspection. Since you guys are going through a similar process yourselves, I'm sure you understand how this whole project is a huge undertaking and there are a lot of evolving decisions and factors that come into play every day. We go back to the rules each time to see if anything needs to be updated or discussed again.

As you've noted, we are a family of 6, with college just around the corner for our eldest by the time the house is built -- maybe one day he and the other kids will want to come back to visit/stay. In addition, our family was heavily impacted by Covid and I lost my father as a result of it. My mother is aging and I really want to be able to provide long-term support and care for her, but we are unable to in our current house. We are also very close to Grace's parents and we would like to provide for them too when needed. Therefore, we wanted to build a spacious home to accommodate our growing family needs as we hope to stay here and make this our final home.

We started looking into adding a JADU in the initial submission, but we realized after the first comment letter came back from the city that the rule had changed for a JADU at the beginning of 2021. So, in our 2nd draft, we shifted towards an attached ADU to better fit our needs. While putting together the 2nd draft of the floor plan, we were under the impression that interior access to the attached ADU from the primary residence was not allowed, but the rule wasn't very clear to us. To be conservative, we drafted it with no interior access for now and planned to update it once our builder had further discussions to confirm with the City planner after our 2nd submission. Unfortunately, the whole design process is taking longer than we expected, so the meeting hasn't happened yet with the planner. If we receive confirmation that we can include an interior access, then all we'll need to do is simply add a door to the current plan in our next submission. If we receive confirmation that we cannot include an interior access, then we'll need to go back to the drawing board. The above is what we have been planning all along and again, we were not trying to skirt around any rules.

We want to thank you for sharing your thoughts. We love the neighborhood and agree with you that having trees all around us is part of the beauty of Los Altos. Currently, the land is quite bare in the front and back and our plans show we will be planting a lot of trees and plants to add to the landscape. We understand that misunderstandings can happen if we don't have an open line of communication. Hopefully, we've provided

some clarity to the situation and we hope this isn't an issue that will dampen our future relationship. If you have any further questions or concerns, we are happy to discuss them with you in person.

Brian & Grace

### **From 10/3/21 (Kolstads to Kims):**

Hi Brian and Grace,

We want to first say that we are very sorry for your loss. I lost my wife 3 years ago and Kristen and I just got married in February. I too have a son who has graduated college this year and we fully expect that he will be the one living in our ADU once the construction is completed. My daughter is 20 and just started University of Oregon this week. We are having to remodel our house because Kristen has 2 kids as well, her daughter a Junior in High School and her son a 6th grader at Almond.

We too would like to have a good relationship with our neighbors. Honestly, we were very taken aback by receiving certified mail with a CC list as our first interaction with you. When we went through the same process ourselves, we went door to door to speak with the neighbors and describe our project and ours is just a remodel. We have been here for 24 years, so we did not have to introduce ourselves much. It would have been a perfect opportunity and a nice way for you to meet the neighbors, but instead, it came across as cold and a bit of a legal checklist item.

When we first reviewed your plans, we gave an email response and asked if you'd like to discuss in person. We, literally, just went through the same process and could explain all of the rules about ADUs and JADUs. Because of our timeline, we were the first attached ADU approved as a remodel and got to go through the whole learning process with the design and planning review teams as well as our neighbors. The main rules of an ADU is that it is to be treated completely separate from the house with no access from the house directly. It must have separate HVAC, water heater, fuse panel, etc. In addition, it must meet the fire rules and have 1 hour fire walls for any wall or ceiling shared with the main house. In our design, we went so far as to not have any windows even looking into the main house backyard area to keep things completely separate. We also made ours ADA accessible for the same reasons you cited with your and your wife's parents.

We did not receive a response to our email at all. The next contact we had was another email and new plans. We really do like the changes that you have made to the exterior of the home. We know we can't really comment on the aesthetics, but we like the new one much better. You addressed many of the exterior concerns that we had with the house, but the biggest interior issue simply grew bigger. What was clear, and you just confirmed, is that you intend to have access to the ADU from the main house. This seems to be what you are upset about us pointing out, and yet, you admit that these accusations are true ("The above is what we have been planning all along"). Direct access is strictly not allowed and we're not sure why you believe the rules are vague. You will definitely receive confirmation from the city that this access is not allowed.

The "ADU" as drawn has no exterior access other than a sliding glass door (the prior design had none either). Additionally, the sliding glass door overlaps with the "kitchen" cabinets which were clearly added as an afterthought. It has no space for a water heater or laundry called out. It does not call out the requirement of the fire separation walls and ceilings. Your eldest still has 3 years of high school and will still need a place to stay when he comes home from college. You also say that the rules changed for the JADU at the beginning of 2021, however you designed your home taking full advantage of the square footage this allows beyond the lot coverage percentage. Your second iteration pushes this even further. Perhaps you should explore the option of a basement as this allows a much greater living space while still meeting the rules. We just went through this process and were scrutinized ourselves throughout. We had to play by all the rules and you will too.

We have nothing but the best of intentions for ensuring your home meets the rules. We are sorry if the bluntness of the feedback causes you pause. We had several changes that we had to make late in the process and getting new soils, engineering, architecture amended for each of them is costly and time consuming as you noted. I hope that the early feedback and clarity of the rules will help for you to design a home that will not require future costly edits. We will surely invite you over for a meal once our project is completed which we hope will be early next summer.

Thanks,  
Chris and Kristen



To: Los Altos Design Review Commission

From: Dave and Dawn Edgren

Re: Comments on Proposed Housing Project at 283 Sunkist Lane

Date: February 14, 2022

We are Dave and Dawn Edgren. We reside at 277 North Avalon Dr., Los Altos. We have resided in our home for more than 22 years, since 1999. We moved to Los Altos for access to the excellent public schools, the nice, relaxed neighborhoods largely filled with rancher-style homes, and for proximity to the quaint Los Altos village. Growing up, our daughters attended Almond Elementary, Egan Junior High, and Los Altos High School. We have a friendly neighborhood. Every other year, the neighbors on North Avalon Dr. gather for a block party. We walk our dog every day in the neighborhood.

We have a number of concerns and object to the design of the proposed two-story project at 283 Sunkist Lane. For starters, the style of the structure is like nothing anywhere in our neighborhood. Most of the homes in our neighborhood are single story, rancher-style homes. While there is a scattering of two-story homes in our neighborhood, the designs of these two-story homes are such that the second stories are smaller relative to the first stories, typically designed with a master bedroom suite on the second floor. The proposed structure at 283 would have a second floor almost as big as the first floor; 1,771 square feet and 2,259 square feet, respectively. This design in total resembles a monolithic, straight up structure with hard, sharp corners and bright white exterior vertical walls, completely out of scale and proportion to the other houses in the neighborhood. This design would set an unacceptable precedent by allowing commercial-looking structures within a residential neighborhood.

Moreover, the present westerly view from our house is over the roof line of our neighbors across the street at 290 North Avalon Drive. The view is that of a stand of stately, mature redwood trees. The proposed structure would obliterate this view of the trees and replace it with an enormous, white, blocky, commercial-looking stucco structure.

We would also like to comment on deficiencies in the landscaping design of the proposed structure. As drawn, there would be vegetative screens planted immediately next to the fence lines. We have a personal experience with just such a planting layout which can cause adverse consequences. Our next-door neighbor planted vegetative screen along the common fence of our properties. The height of this screen has grown to more than 17 feet. Unfortunately, their bushes grow not just on their property but also spread onto ours. As a result, we end up paying our gardener about \$1000 a year to cut back their overgrowth on our side of the fence. Additionally, we had a producing dwarf apple tree and a producing dwarf pear tree thriving near the fence on our side of the property line. After the neighbor's vegetative screen was planted and became mature, both fruit trees died. We believe that the invasive root systems of that vegetative wall just over the fence choked the life out of our productive little trees.

We hope to be able to welcome the Kims to our neighborhood. This would be possible if they would re-design their house so that it would align to the scale, style, and residential character of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

*Dave Edgren*  
*Dawn Edgren*

Dave and Dawn Edgren

277 North Avalon Dr.

## Steve Golden

---

**From:** Steve Drenker <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 14, 2022 10:39 AM  
**To:** Steve Golden  
**Cc:** Jon Gavenman; Kimberly Gavenman; Paul Foerster; Dawn Edgren; David Edgren; Cathy Chin; Ken Sims; Susan and Kenneth Sims; Ken Sims; Patrick Drenker; Teri Drenker; Nilufer Vesuna; Jeanne & Paul Foersters; Sue Jamp; Kerstin H.; Kerstin Hellmann; Sarosh Vesuna  
**Subject:** 283 Sunkist Lane proposal

Hello, Mr. Golden.

My wife Teri and I have lived on Avalon Drive for 39 years. We previously lived in the very congested midtown area of Palo Alto and searched up and down the peninsula for a location with a semi-rural feel, spaciousness, a close-knit neighborhood, excellent schools, close proximity to a vibrant downtown area, a town commitment to maintaining a small-town feel, good parks, and a well-run city government. We chose Los Altos because it met all of our desires and has been a wonderful place to raise our family. It was our dream to be able to live here and we have loved all of our time here.

Like many, I am absolutely dismayed by the rampant growth and development in our town that has been eroding the quality of life we sought here.

We strongly oppose the design of the house proposed at 283 Sunkist Lane. There are many things wrong with the proposal that violate the city design guidelines, among these are the planned huge flat rear wall, the massing of the house, the loss of daylight and views by our friends on Avalon, the devastating loss of privacy by neighbors on the west side of Avalon, and the proposal by the owners to plant trees six feet apart at the fence line that will grow to 40 feet in height at maturity. We commend our friend and neighbor Sarosh for his tireless effort to review the guidelines and flag these violations to all of our affected neighbors.

While the design firm is local, we are appalled that they selected an architect in India who has most likely never been to Los Altos to get a feel for our neighborhood and does not understand the character of our neighborhoods.

Our beautiful city is changing rapidly. For decades, the city fought to retain the "village like" atmosphere of Los Altos. In the 1980s, the city began doing a good job stopping the growth of outsize two story homes on quarter acre lots. I hope the city is able to continue its fine efforts to preserve the treasured character of our wonderful neighborhoods and get the product at 283 Sunkist scaled back to a sensible size.

Once projects like that get a foothold, they are quickly followed by others that will permanently destroy the character of the town we love.

Thank you for your efforts to lead this review process.

Regards,

Steve and Teri Drenker  
265 Avalon Drive  
Los Altos, CA 94022

## Steve Golden

---

**From:** catherineychin@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 14, 2022 5:12 PM  
**To:** Steve Golden  
**Cc:** 'Jon Gavenman'; 'Kimberly Gavenman'; 'Paul Foerster'; 'Dawn Edgren'; 'David Edgren'; 'Ken Sims'; 'Susan and Kenneth Sims'; 'Ken Sims'; 'Steve Drenker'; 'Patrick Drenker'; 'Teri Drenker'; 'Nilufer Vesuna'; 'Jeanne & Paul Foersters'; 'Sue Jamp'; 'Sarosh Vesuna'; Cathy Chin  
**Subject:** RE: 283 Sunkist Lane - New 2-story home development (input from affected Avalon Drive Neighbors)

Mr. Golden,

I love Los Altos, heavily support local merchants and believe I am an open minded and friendly neighbor. I enjoyed meeting the Kims and hearing about their building plans. That said, I agree with the design issues previously sent to you from Avalon Neighbors. I am particularly sensitive to these issues because I struggled with privacy issues from another Sunkist home for 30 years. The stress of being on public display every time my family went into the backyard robbed us of fully enjoying our home. I eventually worked with my Sunkist neighbor, who has a one-story home, but this would not have been possible for a two-story structure that peered into my backyard. I am hopeful the Kims will get a home they love, while preserving the home life joy on Avalon.

Respectfully,  
Cathy Chin

---

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

~~Services Manager~~



To: Mr. Steve Golden & Members of the Los Altos Design Review Commission  
From: Sarosh & Nilufer Vesuna, 300 Avalon Drive, Los Altos  
Subject: Comments related to 283 Sunkist Lane - New 2-story development project  
Date: Feb 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022

We moved to Los Altos in 1992 for all the wonderful reasons that our decades long neighbors have already stated in their letters. A few of those reasons include great schools, friendly neighbors, abundance of trees and other foliage and above all a large concentration of single-story homes built tastefully & proportionately relative to lot size so as not to intrude on the view, privacy, sunshine and airflow, for neighboring homeowners.

This letter is intended to supplement the email exchanges and the 4-page document titled, **“Perspectives on the Physical Qualities and Character of the 283 Sunkist residential neighborhood”** which all the affected Avalon neighbors sent to the owners and architects of 283 Sunkist and to Mr. Steve Golden, L.A. Planning dept in Oct’21. We would like to sincerely thank Steve for patiently guiding us through the Los Altos approval process and being prompt in all correspondence with us. Steve even responds on weekends, which is going above & beyond his call for duty.

The first sentence of the Los Altos Residential Design Guidelines document states that the “guidelines were developed after an extensive community-wide look at the values and expectations that neighborhoods have for the housing that surrounds them.” Those words and the 40+ pages that followed, were enough to convince us of the exceptional values that Los Altos stands by and would continue to protect, in supporting its homeowners and preserving the semi-rural nature of our neighborhoods.

Over the last 30 years we have raised our family in our home. Our two sons attended Almond, Egan, LAHS, Boy Scout Troop 37, played on school & competitive sports teams and volunteered in the immediate community. Our family has been able to enjoy, appreciate and participate in our neighborhood, because several generations of city leaders supported these neighborhood “values and expectations” for 70 years, since 1952. For the last 30 years in our current home, there has not been a single instance when we needed to complain to the city about any neighborhood home development. In large part Los Altos city leaders made sure that the well documented “values & expectations” were upheld.

The proposed 4800+ sq-ft. 2-story project/home at 283 Sunkist, defies all “values and expectations” that we, as immediate neighbors have for the “housing that surrounds us”. Since July’21 when we received the first letter from the 283 Sunkist owners about building their “dream home”, all of us on Avalon Drive who are affected by this development have repeatedly communicated to them that building their “dream home” does not have to infringe on the privacy, view, sunlight, breeze and above all destroy the “dream homes” of all their neighbors. We invited them to visit our back yards, which they did on July 26<sup>th</sup>, 2021, when several of us met with the 283 Sunkist owners. Within a few days of receiving their initial letter we suggested various ways of mitigating our concerns, such as building a large single-story home with a huge basement. Their response was that they wanted to have a larger backyard for their family’s enjoyment, with absolutely no concern for the fact that they will be inhibiting the enjoyment of backyards of all several their neighbors, by building 20 feet high straight up white walls and a 27-foot roof line. It did not matter to them that their proposed 40 feet high continuous wall of bushes right at the fence-line, which will intrude 30 feet horizontally into their neighbors’ yards, completely destroys the enjoyment of their neighbors’ yards, by cutting off the view of the skyline, sunlight to allow

neighbors trees to grow, or allowing the breeze to flow through, while they can continue to enjoy all these from the luxury of their second-story bedrooms and family room.

Throughout our correspondence, we have been shocked by the owner's apathy toward the concerns of decades long residents of our neighborhood, and minimal consideration of our rights under the Los Altos Residential Design Guidelines. They did not care that Los Altos requires good neighbor fences not to exceed 6 feet in height with allowance for a 1- or 2-foot decorative trellis, for the very reason that it is "**substantially open to the passage of light and air**" for the enjoyment of all neighbors. Placing 40 ft tall straight line of bushes, at or near the fence line, that will intrude 30 ft into their neighbors' yards, is unacceptable. You cannot mitigate a 27-foot-tall building by placing 40-foot-tall green barrier right at your neighbor's fence line.

It is unfortunately clear to us now, that the 283 Sunkist owners are only interested in getting their way, and have no loyalty, care, or consideration for what makes our neighborhood a very special place.

This personal letter, which, in 3 decades we have never had to write, comes from the heart. It is intended to implore you to think about how you would feel, if you were in our shoes, and all you saw from your bedrooms, family room, breakfast nook, kitchen windows and your entire back & side yard was a 20-foot white wall with a 27-foot-tall barrier (roofline). Or if you noticed that your back or side fence had grown to be a green 30-40 feet tall barrier. All of us use our backyards to entertain family & friends for lunch & dinners, especially more so during the pandemic. On Avalon Dr. we all meet our neighbors often, communicate freely and effectively when matters of fencing and foliage come up, cost sharing and doing what is best for all neighbors. We fear what our Los Altos neighborhood will become if we allow developments where neighbors are separated by 30 – 40 ft tall fences.

We would like to invite each member of the Design Review Commission and Planning dept to visit our homes at your convenience, over the next several months, to get a glimpse of what we are potentially facing, our loss of privacy, enjoyment of sunlight and flow of air, 24x7x365 for the next 70 years, if this project is allowed to go through as currently proposed. We realize that this is just the first step in a very long process. If this behemoth project is allowed move forward, it will set a negative precedent in Los Altos by allowing the creation of giant barriers between neighbors and completely lose the "values and expectations that neighborhoods have for the housing that surrounds them", upheld by generations of Los Altos leaders and cherished by all residents for over 70 years.

Despite these concerns, we whole-heartedly welcome our new neighbors to the thriving family-friendly neighborhood of Los Altos.

Building a new "dream home" in Los Altos should not result in destroying the "dream homes" of the rest of the currently harmonious & friendly community.

Sincerely,

*NSVesuna & SVVesuna*

Nilufer & Sarosh Vesuna

300 Avalon Drive, Los Altos

## Steve Golden

---

**From:** Gavenman, Jon <jgavenman@cooley.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 15, 2022 10:33 PM  
**To:** Los Altos Design Review Commission; Steve Golden  
**Subject:** 283 Sunkist Lane - New 2-story home development - Input from Affected Neighbor (288 N. Avalon Drive)

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for your time and attention to this process, and to the feedback of the neighbors affected by the proposed plans for 283 Sunkist Lane. As our property directly borders the 283 Sunkist property on two sides, and shares a lot of fence line with our new neighbors, this is a painful letter for us to submit. It is the first such submission we have ever thought to make in the 22+ years we've lived together in Los Altos, and it is frankly just the third such situation of which I'm personally aware in the 45+ years I have lived in Los Altos generally (I was raised on Richelieu Court after my parents built their house new, on what used to be apricot orchard, in about 1966 – I went to Portola and then Loyola Elementary School (after Portola closed), then Egan and then Los Altos High School (class of 1984)). It used to be that neighbors around here worked things out with each other. I guess those days are changing.

It pains us to think that our early impressions of our new neighbors, and their impressions of us, will have started with an argument over their ability to build their “dream home”. But, despite consistent dialogue with the 283 Sunkist owners and their architects as described in the next paragraph, we are here.

Los Altos has quite specific Residential Design Guidelines. As you likely know from prior correspondence, despite multiple conversations and correspondence with the 283 Sunkist owners and their architects, starting last summer, pointing out our (and our neighbors') concerns regarding the 283 Sunkist design (some of which are shared and some of which vary by proximity to 283 Sunkist), the Residential Design Guidelines have been broadly ignored in fundamental respects in the name of “dream home”. The result of that approach is quite simply that the design fails the most basic of the guidelines: “preserve neighborhood identity” and “compatibility with existing residential” environment. As you will note from the submitted plans and a review of surrounding homes, there are simply no homes in or around 283 Sunkist that have a combination, among other things, of:

- 1) 20 foot high straight up white walls, which appear monolithic in design and look nothing like the rest of the homes in and around the property.
- 2) A 27 foot roof line, cutting off views of the hills (and the sky at sunset) from neighboring backyards.
- 3) A stunning structure mass and bulk, as well as a massive lack of proportion (visual and structural) relative to surrounding homes. Please note that the 283 Sunkist design is for an almost-5,000 square-foot home (we note, with some astonishment, the fully attached “ADU” square footage, as we had no previous idea that one could “attach” an ADU space to a house and thereby effectively gain extra square footage for living space). Our home, including an additional (permitted) rear unit, is approximately 70% that square footage, despite our lot being approximately 10% larger than the 283 Sunkist lot.
- 4) A second story balcony overlooking our backyard and the backyards of several Avalon Drive neighbors, encroaching on valued backyard privacy. Their balcony, as designed, will directly overlook our backyard hot tub area and primary bedroom and bathroom.
- 5) A 40 foot high bush wall at the fence line, which will (as drawn, and in actuality) cross over the fence and impose plant maintenance costs and impact the root systems on our side of the line. The root system impact will also impact our ability to grow plants and trees on our side of the fence line, thus forcing our plants to exist further away from the fence and reducing our unplanted backyard property space, while optimizing the space and privacy of the 283 Sunkist backyard. The redwood tree in the corner of their property, which we love for its beauty and the shade it provides us, already has drought-affected roots coming up to the surface of our backyard as the tree desperately seeks

water in our increasingly inhospitable climate. There is simply no way that 40-foot high bushes will not further deplete the scarce water supply for plants in our backyard and may actually impair the redwood itself.

Despite our neighbors' and our attempts to convey our concerns with the designs, the 283 Sunkist approach to design principles appears to be simple: "Whatever I want to build on my side of the fence is what I should get to build on my side of the fence.". Sadly, that approach ignores that fundamental point of the Residential Design Guidelines, the neighbors around 283 Sunkist, and our neighborhood look and feel. The 283 Sunkist design is simply inconsistent with the other home designs surrounding it. In fact, the Guidelines themselves already contain what should be the Commission's answer as to the 283 Sunkist design plans: "If your-home design deviates significantly from these guidelines and your neighborhood, you will either be required to provide mitigation or to redesign your project." As there is no mitigation for the problems highlighted short of redesign, the design should be rejected by the Design Review Commission. We are thrilled that the 283 Sunkist owners have reached the point in their lives of building their "dream home". That "dream home", however, should not be allowed as designed in this neighborhood.

As noted at the outset of this letter, we very much appreciate your time, attention and efforts in considering this matter. Additional thanks to Mr. Steve Golden, for his specific attention to this matter over the last several months as this process has proceeded to this point.

Best regards,

Jon and Kimberly Gavenman, 288 N. Avalon Drive

**Jon Gavenman**

Cooley LLP  
3175 Hanover Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130  
+1 650 843 5055 office  
+1 650 849 7400 fax  
[jgavenman@cooley.com](mailto:jgavenman@cooley.com)  
Pronouns: He/Him/His

[www.cooley.com](http://www.cooley.com)

Cooley is committed to [racial justice](#)

Cooley GO > [Start and build your business](#)

---

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient, please be advised that the content of this message is subject to access, review and disclosure by the sender's Email System Administrator.

## Steve Golden

---

**From:** Steve Drenker <sdrenker@pacbell.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 16, 2022 1:39 PM  
**To:** Los Altos Design Review Commission; Planning Services  
**Subject:** Reference to: SC21-0014 - Baba Burhan - 283 Sunkist Lane

To the members of the Los Altos Design Review Commission and the Los Altos Planning Commission:

My wife Teri and I have lived on Avalon Drive for 39 years. We previously lived in the very congested midtown area of Palo Alto and searched up and down the peninsula for a location with a semi-rural feel, spaciousness, a close-knit neighborhood, excellent schools, close proximity to a vibrant downtown area, a town commitment to maintaining a small-town feel, good parks, and a well-run city government. We chose Los Altos because it met all of our desires and has been a wonderful place to raise our family. It was our dream to be able to live here and we have loved all of our time here.

Like many, I am absolutely dismayed by the rampant growth and development in our town that has been eroding the quality of life we sought here.

**We strongly oppose the design of the house proposed at 283 Sunkist Lane.** There are many things wrong with the proposal that violate the city design guidelines, among these are the planned huge flat rear wall, the massing of the house, the loss of daylight and views by our friends on Avalon, the devastating loss of privacy by neighbors on the west side of Avalon, and the proposal by the owners to plant trees six feet apart at the fence line that will grow to 40 feet in height at maturity.

This massive building is completely out of character with the single-story feel of our neighborhood and will forever degrade the charming nature of our neighborhood, our residential streets and the town of Los Altos.

We are dismayed at the inclusion of an ADU within the footprint of the main house. Its inclusion in the main structure should cause the building to be classified as an apartment building in violation of city codes for multi-family housing.

While the design firm is local, we are appalled that they selected an architect in India who has most likely never been to Los Altos to get a feel for our neighborhood and does not understand the character of our neighborhoods.

Our beautiful city is changing rapidly. For decades, the city fought to retain the "village like" atmosphere of Los Altos. In the 1980s, the city began doing a good job stopping the growth of outsize two story homes on quarter acre lots. I hope the city is able to continue its fine efforts to preserve the treasured character of our wonderful neighborhoods and get the product at 283 Sunkist scaled back to a sensible size. Ideally it would be reduced to a single story design with a basement.

Once projects like that get a foothold, they are quickly followed by others that will permanently destroy the character of the town we love.

The Kims want to build their "dream home" in our area. They seem to be completely unaware that we and our neighbors moved here because this was our "dream area" and their plans for their outscale and massive "dream home" are going to destroy the character of our neighborhood and our dreams. The project should be denied or greatly scaled back.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Steve and Teri Drenker  
265 Avalon Drive  
Los Altos, CA 94022