



# PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

7:00 PM - Thursday, May 05, 2022

*via Teleconference*

---

Per California Executive Order N-29-20, the Commission will meet via teleconference only. Members of the Public may call (650) 242-4929 to participate in the conference call (Meeting ID: 146 374 2409) or via the web at <https://meetings.ringcentral.com/j/1463742409>) Members of the Public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Public testimony will be taken at the direction of the Commission Chair and members of the public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit written testimony prior to the meeting at [PCPublicComment@losaltosca.gov](mailto:PCPublicComment@losaltosca.gov). Emails received prior to the meeting will be included in the public record.

## ESTABLISH QUORUM

### PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

*Members of the audience may bring to the Commission's attention any item that is not on the agenda. Please complete a "Request to Speak" form and submit it to the Staff Liaison. Speakers are generally given two or three minutes, at the discretion of the Chair. Please be advised that, by law, the Commission is unable to discuss or take action on issues presented during the Public Comment Period. According to State Law (also known as "the Brown Act") items must first be noticed on the agenda before any discussion or action.*

## ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION/ACTION

### CONSENT CALENDAR

*These items will be considered by one motion unless any member of the Commission or audience wishes to remove an item for discussion. Any item removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion will be handled at the discretion of the Chair.*

**1. Planning Commission Minutes**

Approve minutes of the regular meeting of April 7, 2022.

## DISCUSSION

**2. SB9 Joint Commission Subcommittee**

## COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS

## POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

## ADJOURNMENT

*SPECIAL NOTICES TO PUBLIC: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Altos will make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk 72 hours prior to the meeting at*

*(650) 947-2720. Agendas, Staff Reports and some associated documents for Commission items may be viewed on the Internet at [www.losaltosca.gov/meetings](http://www.losaltosca.gov/meetings). In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Altos will make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (650) 947-2720. If you wish to provide written materials, please provide the Commission Staff Liaison with 10 copies of any document that you would like to submit to the Commissioners in order for it to become part of the public record. If you challenge any planning or land use decision made at this meeting in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing held at this meeting, or in written correspondence delivered to the City Council at, or prior to, the public hearing. Please take notice that the time within which to seek judicial review of any final administrative determination reached at this meeting is governed by Section 1094.6 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. For other questions regarding the meeting proceedings, please contact the City Clerk at (650) 947-2720.*

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE  
CITY OF LOS ALTOS, HELD ON THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2022 BEGINNING AT  
7:00 P.M. HELD VIA VIDEO/TELECONFERENCE PER EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20**

Per California Executive Order N-29-20, the Commission will meet via teleconference only. Members of the Public may call (650) 419-1505 to participate in the conference call (Meeting ID: 147 620 2356 or via the web at <https://tinyurl.com/s3uyy4v7>) Members of the Public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Public testimony will be taken at the direction of the Chair and members of the public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit written testimony prior to the meeting at [PCpubliccomment@losaltosca.gov](mailto:PCpubliccomment@losaltosca.gov). Emails received prior to the meeting will be included in the public record.

**ESTABLISH QUORUM**

PRESENT: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, Roche, Bodner

ABSENT: Commissioners Marek and Steinle

STAFF: Interim Planning Services Manager Golden, Contract Planner Hayagreev, and Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Peter Mills of Solana Drive provided SB9 Objective Standards comments and stated his concern about narrow streets and access. He invited the commissioners to walk his street with him to show his concerns.

**ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION/ACTION**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. Planning Commission Minutes**

Approve minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of March 17, 2022.

Action: Upon motion by Commissioner Bodner, seconded by Commissioner Ahi, the Commission recommended approval of the minutes from the March 17, 2022 Study Session and Regular Meeting with a correction by Commissioner Bodner that she joined before the first item of the Regular Meeting. The motion was approved (5-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, Bodner and Roche,

NOES:

ABSENT: Steinle, Marek

**PUBLIC HEARING**

- 2. 19-D-01, 19-UP-01 and 19-SD-01 – Gregory and Angela Galatolo – 4350 El Camino Real**  
Multiple-Family Design Review, Conditional Use Permit and Tentative Subdivision map for a new multiple-family development with a five-story building with 47 condominium units

along El Camino Real with two levels of underground parking. The proposal includes seven affordable units with four moderate-income units and three very-low-income units, and a density bonus with development incentives to allow for increased building height and a reduced parking aisle width. A Mitigated Negative Declaration with Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will be considered. *Project Planner: Hayagreev* THIS ITEM WAS RECOMMENDED TO BE CONTINUED FROM THE MARCH 17, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Chair Doran noted that Commissioner Steinle had to recuse himself because he has a conflict of interest because he lives within 500 feet of the project at 4350 El Camino Real.

#### STAFF PRESENTATION

Contract Planner Hayagreev presented the staff report recommending Planning Commission denial to the City Council of Multiple-Family Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, Vesting Tentative Map, Density Bonus and Development incentives Applications for 19-D-01, 19-UP-01 and 19-SD-01 for 4350 El Camino Real per the findings and conditions contained in the resolution and gave a brief overview.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan said that the Planning Commission should not deliberate over the conformance of story pole installation.

#### COMMISSION QUESTIONS OF STAFF

Commissioner Bodner asked about the density bonuses of other projects that were approved along El Camino Real.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden said that is some research that staff could do and bring back to the Commission.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan said the maximum density bonus was 35% under state law and above that is discretionary unless you are 100% affordable. The project would have to conform to the objective standards in order to get the protection of the Housing and Accountability Act if they were resubmit under SB330.

#### APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Applicant Angie Galatolo introduced the project and provided a presentation.

Project Architect Michael Rizza provided a project presentation and went over the project details.

#### COMMISSION QUESTIONS OF APPLICANT

Commissioner Ahi

- What is the color supposed to be on the equitone stone siding on the entryway?
  - Answer Michael Rizza: Gray colored stone.
- Garage ramp with two doors, one doesn't seem wide enough, and why is one pushed back and not one opening?
  - Answer Michael Rizza: They are on two different planes, one is 10 feet wide and the other is 8.5 feet.
  - Answer Michael Rizza and Alex Seidel: It has an adequately sized width for one-way traffic but could be looked at and adjusted if needed.

- Why do the bedrooms face the neighboring complex, questioned the windows in the closets of the bedroom and if there are egress windows?
  - Alex Seidel Answer: This is a five-story building that is Type III construction and does not need egress windows.
  - Alex Seidel Answer: There are recessed windows against Peninsula Real.
  - Alex Seidel Answer: He will look into the “closet” window and can adjust it as needed.

#### Vice-Chair Mensinger

- What other El Camino Real projects is the density bonus of 86% consistent with?
  - Answer Project applicant Angie Galatolo: The density bonus she is asking for is comparable to the 4898 and 4656 El Camino Real projects that were approved.
- Are you open to change in distribution of the Below Market Rate (BMR) units?
  - Answer Angie Galatolo: Have discussed with staff in the past. The fifth floor pays for the construction of the extra three BMR units they are providing but would explore.
- Surprised the project is not meeting the objective standards after staff conveyed the inconsistencies.
  - Answer Angie Galatolo: We had to keep the inconsistencies to make the project viable for construction given the current economics.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated standard means any standard, including density that is quantifiable and objective.

#### Chair Doran

- Where will the mechanical HVAC systems be located?
  - Answer Alex Seidel: Split system HVAC and condensers are located on the rooftop.
- Is the risk safety net the fifth floor of market rate units?
  - Answer Angie Galatolo: That is correct.

#### Commissioner Bodner

- Density bonus questions on this project vs. past projects?
  - Answer Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan: Do not know what was done two years ago, but the density standard has been the same and the State density bonus has increased. Also, the type of BMR unit distribution for this project does not meet the current inclusionary standards of density bonus law for affordable housing.

Commissioners Bodner and Ahi note their confusion with the density bonuses previously approved for projects and this one.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated this is a discretionary bonus.

Vice-Chair Mensinger asked a clarification question on how to calculate the density bonus being allowed. Is it based on the number of units provided, not on the square footage of those units?

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated the density bonus is based on units and not square footage and separate from that is the City’s inclusionary ordinance standards.

Interim Planning Services Manger Golden commented on the previous project approved on El Camino Real and stated that mix of types of BMR units and categories were different compared to

4350 El Camino Real. The City accepted a higher number of low- and very-low-income units over moderate-income for those projects. This project proposes four moderate income units and three low-income units.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

Resident Terri Couture gave her support for the project and the additional housing along El Camino Real.

Resident Diana Leung from 4388 El Camino Real stated there is lots of development in the area; traffic light timing is getting longer with so many residential units being added; it is hard to find parking especially on trash collection day; is concerned about the loss of the gas station; the removal of the gas station and its hazardous chemicals; the extra noise and pollution from construction; and about setbacks due to loss of fresh air, natural light and privacy that will be impacted.

Resident Don Gardner stated concern with the five-story tall building being put in front of a three-story building, the privacy impacts, and the developer maximizing profit with a five-story building when it should only be three-stories.

Resident Anne Paulson stated that the applicant should follow the rules about the number/type of the affordable BMR units and distribution of them as the other previously approved projects, and if they do, give the density bonus to them.

Resident Cindy of 4388 El Camino Real and Los Altos High student stated concerns about the environment and impacts to the surrounding residents, general pollution (wildlife, noise, light, etc.), from the project as well as CO2 emissions from construction.

### APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Project Applicant Angie Galatolo stated that the gas station has pollution if it remains, the site would be remediated after removal of the gas station and environmental issues removed, and the land value will increase with this project.

THE PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED.

### COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Roche

- Could benefit from a comparison of data for BMR and density approvals granted on other projects.
- Concerned about the height, size and bulk of the building, and the lack of human scale.
- Concerned about parking and that there is no guest parking being provided.
- Concerned about the type, size, and distribution of the BMR units in the building.

Vice-Chair Mensinger

- Appreciates staff's recommendation and staff report.
- Cannot support project as presented.
- The project should have a different distribution of BMR housing units that meet our standards.

Commissioner Bodner

- Should apply our standards equitably to different projects for consistency.
- Conflicted about how to review this project and staff's recommendation that seems inconsistent.
- Need to have more discussion about the design of the project.
- Concerned about the mix of density and distribution of the affordable BMR units.

#### Chair Doran

- Concerned that the economics of the project is the reason why the fifth floor is needed, and the expensive units are exclusively on the top floor and the affordable BMR units on the lower floors.
- Should revisit and look at the distribution of BMR affordable housing units.
- Relook at visitor parking.
- Suggested moving the project forward and conditioning the project for approval.

#### Commissioner Ahi

- Ok with the density bonus request.
- Height and access concessions are fine.
- Get advice on the unit distribution of BMR housing from industry experts.
- Architecture
  - The corner condition is not designed in an effective way.
  - Entryway should have more distinguishable features such as awnings over the lobby, a building number and more visible lobby.
  - More landscaping needed in the front.
  - The dark gray and the size of the pattern of the siding makes it look too heavy. Use larger panels or a lighter color for that portion of the building.
  - Driveway should be modified to have one single entry.
  - Does not endorse the glass railings.
  - Concerned about the areas facing the neighboring buildings on page A3.2 of the plan because of the dark and heavy materials. Need to break the material up and reduce the verticality.
  - Could condition the project and move it forward as they have in the past.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden and Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan clarified the actions needed for this project at tonight's meeting.

Commissioner Bodner asked about the specific design recommendations by staff in the report.

Contract Planner Hayagreev responded, explained the recommendations in the staff report, and pointed out the design findings that need to be made for the project.

Project applicant Angela Galatolo said she is willing to look at the design issues and the BMR unit distribution and make revisions.

Commissioner Ahi stated concern about moving this project forward with so many of the elements needing change.

Vice-Chair Mensinger said she would prefer the project return to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Bodner said she would prefer the project return to the Planning Commission, staff should have housing experts weigh in with the correct mix of affordable housing units, and change some of the design elements of the project.

Commissioner Roche said he prefers that the project return to the Planning Commission.

Chair Doran said she preferred to continue the project.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Doran, seconded by Commissioner Bodner the Commission recommends continuance of Multiple-Family Design Review, Conditional Use Permit, Vesting Tentative Map, Density Bonus and Development incentives Applications 19-D-01, 19-UP-01 and 19-SD-01 for 4350 El Camino Real with the following direction:

- Address the design comments on pages 13-17 of the staff report; and
- Revise the size, mix, and distribution of the BMR units, including getting advice from a housing expert.

The motion was approved (5-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Chair Doran Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, Bodner and Roche

NOES: None

RECUSAL: Steinle

ABSENT: Marek

#### **COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS**

None.

#### **POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Chair Doran, Commissioners Roche and Ahi asked to put the Joint Commission subcommittees for SB9 on a future agenda for discussion.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden gave an overview of future agenda items.

Staff is looking at mechanical parking lifts in late spring/early summer for field visits with the Commission.

Chair Doran asked to have a discussion on the application of modular construction for mid-rise and high-rise buildings and the design elements.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Doran adjourned the meeting at 9:08 PM.

---

Steve Golden  
Interim Planning Services Manager





Date: May 5, 2022

Agenda Item #2

## PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

**Meeting Date:** May 5, 2022

**Subject:** Form A Combined SB9 Objective Standard Enhancement Subcommittee of Design Review Commission (DRC) and Planning Commission (PC) by Electing Commissioners to the Subcommittee

**Prepared by:** Jia Liu, Associate Planner

**Reviewed by:** Steve Golden, Interim Planning Services Manager

**Attachments:**

- A. April 6, 2022 Joint DRC and PC Study Session Staff Report with Attachments for SB 9 Objective Standards
- B. Draft April 6, 2022 Meeting Minutes

**Recommendation:**

Establish a combined Subcommittee from Design Review Commission (DRC) and Planning Commission (PC) to further evaluate the SB 9 objective standards as voted by the PC at the April 6, 2022 Joint DRC and PC Study Session meeting by electing two Subcommittee members. Accept additional comments on SB9 development concerns and/or enhancements to existing SB9 objective standards.

**Environmental Review:**

The establishment of a Subcommittee is not a “project” within the meaning of Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines.

**Background:**

On December 14, 2021, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2021-57 in response to the State’s allowance of authorized objective standards for the development of single-family residences per California Senate Bill 9 (SB 9). As directed by the City Council, staff was tasked to hold one or more study sessions with the PC and DRC to obtain feedback from both Commissions and the public for any amendments to the objective design standards.

On April 6, 2022, a Joint DRC and PC Study Session was scheduled at which both DRC and PC voted to establish a joint subcommittee from the DRC and PC subject to Brown Act to further evaluate the SB9 objective standards.

For commissioners’ reference, the April 6, 2022 Joint DRC and PC Study Session staff report with attachments are provided in Attachment A and the draft meeting minutes is provided in Attachment B.



## STUDY SESSION

### Agenda Item #1

## JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

**Meeting Date:** April 6, 2022

**Subject:** Review the City's SB9 Objective Standards, conduct Study Session to consider any appropriate modifications to the standards, provide direction to staff and/or recommendations to City Council, consider possible formation of one or more ad hoc subcommittees to study the issue further, and find that the commissions' action in considering proposed changes to the City's objective standards is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378 and 15306.

**Prepared by:** Jia Liu, Associate Planner

**Reviewed by:** Steve Golden, Interim Planning Services Manager

### **Attachments:**

- A. Resolution No. 2021-57 Objective Standards for Single Family Residences
- B. Public Comments Received for SB 9 Objective Standards
- C. SB 9 Fact Sheet from HCD (March 2022)

### **Recommendation:**

Review adopted SB 9 Objective Standards and further input provided by Council members, Design Review Commission Subcommittee members, city staff and the community to improve and enhance the SB 9 objective design standards as directed by City Council. The Commissions may wish to consider organizing a subcommittee (or subcommittees) to complete this work. Subcommittee formation could include one or two subcommittees from each commission or a combined subcommittee with members from each commission. Recommended updates and revisions by the subcommittee(s) would first be reviewed by the full commission(s) who in turn would make final recommendations to the City Council.

### **Environmental Review:**

The study session is not a "project" within the meaning of Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines in that the purpose of the study session is merely to provide feedback to staff before staff initiates the recommended amendments to the adopted Resolution No. 2021-57 to regulate the objective standards for single-family residence that is subject to SB 9 process. Additionally, a study session comes within the exception to review under the California Environmental Quality (CEQA) Guidelines per Section 15306 (Information Collection) since the purpose of the study session is to obtain public input and to provide feedback.



**Subject:** SB9 Objective Standards Updates Study Session

---

**Background:**

State Senate Bill (SB) 9

On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed Senate Bill 9, which became effective on January 1, 2022. SB 9 mandates any local municipality must ministerially allow an urban lot split and a proposed housing development containing no more than two residential units on a single-family residential zoned parcel if such housing development meets certain requirements. SB 9 authorizes a local agency to impose objective development standards that shall not preclude the construction of two single-family units with four-foot rear and side yard setbacks and 800 square feet each in floor area.

Adoption of Objective Design Standards – Phase I

On December 14, 2021, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2021-57 in response to the State’s allowance of authorized objective standards for the development of single-family residences per SB 9. Below is a summary of discussions and meetings that lead to the adoption of the SB 9 objective design standards:

- On October 26, 2021, the City Attorney’s Office gave an SB 8 and SB 9 presentation to the City Council. City staff were directed to work with a subcommittee of the Design Review Commission (DRC) as a resource to create single family objective zoning standards and to provide the City Council a project update on November 9th.
- On November 3rd, the City Attorney’s Office gave an SB 8 and SB 9 presentation to the Design Review Commission (DRC). At this meeting city staff asked that a DRC Ad Hoc Subcommittee composed of two members be formed so input could be provided on the SB 9 objective design standards.
- On November 9th, City staff met with the DRC Ad Hoc Subcommittee to discuss the draft single-family objective standards. Additionally, at the November 9, 2021 Council meeting, staff provided updates on SB 9 single-family residential objective standards progress to the Council.
- On November 30, 2021, staff presented the recommended objective design standards in a draft resolution to the City Council. The Council continued the item to the December 14, 2021 Council meeting with specific direction for revisions to the resolution.
- On December 14, 2021, Resolution No. 2021-57 was adopted by the Council with the Council’s direction to revisit the SB 9 single-family residential objective standards in 2022. Item #3 in the resolution directed staff to hold study sessions with the Planning Commission and Design Review Commission to obtain feedback from the commissions and the public to inform the Council on feedback to the objective design standards. Council also identified specific items needing further examination that are included in the list below.

SB 9 Applications Received

As of the publication of this staff report, the city has received three separate SB 9 applications. Each application was for a new single-family residence on an existing parcel which are authorized under SB



**Subject:** SB9 Objective Standards Updates Study Session

---

9 regulations that allow for the development of no more than two residential units on one parcel. No approvals have been granted to any of the applications.

SB 9 HCD Fact Sheet

On March 25, 2022, the California Department of Housing and Community Development released the “SB 9 Fact Sheet” (Attachment C) which provides further clarifying information regarding SB 9.

**Discussion/Analysis:**

In the Council’s adoption of the SB 9 Objective Design Standards, staff was directed to hold one or more study sessions with the Planning Commission and Design Review Commission to obtain feedback from the Commissions and the public for any amendments to the design standards. This study session provides the commissions an opportunity to any feedback or determine whether further are necessary for the SB 9 Objective Design Standards and how to best organize themselves and make efficient use of the commissions’ time. If there is interest by one or both of the commissions to further study and additional feedback to the standards, a subcommittee or subcommittees be formed to work more efficiently to develop recommendations for the commissions. Two independent subcommittees could be formed by each commission, or a joint commission subcommittee with members from both commissions could be formed.<sup>1</sup> While residential design issues related to single-family residential development are delegated to the Design Review Commission, there are land use related issues as it relates to intensity of development (e.g. floor area and lot coverage maximums, land division, and overall residential land use issues) that may interest the Planning Commission. In the case of any subcommittee(s) that is formed, the subcommittee’s recommendations would be brought to their respective commission, which in turn would make a recommendation to the Council.

Potential Discussion Items for Further Examination – Phase II

Staff has summarized below potential design related issues and specific objective design standards recommended for further examination by the direction from the City Council, comments received from the DRC Subcommittee during Phase I, implementation of adopted design standards on SB 9 projects submitted, and other comments provided by the public:

Items Directed by the Council at the December 14, 2021 Council Meeting:

- Whether building colors should be regulated;
- A better definition or requirement regarding the maturity of screening vegetation;
- Definition and requirements for floor area ratio, which would need to be addressed by ordinance;
- Consideration of allowing taller plate heights if larger setbacks are designed;

---

<sup>1</sup> In either case, the subcommittee cannot constitute a quorum of any one commission. A joint subcommittee would be subject to the Brown Act.



**Subject:** SB9 Objective Standards Updates Study Session

---

- Whether affordable housing requirements can be incorporated; and
- Further research and consideration for street access and safety.

Unresolved Items from the Phase I DRC Subcommittee:

- Definition of site coverage – consideration shall be provided toward a paving per open space standard in the rear yard and how it will impact the drainage, stormwater, etc.;
- Definition of floor area – consideration to include tall ceilings (i.e., two-story ceiling heights to be double counted for floor area); and
- Garage door design and materials.

Recommended Items from Staff:

- Revise APPDENDIX 1, 2.D through G excluding E., to include appropriate setbacks for all residential zoning districts (the setbacks for R1-10 is the only one provided);
- Second story step-back requirements;
- Consideration of minimum tree replacement requirements when protected trees will be removed (i.e. A minimum of one, Category II size tree with a minimum size of 15 gallons or 24-inch box shall be planted for each protected tree up to four trees);
- Add an exception note to Objective Design Standard 2.E.a. - Additional tree planting is not required when existing trees meet or exceed the required planting standards.
- Objective Design Standard 3.D, add language to establish that screening is required for two-story residences only.
- Address height/bulk/scale for non-traditional construction methods that do not have a “plate” structure member;
- Establishment of SB 9 review fees on SB 9 housing and urban lot splits;
- Review and/or simplify daylight plane requirements (i.e. including SB9, each structure type has a different daylight plane in the zoning code); and
- Consideration of restricting the percentage of the ceiling height for each story that exceeds the wall plate height limits.

Comments Provided by the Public (Attachment B):

- Concern regarding urban lot splits on double frontage streets;
- Concern regarding urban lot splits on lots taking access from substandard streets; and
- Privacy concern and lighting impacts for development placed on sloping different lots.

## RESOLUTION NO. 2021-57

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS  
ESTABLISHING OBJECTIVE STANDARDS FOR SINGLE FAMILY  
RESIDENCES TO IMPLEMENT SENATE BILL 9**

**WHEREAS**, on September 16, 2021, the Governor signed Senate Bill 9 (Stats. 2021, Ch. 162) (“SB 9”); and

**WHEREAS**, SB 9 allows for streamlined ministerial approval for certain residential dwelling units in single-family residential zones; and

**WHEREAS**, SB 9 requires the City to apply objective design standards to residential dwelling units approved pursuant to the legislation and prohibits discretionary design review for such units; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Los Altos has adopted Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (the “SFRDG”) pursuant to Section 14.76.020 of the Los Altos Municipal Code; and

**WHEREAS**, to implement SB 9, it is necessary or convenient that the City Council amend the SFRDG to specify objective design criteria applicable to new single-family homes; and

**WHEREAS**, SB 9 allows cities to impose certain standards for projects approved under that legislation, which the City Council desires to adopt; and

**WHEREAS**, certain ambiguities in SB 9 require resolution pending guidance from the judiciary and the Department of Housing and Community Development.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the City Council of the City of Los Altos, as follows:

1. Effective January 1, 2022, the SFRDG are hereby amended to include as APPENDIX D-1 thereof the objective single-family design guidelines (the “Objective Standards”) attached to this Resolution as **Appendix 1**. After January 1, 2022, applications to remodel existing single-family residences and applications to construct new single-family residences not subject to approval under SB 9 shall continue to be subject to the SFRDG. Applications to construct new dwelling units subject to approval under SB 9 shall comply with the Objective Standards. Applicants for projects subject to approval under SB 9 are strongly encouraged to comply with all provisions of the SFRDG to ensure high quality design and neighborhood compatibility.
2. Nothing in this Resolution or its appendices is intended to preclude the application to SB 9 projects of: building codes, state and local rules with respect to accessory

dwelling units and junior accessory dwelling units, or other laws generally applicable to housing development projects of one to four units.

3. As soon as practicable, Staff is directed to hold one or more study sessions with the Planning Commission and with the Design Review Commission to obtain feedback concerning the Objective Standards from both commissions and from the public. Relying on such feedback and the experience of Staff in implementing SB 9, Staff is hereby directed to return to the City Council no later than May 2022 to report on the implementation of SB 9 and to recommend any amendments to the Objective Standards.
4. SB 9 authorizes local agencies to impose certain standards and requirements outlined in **Appendix 2** to this Resolution. Those standards and requirements are hereby adopted, and the SFRDG is hereby amended to incorporate the standards as APPENDIX D-2 thereof.
5. SB 9 contains certain ambiguities that require interpretation. Pending further guidance from the Department of Housing and Community Development and the judiciary, Staff are hereby directed to follow the guidance included in the interpretive guidance document attached as **Appendix 3** to this Resolution. If guidance from HCD or the judiciary conflicts with anything in **Appendix 3**, then that guidance shall control.
6. The City Council hereby finds that the adoption of this Resolution is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3) (Common Sense Exemption) and 15308 (Actions by Regulatory Agencies for the Protection of the Environment), in that the regulations hereby imposed are intended to preserve scenic quality for the City of Los Altos by establishing design guidelines to protect the existing community character, and because it can be seen with certainty that the adoption of the regulations hereby imposed will not have a significant effect on the environment (or that any such effect is wholly speculative), and none of the circumstances in CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 applies.
7. In adopting this Resolution, the City Council intends that it be construed to be consistent with the state and federal constitutions and with applicable state housing laws, including SB 9. If any section, sentence, clause, or phrase of this Resolution (including its appendices), is, for any reason, held to be invalid or unconstitutional, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions hereof.
8. Any person wishing to challenge the validity of any provision of this Resolution (including its appendices), whether facially or as applied, shall, if aggrieved by such provision, appeal to the City Council pursuant to Chapter 1.12 of the Los Altos Municipal Code. As used herein, a person is “aggrieved” if, (a) a provision of this Resolution would prevent the individual from seeking approval of a housing development project for which the individual would like to apply, and (b) in the opinion of the individual, the challenged provision is invalid or unconstitutional. If the City

Council grants an appeal a facial challenge, then it shall direct staff to propose appropriate amendments to this Resolution, consistent with the City Council’s decision on the appeal. If the City Council grants an as-applied challenge, then it may allow an exception to standards to the limited extent necessary to avoid the invalidity or unconstitutionality.

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Los Altos at a meeting thereof on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2021 by the following vote:

- AYES: Council Members Fligor, Lee Eng, Weinberg, Vice Mayor Meadows and Mayor Enander
- NOES: None
- ABSENT: None
- ABSTAIN: None



Anita Enander, MAYOR

Attest:



Andrea Chelemengos, MMC, CITY CLERK



**APPENDIX 1**  
**OBJECTIVE STANDARDS ADOPTED AS**  
**APPENDIX D-1 TO THE SFRDG**

**Objective Standards for Single-Family Residential Zone**

It is intent that the following standards shall not be applied to preclude a housing development project allowed under SB 9. As used here, a residential dwelling unit includes living space only and not parking or accessory structures.

**1. Definition – any term not defined in this section has the meaning given in the City Municipal Code unless otherwise specified.**

“Secondary front lot line” means a lot line abutting a street which is not a front lot line.

“Plate height” means the vertical distance measured from the top of the finished floor to the top of the plates.

“Exterior finish” refers to the exterior façade of a house, excluding the roofs, trim, windows, doors, and shutters.

“Exterior trim” refers to the finish materials on the exterior of a building, such as moldings applied around openings (window trim, door trim), siding, windows, exterior doors, attic vents, and crawl space vents.

“Lines of sight” means with a 60-degree angle beginning at the starting point, 30 degrees to the left and 30 degrees to the right in horizontal perspective.

“High-quality transit corridor” means corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than fifteen minutes during the morning and afternoon peak commute hours.

“Major transit stop” means a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

**2. SB 9 – Development Standards**

**A. Lot Split and Minimum Site Area.**

An existing parcel shall not be subdivided into more than two parcels. The smallest subdivided parcel shall not be less than forty percent (40%) of the original parcel, and both newly subdivided parcels each shall be no smaller than one thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet.

**B. All development standards under Government Code Section 66411.7 are hereby adopted.**

**C. Site Frontage and Site Width.**

- a. The minimum width of the access corridor for each flag lot shall be twenty (20) feet, and shall provide direct access to a public or private street.
- b. Easements for the provision of public services and facilities and egress and ingress are required.

**D. Coverage.** The following coverage standards apply unless two single-family units with four-foot rear and side-yard setbacks and 800 square feet each in floor area are precluded.

- a. The maximum coverage for all structures in excess of six feet in height shall be thirty-five (35) percent of the total area of the site where the height of one-story development does not exceed twenty (20) feet.
- b. A minimum of fifty (50) percent of the required front yard area shall be a combination of pervious landscape material and landscaping.
- c. On sites where the lot coverage exceeds thirty (30) percent, two-story structures shall not be allowed.

**E. Floor Area Ratio.** The following coverage standards apply unless two single-family units with four-foot rear and side-yard setbacks and 800 square feet each in floor area are precluded.

- a. For lots with a net site area not exceeding eleven thousand (11,000) square feet, the maximum floor area shall be thirty-five (35) percent of the net site area.
- b. For lots with a net site area exceeding eleven thousand (11,000) square feet, the maximum floor area shall be three thousand eight hundred fifty (3,850) square feet plus ten (10) percent times the net site area minus eleven thousand (11,000) square feet.

**F. Setbacks.**

- a. Except as noted below, the minimum setbacks shall be as follows:

<b>Front*</b>	
<b>First Story</b>	25 feet
<b>Second Story</b>	30 feet
<b>Secondary Front*</b>	
<b>First Story</b>	10 feet
<b>Second Story</b>	13 feet

<b>Side</b>	
<b>First Story</b>	No less than 4 feet. However, to reduce the privacy impacts to abutting property owners, applicants are encouraged to voluntarily increase the setbacks to be at least 10 feet from the side property lines.
<b>Second Story*</b>	No less than 11.5 feet. However, to reduce the privacy impacts to abutting property owners, applicants are encouraged to voluntarily increase the second story setback to be at least 17.5 feet from the side property lines.
<b>Rear</b>	No less than 4 feet. However, to reduce the privacy impacts to abutting property owners, applicants are encouraged to voluntarily increase the rear setback to be at least 10 feet from the rear property line.

- b. No architectural features (i.e. cantilevers, bay windows, and/or any other architectural projections) shall be allowed within the side and rear required setback areas except for 12-inch maximum eaves with four-inch maximum gutters.
- c. Notwithstanding these rules, the applicant shall be allowed to construct within the dimensions of an existing legal building.

\*Unless two single-family units with four-foot rear- and side-yard setbacks and 800 square are precluded.


**G. Height of Structures.**

No structure shall exceed two stories or twenty-seven (27) feet in height from the natural grade. On flag lots the height of structures shall be limited to one story and twenty (20) feet in height. Basements shall not be considered a story. When the lot coverage exceeds or is proposed to exceed thirty (30) percent, the maximum height of structures shall be twenty (20) feet.

**H. Daylight Plane.**

- a. No portion of any residential units shall extend above or beyond a daylight plane unless two single-family units with four-foot rear- and side-yard setbacks and 800 square feet each in floor area are precluded.

- b. The daylight plane starts at a height of eight feet and six inches (8'-6") at the property line and proceeds inward at 6:12 slope. At eleven feet and six inches from the property line, the daylight plane increases to twenty-three feet (23') and proceeds inward at 6:12 slope. All appurtenances, including chimneys, vents and antennas, shall be within the daylight plane. The daylight plane is not applied to a side or rear property line when it abuts a public alley or public street. However, the daylight plane shall not be enforced if it prohibits two single-family units with 4-foot rear and side-yard setbacks and 800 square feet each in floor area. Notwithstanding this requirement, the maximum required rear and side yard setback shall be no less than four feet.



## I. Basements.

Basements shall be regulated as follows:

- Basements shall not extend beyond the floor area of the first floor of the main or accessory structure above;
- Light wells, ingress and egress wells, patio wells, and other similar elements shall not be permitted within a required setback yards.
- Light wells, ingress and egress wells, patio wells, and other similar elements shall utilize vertical retaining walls. Contour graded slopes, which expose the basement as a story, are prohibited.
- Light wells, ingress and egress wells, patio wells, and other similar elements shall be at least seventy-five (75) percent open in area to light and air above.

**J. Outdoor Kitchen, Barbeques, Fireplaces, and Swimming Pools.**

Outdoor kitchen barbeques, fireplaces, and swimming pools shall be subject to zoning standards of the underlying zoning district.

**K. Parking.**

- a. One covered parking space for each unit with minimum dimensions of nine (9) feet in width and eighteen (18) feet in depth is required. Uncovered parking shall be allowed only to the extent necessary to facilitate the construction of two units that each is 800 square feet in size.
- b. No parking is required in either of the following instances:
  - 1) The subject parcel is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor or a major transit stop.
  - 2) A car share vehicle program is located within one block of the parcel.

**L. Signs.**

Signs shall be subject to zoning standards of the underlying zoning district.

**M. Fences.**

Fences shall be subject to zoning standards of the underlying zoning district.

**N. Nonconforming Use Regulations.**

Corrections on nonconforming zoning conditions shall not be required for the ministerial approval of a parcel map application for the creation of a lot split pursuant to SB 9.

**O. Accessory Structures.**

Accessory structures shall be subject to zoning standards of the underlying zoning district.

**3. SB 9 – Objective Design Standards****A. Plate Heights.**

- a. Plate height is limited to 9'-3" for the first floor except that an entry porch may have a maximum plate height of 12' and a garage may have a maximum plate height of 10'.
- b. Plate height is limited to 8'-3" for the second floor.

**B. Second Floor Windows.**

Second floor windows shall be regulated as follows:

- a. On elevations that are facing interior side property lines, a minimum sill height of 4'-6" is required for all second-floor windows.

- b. On elevations that are facing rear property lines adjacent to a neighboring property, a minimum sill height of the California Building Code (CBC) minimum required sill height for egress or light and ventilation shall be provided.
- c. For any windows within ten feet of rear or interior side property lines adjacent to a neighboring property, the maximum second story window size shall be no larger than the CBC minimum required size.

### **C. Balcony and Rooftop Deck.**

Balconies and rooftop decks shall be regulated as follows:

- a. Balconies and/or roof decks are prohibited when facing interior side yards and rear yard adjacent to a neighboring property.
- b. A balcony or a roof deck is allowed only on front elevations facing public and private streets; and a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet side setback shall be provided from the side property lines to the edge of the balcony or roof deck.
- c. The maximum depth for any balconies and rooftop decks shall be four (4) feet.
- d. The maximum size for any balconies and rooftop decks shall be 25 square feet.
- e. Screening devices shall include solid railing walls instead of open railings, and latticework above the required railing height to obscure sight lines from a balcony or a roof deck.

### **D. Screening Vegetation.**

Screening vegetation shall be regulated as follows:

- a. Screening vegetation is required in either of the following situations:
  - 1) Within lines of sight for any proposed balcony and roof deck projected to any side property line, screening vegetation shall be planted.
  - 2) Within lines of sight from each jamb of any windows with a sill height of less than 4'-6" at second floor, screening vegetations shall be planted.
- b. Any required screening vegetation shall be evergreen species reaching to at least fifteen feet through twenty feet in height at their mature age with permanent irrigation and shall be maintained for the life of the project.
- c. At least twenty-four-inch (24-inch) box screening vegetation shall be planted prior to occupancy of the residence.

### **E. Landscaping.**

Onsite landscaping shall be regulated as follows:

- a. Trees selected from the [Street Tree Planting List](#) are required to be planted on site following the standards below:
  - 1) For lots five thousand (5,000) square feet in size or greater, at least two, Category II trees shall be planted with at least one, Category II tree planted in the front yard. For each additional five thousand (5,000) square-foot lot size, one more Category II tree shall be planted onsite.
  - 2) For lots with less than five thousand (5,000) square feet in size, at least one, Category II tree or two Category III trees shall be planted onsite.
  - 3) If there are existing trees onsite, an arborist report, prepared by an ISA certified arborist, may be required to determine the equivalent value of existing trees compared to the Street Tree Planting List.
- b. Water Efficiency Landscape Ordinance (WELo) and its submittal requirements apply to the following projects:
  - 1) New construction projects with new or rebuilt landscape areas that exceed five hundred (500) square feet.
  - 2) Remodels and/or additions to existing single-family houses with new or rebuilt landscape areas that exceed two thousand five hundred (2,500) square feet.

### **F. Construction Materials and Colors.**

All construction materials shall be long-term (30 years) durability and appearance, as per manufacture's specifications. Specifically, the construction materials shall be subject to the following:

- a. Foam trim with a painted stucco finish is prohibited throughout the structure(s).
- b. Mixing roof materials and colors are not allowed except for curved dormers and shed roof structures.
- c. Exterior finish including wainscoting used for one structure shall be no greater than three different materials. Each material may be a different color, but every part of exterior finish comprised of a single material shall be a single color.
- d. Window and door trims shall be limited to one material and one color. The material and color shall be the same for both windows and door trims.


- e. Architectural detailing shall be incorporated such as window and door trim, belly bands, cornices, shutters, column accents to the entry porch, and railings in an integrated composition.

### **G. Site and Building Design.**

The site and building design shall be subject to the following standards to create visual variety and avoid a large-scale appearance:

- a. Driveway shall be designed per the following standards:
  - 1) Each property is prohibited from more than one curb cut or driveway accessing a street unless the subject site is fronting a City's Arterial or Collector road.
  - 2) A curb cut or driveway width connecting to a public or private street shall be no greater than twenty-two (22) feet.
  - 3) For corner lots, driveway connections shall be at least thirty (30) feet from the intersecting corner property lines at the street intersection.
  - 4) If the project impacts a street shoulder, then it shall be improved accordingly per City's Street Shoulder Improvement Policy.
- b. Façade articulation shall be provided with at least six corners on the first floor.
- c. Building entrances shall have a roofed projection (such as a porch) or recess with a minimum depth of at least five feet and a minimum horizontal area of thirty (30) square feet. Any corners within the building entrances shall not count as part of the corners as required above.
- d. Downspout shall be painted to match or accent the exterior finish color.
- e. Attached garage shall be subject to the following standards:
  - 1) Attached garage shall be recessed at least one foot from the front elevation wall plane of the residence.
  - 2) When a three-car attached garage is proposed, visual impact shall be reduced by, (i) using a tandem parking layout inside a two-car-wide garage; (ii) using three single-car-wide garage doors instead of a double and a single garage door; or (iii) setting back one of the doors from the others.





- f. Windows and doors shall either be trimmed or recessed.
- 1) When trimmed, the trim material shall not be less than 3.5" in width by  $\frac{3}{4}$ " in depth when protruding from the wall.
  - 2) When recessed, the building primary siding material shall cover the recessed edge faces and wrap toward the interior face of the window glazing or door face by not less than 2 inches in depth.
- g. The design of roof shall be regulated as follows:
- 1) No more than two types of roof forms shall be used.
  - 2) No more than two roof pitches shall be used.
- h. First floor finished elevation shall be no more than twenty-two (22) inches above existing natural grade on a non-hillside lot. In a flood zone or flood way, the first-floor level may be set at the minimum allowed above grade to meet code requirements.
- i. For a hillside property, a stepped foundation is required where the average slope beneath the proposed structure is 10% or greater.
- j. No permanent noise generating mechanical equipment shall be located in any required side and rear yards. The placement and operation of any such equipment must be consistent with the City's Noise Ordinance.
- k. No exterior staircases above grade shall be allowed.
1. Except for pathway lighting, outdoor lighting fixtures shall be downward facing and fully shielded or recessed.
- m. All new utility services and relocated existing utility services are placed underground pursuant to Chapter 12.68 of Municipal Code.

**APPENDIX 2**  
**STANDARDS ADOPTED PURSUANT TO SB 9 AS**  
**APPENDIX D-2 TO THE SFRDG**

1) **Objective Zoning/Subdivision/Design Standards.** SB 9 authorizes the City to impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards applicable to structures and parcels created by an urban lot split that do not conflict with SB 9 or preclude the construction of two 800 square foot minimum primary dwelling units. Accordingly, all such existing objective City standards shall apply to SB 9 projects, in addition to any additional objective standards that the City may adopt.

2) **Maximum Units and Lots.** The City shall not approve more residential dwelling units or lots for any SB 9 project than required under state law, as set forth in Appendix 3 of City Council Resolution No. 2021-57.

3) **Parking.** SB 9 allows the City to choose to require parking consistent with the terms thereof. Accordingly, the City shall require off-street parking of one space per unit, unless the lot is located within one-half mile walking distance of either a high-quality transit corridor, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 21155 of the Public Resources Code, or a major transit stop, as defined in Section 21064.3 of the Public Resources Code, or unless there is a car share vehicle located within one block of the parcel.

4) **Setbacks.** SB 9 allows the City to choose to require setbacks consistent with the terms thereof. Accordingly, the City shall require setbacks of not less than four feet from the side and rear lot lines in all SB 9 projects, except as otherwise specified in SB 9.

5) **Applicant Residency; Short-Term Rental.** SB 9 requires every applicant for a ministerial lot split to provide an affidavit confirming that the applicant intends to reside in one of the SB 9 units for three years. The City shall enforce this requirement. All units created under SB 9 shall be subject to the City's short-term rental ordinance, codified at Chapter 14.30 of the Los Altos Municipal Code.

6) **Impact/Development Fees.** Applicants for SB 9 projects shall pay all applicable development impact fees imposed by the City.

7) **Historic Properties.** An SB 9 project may not be located at a property included on the State Historic Resources Inventory, as defined in Section 5020.1 of the Public Resources Code, or at a site that is designated by the City as a historic landmark or listed in the City's historic resource inventory, pursuant to Los Altos Municipal Code Chapter 12.44.

8) **Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.** SB 9 authorizes the Building Official to deny a project upon written findings, based on a preponderance of evidence, that the project will have a specific, adverse impact upon public health and safety or the physical environment for which there is no

feasible method to mitigate or avoid. The Building Official shall assess every SB 9 application for such unavoidable adverse impacts and shall, in consultation with the City Attorney, deny a project if an unavoidable adverse impact is identified. The Building Official's determination shall be final. For greater clarity, a project would have a specific, adverse impact on the physical environment if it would have an unavoidable impact on historic resources, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

### APPENDIX 3 INTERPRETIVE GUIDANCE DOCUMENT

SB 9 applies in “single-family residential zones.” The term “single-family residential zone” as used in Government Code Sections 65852.21(a) and 66411.7(a)(3)(A) is not defined. Within the City of Los Altos, the term “single-family residential zone” shall be construed to mean an R1 zoning designation.

The City’s application checklist for single-family homes would require applicants to indicate in writing whether the application is being brought pursuant to SB 9.

SB 9 allows for ministerial approval of certain “new” residential dwelling units. The term “new unit” as used in Government Code Section 65852.21(i)(1) is not defined, but provisions of SB 9 appear to assume that a new residential dwelling unit could include a reconstructed residential dwelling unit. Therefore, the term “new unit,” as used in SB 9, shall be construed to mean any of the following:

- (1) A new residential dwelling unit (other than an accessory dwelling unit)<sup>1</sup> proposed to be constructed on previously vacant ground;
- (2) A new residential dwelling unit (other than an accessory dwelling unit) constructed in place of a demolished residential dwelling unit;<sup>2</sup>
- (3) A residential dwelling unit (other than an accessory dwelling unit) reconstructed to the substantial equivalence of new.

As used above, a residential dwelling unit is reconstructed to the “substantial equivalence of new” if any of the following three sets of criteria apply:

- (1) The residential dwelling unit is stripped to the studs and/or foundation and reconstructed;
- (2) A substantial remodel is proposed in connection with a substantial addition so that the home will have the appearance of a new home and a remaining physical and economic life comparable to that of a new home. These criteria shall be deemed to be met if all the following apply:
  - a. An addition is proposed to an existing residential dwelling unit equal to or greater in size than 50% of the floor area of the existing residential dwelling unit (excluding

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference to accessory dwelling units here is not meant to exclude construction of such units as allowed under Government Code Sections 65852.2 and 65852.22. Rather, the intent here is merely to define the term “new unit” for purposes of Section 65852.21(i)(1).

<sup>2</sup> Nothing herein is intended to exempt an applicant from the requirements of Government Code Section 65852.21(a)(3)-(5).

- garages, accessory dwelling units, other accessory structures, crawl spaces, unfinished attics, and basement floor areas);
- b. At least 25% (or more, if necessary to bring the structure into compliance with applicable building codes) of the existing roof will be demolished, repaired, or replaced, and the entire roof covering will be replaced;
  - c. At least 25% (or more, if necessary to bring the structure into compliance with applicable building codes) of the existing façade will be demolished, repaired, or replaced, the entire façade will be repainted or otherwise resurfaced, and the entire façade for the residential dwelling unit in its completed condition is designed to match;
  - d. All existing floor coverings and plumbing fixtures will be removed and, as applicable, replaced;
  - e. Sprinklers will be installed if not already provided;
  - f. At least 25% (or more, if necessary to bring the structure into compliance with applicable building codes) of existing drywall or other wall coverings will be demolished, repaired, or replaced, and all retained wall covering will be repainted or otherwise resurfaced; and
  - g. All exterior doors and windows will be replaced.
- (3) All the major systems of the home are repaired or replaced so that the home will have the appearance of a new home and a remaining physical and economic life comparable to that of a new home. These criteria shall be deemed to be met if all the following apply:
- a. All existing plumbing, electrical, and HVAC systems will be replaced or rehabilitated consistent with modern building standards to ensure an estimated remaining physical life of at least 50 years for plumbing and electrical systems and 20 years for HVAC systems; and
  - b. The circumstances described in Item Nos. 2(b) to 2(g) apply.

For greater clarity, a lot developed under SB 9 may contain no more than four total residential dwelling units. These shall be limited to the following:

- (1) On a lot that is not split pursuant to Government Code Section 66411.7 and for which an existing primary residential dwelling unit is retained: one existing primary residential dwelling unit, one new primary residential dwelling unit, one accessory dwelling unit, and one junior accessory dwelling unit, for four units in total.
- (2) On a lot that is not split pursuant to Government Code Section 66411.7 and for which an existing primary dwelling unit does not exist or is demolished or reconstructed: two new primary residential dwelling units, one accessory dwelling unit, and one junior accessory dwelling unit, for four units in total.
- (3) On a lot that is split pursuant to Government Code section 66411.7: not more than two existing primary and/or accessory residential dwelling units (including junior accessory

dwelling units) per newly created lot and not more than two new primary residential dwelling units per newly created lot, for an ultimate total of not more than two residential dwelling units per newly created lot and four residential dwelling units total. In lieu of two new primary residential dwelling units on each newly created lot, an applicant may propose one new primary residential dwelling unit together with either a new accessory dwelling unit or a new junior accessory dwelling unit, provided that the applicant submits a written statement with the application for the housing development project indicating the applicant's understanding that providing the accessory dwelling unit or junior accessory dwelling unit will prevent the applicant from constructing a second primary residential dwelling unit. It is the intent of this provision that not more than four units may be constructed per original lot.

March 22, 2022

City Council, Planning Commission, Community Development

RE: City response and plan to address SB9

We understand that the City is amending its “Objective Standards for Single Family Residences” to accommodate the mandate of SB9 from Sacramento.

We have lived in Los Altos for over 40 years, and the last 20 years on a single lane privately owned street that used to be the driveway for the historical house located at the end and which now serves a total of eight houses.

Our experience with dealing with the City Planning Department over the last few years has not endeared them to us. Staff appear to accommodate developers at the expense of residents, using the “standards” to allow development by people who do not become residents of the community.

One fact that has become evident and must be considered when looking at revising the standards for SB9: Not all Los Altos streets are standard size. Although you may allow subdivision of a lot or building ADUs with minimal setback, the streets bear the brunt of the increased housing density.

In our case, the size of our street (15 feet wide) should have been used to modify plans, but it was not. When the neighbors of our street and adjacent streets appeared in unison at a meeting regarding a proposed second story/three level project, (6500 square feet of living space), the meeting was abruptly terminated without allowing comment by our group in order to allow the architect “more time”. Ultimately the project was approved, and although the Design Review Commission advised conditions be placed on the project due to street size, none were, because it was reviewed by a different process when submitted as a one story with ADU thus by-passing the Design Review Commission with no public discussion.

Our point is that the nature of the street/neighborhood is an important consideration in design and function. There are many “unusual” streets such as our own, (including non-standard size, privately owned, and flag lots), where the nature of the street must be considered with respect to the impact of development along these streets. Our neighborhood feels disenfranchised by the City Planning staff based on their response to us.

We request that you specify that non-standard street size, character, and ownership be considered as factors that would trigger open public discussion between the neighborhood and the developer, that limitations are allowed and that such streets are exempted from the SB9 mandate.

Sincerely

Kathy Beck

Bruce Beck

420 Yerba Santa Ave

**Jia Liu**

---

**Subject:** FW: Invitation to see why we are making our request was Re: Request for an addition to the Objective Standards for Single-Family Residences

**From:** Monica Waldman <[contact.mlw@gmail.com](mailto:contact.mlw@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2022 4:32 PM

**To:** Los Altos Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@losaltosca.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@losaltosca.gov)>

**Cc:** Peter Mills <[petermills@me.com](mailto:petermills@me.com)>

**Subject:** Invitation to see why we are making our request was Re: Request for an addition to the Objective Standards for Single-Family Residences

Dear Members of the Los Altos Planning Commission,

Peter and I hope some if not all members of the planning Commission could visit our street to understand our concerns and give us guidance towards making our case in the revised Objective Standards for Single-Family Residences. As a Commissioner myself I know all the Commissioners could not visit at the same time, but we would appreciate a few of you visiting and providing feedback. Please let us know if you have any availability over the next week or two.

Thank you,  
Monica

On Tuesday, February 1, 2022, Monica Waldman <[contact.mlw@gmail.com](mailto:contact.mlw@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Members of the Los Altos Planning Commission,

I am a resident of the cul-de-sac portion of Solana Drive in Los Altos. I read Bruce Barton's "Prefab home draws neighbors' outcry over design" article in the January 25th, 2022 Los Altos Town Crier and am concerned because the situation described in the piece is similar to a situation on my street. I hope that the City will find a way to alleviate similar situations going forward.

My section of Solana Drive has homes on one side of the street with the backyards of homes on neighboring N. Avalon Drive facing Solana Drive. There is a sloped strip of public land between N. Avalon Drive's backyards and Solana Drive's road surface. This makes N. Avalon Drive's backyards higher than street level on the Solana Drive side, creating a similar situation to the homes mentioned in the Town Crier article.

Recently an ADU was added to 127 N. Avalon Drive that is 10 feet from the back fence. While the addition of an ADU and the distance from the back fence are legal, the ADU looms over Solana Drive due to the difference in street height. 65 N. Avalon Drive was rebuilt with numerous lights on the back of the house that, because of the grade difference of the two streets, illuminates not only their backyard but shines onto Solana Drive. I believe the work was done to code, but no consideration was given to the grade difference between the streets and the effect of one house's lighting on its neighboring street.

With the potential of additional ADUs and SB9-related lot subdivisions on N. Avalon Drive, I would like to request that the City include screening landscaping requirements in the next revision of the Objective Standards for Single-Family Residences for ADUs and SB9-related subdivisions built within 10 feet of a property line when the lot is on an incline to ensure the privacy of neighboring homes.

I am including a link to the Los Altos Town Crier article for those who have not read it:

[https://www.losaltosonline.com/news/prefab-home-draws-neighbors-outcry-over-design/article\\_0b97328e-7e17-11ec-b28f-6baed26d214f.html](https://www.losaltosonline.com/news/prefab-home-draws-neighbors-outcry-over-design/article_0b97328e-7e17-11ec-b28f-6baed26d214f.html)

Thank you,





California Department of Housing and Community Development

# SB 9 Fact Sheet

On the Implementation of Senate Bill 9 (Chapter 162, Statutes of 2021)



Housing Policy Development Division  
March 2022

*This Fact Sheet is for informational purposes only and is not intended to implement or interpret SB 9. HCD does not have authority to enforce SB 9, although violations of SB 9 may concurrently violate other housing laws where HCD does have enforcement authority, including but not limited to the laws addressed in this document. As local jurisdictions implement SB 9, including adopting local ordinances, it is important to keep these and other housing laws in mind. The Attorney General may also take independent action to enforce SB 9. For a full list of statutes over which HCD has enforcement authority, visit HCD's [Accountability and Enforcement webpage](#).*

## Executive Summary of SB 9

Senate Bill (SB) 9 (Chapter 162, Statutes of 2021) requires ministerial approval of a housing development with no more than two primary units in a single-family zone, the subdivision of a parcel in a single-family zone into two parcels, or both. SB 9 facilitates the creation of up to four housing units in the lot area typically used for one single-family home. SB 9 contains eligibility criteria addressing environmental site constraints (e.g., wetlands, wildfire risk, etc.), anti-displacement measures for renters and low-income households, and the protection of historic structures and districts. Key provisions of the law require a local agency to modify or eliminate objective development standards on a project-by-project basis if they would prevent an otherwise eligible lot from being split or prevent the construction of up to two units at least 800 square feet in size. For the purposes of this document, the terms “unit,” “housing unit,” “residential unit,” and “housing development” mean primary unit(s) unless specifically identified as an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) or junior ADU or otherwise defined.

## Single-Family Residential Zones Only

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (a); 66411.7 subd. (a)(3)(A))

The parcel that will contain the proposed housing development or that will be subject to the lot split must be located in a single-family residential zone. Parcels located in multi-family residential, commercial, agricultural, mixed-use zones, etc., are not subject to SB 9 mandates even if they allow single-family residential uses as a permitted use. While some zones are readily identifiable as single-family residential zones (e.g., R-1 “Single-Family Residential”), others may not be so obvious. Some local agencies have multiple single-family zones with subtle distinctions between them relating to minimum lot sizes or allowable uses. In communities where there may be more than one single-family residential zone, the local agency should carefully review the zone district descriptions in the zoning code and the land use designation descriptions in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. This review will enable the local agency to identify zones whose primary purpose is single-family residential uses and which are therefore subject to SB 9. Considerations such as minimum lot sizes, natural features such as hillsides, or the permissibility of keeping horses should not factor into the determination.

## Residential Uses Only

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (a))

SB 9 concerns only proposed housing developments containing no more than two residential units (i.e., one or two). The law does not otherwise change the allowable land uses in the local agency's single-family residential zone(s). For example, if the local agency's single-family zone(s) does not currently allow commercial uses such as hotels or restaurants, SB 9 would not allow such uses.

## Ministerial Review

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (a); 66411.7, subds. (a), (b)(1))

An application made under SB 9 must be considered ministerially, without discretionary review or a hearing. Ministerial review means a process for development approval involving no personal judgment by the public official as to the wisdom of carrying out the project. The public official merely ensures that the proposed development meets all the applicable objective standards for the proposed action but uses no special discretion or judgment in reaching a decision. A ministerial review is nearly always a "staff-level review." This means that a staff person at the local agency reviews the application, often using a checklist, and compares the application materials (e.g., site plan, project description, etc.) with the objective development standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards.

## Objective Standards

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (b); 66411.7, subd. (c))

The local agency may apply objective development standards (e.g., front setbacks and heights), objective subdivision standards (e.g., minimum lot depths), and objective design standards (e.g., roof pitch, eave projections, façade materials, etc.) as long as they would not physically preclude either of the following:

**Up to Two Primary Units.** The local agency must allow up to two primary units (i.e., one or two) on the subject parcel or, in the case of a lot split, up to two primary units on each of the resulting parcels.

**Units at least 800 square feet in size.** The local agency must allow each primary unit to be at least 800 square feet in size.

The terms "objective zoning standards," "objective subdivision standards," and "objective design review standards" mean standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official prior to submittal. Any objective standard that would physically preclude either or both of the two objectives noted above must be modified or

waived by the local agency in order to facilitate the development of the project, with the following two exceptions:

**Setbacks for Existing Structures.** The local agency may not require a setback for an existing structure or for a structure constructed in the same location and to the same dimensions as an existing structure (i.e., a building reconstructed on the same footprint).

**Four-Foot Side and Rear Setbacks.** SB 9 establishes an across-the-board maximum four-foot side and rear setbacks. The local agency may choose to apply a lesser setback (e.g., 0-4 feet), but it cannot apply a setback greater than four feet. The local agency cannot apply existing side and rear setbacks applicable in the single-family residential zone(s). Additionally, the four-foot side and rear setback standards are not subject to modification. (Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (b)(2)(B); 66411.7, subdivision (c)(3).)

## One-Unit Development

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (a); 65852.21, subd. (b)(2)(A))

SB 9 requires the ministerial approval of either one or two residential units. Government Code section 65852.21 indicates that the development of just one single-family home was indeed contemplated and expected. For example, the terms “no more than two residential units” and “up to two units” appear in the first line of the housing development-related portion of SB 9 (Gov. Code, § 65852.21, subd. (a)) and in the line obligating local agencies to modify development standards to facilitate a housing development. (Gov. Code, § 65852.21, subd. (b)(2)(A).)

## Findings of Denial

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (d); 66411.7, subd. (d))

SB 9 establishes a high threshold for the denial of a proposed housing development or lot split. Specifically, a local agency’s building official must make a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined in Government Code section 65589.5, subdivision (d)(2), upon public health and safety or the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. “Specific, adverse impact” means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete. (Gov. Code, § 65589.5, subd. (d)(2).)

## Environmental Site Constraints

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (a)(2) and (a)(6); 66411.7, subd. (a)(3)(C) and (a)(3)(E))

A proposed housing development or lot split is not eligible under SB 9 if the parcel contains any of the site conditions listed in Government Code section 65913.4, subdivision (a)(6)(B-K). Examples of conditions that may disqualify a project from using SB 9 include the presence of farmland, wetlands, fire hazard areas, earthquake hazard areas, flood risk areas, conservation areas, wildlife habitat areas, or conservation easements. SB 9 incorporates by reference these environmental site constraint categories that were established with the passing of the Streamlined Ministerial Approval Process (SB 35, Chapter 366, Statutes of 2017). Local agencies may consult HCD's [Streamlined Ministerial Approval Process Guidelines](#) for additional detail on how to interpret these environmental site constraints.

Additionally, a project is not eligible under SB 9 if it is located in a historic district or property included on the State Historic Resources Inventory or within a site that is designated or listed as a city or county landmark or as a historic property or district pursuant to a city or county ordinance.

## California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (j); 66411.7, subd. (n))

Because the approval of a qualifying project under SB 9 is deemed a ministerial action, CEQA does not apply to the decision to grant an application for a housing development or a lot split, or both. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21080, subd. (b)(1) [CEQA does not apply to ministerial actions]; CEQA Guidelines, § 15268.) For this reason, a local agency must not require an applicant to perform environmental impact analysis under CEQA for applications made under SB 9. Additionally, if a local agency chooses to adopt a local ordinance to implement SB 9 (instead of implementing the law directly from statute), the preparation and adoption of the ordinance is not considered a project under CEQA. In other words, the preparation and adoption of the ordinance is statutorily exempt from CEQA.

## Anti-Displacement Measures

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (a)(3); 66411.7, subd. (a)(3)(D))

A site is not eligible for a proposed housing development or lot split if the project would require demolition or alteration of any of the following types of housing: (1) housing that is subject to a recorded covenant, ordinance, or law that restricts rents to levels affordable to persons and families of moderate, low, or very low income; (2) housing that is subject to any form of rent or price control through a public entity's valid exercise of its police power; or (3) housing that has been occupied by a tenant in the last three years.

## Lot Split Requirements

(Reference: Gov. Code, § 66411.7)

SB 9 does not require a local agency to approve a parcel map that would result in the creation of more than two lots and more than two units on a lot resulting from a lot split under Government Code section 66411.7. A local agency may choose to allow more than two units, but it is not required to under the law. A parcel may only be subdivided once under Government Code section 66411.7. This provision prevents an applicant from pursuing multiple lot splits over time for the purpose of creating more than two lots. SB 9 also does not require a local agency to approve a lot split if an adjacent lot has been subject to a lot split in the past by the same property owner or a person working in concert with that same property owner.

## Accessory Dwelling Units

(Reference: Gov. Code, §§ 65852.21, subd. (j); 66411.7, subd. (f))

SB 9 and ADU Law (Gov. Code, §§ 65852.2 and 65858.22) are complementary. The requirements of each can be implemented in ways that result in developments with both “SB 9 Units” and ADUs. However, specific provisions of SB 9 typically overlap with State ADU Law only to a limited extent on a relatively small number of topics. Treating the provisions of these two laws as identical or substantially similar may lead a local agency to implement the laws in an overly restrictive or otherwise inaccurate way.

**“Units” Defined.** The three types of housing units that are described in SB 9 and related ADU Law are presented below to clarify which development scenarios are (and are not) made possible by SB 9. The definitions provided are intended to be read within the context of this document and for the narrow purpose of implementing SB 9.

*Primary Unit.* A primary unit (also called a residential dwelling unit or residential unit) is typically a single-family residence or a residential unit within a multi-family residential development. A primary unit is distinct from an ADU or a Junior ADU. Examples of primary units include a single-family residence (i.e., one primary unit), a duplex (i.e., two primary units), a four-plex (i.e., four primary units), etc.

*Accessory Dwelling Unit.* An ADU is an attached or a detached residential dwelling unit that provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons and is located on a lot with a proposed or existing primary residence. It includes permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation on the same parcel on which the single-family or multifamily dwelling is or will be situated.

*Junior Accessory Dwelling Unit.* A Junior ADU is a unit that is no more than 500 square feet in size and contained entirely within a single-family residence. A Junior ADU may include separate sanitation facilities or may share sanitation facilities with the existing structure.

The terms “unit,” “housing unit,” “residential unit,” and “housing development” mean primary unit(s) unless specifically identified as an ADU or Junior ADU or otherwise defined. This distinction is critical to successfully implementing SB 9 because state law applies different requirements (and provides certain benefits) to ADUs and Junior ADUs that do not apply to primary units.

**Number of ADUs Allowed.** ADUs can be combined with primary units in a variety of ways to achieve the maximum unit counts provided for under SB 9. SB 9 allows for up to four units to be built in the same lot area typically used for a single-family home. The calculation varies slightly depending on whether a lot split is involved, but the outcomes regarding total maximum unit counts are identical.

*Lot Split.* When a lot split occurs, the local agency must allow up to two units on each lot resulting from the lot split. In this situation, all three unit types (i.e., primary unit, ADU, and Junior ADU) count toward this two-unit limit. For example, the limit could be reached on each lot by creating two primary units, or a primary unit and an ADU, or a primary unit and a Junior ADU. By building two units on each lot, the overall maximum of four units required under SB 9 is achieved. (Gov. Code, § 66411.7, subd. (j).) Note that the local agency may choose to allow more than two units per lot if desired.

*No Lot Split.* When a lot split has not occurred, the lot is eligible to receive ADUs and/or Junior ADUs as it ordinarily would under ADU law. Unlike when a project is proposed following a lot split, the local agency must allow, in addition to one or two primary units under SB 9, ADUs and/or JADUs under ADU Law. It is beyond the scope of this document to identify every combination of primary units, ADUs, and Junior ADUs possible under SB 9 and ADU Law. However, in no case does SB 9 require a local agency to allow more than four units on a single lot, in any combination of primary units, ADUs, and Junior ADUs.

See HCD’s [ADU and JADU webpage](#) for more information and resources.

## Relationship to Other State Housing Laws

SB 9 is one housing law among many that have been adopted to encourage the production of homes across California. The following represent some, but not necessarily all, of the housing laws that intersect with SB 9 and that may be impacted as SB 9 is implemented locally.

**Housing Element Law.** To utilize projections based on SB 9 toward a jurisdiction’s regional housing need allocation, the housing element must: 1) include a site-specific inventory of sites where SB 9 projections are being applied, 2) include a nonvacant sites analysis demonstrating the likelihood of redevelopment and that the existing use will not constitute an impediment for additional residential use, 3) identify any governmental constraints to the use of SB 9 in the creation of units (including land use controls, fees,

California Department of Housing and Community Development – SB 9 Fact Sheet



and other exactions, as well as locally adopted ordinances that impact the cost and supply of residential development), and 4) include programs and policies that establish zoning and development standards early in the planning period and implement incentives to encourage and facilitate development. The element should support this analysis with local information such as local developer or owner interest to utilize zoning and incentives established through SB 9. Learn more on HCD's [Housing Elements webpage](#).

**Housing Crisis Act of 2019.** An affected city or county is limited in its ability to amend its general plan, specific plans, or zoning code in a way that would improperly reduce the intensity of residential uses. (Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (b)(1)(A).) This limitation applies to residential uses in all zones, including single-family residential zones. “Reducing the intensity of land use” includes, but is not limited to, reductions to height, density, or floor area ratio, new or increased open space or lot size requirements, new or increased setback requirements, minimum frontage requirements, or maximum lot coverage limitations, or any other action that would individually or cumulatively reduce the site’s residential development capacity. (Gov. Code, § 66300, subd. (b)(1)(A).)

A local agency should proceed with caution when adopting a local ordinance that would impose unique development standards on units proposed under SB 9 (but that would not apply to other developments). Any proposed modification to an existing development standard applicable in the single-family residential zone must demonstrate that it would not result in a reduction in the intensity of the use. HCD recommends that local agencies rely on the existing objective development, subdivision, and design standards of its single-family residential zone(s) to the extent possible. Learn more about [Designated Jurisdictions Prohibited from Certain Zoning-Related Actions](#) on HCD’s website.

**Housing Accountability Act.** Protections contained in the Housing Accountability Act (HAA) and the Permit Streaming Act (PSA) apply to housing developments pursued under SB 9. (Gov. Code, §§ 65589.5; 65905.5; 65913.10; 65940 et seq.) The definition of “housing development project” includes projects that involve no discretionary approvals and projects that include a proposal to construct a single dwelling unit. (Gov. Code, § 65905.5, subd. (b)(3).) For additional information about the HAA and PSA, see HCD’s [Housing Accountability Act Technical Assistance Advisory](#).

**Rental Inclusionary Housing.** Government Code section 65850, subdivision (g), authorizes local agencies to adopt an inclusionary housing ordinance that includes residential rental units affordable to lower- and moderate-income households. In certain circumstances, HCD may request the submittal of an economic feasibility study to ensure the ordinance does not unduly constrain housing production. For additional information, see HCD’s [Rental Inclusionary Housing Memorandum](#).

## MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS, HELD ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2022, BEGINNING AT 6:00 P.M. HELD VIA VIDEO/TELECONFERENCE PER EXECUTIVE ORDER N-29-20

**Please Note: Per California Executive Order N-29-20, the Commissions will meet via teleconference only. Members of the Public may call (650) 419-1505 to participate in the conference call (Meeting ID: 147 172 8228 or via the web at <https://tinyurl.com/47m86y9y>). Members of the Public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Public testimony will be taken at the direction of the Commission Chair and members of the public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. Members of the public are also encouraged to submit written testimony prior to the meeting at [DRCpubliccomment@losaltosca.gov](mailto:DRCpubliccomment@losaltosca.gov). Emails received prior to the meeting will be included in the public record.**

### ESTABLISH QUORUM FOR STUDY SESSION - 6:00 PM JOINT STUDY SESSION WITH PLANNING COMMISSION

DRC PRESENT: Vice-Chair Ma, Commissioners Harding and Kirik  
DRC ABSENT: Chair Blockhus and Commissioner Bishop  
PC PRESENT: Chair Doran, Vice-Chair Mensinger, Commissioners Ahi, Roche and Steinle  
PC ABSENT: Commissioners Bodner and Marek  
STAFF: Interim Planning Services Manager Golden, Senior Planner Gallegos, Associate Planner Liu, City Attorney Houston and Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan

#### 1. **Review and Update SB9 Objective Standards**

Review the City's SB9 Objective Standards, conduct Study Session to consider any appropriate modifications to the standards, provide direction to staff and/or recommendations to City Council, and consider possible formation of one or more ad hoc subcommittees to study the issue further.

#### STAFF PRESENTATION

Associate Planner Liu provided a presentation on the SB9 Objective Standards.

City Attorney Houston provided information on subcommittees and Brown Act rules.

#### COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Chair Doran asked for point of order and clarification and if they take public comment and then discussion.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden advised to discuss and then take public comment.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan make comments on the last review to help frame the discussion for tonight's meeting.

Vice-Chair Ma asked what the timeline is after subcommittee formation and clarification on forming the subcommittees.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden stated that the City Council directed staff to return in May, but staff will advise the Council in May if there is still discussion occurring with subcommittees. He said that the subcommittees shall not exceed a quorum of the commissions.

## COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Kirk discussed injecting some of the DRC subcommittee issues on balconies, privacy, and double height spaces related to bulk and mass into the SB9 language to help formulate some good criteria for the administrative review for approval.

Vice-Chair Ma asked with the density getting higher with more housing, how does this relate to our tree protection policy, privacy impacts, and is it objective or subjective on tree removal?

Chair Doran asked if there is document discussion addressing fire access on secondary unit developments on lots.

Associate Planner Liu said that staff has not evaluated this, but we will reach out to Santa Clara County Fire to understand their requirements on driveway widths or turnarounds.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan said the Statute does require access but does not define what it is.

Vice-Chair Ma said they did not provide a report to outline the subcommittee meeting, but information was conveyed verbally, and the items outlined by the DRC regarding SB9 are in the agenda report.

Interim Planning Service Manager Golden provided some clarification on the previous review of SB9, this second review before the Commissions tonight, and said the goal for tonight is the creation of subcommittees and what the next step is for the Commissions.

## PC COMMENTS

PC Comments or discussions to be included in further discussion with SB9.

### Commissioner Ahi

- The flag lot scenario concerned him when it is the only feasible option for a lot. When you limit the height to one-story (20 feet) and the access corridor to 20 feet, it will constrain development on a lot of lots.
- FAR and Lot Coverage are both at 35% and when implementing SB9, it appears incorrect. It does not match the community and if we want these new projects to fit into Los Altos, we need it to work and we must think about it in that way.
- Suggested a solution is to keep the lot coverage at 30% and the FAR could be increased to 40% or 45% so you have a more balanced unit, and it doesn't look awkward.
- The plate heights are a little odd when 9 feet at the first story and 8.5 feet at the second story is the standard.
- He questioned the reason for having a 9-foot, 3-inch plate height for the first story and 8-foot, 3-inch second story plate height was and said it should be addressed to be consistent with the standard.
- Parcels are different in Los Altos, and we need to look to see what works in Los Altos neighborhoods.

### Commissioner Roche

- The rear yard setback at 4 feet is an issue because it is very close to the neighbor and wants this to be reviewed.
- Different elevations of sites should be a consideration due to potential privacy impacts between neighbors.
- Consideration of window design and sill heights on second stories for privacy.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated that the four-foot rear setback is mandated by State law.

Chair Doran

- How will SB9 conflict with the building code.
- She needs more time to look at document.
- She wants to be part of subcommittee.
- When you decrease setbacks, what happens to the homes built that had to adhere to the building code.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated that building codes still apply with SB9. SB9 does not alter the building code, it alters zoning code and land use.

Vice-Chair Mensinger

- Can you build one house with four-foot setbacks under SB9?

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan answered yes.

City Attorney Houston ask the Commissioners to please read the Department of Housing and Community Development's (HCD) FAQ's if they haven't already.

Vice-Chair Mensinger

- From a policy perspective, why is the state compelling us to use the setback in SB9?

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated in general, there is a sense among legislature that local agencies impose too many regulations that limit housing development and setbacks are one of those issues.

Vice-Chair Mensinger

- We should look at the objective standards in reviewing all projects as having 4-foot setbacks as a starting point.

Commissioner Kirik

- Concerned SB9 is being used for circumventing the DRC concerns and neighbors on projects.
- Respect the existing Residential Design Guidelines and restrict the development of SB9 projects to preserve the character of Los Altos.
- He does not want to see dense clusters and upset neighbors in Los Altos.

Commissioner Ahi

- Responded that the goal is not to restrict housing development, but to have an incentive to promote more housing to meet the intent of SB9. It is a balance.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan

- We cannot have restrictions just to have restrictions.
- We can adopt objective standards with an intent to preserve the community character of Los Altos.

Chair Doran commented on the different perspectives of each Commission and the importance of being on the same page in the subcommittees.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan said it is great both Commissions are here to provide their expertise and input.

Vice-Chair Ma said the essence of SB9 is to create more housing units, but there needs to be a balance. We should use our local ordinance and Residential Design Guidelines as a basis in reviewing projects to preserve the character of single-family neighborhoods in Los Altos. He then asked for clarification on a project using SB9 to build a single house on the lot with a four-foot setback.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan clarified that yes, a two-story single-family home could be built with a four-foot setback and not be reviewed by the DRC. Only projects that do not qualify for SB9 or if the applicants voluntarily want to go through a different review process would you the DRC review a project.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden clarified staff's recommendation in the staff report and how the Commissions may want to move forward.

Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Ma opened the meeting for public comment.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Anne Paulson said whatever standards the City chooses, make them easy to evaluate. Sometimes we get complimented standards that make it hard for staff to follow and the applicant to understand like with ADUs and projects take longer.

Tim appreciates staff's support of SB9 development for taking care of his family.

Jeannine Valadez supports increased housing and multi-generational housing, supports the objective standards to incentivize housing development. Does not appreciate standards to block housing development.

Jill Woodford supports SB9 but concerned with the wrong development happening that does not respect privacy. She suggested increasing the ADU size to 1,500 square feet and relaxing the ADU restrictions to support SB9 for multi-generational housing and care giving.

The Alon family spoke in support of SB9 and multi-generational housing for care giving and relaxing the ADU regulations.

Monica Waldman stated that street access needs to be considered in special cases in neighborhoods when it comes to lot splits for safety reasons. She also noted that basements do not count as square footage so a development can be over the maximum allowed.

Chair Doran closed the public comment period.

Chair Doran commented on the options for forming a joint subcommittee of the two Commissions.

Vice-Chair Mensinger said it may be a good idea to have a combination subcommittee of the DRC and PC members.

Vice-Chair Ma agreed and wanted to have an internal subcommittee from each commission.

Commissioner Harding nominated the current DRC subcommittee members of Vice-Chair Ma and Commissioner Kirik for the joint subcommittee.

Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan said it appears to be a request one joint subcommittee.

Chair Doran and Commissioner Kirik both want to have internal discussions within the commissions at their next meetings regarding subcommittee members.

Vice-Chair Ma agreed.

Chair Doran and Vice-Chair Ma re-opened the public comment period.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

Peter Mills raised the issue of double lots and wanting access and driveways from the frontage of existing buildings. There are street access issues on Salano Drive and others, so there is a need to look at the objective standards and how SB9 will affect the substandard streets. He invited the commissioners to his street to understand the issue and said to contact him at his email [Pbmsv@icloud.com](mailto:Pbmsv@icloud.com).

Chair Doran closed the public comment period.

#### PC Action

Action: Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Mensinger, seconded by Chair Doran, the Commission moved to appoint up to three members of the Planning Commission to a joint subcommittee to evaluate the objective standards of SB9.

The motion was approved (5-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Ahi, Doran, Mensinger, Roche and Steinle

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bodner and Marek

#### DRC Action

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Harding, seconded by Commissioner Kirik, the Commission moved to establish two members of the Design Review Commission on a joint committee for future conversation on SB9.

The motion was approved (3-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Harding, Kirik, and Ma

NOES: None

ABSENT: Blockhus and Bishop

City Attorney Houston and Deputy City Attorney Ramakrishnan stated there is no consensus needed, and the DRC can have its own recommendations and PC can have its recommendations to the Council.

#### **STUDY SESSION ADJOURNMENT: 7:19 PM**

#### **BREAK – Will reconvene at 7:25 PM**

#### **ESTABLISH QUORUM FOR REGULAR MEETING - 7:26 PM**

PRESENT: Vice-Chair Ma, Commissioners Harding and Kirik

ABSENT: Chair Blockhus and Commissioner Bishop

STAFF: Interim Planning Services Manager Golden, Senior Planner Gallegos and Associate Planner Liu

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Peter Mills made a comment regarding SB9, and he would like the objective standards state that someone subdividing a lot shall access the housing units where there is currently access provided. No driveways or walkways from rear property line that would allow parking on both sides of the narrow street and impede access for vehicles.

## **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION/ACTION**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

#### **2. Design Review Commission Minutes**

Approve minutes of the regular meeting of March 16, 2022.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Kirik, seconded by Commissioner Harding, the Commission approved the minutes of the regular meeting of March 16, 2022 as written.

The motion was approved (3-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Harding, Kirik, and Ma

NOES: None

ABSENT: Blockhus, Bishop

### **DISCUSSION**

Vice-Chair Ma stated a conflict of interest for agenda item #4 at 944 Aura Way and said the project would have to be continued to another meeting.

Interim Planning Services Manager Golden suggested making a motion to continue the project to a date certain for the next meeting on May 4, 2022.

Due to lack of a quorum to make the vote, the project was continued by default to the next meeting.

#### **3. SC21-0027 - Farnaz Khadiv – 2256 Deodara Drive**

Design Review for a two-story addition to an existing two-story house. The project includes a 774 square-foot addition at the first story and an 703 square-foot addition at the second story with a new 469 square-foot basement. This project will be considered categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act. *Project Planner: Gallegos* This item was continued from the March 17, 2022 DRC meeting.

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

Senior Planner Gallegos presented the staff report recommending approval of design review application SC21-0027 subject to the listed findings and conditions and answered questions from Commissioner Kirik and Vice-Chair Ma.

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Project applicant Farnaz Khadiv and owner Roza Alon provided a project presentation.

Alon Family thanked Commissioner Kirik for his insightful feedback. At the time of the November meeting, she was not thrilled. After going through the process, she is overall more pleased with the design. She thanked him for his honest feedback. With regard to first floor, we have substantially reduced the appearance of bulk and have forwarded the neighbor letters.

## DRC QUESTIONS TO APPLICANT

None.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Neighbor David Norlander spoke in support of the project.

Vice-Chair Ma closed the public comment period.

Commissioner discussion then proceeded.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Kirik, seconded by Commissioner Harding, the Commission approved design review application SC21-0027 subject to the staff report findings and conditions.

The motion was approved (3-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Harding, Kirik, and Ma

NOES: None

ABSENT: Blockhus, Bishop

### 4. SC21-0035 – Eric Keng – 944 Aura Way

Design review application for a new 4,010 square-foot two-story single-family residence with 2,692 square feet on the first story and 1,317 square feet on the second story. A 798 square-foot detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is also proposed, but not subject to design review. A categorical exemption under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines will be considered for this project. *Project Manager: Golden* **THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED DUE TO LACK OF A QUORUM**

### 5. SC21-0056 – Walter Chapman - 808 Pico Lane

Design Review for a two-story addition to an existing one-story house. The development includes a 788 square-foot addition at the first floor and a 779 square-foot addition at the second floor. This project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act. *Project Manager: Liu*

## STAFF PRESENTATION

Associate Planner Liu presented the staff report recommending approval of design review application SC21-0056 subject to the listed findings and conditions and answered questions from Commissioner Kirik and Vice-Chair Ma.

## DRC QUESTIONS TO STAFF

Commissioner Kirk asked whether the neighboring property was in PUD.

Vice-Chair Ma asked a question on landscaping and if the neighbor wants to have a taller fence and trees for privacy.

## APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Project designer Walter Chapman presented the project. He said that when the plans were submitted, the owner was going to use aluminum windows, the problem with clad windows is they have less of an architectural issue, and the owner would like to go with black vinyl with trim on the windows.

### Recommended Revisions

- Revise window to make vinyl with quality wood trim.
- Will add lattice to rear fence to improve privacy.



The property owner did not speak.

### DRC QUESTIONS TO APPLICANT

Commissioner Kirik asked the applicant if he can reduce the second story plate height by lowering it to an 8-foot plate height at the second story.

Applicant Walter Chapman stated that a reduced height is too low in scale and looks like a small box on house, and the taller height gives it a more farmhouse look.

Commissioner Kirik said that the first thing that struck him is the window of neighbors, it is a different situation. He would want it addressed with lattice on fence to address privacy. He then asked why there wasn't a landscape plan and to please do something to address the neighbor issue.

Applicant Walter Chapman stated that there are quite a few trees on the site, the owner's intention is to use the yard for planting, and they didn't want to alter landscape plan. He said the willow tree is not a good choice and rather than dictating to owners, he would like the two owners to resolve the issues.

Vice-Chair Ma said he needs to hear from the neighbor.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Vice-Chair Ma closed the public comment period.

Commissioner discussion then proceeded.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Harding, seconded by Commissioner Kirik, the Commission approved design review application SC21-0056 subject to the staff report findings and conditions with the following additional condition:

- The applicant and neighbor at 50 Chester Circle shall work together on landscaping plantings to address concerns regarding privacy by time of final inspection.

The motion was approved (3-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Harding, Kirik, and Ma

NOES: None

ABSENT: Blockhus, Bishop

### **COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS**

None.

### **POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Make all Planning Commissioners attend five DRC meeting to understand the ministerial guidelines.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Blockhus adjourned the meeting at 8:37 PM.

---

Sean Gallegos  
Senior Planner

DRAFT