# DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA <br> 7:00 PM - Wednesday, January 04, 2023 <br> Telephone/Video Conference Only 

Please Note: Per California Executive Order N-29-20, the Commissions will meet via teleconference only. Members of the Public may call (253) 215-8782 to participate in the conference call (Meeting ID: 84114231135 or via the web at https://tinyurl.com/52fzsjy7 with Passcode: 868380). 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. 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. Design Review Commission Minutes

Approve the minutes of the regular meeting of November 2, 2022.

## DISCUSSION

2. SC22-0024 - Kyle Chan - 905 Leonello Avenue

Design Review for a new two-story single-family house. The project includes a 2,518 squarefoot first story and 1,269 square-foot second story. This project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act. Project Planner: Gallegos
3. SC22-0027 - Varada Malavika Rao- $\mathbf{3 6 3}$ W. Edith Avenue Design Review for a two-story addition to a one-story single-family house. The project includes a 49 square-foot one-story addition and 805 square-foot two-story addition. This project is
categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act. Project Planner: Gallegos

## 4. $\mathbf{2 0 2 3}$ Meeting Schedule - Agenda Report

## COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS

## POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

## ADJOURNMENT

## SPECIAL NOTICES TO PUBLIC

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and California Law, it is the policy of the City of Los Altos to offer its programs, services and meetings in a manner that is readily accessible to everyone, including individuals with disabilities. If you are a person with a disability and require information or materials in an appropriate alternative format; or if you require any other accommodation, please contact department staff. Advance notification within this guideline will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. The City ADA Coordinator can be reached at (650) 947-2607 or by email:

Agendas, Staff Reports and some associated documents for Design Review Commission items may be viewed on the Internet at http://losaltosca.gov/meetings.

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.

For other questions regarding the meeting proceedings, please contact the City Clerk at (650) 947-2720.


# DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES <br> <br> 7:00 PM - Wednesday, November 2, 2022 <br> <br> 7:00 PM - Wednesday, November 2, 2022 <br> <br> Telephone/Video Conference Only ${ }^{1}$ 

 <br> <br> Telephone/Video Conference Only ${ }^{1}$}

## CALL MEETING TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m. Chair Blockhus called the meeting to order.

## ESTABLISH QUORUM

PRESENT: Chair Harding, Vice-Chair Ma, Commissioners Blockhus and Mantica
ABSENT: Commissioner Klein
STAFF: Planning Services Manager Williams, Senior Planner Gallegos, and Associate Planner Liu

## PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

## ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION/ACTION

## CONSENT CALENDAR

## 1. Design Review Commission Minutes

Approve minutes of the regular meeting of October 19, 2022.

Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Blockhus, seconded by Vice-Chair Ma, the Commission approved the minutes of the regular meeting of October 19, 2022 as written.
The motion was approved (4-0) by the following vote:
AYES: Harding, Ma, Blockhus, and Mantica
NOES: None

## PUBLIC HEARING

## 2. V21-0003 \& DR22-0067 - California Water Service - $\mathbf{1 0 9 0 0}$ Beechwood Lane

Request for a Variance for a 10 -foot front yard setback, where a 25 -foot setback is required in the R1-10 Zoning District and design review applications for an emergency generator in a sound attenuating accessory structure for a pre-existing community facility, an existing potable water pump station at 10900 Beechwood Lane. No other improvements are proposed for the site. The project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, as amended because it involves an existing facility of a public utility service. The project was continued from July 6, 2022 DRC meeting. Project Planner: Gallegos

[^0]
## STAFF PRESENTATION

Senior Planner Gallegos presented the staff report recommending approval of variance and design review applications V21-0003 and DR22-0067 subject to the listed findings and conditions and answered questions from Commissioner Blockhus and Vice-Chair Ma.

## APPLICANT PRESENTATION

California Water Service representative Cindy Bertsch presented the project and answered a question from Commissioners Blockhus.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

None.
Chair Harding closed the public comment period.
Commissioner discussion then proceeded.
Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Blockhus, seconded by Commissioner Mantica, the Commission approved variance and design review applications V21-0003 and DR22-0067subject to the listed findings and conditions.
The motion was approved (4-0) by the following vote:
AYES: Harding, Ma, Blockhus, and Mantica
NOES: None

## 3. V22-0003 \& SC22-0019 - John Aldrich - $\mathbf{5 6 2}$ University Avenue

Request for a Variance for an 18.3-foot-tall pergola, where a 12 -foot height is permitted in the R1-10 Zoning District and design review application for a new second story deck with pergola at 562 University Avenue. The project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, as amended because it involves an addition to an existing single-family house. Project Planner: Gallegos

STAFF PRESENTATION
Senior Planner Gallegos presented the staff report recommending approval of variance and design review applications V22-0003 and SC22-0019 subject to the listed findings and conditions and answered a question from Vice-Chair Ma regarding the spa equipment.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
Project applicant John Aldrich presented the project.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

None.
Chair Harding closed the public comment period.
Commissioner discussion then proceeded.
Action: Upon a motion by Vice-Chair Ma, seconded by Commissioner Klein, the Commission approved variance and design review applications V22-0003 and SC22-0019 subject to the listed findings and conditions.
The motion was approved (4-0) by the following vote:

AYES: Harding, Ma, Blockhus, and Mantica
NOES: None

## DISCUSSION

## 4. SC22-0014 - Joseph Xu - $\mathbf{1 0 7 4}$ Riverside Drive

Design Review for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,005 square feet at the first story and 1,692 square feet at the second story. A 779 square foot attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) is also proposed, but not subject to design review. This project is categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act. Project Planner: Liu

## STAFF PRESENTATION

Associate Planner Liu presented the staff report recommending approval of design review application SC22-0014 subject to the listed findings and conditions and answered clarifying questions from ViceChair Ma and Commissioner Blockhus.

## APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Project applicant, Joseph Xu , presented the project and answered questions from Commissioners Blockhus and Vice Chair Ma.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

None.
Chair Harding closed the public comment period.
Commissioner discussion then proceeded.
Action: Upon a motion by Commissioner Blockhus, seconded by Commissioner Mantica, the Commission approved design review application SC22-0014 subject to the listed findings and conditions, with the following change:

- Modify condition No. 5 for the applicant to work with staff and the neighboring property owners to coordinate the evergreen screening vegetation along the rear property line.
The motion was approved (4-0) by the following vote:
AYES: Harding, Ma, Blockhus and Mantica
NOES: None


## COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS AND COMMENTS

## POTENTIAL FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Senior Planner Gallegos stated that the next meeting would be on January 4, 2023 and there are two items on the agenda.

## ADJOURNMENT

Chair Harding adjourned the meeting at 8:40 PM.

Senior Planner


TO: Design Review Commission
FROM: Sean K. Gallegos, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: SC22-0024 - 905 Leonello Avenue

## RECOMMENDATION:

Approve design review application SC22-0024 subject to the findings and conditions

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a design review application for a new two-story house. The project includes 2,884 square feet on the first story and 1,202 square feet on the second story. The project also includes a 660 squarefoot, one-story attached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU); but it is not part of this design review application. This project should be categorically exempt from further environmental review under Section 15303 of the California Environmental Quality Act The following table summarizes the project's technical details:

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

|  | Existing | Proposed | Allowed/Required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Coverage: | 2,600 square feet | 3,787 square feet | 3,247 square feet |
| Floor Area: |  |  |  |
| First floor | 2,600 square feet | 2,518 square feet |  |
| Second floor |  | 1,269 square feet |  |
| Total | 2,600 square feet | 3,787 square feet | 3,789 square feet |
| Setbacks: |  |  |  |
| Front | 24.75 feet | 25 feet | 25 feet |
| Rear | 55.1 feet | 45.1 feet | 25 feet |
| Right side ( $1^{\text {st/ }} 2^{\text {nd }}$ ) | 12.2 feet | 7.8 feet/21.4 feet | 7.8 feet/15.3 feet |
| Left side ( $1^{\text {st }} / 2^{\text {nd }}$ ) | 11.75 feet | 7.8 feet/22.6 feet | 7.8 feet/15.3 feet |
| Height: | 14 feet | 25 feet | 27 feet |

## BACKGROUND

## Neighborhood Context

The subject property is located in a Diverse Character Neighborhood as defined in the City's Residential Design Guidelines. The subject site is located on south the side of a dead-end street on Leonello Avenue, with the nearest cross-street at Covington Road. The houses in this neighborhood are primarily a combination of one-story and two-story homes with simple forms and rustic materials. However, 906 Leonello Drive is a twostory house that represents a larger scale, while maintaining simple forms and horizontal emphasis consistent with the neighborhood. The landscape along Leonello Avenue is varied with a variety of large mature trees, but no distinct street tree pattern.

## Zoning Compliance

The subject property is considered a narrow corner lot, which is defined as a lot that is less than 80 -feet in width. For narrow lots, the interior side yard setback is reduced from 10 feet to 10 percent of the width of the lot, with an additional 7.5 feet added for the second story setback. Since the lot is 77.97 feet in width, the required interior side yard setback is 7 feet, 9.5 inches, with a second story side yard setback of 15 feet, 3.5 inches.

## DISCUSSION

## Design Review

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

The proposed project uses a more contemporary architectural style and materials than those found in the surrounding neighborhood but is designed to relate to the houses in the immediate vicinity. The project incorporates design elements that are found in the neighborhood such hipped roof, articulated massing, low-pitched roof, and high-quality materials that are compatible with the neighborhood. The detailing and materials of the structure reflect a high level of quality and appropriate relationship to the rustic qualities of the area. The proposed building materials, which include cement plaster, stone veneer, cement fiber window trim, wood windows and standing seam metal roof, are integral to the design. Overall, the design incorporates a contemporary style with simple elements and quality materials that produce a thoughtful and integrated appearance that is compatible with the character of the area.

According to the Residential Design Guidelines, a house should be designed to fit the lot and should not result in a home that stands out in the neighborhood. The proposed project is sensitive to the scale of the neighborhood and incorporates similar massing found within the neighborhood context. The proposed nine-foot, six-inch tall first floor wall plate is consistent with the eight-foot to nine-foot plate heights of existing residences in the neighborhood. The eight-foot, six-inch second floor wall plate height along the front,
right and rear elevation is partially concealed within the roof, which minimizes the perception of bulk.

The City's Residential Design Guidelines suggest various ways to minimize bulk, which includes using more than one material on an elevation, incorporating architectural elements to soften the elevation, minimizing the use of two-story high design elements, and keeping second floor exterior wall heights low. The front elevation massing is broken up with multiple hipped roof forms, a defined recessed entry, and low eave lines that emphasize the horizontal profile of the first story. The second floor is centered over the first story and visually softened by being recessed within the roofline of the structure. The low-pitched roof provides variation of the eave line facing the street, limits the height of the building in comparison to adjacent houses and diminishes the overall scale of the structure. The design does not create an abrupt change and is well proportioned and articulated to reduce the effect of bulk and mass.

## Privacy

On the left (north) side elevation of the second story, there are six windows with six-foot sill heights. Due to their placements and tall sill heights, the proposed windows do not create unreasonable privacy impacts.

On the right (south) side elevation of the second story, there are six windows with sixfoot sill heights. Due to their placements and tall sill heights, the proposed windows do not create unreasonable privacy impacts.

On the rear (east) second story elevation, there is one window for the primary bathroom with a three-foot sill height, and French doors with side lights exiting from the primary bedroom to a balcony. The rear-facing balcony has a depth of four feet and a width of 14 feet. The balcony size does comply with the four-foot maximum balcony depth recommended in the Residential Design Guidelines, and it is considered passive in nature due to its depth and it being off a bedroom. The rear balcony presents an integrated appearance and the privacy wall along the right side of the balcony diminishes privacy impacts. The landscape plan includes retaining existing mature on-site trees and adding Podocarpus Gracilior along the side and rear property lines to further minimize privacy impacts. With the existing and proposed screening trees and the passive nature of the balcony, the window at the rear of the structure and the balcony would not result in unreasonable privacy impacts.

In general, the Design Review Commission has previously considered second story windows with a minimum four-foot six-inch windowsill heights acceptable to minimize direct views into neighboring properties. When there are perceived privacy impacts, installation of screening vegetation is another common practice to mitigate the interference with privacy. As discussed above, with the proposed design of second story windowsill heights, placement of windows, setbacks to the property lines, and new and existing vegetation, staff considers the subject project is designed to avoid unreasonable potential privacy impacts to the adjacent residential neighbors.

Design Review Commission
SC22-0024-905 Leonello Avenue
January 4, 2023

## Landscaping

The application includes an arborist report (Attachment F) that provides an inventory of the 15 on-site trees and six trees on adjacent properties. The applicant proposes the removal of one protected argyle apple tree (No. 9) due to being diseased. The applicant proposes the removal of four additional trees (nos. 7, 8, 18 and 21, but they are not protected under the City's Tree Protection Ordinance.

A comprehensive landscaping plan has been provided, which includes street trees and screening trees. The landscaping plan includes maintaining the existing redwood, oak, Monterey pine and loquat trees in the side and rear yards. The project meets the City's landscaping regulations and street tree guidelines with the new landscaping and hardscape. Since the new landscaping area exceeds 500 square feet, the project requires a landscape plan that complies with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations.

## Environmental Review

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

## Public Correspondence

A public meeting notice was posted on the property and mailed to 11 nearby property owners on Holly Avenue and Oakhurst Avenue.

Cc: Kyle Chan, Applicant and Architect Zhang Daiua and Song Peiran, Property Owners

Attachments
A. Public Notification Map
B. Neighborhood Combability Worksheet
C. Public Notice Poster
D. Materials Board
E. Applicant Outreach
F. Arborist Report, October 6, 2022
G. Design Plans

## FINDINGS

SC22-0024-705 Leonello Avenue

With regard to the new two-story house, the Design Review Commission finds the following in accordance with Section 14.76.050 of the Municipal Code:
a. The proposed structure complies with all provisions of this chapter;
b. The height, elevations, and placement on the site of the proposed structure, when considered with reference to the nature and location of residential structures on adjacent lots, will avoid unreasonable interference with views and privacy and will consider the topographic and geologic constraints imposed by particular building site conditions;
c. The natural landscape will be preserved insofar as practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal; grade changes shall be minimized and will be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed areas;
d. The orientation of the proposed structure in relation to the immediate neighborhood will minimize the perception of excessive bulk and mass;
e. General architectural considerations, including the character, size, scale, and quality of the design, the architectural relationship with the site and other buildings, building materials, and similar elements have been incorporated in order to insure the compatibility of the development with its design concept and the character of adjacent buildings; and
f. The proposed structure has been designed to follow the natural contours of the site with minimal grading, minimum impervious cover, and maximum erosion protection.

## Design Review Commission

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

SC22-0024-705 Leonello Avenue

## GENERAL

1. Expiration

The Design Review Approval will expire on January 4, 2025 unless prior to the date of expiration, a building permit is issued, or an extension is granted pursuant to Section 14.76.090 of the Zoning Code.
2. Approved Plans

The approval is based on the plans and materials received on December 5, 2022, except as may be modified by these conditions.
3. Protected Trees

The existing trees to be retained that are identified on the site plan shall be protected under this application and cannot be removed without a tree removal permit from the Development Services Director. Tree No. 9 shall be removed as part of this design review permit application.
4. Tree Removal Approved

Tree No. 9 shown to be removed on the site plan of the approved set of plans are hereby approved for removal. Tree removal shall not occur until a building permit is submitted and shall only occur after issuance of a demolition permit or building permit. Exceptions to this condition may be granted by the Community Development Director upon submitting written justification.

## 5. Encroachment Permit

An encroachment permit shall be obtained from the Engineering Division prior to doing any work within the public right-of-way including the street shoulder. All work within the public street right-of-way shall be in compliance with the City's Shoulder Paving Policy.
6. Landscaping

The project shall be subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) pursuant to Chapter 12.36 of the Municipal Code if over 500 square feet or more of new landscape area, including irrigated planting areas, turf areas, and water features is proposed.
7. Underground Utility and Fire Sprinkler Requirements

Additions exceeding fifty (50) percent of the existing living area (existing square footage calculations shall not include existing basements) and/or additions of 750 square feet or more shall trigger the undergrounding of utilities and new fire sprinklers. Additional square footage calculations shall include existing removed exterior footings and foundations being replaced and rebuilt. Any new utility service drops are pursuant to Chapter 12.68 of the Municipal Code.

## 8. Indemnity and Hold Harmless

Design Review Commission
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January 4, 2023

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

## INCLUDED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT SUBMITTAL

9. Conditions of Approval

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

## 10. Tree Protection Note

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

## 11. Water Efficient Landscape Plan

Provide a landscape documentation package prepared by a licensed landscape professional showing how the project complies with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Regulations and include signed statements from the project's landscape professional and property owner.
12. Reach Codes

Building Permit Applications submitted on or after January 26, 2021 shall comply with specific amendments to the 2019 California Green Building Standards for Electric Vehicle Infrastructure and the 2019 California Energy Code as provided in Ordinances Nos. 2020-470A, 2020-470B, 2020-470C, and 2020-471 which amended Chapter 12.22 Energy Code and Chapter 12.26 California Green Building Standards Code of the Los Altos Municipal Code. The building design plans shall comply with the standards and the applicant shall submit supplemental application materials as required by the Building Division to demonstrate compliance.

## 13. California Water Service Upgrades

You are responsible for contacting and coordinating with the California Water Service Company any water service improvements including but not limited to relocation of water meters, increasing water meter sizing or the installation of fire hydrants. The City recommends consulting with California Water Service Company as early as possible to avoid construction or inspection delays.

## 14. Green Building Standards

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

## 15. Underground Utility Location

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

## 16. Outdoor Condensing Unit Sound Rating

Show the location of any air conditioning unit(s) on the site plan including the model number of the unit(s) and nominal size of the unit. Provide the manufacturer's specifications showing the sound rating for each unit. The air conditioning units must be located to comply with the City's Noise Control Ordinance (Chapter 6.16) and in compliance with the Planning Division setback provisions. The units shall be screened from view of the street.

## 17. Storm Water Management

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

## PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING OR DEMOLITION PERMIT

## 18. Tree Protection

Tree protection fencing shall be installed around the dripline(s), or as required by the project arborist, of the existing trees to be retained as shown on the site plan. Tree protection fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five feet in height with posts driven into the ground and shall not be removed until all building construction has been completed unless approved by the Planning Division.

## 19. School Fee Payment

In accordance with Section 65995 of the California Government Code, and as authorized under Section 17620 of the Education Code, the property owner shall pay the established school fee for each school district the property is located in and provide receipts to the Building Division. The City of Los Altos shall provide the property owner the resulting increase in assessable space on a form approved by the school district. Payments shall be made directly to the school districts.

## PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION

## 20. Landscaping Installation and Verification

Provide a landscape Certificate of Completion, signed by the project's landscape professional and property owner, verifying that the trees, landscaping and irrigation were installed per the approved landscape documentation package. (Note: only include if project exceeds the 500/2,500 sq ft threshold.)

## 21. Landscape Privacy Screening

The landscape intended to provide privacy screening shall be inspected by the Planning Division and shall be supplemented by additional screening material as required to adequately mitigate potential privacy impacts to surrounding properties. (Should be applied to all two-story projects and one-story projects as needed).
22. Green Building Verification

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

## Notification Map



Print Date: August 31, 2022
$\underbrace{0}_{0}$

P Schools
Park and Recreation Areas
Situs Label
TaxParcel
$\square$ City Limit
Road Names

## - Waterways

## NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY WORKSHEET

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

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

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

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

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

Project Address 905 Leonello Ave, Los Alto, CA 94024
Scope of Project: Addition or Remodel $\qquad$ or New Home
$\square$ Age of existing home if this project is to be an addition or remodel? $\qquad$ Is the existing house listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory? No

## What constitutes your neighborhood?

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

## Streetscape

## 1. Typical neighborhood lot size*:

Lot area: 13,800
Lot dimensions: Length 138
Width 100 feet
If your lot is significantly different than those in your neighborhood, then note its: area 10,825 , length 138.88 , and width 78.1
2. Setback of homes to front property line: (Pgs. 8-11 Design Guidelines)

Existing front setback if home is a remodel? $\qquad$
What \% of the front facing walls of the neighborhood homes are at the front setback 90 \%
Existing front setback for house on left N/A ft./on right 25 ft .

Do the front setbacks of adjacent houses line up? Yes
3. Garage Location Pattern: (Pg. 19 Design Guidelines)

Indicate the relationship of garage locations in your neighborhood* only on your street (count for each type)
Garage facing front projecting from front of house face 2
Garage facing front recessed from front of house face 5
Garage in back yard 3
Garage facing the side $\qquad$
Number of 1-car garages__; 2-car garages 10 ; 3-car garages

## 4. Single or Two-Story Homes:

What \% of the homes in your neighborhood* are:
One-story 80
Two-story 20

## 5. Roof heights and shapes:

Is the overall height of house ridgelines generally the same in your neighborhood*? №
Are there mostly hip $\square$, gable style $\square$, or other style $\square$ roofs*?
Do the roof forms appear simple $\qquad$ or complex $\qquad$ ?
Do the houses share generally the same eave height No _ ?
6. Exterior Materials: (Pg. 22 Design Guidelines)

What siding materials are frequently used in your neighborhood*?
$\underline{\boldsymbol{V}}$ wood shingle $\underline{\boldsymbol{v}}$ stucco _ board \& batten _ clapboard
tile $\qquad$ stone $\underline{\boldsymbol{V}}$ brick $\qquad$ combination of one or more materials (if so, describe) AND STONE

What roofing materials (wood shake/shingle, asphalt shingle, flat tile, rounded tile, cement tile, slate) are consistently (about $80 \%$ ) used? ASPHALT SHINGLE If no consistency then explain:
7. Architectural Style: (Appendix C, Design Guidelines)

Does your neighborhood* have a consistent identifiable architectural style? $\square$ YES 区 NO

Type? ㄸ. Ranch ■ Shingle ■Tudor ■Mediterranean/Spanish $\square$ ㅁontemporary ㅁColonial $\square$ Bungalow ㅁOther

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

Does your property have a noticeable slope? №
What is the direction of your slope? (relative to the street)

Is your slope higher $\square$ lower $\square$ same $\sqrt{\boldsymbol{V}}$ in relationship to the neighboring properties? Is there a noticeable difference in grade between your property/house and the one across the street or directly behind?

## 9. Landscaping:

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

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

## PARTIALLY VISIBLE, BLOCKED BY TREES

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

## 10. Width of Street:

What is the width of the roadway paving on your street in feet? 25 Is there a parking area on the street or in the shoulder area? Yes Is the shoulder area (unimproved public right-of-way) paved, unpaved, gravel, landscaped, and/or defined with a curb/gutter? GRAVEL

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

Such as roof material and type（hip，gable，flat），siding（board and batten， cement plaster，horizontal wood，brick），deep front yard setbacks， horizontal feel，landscape approach etc．：
GABLE ROOF，SOME HIPS ROOF．M IXED OF SIDING OR STUCCO M OSTLY 25FT FRONT SETBACKS

## General Study

A．Have major visible streetscape changes occurred in your neighborhood？
$\square$ YES 『 NO

B．Do you think that most（ $\sim 80 \%$ ）of the homes were originally built at the same time？$\square$ YES 区 NO

C．Do the lots in your neighborhood appear to be the same size？
$\square$ YES ® NO

D．Do the lot widths appear to be consistent in the neighborhood？
$\square$ YES 『 NO
E．Are the front setbacks of homes on your street consistent（ $\sim 80 \%$ within 5 feet）？図 YES $\square$ NO

F．Do you have active CCR＇s in your neighborhood？（p． 36 Building Guide） $\square$ YES 区 NO

G．Do the houses appear to be of similar size as viewed from the street？
$\square$ YES ® NO
H．Does the new exterior remodel or new construction design you are planning relate in most ways to the prevailing style（s）in your existing neighborhood？

囚 YES ■ NO

## Summary Table

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

| Address | Front <br> setback | Rear <br> setback | Garage <br> location | One or two stories | Height | Materials | Architecture <br> (simple or <br> complex) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 921 Leonello Ave | 25 | 30 | FRONT | 1 | 15 | SIDING | SIM PLE |
| 906 Leonello Ave | 25 | 29 | FRONT | 2 | 25 | STONE/STUCCO/ | COM PLEX |
| 918 Leonello Ave | 40 | 18 | BACK | 1 | 15 | SIDING | SIM PLE |
| 930 Leonello Ave | 25 | 37 | FRONT | 1 | 15 | SIDING | SIM PLE |
| 944 Leonello Ave | 25 | 37 | BACK | 1 | 15 | STUCCO | SIM PLE |
| 906 Seena Ave | 25 | 30 | BACK | 2 | 22 | STUCCO | SIM PLE |
| 1129 Lincoln Dr | 25 | 20 | FRONT | 1 | 15 | SIDING | SIM PLE |
| 1135 Lincoln Dr | 25 | 20 | FRONT | 1 | 15 | SIDING | SIM PLE |
| 1141 Lincoln Dr | 25 | 20 | FRONT | 1 | 15 | STUCCO | SIM PLE |
| 1147 Lincoln Dr | 25 | 20 | FRONT | 1 | 15 |  |  |

## Sean Gallegos

From:
Daihua Zhang
Sent:
Thursday, December 22, 2022 11:06 AM
To:
Kyle Chan; Ann Song; Sean Gallegos; Yvonne Dupont
Property posting 905 Leonello

Hi Sean and Kyle,
I picked up the notice from the city hall today and added it onto our post board. Please find pictures attached and let us know if Everything's ok.

Happy holidays BTW.
Thanks.
Rick (Daihua)


Sent from my iPhone

## ATTACHMENT $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{m}}$

| EXTERIOR FINISH SCHEDULE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SYMBOL | MATERIAL | COLOR |
| R1 | STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF | METALLIC GRAY |
| $52$ | MARQUEE LIMESTONE VENEER | BEIGE |
| (CP) | SMOOTH CEMENT PLASTER |  |
| (1) | BENJAMIN MOORE | beice |
| $\mathrm{P} 2$ | BENJAMIN MOORE | GRAPHITE |
| (G) | GUTTER / METAL PANEL | GRAPHITE |
| (W1) | PARKLEX NATURAL SIDING | MUSTARD |
| WINDOW W/ GRAPHITE TRIM BY MARVIN OR SIM. |  |  |
| GARAGE: FIBERGLASS PANEL <br> SIDING FINISH W/ LIGHT <br> BY OVERHEAD DOOR COMPANY OR SIM. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |



## ATTACHMENT ${ }^{\text {F }}$ F

905 Leonello Ave, Los Altos, CA 94024

July, 2022
To: Los Altos Design Review Commission

Dear Design Review Commission,

This letter is to provide a summary of the communications with our neighbors regarding the new 2 -story house design.

We were able to meet most of the inner circle neighbors in person to show the design, discuss and address feedbacks. We received many genuine congratulations from the neighbors and in general no objections to the overall design. The adjacent neighbors care about the privacy impact. Visiting the neighbors also gave us new perspectives of neighbors' views to our yard and house. Based on our evaluation and the neighbors' feedbacks, we made a few changes:

- Increased the ADU setback by 1 feet.
- Added screening trees on the north, east and south sides
- Raised 2-floor balcony side wall to 6 feet with wood boards
- Reduced three 2 -floor windows to half of the original size

We have received written and verbal consent from most of the neighbors. The south side neighbor acknowledged the changes which are in respond to their privacy concerns, while have not signed the consent letter. Similarly, there is no change request from the east side neighbor while no consent letter either.

For neighbors on Leonello Ave, not in the inner circle, we also tried to talk in person. For neighbors who are not available at the time we visited, we left the design in the mailbox.

The neighborhood response is largely positive. It was also a great opportunity for us to know every neighbor around us. We are grateful to have kind and pleasant neighbors. We are also very thankful to our Architect who support us for iterations of changes.

We have lived in this house for 4 years and expanded the family with 2 more kids here. We enjoy and appreciate this quiet neighborhood and the wonderful town of Los Altos. We are excited to stay here while have a bigger and newer house to raise the three kids.

Thank you very much for your time to read this letter and review the design packet. We are looking forward to working with the City, following design and building guidelines, and having a new house here.

Warm regards,


Daihua Zhang
Peiran Song
The Zhang Family

* Written acknowledgement/consent letter received
$\star$ Email consent received
t Verbal consent received
$\star$ Shared printed elevation and landscape designs. Discussed in person. Consent not received.
* Shared elevation and landscape designs. No comments received.

To: Los Altos Design Review Commission
Re: Zhang Residence
905 Leonello Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024
Request for 2-story Design Review

## Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to show my support for the approval of the new building plan set forth by my neighbor, Mr. and Mrs. Chang, to build a new 2-story home on 905 Leonello Ave in Los Altos.

I have reviewed and discussed the design plan with Mr. and Mrs. Chang.
I believe that the proposed design plan is a positive addition to our neighborhood.
Thank you.

Yours Truly,


## 905 Leonello home rebuild

3 messages
Daihua Zhang [zhangdaihua@gmail.com](mailto:zhangdaihua@gmail.com)
Mon, Jul 18, 2022 at 10:57 PM
To: Bruce Currivan [bcurrivan@gmail.com](mailto:bcurrivan@gmail.com)
Hi Bruce,
This is Rick. We are your neighbor at the north end of the road, on the east side. My wife (Peiran) and I stopped by your house with 3 kids last weekend but you and Ani were not home. We mentioned to Ani about the plan of rebuilding our home before, but now it's getting more formal. Our architect has pretty much finished the design and is about to submit the package for design review at the city.

We would like to share the evaluation design with you (see attached) and check if you have any concerns and/or suggestions. This way we can address them ahead of time. Since it's a two story home it's going to take a longer process than 1 -story ones (of course you know all this better than we do), but I think if we can get support from our neighbors things can move more smoothly. We've been talking to neighbors all around us and hope to get your understanding and support. We do have a strong need for bigger space as we grow our family (we added two boys since we moved to our street in 2018). Since we love this neighborhood so much and don't want to move to another place. Rebuilding the house looks to be the best option for us.

Thank you very much in advance. Let me know if you have any questions or concerns. My phone number is 650-3058691.

Best,
Rick

## 2 attachments

2112 A3.2.pdf
45K
2112 A3.1.pdf
43K

Bruce Currivan [bcurrivan@gmail.com](mailto:bcurrivan@gmail.com)
Wed, Jul 20, 2022 at 9:26 PM
To: Daihua Zhang [zhangdaihua@gmail.com](mailto:zhangdaihua@gmail.com)
Hi Rick and Peiran,
The house looks wonderful. Best of luck with the building process.
Sorry we missed you. Please text us to visit anytime. We would be happy to share any experiences we had building with you.

Regards,
Bruce and Ani Currivan
965 Leonello
949-400-1560 cell
[Quoted text hidden]

Hi Bruce,
Thank you and Ani for your support and blessings!

Rick
[Quoted text hidden]

July 25, 2022

To: Los Altos Design Review Commission<br>Re: Zhang Residence<br>905 Leonello Ave<br>Los Altos, CA 94024<br>Request for 2-story Design Review

I'm writing this letter to advise that Mr. and Mrs. Chang located at 905 Leonello Avenue, Los Altos, CA have shared their plans for building a two story house on their property.

The couple have taken great care in introducing themselves to not only us but other neighbors as well. The house plans have taken privacy issues into consideration as much as possible in both the areas of construction and landscaping. With that said, our primary concern is the planned addition of the second story balcony facing our home's master bedroom's sliding glass doors facing their property. While we can appreciate their desire to enjoy the balcony's view of their backyard, unfortunately it may also include a view into our home.

To mitigate this issue, the landscaping plans do include Podocarpus trees along our shared back fence. While these trees may screen the balcony view into our yard and bedroom, we just needed to share this concern during the planning process.
Overall, Mr. and Mrs. Zhang have taken great care in taking the neighbors' concerns into consideration in their current design plans. We look forward to continued communication as design plans are finalized, invitations) to Commission-sponsored neighborhood review meetings and receiving updates on changes impacting our above-expressed concern as construction begins.

Thank you,
Mr. and mrs. B. Jönzzon
Mr. and Mrs. B. Jonzzon
1129 Lincoln Drive
Mountain View, CA 94040

1135 Lincoln Dr, Mountain View, CA 94040

To: Los Altos Design Review Commission
Re: Zhang Residence
905 Leonello Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024
Request for 2-story Design Review

## Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to show my support for the approval of the new building plan set forth by my neighbor, Mr. and Mrs. Zhang, to build a new 2-story home on 905 Leonello Ave in Los Altos.

I have reviewed and discussed the design plan with Mr. and Mrs. Chang.
I believe that the proposed design plan is a positive addition to our neighborhood.
Thank you.

Yours Truly,


## 1141 LINCOLN

To: Los Altos Design Review Commission
Re: Zhang Residence 905 Leonello Ave Los Altos, CA 94024
Request for 2-story Design Review

## Dear Sir/Madam,

Im writing to show my support for the approval of the new building plan set forth by my neighbor, Mr. and Mrs. Zhang, to build a new 2-story home on 905 Leonello Ave in Los Altos.

I have reviewed and discussed the design plan with Mr. and Mrs. Zhang.
I believe that the proposed design plan is a positive addition to our neighborhood. Thank you.


## From Rick - 905 Leonello Reconstruction

3 messages
Daihua Zhang [zhangdaihua@gmail.com](mailto:zhangdaihua@gmail.com)
Sun, Jul 17, 2022 at 10:31 PM
To: "plsteffen@comcast.net" [plsteffen@comcast.net](mailto:plsteffen@comcast.net)
Hi Paul,
Nice to know you through Bernt! It's so nice of him to introduce me and my family to you. We were visiting him and Kathy before we made the stop to your house.
Ann (Peiran) and I moved here together with our daughter Serena in 2018. Since then we've added two new members into the family - Aaron and Alvin. We have no plan to add more:).
Our current home is $3 \mathrm{~b} / 2 \mathrm{~b}$ of $\sim 1900$ sf. It's becoming a bit too small for our family size, especially when we have parents visiting us. So we decided to rebuild this house. There's going to be a long process and a lot of work, but we think eventually it will be worth it.

Please find the elevation plan our architect made for us in the attachment. We decided to make it 2-story because we can make a good backyard space for the kids this way. It will be the kid's bedrooms on the second floor on the west side.

We are about to submit the designs to the city for review, but before that we would like to hear inputs from all neighbors around us. If you have any concerns please let us know so that we can address them ahead of time. After the city's design review there will be detailed structural designs and construction drawings, and a final round of building permit approval. If everything goes smoothly, we will be able to start the project within a year from now. The construction will take another 1.5-2 years.

Please check our designs when you get time and let us know if they look fine. Thank you!
Regards,
Rick

## 2 attachments

2112 A3.1.pdf
43K
2112 A3.2.pdf 45K

PAUL STEFFEN [plsteffen@comcast.net](mailto:plsteffen@comcast.net)
Wed, Jul 20, 2022 at 8:21 AM
To: Daihua Zhang [zhangdaihua@gmail.com](mailto:zhangdaihua@gmail.com)
Hello Rick,
It was a pleasure meeting you and Ann and your family the other night.
Thank you for sending the elevation plan. Looks good. Best of luck with the rebuild of your home.
Best regards,

## Paul Steffen

[Quoted text hidden]

Thank you so much Paul!
We'll go ahead to submit our designs then. Will keep you posted.

Rick
[Quoted text hidden]

## ATTACHMENT F <br> Agenda Item 2. <br> 

## ARBORIST REPORT

TREE PROTECTION PLAN

REV. OCTOBER 6, 2022

PREPARED FOR: ANN SONG

PROJECT: 905 LEONELLO AVE, LOS ALTOS, CA 94022
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## Introduction

## ASSIGNMENT

On April 20, 2022, I visited the project site at 905 Leonello Avenue, Los Altos. I had accepted the assignment of Project Arborist, agreeing to write an industry-standard tree protection plan for their building permit application. The scope of the assignment, as specified by the City of Los Altos, was to include all trees of four inches and larger (4" DBH +) on and overhanging the property. After review of project plans, it was my understanding that the existing one-story house and would be demolished, and a new two-story home with attached garage would be built in its place. The existing hardscaping would be removed and replaced with new pavers. Recommendations in this report are based off review of the following:

- Proposed Site Plan A0.5 by Kyle Chan Architect (2.18.2022)
- Topographic Survey C. 0 by WEC Associates (8.25.2021
- Landscape Site Plan L1 by Gregory Lewis Landscape Architects (7.18.2022)

I identified 21 trees for inclusion in this report including five (5) Protected trees on the neighboring properties or on the public right-of-way. One (1) Protected tree in very poor condition was requested for removal. Four (4) trees without special status were also slated for removal. All other trees in the area were either sub-size (<4" DBH) or sufficiently distant from the work.

## USES OF THIS REPORT

This report was written by Busara Firestone, Project Arborist, to serve as a resource for the property owner, designer, and builder. It provides instructions for retaining, protecting and working around trees during construction, as well as information on City requirements. I recommend that all tree protection measures in this report be shown on the final grading, construction, and landscape plans, and adhered to during construction.

## LIMITATIONS

Trees assessed were limited to the scope of work identified in the assignment. I have estimated the trunk diameters of trees with barriers to access or visibility (such as those on neighboring parcels or behind debris).

Although general structure and health were assessed, formal Tree Risk Assessments were not conducted unless specified. Disease diagnostic work was not conducted unless specified. All assessments were the result of ground-based, visual inspections. No excavation or aerial inspections were performed. Recommendations beyond those related to the proposed construction were not within the scope of work. Full tree risk assessments were not within the scope of work, although assessments of health and structure factored into my condition ratings for each tree.

My tree impact and preservation assessments were based on information provided in the plans I have reviewed to date, and conversations with the involved parties. I assumed that the guidelines and setbacks recommended in this report would be followed. Assessments, conclusions, and opinions shared in this report are not a guarantee of any specific outcome. If additional information (such as engineering or landscape plans) is provided for my review, these assessments would be subject to change.

## How Construction Can Damage Trees

## Damage to Roots

## Where are the Roots?

The most common types of injury to trees that occur during property improvements are related to root cutting or damage. Tree roots extend farther out than people realize, and the majority are located within the upper $\mathbf{2 4}$ inches of soil. The thickest roots are found close to the trunk, and taper and branch into ropey roots. These ropey roots taper and branch into an intricate system of fine fibrous roots, which are connected to an even finer system of fungal filaments. This vast below-ground network is tasked with absorbing water and nutrients, as well as anchoring the tree in the ground, storage, and communication.

## Damage from Excavation

Any type of excavation will impact adjacent trees by severing roots and thus cutting off the attached network. Severing larger roots, or trenching across the root plate, destroys large networks. Even work that appears to be far from a tree (like on the far side of the yard), will impact the fibrous root system where excavation is taking place. Placing impervious surface over the ground, or installing below ground structures, such as a pool, or basement wall, will remove rooting area permanently from a site.

## Damage from Fill

Adding fill can smother roots, making it difficult for them to access air and water. The roots and other soil life need time to colonize the new upper layers of soil.

## Changes to Drainage and Available Water

Changes to the hydrology of the site, caused for instance by new septic fields, changes to grade, and drainage systems, can also cause big changes in available water for trees. Trees can die from lack of water or disease if their water supply dries up or gets much wetter than they are used to.

## Soil Compaction and Contamination

In addition, compaction of soil, or contamination of soil with wash-water, paint, fuel, or other chemicals used in the building process, can cause damage to the rooting environment that can last many years. Tree protection fencing creates a barrier to protect as many roots as possible from this damage. Potential causes may include travelling vehicles, equipment storage, and washing out concrete.

## Mechanical Injury

Injury from the impact of vehicles or equipment can occur to the root crown, trunk, and lower branches of a tree. The bark protects a tree - creating a skin-like barrier from disease-causing organisms. The stem tissues support the weight of the plant, and conducting the flow of water, sugars, and other important compounds throughout the tree. When the bark and wood is injured, the structure and health of the tree is compromised.

## Tree Impact Assessment

## SITE DESCRIPTION

The parcel was on a rectangular residential lot typical of the neighborhood. The property was without notable topography (no slopes). There was an Idaho locust (Robinia idahoensis) and persimmon (Diospyros kaki) in front of the property in the public right-of-way. In the back yard were some small ornamental and fruit trees, screening trees along the back property line, and a large Eucalyptus. There were also several neighboring trees bordering the property including two (2) mature coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia).

## DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK

It was my understanding that the existing one-story house would be demolished, and a new two-story home with attached garage would be built in its place. The existing hardscaping would be removed and replaced with new pavers.

## TREE INVENTORY

This tree preservation plan includes an attached inventory of all trees four inches and larger (4"DBH+) on or overhanging the property as well as adjacent Street Trees as necessary. According to the City of Los Altos a "Protected Tree" was any tree that was 48 -inches or greater in circumference when measured at 48 -inches above the ground.

The Inventory included each tree's number (as shown on the TPZ map), measurements, condition, level of impact (due to proximity to work), tolerance to construction, overall suitability for conservation, and prescription (remove/retain).

## IMPACTS TO PROTECTED TREES

I identified 21 trees for inclusion in this report including five (5) Protected trees on the neighboring properties and two (2) in the public right-of-way. All other trees in the area were either sub-size (<4" DBH) or sufficiently distant from the work. Please see next section for a list of proposed tree removals. Anticipated impacts to trees to be retained with Protected status are as follows:

Tree \#1 (Locust, Street Trees): This tree would be expected to sustain a moderate (acceptable) impact of $10-25 \%$ roots loss from the proposed installation of the new driveway and front walkway. Please see "Special Tree Protection Measures" section of this report for guidelines on working within $6 x$ DBH of this tree.

Tree \#2 (persimmon, Street Tree): would incur a "low" impact (no more than 10\% root loss) from the proposed installation of the front walkway.

Trees \#3 and \#4 (neighboring oak and blue gum eucalyptus): These trees would be expected to sustain a moderate (acceptable) impact of $10-25 \%$ roots loss from the proposed excavation of the new foundation which would be no closer than the original. Please see "Special Tree Protection Measures" section of this report for guidelines on working within 6x DBH of this tree.

Tree \#20 (neighboring oak): assuming the existing mow strip would be demolished, and new landscaping installed in the back yard, this tree would be expected to sustain a moderate (acceptable) impact of $10-25 \%$ roots loss from the proposed excavation of the new foundation as long as guidelines are followed. Please see "Special Tree Protection Measures" section of this report for guidelines.

The evaluation of anticipated project impacts to the woodland was summarized in the Tree Inventory under the heading "Impact Assessment." These included impacts of grading, excavation for utility installation, retaining walls, drainage or any other aspect of the project that could impact the service life of the tree. The anticipated impact due to proximity to work was provided using a rating system. General species tolerance to construction, and condition of the trees (health and structural integrity), was also provided. These factors, as well as tree age, soil characteristics, and species desirability, all factored into an individual tree's suitability
rating, as summarized on the Inventory. Suitability of trees to be retained was rated as "high," "moderate," or "low."

## REQUESTED TREE REMOVALS

One (1) Protected tree in very poor condition was requested for removal:

- Tree \#9 (Argyle apple, Eucalyptus cinerea): Although the client valued this tree and wished to preserve it, they are requesting removal at my recommendation. I observed that the lower trunk had a sunken look, and upon investigation, found that more than $50 \%$ of its circumference was rotten, with the outer wood coming apart easily in my hands. Ann had reported that another Eucalyptus had failed at trunk in years prior and it was my assessment that whole-tree failure of this one was probable within the next two years. Recent reduction pruning of its canopy has reduced the loading on the defect and will buy some time. However, with the house located within the fall zone, I recommended removal as soon as the City provides approval and before the next storm season if possible. Based on its very poor and potentially dangerous condition, removal of Tree \#9 may be justified by City code chapter 11.08.090 Clause A. 1 "the condition of the tree with respect to disease." Please see photos at the end of this report.
- Four (4) trees without special status were also slated for removal; Trees \#7, \#8, \#18, and \#21. I recommended these for removal based on poor condition and/or severe project impacts. Please see the Tree Inventory table for condition and impact ratings for these trees.


## Tree Preservation \& Mitigation Measures

## PRE-CONSTRUCTION

## Establish Tree Protection Zones (TPZ):

The Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) shall be a fenced-off area where work and material storage is not allowed. This barrier protects the critical root zone and trunk from compaction, mechanical damage, and chemical spills.

## TPZ SPECIFICATIONS:

From "Tree Protection During Construction" (Ord. 07-314 § 2 (part); prior code § 10.2.26513):
Protected trees designated for preservation shall be protected during development of a property by compliance with the following, which may be modified by the planning director:
a. Protective fencing* shall be installed no closer to the trunk than the dripline, and far enough from the trunk to protect the integrity of the tree. The fence shall be a minimum of four feet in height and shall be set securely in place. The fence shall be of a sturdy but open material (i.e., chain-link), to allow visibility to the trunk for inspections and safety. There shall be no storage of any kind within the protective fencing.

[^1]b. The existing grade level around a tree shall normally be maintained out to the dripline of the tree. Alternate grade levels may be approved by the planning director.
c. Drain wells shall be installed whenever impervious surfaces will be placed over the root system of a tree (the root system generally extends to the outermost edges of the branches).
d. Trees that have been damaged by construction shall be repaired in accordance with accepted arboriculture methods.
e. No signs, wires, or any other object shall be attached to the tree.

Since protecting out to the dripline may not be practical given site restrictions, I recommend the following locations for TPZ fencing:

- Trees \#1 and \#2 (City Street Trees): Establish standard TPZ fencing to drip line (extent of canopy) or the greatest extent as possible, as limited by the property line, street, and location of work. See attached "TPZ Map" for recommended fencing locations
- Trees \#3 and \#4 (neighboring oak and blue gum eucalyptus): These trees may be protected as a group within the same perimeter. Establish standard TPZ fencing radius to the greatest extent possible as limited by the property lines. Leave the minimum necessary workspace around the proposed structure and access around the house (usually $4^{\prime}-5^{\prime}$ ). Please see recommended fencing location on attached "TPZ Map."
- Tree \#20 (neighboring oak): Establish standard TPZ fencing to drip line (extent of canopy) or the greatest extent as possible, as limited by the property line and location of work. See attached "TPZ Map" for recommended fencing locations


## Preventing Soil Disturbance \& Root Damage

I recommend that anywhere workers and vehicles will be traveling over bare ground within fifteen feet of a tree's dripline should have material applied over the ground to disperse the load. This may be done by applying a six to 12 -inch layer of wood chip mulch to the area. With this method, mulch in excess of four inches would have to be removed after work is completed. As an alternative method that would not require mulch removal, the contractor could place plywood (>3/4-inch-thick) or road mats over a four-inch layer of mulch. Mulch should be spread manually so as not cause compaction or damage.

## Pruning Branches

I recommend that each tree that is designated to remain shall be pruned as necessary to provide clearance for development, while maintaining a natural appearance. Branches must be pruned to allow clearance for proposed structures and the passage of workers, vehicles and machines. Any large dead branches should be pruned out for the safety of people working on the site.

Pruning should be specified in writing adhering to ANSI A300 Pruning Standards and performed according to Best Management Practices endorsed by the International Society of Arboriculture. Any pruning (trimming) of branches should be supervised by an ISA-certified arborist.

## Pre-Construction Inspection

Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit (including Grading or Demolition Permits), it is common for municipal Planning and Building Departments to request a pre-construction site inspection and report, to verify that all required tree protection and erosion control measures are in place. Inquire with your Planning Department contact for requirements.

## DURING CONSTRUCTION

## Special Tree Protection Measures

1. Trees \#1 (Locust, Street Tree), \#3 (neighboring coast live oak), \#4 (neighboring eucalyptus, and \#20 (neighboring coast live oak)
a. Demolition of existing hardscape (ex: original foundation and hardscaping) should be performed in a manner that avoids tearing roots: Using the smallest effective machinery, break up pieces of the concrete and lift pieces up and away from trees. Cut roots embedded in paving rather than tearing them (see instructions on "Root Pruning").
b. Hardscaping (walkways, driveways, patios): When excavating within:

- Six feet (6') of Tree \#1's trunk...
- 20 feet of Trees \#3's trunk...
- 13 feet of Tree \#4's trunk...
- 10 feet of Tree \#20's trunk...

Use hand tools. Leave roots encountered undisturbed if possible. Excavation depth for installation of new landscape materials within the above distances of these trees should be no more than four inches ( 4 ") into original grade. Minimize compaction of subgrade under pavers. If roots must be cut, please see section titled "Root Pruning."

## 2. Trees \#3 and \#4 (neighboring oak and eucalyptus)

c. Excavation guidelines for installation of new foundation: When excavating underneath the canopy, or within 20 feet of these large neighboring trees, use hand tools within top 36 inches of soil depth. If roots over one inch (1") must be cut, see instructions on "Root Pruning."

## 3. Tree \#20 (neighboring oak)

a. Demolition of existing mow strip should be performed in a manner that avoids tearing roots: Using the smallest effective machinery, break up pieces of the concrete and lift
pieces up and away from trees. Cut roots embedded in paving rather than tearing them (see instructions on "Root Pruning").
b. Regarding new landscaping, no grading or excavation of a depth greater than 4 inches should be planned within 10 feet of the trunk.
c. I recommend against an irrigated turf lawn within 15 feet of the tree, as year-round watering encourages oak root fungus and may shorten the lifespan of the tree. Consider native or Mediterranean plants under the canopy of this tree that require little water once established.

## Project Arborist Supervision

If arborist monitoring is required during the project, I recommend the following monitoring schedule:

- Pre-construction site inspection, to verify that all required tree protection and erosion control measures are in place.
- Demolition or deconstruction, grading, and excavation, and/or trenching activities where grade changes exceed 4" within the drip line of a protected tree. Boring for pier installation.
- Monthly TPZ compliance inspections.
- Any pruning or root pruning activities detailed in the pruning specifications provided herein.
- Final compliance report

Adjusting established TPZ locations may be necessary for specific phases of the project and would require approval by the consulting arborist and the City.

## Irrigation

Maintain normal irrigation; as a rule of thumb, provide 1-2 inches per month. Water slowly so that it penetrates 18 inches into the soil, to the depth of the tree roots. However, native oaks usually should not be provided supplemental water during the warm, dry season (June September) as this activates oak root fungus. Therefore, native oaks should only be watered October - May when rain has been scarce.

## Root Pruning

Roots often extend farther beyond the tree than people realize. Even outside of the fencing protecting the critical root zone, there are roots that are important to the wellbeing of the tree. Builders may notice torn roots after digging or trenching. If this happens, exposed ends should be cut cleanly. The cut should be made perpendicular to the growth of the root (i.e. a "square cut") at a location where bark is undamaged and intact.

However, the best way to cut roots is to cut them cleanly before they are torn by excavating equipment. Roots may be exposed by gentle excavation methods and then cut selectively. Alternatively, a tool specifically designed to cut roots may be used to cut through the soil on the tree-side of the excavation line prior to digging so that roots are not torn.

I recommend that root pruning of any root over one inch ( $1^{\prime \prime}$ ) be supervised by the Town Arborist (or Project Arborist).

## POST-CONSTRUCTION

Ensure any mitigation measures to ensure long-term survival including but not limited to:

## Continued Tree Care

Provide adequate and appropriate irrigation. As a rule of thumb, provide 1-2 inches of water per month. Water slowly so that it penetrates 18 inches into the soil, to the depth of the tree roots. Native oaks usually should not be provided supplemental water during the warm, dry season (June - September) as this activates oak root fungus. Therefore, native oaks should only be watered October - May when rain has been scarce.

Mulch insulates the soil, reduces weeds, reduces compaction, and promotes myriad benefits to soil life and tree health. Apply four inches of wood chips (or other mulch) to the surface of the soil around trees, extending at least to the dripline when possible. Take care not to pile mulch against the trunk.

Do not fertilize unless a specific nutrient deficiency has been identified and a specific plan prescribed by the project arborist (or a consulting arborist).

## Post-Construction Monitoring

Monitor trees for changes in condition. Check trees at least once per month for the first year post-construction. Expert monitoring should be done at least every 6 months or if trees show signs of stress. Signs stress include unseasonably sparse canopy, leaf drop, early fall color, browning of needles, and shoot die-back. Stressed trees are also more vulnerable to certain disease and pest infestations. Call the Project Arborist, or a consulting arborist if these, or other concerning changes occur in tree health.

## Conclusion

The proposed building project appeared to be a valuable upgrade to the property and neighborhood. If the recommendations and protection measures in this report are followed, all protected trees identified for preservation are expected to survive.

If any of the parties involved have questions on this report, or require Project Arborist supervision or technical support, please do not hesitate to contact me at (408) 497-7158 or busara@bofirestone.com.

Signed,


Bo Firestone | ISA Certified Arborist WE-\#8525A | ASCA Registered Consulting Arborist RCA \#758 | ISA Qualified Tree Risk Assessor | ASCA Tree and Plant Appraisal Qualification | Member - American Society of Consulting Arborists | Wildlife-Trained Arborist

## Supporting Documents

## Glossary

DBH / DSH: "Diameter at Breast/Standard Height," measured at 4.5' above grade.
CIRCUMFERENCE (CIRC.): Combined trunk circumference at 4.5' above grade.
SPREAD: Diameter of canopy between farthest branch tips.
PROTECTED TREE: According to Los Altos City Code,

- Any tree that is 48 -inches (four feet) or greater in circumference when measured at 48inches above the ground.
- Any tree designated by the Historical Commission as a Heritage Tree or any tree under official consideration for a Heritage Tree designation. (All Canary Island Palm trees on Rinconada Court are designated as Heritage Trees.)
- Any tree which was required to be either saved or planted in conjunction with a development review approval (i.e. new two-story house).
- Any tree located within a public right-of-way.
- Any tree, regardless of size, located on property zoned other than single-family (R1).

CONDITION-Ground based visual assessment of structural and physiological well-being:
"Excellent" = 81-100\%; Good health and structure with significant size, location or quality.
"Good" = 61-80\%; Normal vigor, full canopy, no observable significant structural defects, many years of service life remaining.
"Fair" = 41-60\%; Reduced vigor, significant structural defect(s), and/or other significant signs of stress
"Poor" = 21-40\%; In potentially irreversible decline, structure and aesthetics severely compromised
> "Very Poor" = 6-20\%; Nearly dead, or high risk of failure, negative contribution to the landscape

"Dead/Unstable" = 0-5\%; No live canopy/buds or failure imminent
IDEAL TPZ RADIUS: Recommended tree protection radius to ensure healthy, sound trees. Based on species tolerance, age, and size (total combined stem area). Compromising the radius in a specific area may be acceptable as per arborist approval.

AGE: Relative to tree lifespan; "Young" <1/3; "Mature" 1/3-2/3; "Overmature" >2/3
IMPACT: Anticipated impact to an individual tree including......
SEVERE - In direct conflict, removal necessary if plans proceed (distance to root cuts/fill within 3 X DBH or root loss of $>30 \%$ anticipated).

HIGH - Work planned within 6X DBH and/or anticipated root loss of 20\% - 30\%. Redesign to reduce impact should be explored and may be required by municipal reviewer. Retainment may be possible with monitoring or alternative building methods. Health and structure may worsen even if conditions for retainment are met.

MODERATE - Ideal TPZ encroached upon in limited areas. No work or very limited work within 6X TPZ. Anticipated root loss of $10 \%-25 \%$. Special building guidelines may be provided by Project Arborist. Although some symptoms of stress are possible, tree is not likely to decline due to construction related activities.

LOW - Anticipated root loss of less than 10\%. Minor or no encroachment on ideal TPZ. Longevity uncompromised with standard protection.

VERY LOW - Ideal TPZ well exceeded. Potential impact only by ingress/egress.
Anticipated root loss of 0\%-5\%. Longevity uncompromised.
NONE - No anticipated impact to roots, soil environment, or above-ground parts
TOLERANCE: General species tolerance to construction (GOOD, MODERATE, or POOR) as given in Managing Trees During Construction, Second Edition, by International Society of Arboriculture

SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT: An individual tree's suitability for preservation considering impacts, condition, maturity, species tolerance, site characteristics, and species desirability. (HIGH, MODERATE, or LOW)

PRESCRIPTION: Preserve (retain with protection measures) or Remove

## Sources

Fite, Kelby, and E. Thomas Smiley. Managing trees during construction, second edition.
Champaign, IL: International Society of Arboriculture, 2016. Print.

ISA. Guide for Plant Appraisal, $10^{\text {th }}$ edition, second printing. Atlanta, GA: International Society of Arboriculture, 2019. Print.

ISA. Species Classification and Group Assignment, 2004 Western Chapter Regional Supplement. Western Chapter ISA.

Smiley, E. Thomas, Nelda Matheny, and Sharon Lilly. Best Management Practices: Tree Risk Assessment: International Society of Arboriculture, 2011. Print.

## PHOTOS (A - C)



PREPARED BY: BUSARA FIRESTONE
ISA-CERTIFIED ARBORIST \#WE-8525A

PHOTO B - Lower trunk of Tree \#9 (Eucalyptus cinerea). Note sunken tissue where trunk "flare" should be. Condition was similar on back side of tree.

Photo taken 4/20/22 by B. Firestone



ISA-CERTIFIED ARBORIST \#WE-8525A


Date: 4/29/2022

| ALL TREES 4" AND OVER ON OR OVERHANGING THE PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TREE IMPACT ASSESSMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | Common Name | Botanical Name | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DBH } \\ & \text { (inches) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { math. } \\ & \text { DBH } \\ & \text { (inches) } \end{aligned}$ | Height (feet) | Spread (feet) | Status | Condition | Age | Species Tolerance | TPZ mult. Factor | Ideal TPZ <br> Radius (ft) | Impact Level ** | Suitability Rating | Prescription |
| 1 | Idaho Locust | Robinia Idahoensis | 11 | 11 | 30 | 15 | PROTECTED | FAIR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 11 | MODERATE** | MODERATE | PRESERVE |
| 2 | Persimmon | Diospyros kaki | 8 | 8 | 25 | 12 | PROTECTED | FAIR | mature | HIGH | 8 | 5 | LOW | MODERATE | PRESERVE |
| 3 | Coast Live Oak | Quercus agrifolia | est. 40 | 40 | 50 | 30 | PROTECTED | FAIR | mature | HIGH | 8 | 27 | MODERATE | moderate | Preserve |
| 4 | Blue Gum | Eucalyptus globulus | est. 25 | 25 | 55 | 20 | PROTECTED | FAIR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 25 | MODERATE | MODERATE | PRESERVE |
| 5 | Surinam Cherry | Eugenia uniflora | 6 | 6 | 15 | 5 | (not protected) | FAIR | overmature | moderate | 15 | 8 | moderate | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 6 | Surinam Cherry | Eugenia uniflora | 6 | 6 | 15 | 5 | (not protected) | FAIR | overmature | moderate | 15 | 8 | moderate | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 7 | Surinam Cherry | Eugenia uniflora | 7 | 7 | 15 | 5 | (not protected) | VERY POOR | OVERMATURE | MODERATE | 15 | 9 | MODERATE | LOW | REMOVE (X) |
| 8 | Yucca | Yucca spp. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | (not protected) | FAIR | mature | MODERATE | 12 | 10 | SEVERE | moderate | REMOVE (X) |
| 9 | Argyle Apple | Eucalyptus cinerea | 32 | 32 | 55 | 20 | PROTECTED | VERY POOR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 32 | MODERATE | LOW | REMOVE (X) |
| 10 | Limewood | Piitosporum eugenioides | 8, 7.5, 7 | 13 | 30 | 20 | (not protected) | FAIR | OVERMATURE | MODERATE | 15 | 16 | moderate | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 11 | Limewood | Piitosporum eugenioides | 8,5.5 | 10 | 30 | 15 | (not protected) | FAIR | OVERMATURE | moderate | 15 | 13 | moderate | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 12 | Limewood | Piitosporum eugenioides | 8 | 8 | 30 | 10 | (not protected) | FAIR | OVERMATURE | MODERATE | 15 | 10 | MODERATE | MODERATE | PRESERVE |
| 13 | Limewood | Piitosporum eugenioides | 8,7 | 11 | 30 | 15 | (not protected) | FAIR | OVERMATURE | moderate | 15 | 14 | MODERATE | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 14 | Limewood | Piitosporum eugenioides | 14 | 14 | 30 | 15 | (not protected) | FAIR | OVERMATURE | moderate | 15 | 18 | MODERATE | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 15 | Limewood | Piitosporum eugenioides | 13 | 13 | 25 | 20 | (not protected) | FAIR | OVERMATURE | moderate | 15 | 16 | moderate | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 16 | Myoporum | Myoporum laetum | 9 | 9 | 20 | 20 | (not protected) | FAIR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 9 | MODERATE | LOW | PRESERVE |
| 17 | Japanese Maple | Acer palmatum | 4 | 4 | 10 | 10 | (not protected) | FAIR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 4 | MODERATE | moderate | PRESERVE |
| 18 | Lemon | Citrus limon | 4 | 4 | 10 | 10 | (not protected) | FAIR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 4 | SEVERE | LOW | REMOVE (X) |
| 19 | Holly | Ilex spp. | est. 6, (2) 4 | 8 | 15 | 15 | (not protected) | FAIR | MATURE | HIGH | 8 | 5 | MODERATE | MODERATE | PRESERVE |
| 20 | Coast Live Oak | Quercus agrifolia | est. 18 | 18 | 40 | 30 | PROTECTED | FAIR | MATURE | HIGH | 8 | 12 | moderate | Moderate | PRESERVE |
| 21 | Yucca | Yucca spp. | 4 | 4 | 10 | 5 | (not protected) | FAIR | MATURE | MODERATE | 12 | 4 | SEVERE | Low | REMOVE (X) |
| KEY: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# | Neighboring tree (overhanging property) / public right-of-way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tree Removal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SEE GLOSSARY FOR DEFINITION OF TERMS
**ASSUMES STANDARD AND SPECIAL TREE PROTECTION MEASURES ARE FOLLOWED.


|  |
| :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { DATE: } \\ & \text { rev. } 10 / 06 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| TPZ ELEMENTS DRAWN: B. FIRESTONE ISA-CERTIFIED ARBORIST \#WE-8525A |
| BASE MAP: SITE PLAN LT by GREGORY LEWIS LAND SCAPE ARCHITEC (07/18/2022) |
| ARBORIT REPORT |

PERMIT SUBMISSION SET

## ATTACHMENT G

kc kylechan





|  |  |  |  | TREE PROTECTION PLAN - ABBoRIST REPORT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Leonello Ave Song Residence rever 10/06/22 TreE Protection plan - ABborstreen <br> POST-CONSTRUCTION <br>  $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ <br>  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\square$ <br>  <br> Sources $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |







（









Landscape Site Legend
1 Compacted baserock and gravel in ROW for parking
[2] AC paving in ROW to connect road to driveway
3 Driveway - Interlocking pavers - manuut, style, pattern, and color to be selecceced by owners
4 Front walk - Interlocking pavers - a litte different than driveway but complimentary to oi- $m$ and
and color to be selected by owners

5 Front porch - tile on concrete base or plain conc. - finish and pattern to be selected by owner
$\qquad$
3 New solid redwood $6^{\prime}+1^{\prime}$ 'atitice fence with matching gate
B Side yard paths - Interlocking pavers - same as front
(6) Rear Patio - Conc. interlocking pavers to be selected by

10 Covered Patio - tile on concrete base or plain conc. finish and pateern to be sesecected by owner
11 Path way - Interlocking pavers - same as front

12
13 Kid's Play Area - bark
Impervious Paving in Front Yard Setback Total Area in Front Yard Setback
$78 \times 25=1955$ st
Drivew wy $=540.6$ sf
Front walk $=218 \mathrm{sf}$
Total impervious $=758.6$
$758.6 / 1950=38.9 \%$ KK

Landscape Screening


3 On he southeast side of the eraer yard theie is alalage Oaknexd door and lagge
Pucalypus next door on the suill side of the roposesed house. we are adding sone
Pooccapus


Landscape Screening
Podocarpus gracilior



TO: Design Review Commission
FROM: Sean K. Gallegos, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: SC22-0027-363 West Edith Avenue

## RECOMMENDATION:

Approve design review application SC22-0027 subject to the listed findings and conditions

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is a design review application for a first and second-story addition to an existing single-story residence. The project includes adding 86 square feet for a porch at the first story and a new 805 square-foot second story. This project should be considered categorically exempt from further environmental review under Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) since it involves an addition to an existing single-family residence in an area zoned for residential uses. The following table summarizes the project's technical details:

General Plan Designation:
Zoning:
Parcel Size:
Materials:

Single-Family, Medium Lot
R1-10
10,400 square feet
Composition shingle roof; stucco exterior and wood horizontal siding

|  | Existing | Proposed | Allowed/Required |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| COVERAGE: | 2,825 square feet | 2,993 square feet | 3,120 square feet |
| FLOOR AREA: | 2,777 square feet | 3,519 square feet | 3,640 square feet |
|  |  |  |  |
| SETBACKS: | 25 feet | 25 feet | 25 feet |
| Front | 38.5 feet | 38.5 feet | 25 feet |
| Rear | 10.2 feet | 10.2 feet $/ 18.1$ feet | 10 feet $/ 17.5$ feet |
| Right side $\left(1^{\text {st }} 2^{\text {nd }}\right)$ | 10 feet | 10.3 feet $/ 17.6$ feet | 10 feet $/ 17.5$ feet |
| Left side $\left(1^{\text {nd }}\right)$ | 15.75 feet | 23.5 feet | 27 feet |
| HEIGHT: |  |  |  |

## BACKGROUND

## Neighborhood Context

The subject property is located on West Edith Avenue between Cypress Drive and Foothill Expressway. The surrounding neighborhood is considered a Consistent Character Neighborhood as defined in the City's Residential Design Guidelines with similar characteristics of low scale, house style, type, setbacks, and streetscape character. The residences on West Edith Avenue are a mixture of one and two-story residences that have mostly retained their original front façade aesthetics, architectural detailing, and exterior materials mainly consisting of stucco, wood, and brick materials. The landscape along the street is varied with no street tree pattern but most properties include at least one medium to large tree in the front
 yard.

## DISCUSSION

## Design Review

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

As depicted in the design plans (Attachment E), the applicant is proposing an 86 square-foot porch to the first story and a new 805 square-foot second story.

## First-Story Addition and Exterior Modifications

A proposed 86 square-foot addition would add a one-story porch along the front elevation. The additional exterior changes include:

- Along the front elevation:
- The addition of a projecting and defined 86 square-foot porch with hipped roof form;
- Removal of the board and batten and horizontal siding, and its replacement with a stucco exterior finish;
- Removal of the horizontal siding in the gables;
- Replacement of a three-panel window with two, two-panel windows in the garage;
- Removal of the bay window in bedroom No. 2 and its replacement with a twopanel window.
- Addition of a projecting and defined porch with a gable roof form and wood
and stone veneer detailed columns.
- Along the interior right-side elevation
- The gable roof was modified to a Dutch gable to eliminate existing encroachments into the daylight plane;
- The replacement of a small window in the laundry room and bedroom No. 2 and large window in the office;
- The addition of a new medium sized window in bathroom No. 1; and
- A new garage door
- Along the interior left-side elevation
- The gable roof was modified to a Dutch gable to eliminate existing encroachments into the daylight plane;
- The replacement of a window in the laundry room and bedroom No. 2 and window in the office;
- The addition of a new window in bathroom No. 1; and
- A new garage door
- Along the rear (east) elevation
- Replacement of a window in bathroom No. 1 with a similar window and the replacement of the window in the primary bedroom with a two-panel sliding door. The windows and doors will match the new window style for the house;
- Replacement of a window in the dining with a large multiple-panel window with a door. The windows and doors will match the new window style for the house; and
- Replacement of two windows in the kitchen.

Staff finds the proposed first-story addition and exterior modifications to be in compliance with the R1-10 zoning district development standards, the Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines, and the design review findings pursuant to Section 14.76.060 of the Zoning Code and therefore recommends design review approval of the first-story addition and exterior modifications. A materials board is provided in the project plans.

## Second-Story Addition

The design plans propose an 805 square-foot second story addition to the existing one-story house. The second story will include area for an office, lounge, bedroom no. 4, bathroom no. 3, and bedroom no. 3 . With regards to building setbacks, the second story addition exceeds the secondstory setbacks as described in the table on Sheet A-2, and it is in conformance with the required standards. Please refer to the table above for more specific setbacks.

The second story addition's roof forms will match the existing 4:12 pitched roof that are integrated with the existing roof forms. Proposed second floor roof materials will match the first story roof material to be composition shingles. For the wall plate height at the second story, the proposed addition will feature an eight-foot-tall plate height, which is consistent with the existing first story wall plate height of eight feet. The proposed second story addition will have an overall height of 23.5 feet, which will be less than the allowed maximum height of 27 feet.

Design Review Commission
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Consistent with the design review findings, given the minor exterior modifications to the first story wall plate heights along the right side and the modest sized second-story addition with its low scale wall plate heights and roof forms, the proposed design will minimize the perception of excessive bulk and mass.

With regards to exterior materials, the project is matching the aesthetics of the existing residence and utilizing materials of similar quality to those found in the existing neighborhood. The firststory addition and other modified portions of the first story will use stucco siding and horizontal wood siding board will be used on the second-story which is similar to the horizontal lap wood siding installed on other residences in the neighborhood. The existing roof will be replaced, and the new roof will be a composition shingle material.

Overall, the design of the project appears to be an appropriate design within this Consistent Character Neighborhood and conforms to of the Residential Design Guidelines and Design Review findings.

## Privacy

Along the left (west) elevation, there is a small window with a minimum windowsill height of five feet, ten inches in the office. Due to tall sill height of the windows of the bathroom, the proposed window does not create unreasonable privacy impacts.

Along the right (east) elevation of the second story, there are three windows proposed along the second story. The elevation includes a medium-sized window in bedroom no. 4 with a three-foot, six-inch sill height, a small-sized window with a 5.9 -foot sill height, and a medium-sized window in bedroom no. 3 with a three-foot, six-inch sill height. Due to tall sill height of the windows of the bathroom, the proposed window does not create unreasonable privacy impacts. The bedrooms with the three-foot, six-inch sill height may impact privacy due to its views towards the adjacent house or side yard area. To ensure that there are no additional privacy impacts, staff recommends Condition No. 4 to raise the sill of the bedrooms to four-foot, six-inches. With the proposed windowsill heights, the proposed windows along the left elevation will not create unreasonable privacy impacts.

Along the rear (north) second story elevation, there are three windows proposed: one mediumsized window with a sill heigh of three feet, six inches for bedroom no. 3 and two large six-panel windows for the dining room with a sill height of 9 feet, two inches. The rear elevation may have potential privacy impact due to the large window with a lower sill height. Staff considered the privacy impact will be minimal because the setback from the rear property line to the window will be 36 feet and 6 inches, greater than the required rear setback of 25 feet. Also, existing dense screening vegetation and trees along rear property line and the applicant proposing new Podacarpus gracilior along the right property line should mitigate potential privacy impact. The details of the proposed screening vegetation are provided in the "Landscaping and Trees" section of this staff report.

## Landscaping and Trees

Design Review Commission
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Ten existing trees are depicted within the proximity of the subject site, please see sheet A-1 for the table identifying all trees on the site. Since the proposal is a minor addition to the first story and the second-story addition is within the footprint of the existing structure, the applicant is not proposing to remove any trees. Consistent with the Submittal Requirements for Two-Story Residential Design review handout, an arborist report is not required for the proposal due to the proposed addition not falling within the inner $2 / 3$ rds of the dripline of any protected tree.

A new landscaping plan is proposed including a number of evergreen screening vegetation on Sheet A-13. The proposed screening vegetation will be planted along all the property lines and are outlined in Table 1 below.

## Table 1: Proposed Screening Plant List

| Common Name | No. | Size | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Podocarpus Gracilior | 10 | 15-gallon | $20-60$ ' tall $\times 10$ ' wide |

The plans indicate the existing landscaping is to remain, therefore staff has included the standard condition of approval that requires the applicant to maintain or provide new landscaping as needed, which will be inspected before final inspection. In addition to preserving many of the existing trees and landscaping on the site, the project will be planting new evergreen screening. New or rebuilt landscaping would need to satisfy the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance requirements should it exceed the 2,500 square-foot landscaping threshold for residential additions (Condition of Approval No. 6 and 18). Overall, the existing and proposed landscaping meets the intent of the City's landscape regulations and street tree guidelines.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This project should be considered categorically exempt from environmental review under Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act because it involves the addition of a second story on an existing single-family residence on an existing lot in an area zoned for residential uses.

## PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

A public meeting notice was posted on the property and mailed to 8 property owners in the immediate vicinity on West Edith Avenue, Cypress Drive, and Warec Way. The applicant also posted the public notice sign ( 24 " x 36 ") in conformance with the Planning Division posting requirements.

No correspondence was received from neighboring property owners.

Cc: Varada Malavika Rao, Architect and Applicant<br>Sankaralingham Anand and Ganeshan Ramya, Property Owner
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Attachments:
A. Public Notification Map
B. Neighborhood Compatibility Worksheet and Neighbor Review Document
C. Applicant Outreach
D. Public Notice Poster
E. Design Plans

## FINDINGS

## SC22-0027-363 West Edith Avenue

With regard to the first-story modifications and second story addition to an existing one-story house, the Design Review Commission finds the following in accordance with Section 14.76.060 of the Municipal Code:
a. The proposed residence complies with all provision of this chapter;
b. The height, elevations, and placement on the site of the new residence, when considered with reference to the nature and location of residential structures on adjacent lots, will avoid unreasonable interference with views and privacy and will consider the topographic and geologic constraints imposed by particular building site conditions;
c. The natural landscape will be preserved insofar as practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal; grade changes shall be minimized and will be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed areas;
d. The orientation of the proposed new residence in relation to the immediate neighborhood will minimize the perception of excessive bulk and mass;
e. General architectural considerations, including the character, size, scale, and quality of the design, the architectural relationship with the site and other buildings, building materials, and similar elements have been incorporated in order to insure the compatibility of the development with its design concept and the character of adjacent buildings; and
f. The proposed residence has been designed to follow the natural contours of the site with minimal grading, minimum impervious cover, and maximum erosion protection.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

SC22-0005-363 West Edith Avenue

## GENERAL

1. Expiration

The Design Review Approval will expire on January 4, 2025 unless prior to the date of expiration, a building permit is issued, or an extension is granted pursuant to Section 14.76.090 of the Zoning Code.
2. Approved Plans

The approval is based on the plans and materials received on December 1, 2022, except as may be modified by these conditions and as specified below.
3. Encroachment Permit

An encroachment permit shall be obtained from the Engineering Division prior to doing any work within the public right-of-way including the street shoulder. All work within the public street right-of-way shall be in compliance with the City's Shoulder Paving Policy.
4. Protected Trees

The existing trees and proposed evergreen screening shall be protected under this application and cannot be removed without a tree removal permit from the Development Services Director.
5. Windowsill Height

The sill height of the bedroom no. 3 and 4 along the right (east) side elevation shall be increased to a minimum of four-foot, six inches.
6. Landscaping

The project shall be subject to the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) pursuant to Chapter 12.36 of the Municipal Code if 2,500 square feet or more of new or replaced landscape area, including irrigated planting areas, turf areas, and water features is proposed. Any project with an aggregate landscape area of 2,500 square feet or less may conform to the prescriptive measures contained in Appendix D of the City's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
7. Underground Utility and Fire Sprinkler Requirements

Additions exceeding fifty (50) percent of the existing living area (existing square footage calculations shall not include existing basements) and/or additions of 750 square feet or more shall trigger the undergrounding of utilities and new fire sprinklers. Additional square footage calculations shall include existing removed exterior footings and foundations being replaced and rebuilt. Any new utility service drops are pursuant to Chapter 12.68 of the Municipal Code.
8. Indemnity and Hold Harmless

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

## INCLUDED WITH THE BUILDING PERMIT SUBMITTAL

9. Conditions of Approval

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

## 10. Tree Protection Note

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

## 11. Green Building Standards

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

## 12. Air Conditioner Sound Rating

Show the location of any new air conditioning unit(s) on the site plan including the model number of the unit(s) and nominal size of the unit. Provide the manufacturer's specifications showing the sound rating for each unit. The air conditioning units must be located to comply with the City's Noise Control Ordinance (Chapter 6.16) and in compliance with the Planning Division setback provisions. The units shall be screened from view of the street.

## 13. Storm Water Management

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

## 14. California Water Service Upgrades

You are responsible for contacting and coordinating with the California Water Service
Company any water service improvements including but not limited to relocation of water meters, increasing water meter sizing or the installation of fire hydrants. The City recommends consulting with California Water Service Company as early as possible to avoid construction or inspection delays.

## 15. Underground Utility Location

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

## PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING OR DEMOLITION PERMIT

## 16. Tree Protection

Tree protection shall be installed around the dripline(s) of the trees as shown on the site plan approved with the building permit plans. Fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five
feet in height with posts driven into the ground and shall not be removed until all building construction has been completed unless approved by the Planning Division.

## 17. School Fee Payment

In accordance with Section 65995 of the California Government Code, and as authorized under Section 17620 of the Education Code, the property owner shall pay the established school fee for each school district the property is located in and provide receipts to the Building Division. The City of Los Altos shall provide the property owner the resulting increase in assessable space on a form approved by the school district. Payments shall be made directly to the school districts.

## PRIOR TO FINAL INSPECTION

## 18. Landscaping Installation

All front yard, exterior side, interior side, and rear yard landscaping, street trees and privacy screening trees shall be maintained and/or installed as shown on the approved plans or as required by the Planning Division.

## 19. Tree Protection

Tree protection fencing shall be installed around the dripline(s), or as required by the project arborist, of the existing trees as shown on the site plan. Tree protection fencing shall be chain link and a minimum of five feet in height with posts driven into the ground and shall not be removed until all building construction has been completed unless approved by the Planning Division

## 20. Landscape Privacy Screening

The landscape intended to provide privacy screening shall be inspected by the Planning Division and shall be supplemented by additional screening material as required to adequately mitigate potential privacy impacts to surrounding properties.
21. Green Building Verification

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

ATTACHMENT A
363 W. Edith Avenue Notification Map


## - Waterways

## NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY WORKSHEET

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

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

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

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

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

Project Address 363 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022
Scope of Project: Addition or Remodel $\qquad$ or New Home $\qquad$ Age of existing home if this project is to be an addition or remodel? 60 Is the existing house listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory? No

## What constitutes your neighborhood?

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

## Streetscape

## 1. Typical neighborhood lot size*:

Lot area: 10,000
Lot dimensions: $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Length } 120 & \text { feet } \\ \text { Width } 85 & \text { feet }\end{array}$
If your lot is significantly different than those in your neighborhood, then note its: area $10,374 \mathrm{SF}$, length 130 feet , and width 80 feet $\qquad$
2. Setback of homes to front property line: (Pgs. 8-11 Design Guidelines)

Existing front setback if home is a remodel?Yes
What $\%$ of the front facing walls of the neighborhood homes are at the front setback $100 \%$
Existing front setback for house on left 30 $\qquad$ ft./on right 30 ft .
Do the front setbacks of adjacent houses line up? Yes
3. Garage Location Pattern: (Pg. 19 Design Guidelines)

Indicate the relationship of garage locations in your neighborhood* only on your street (count for each type)
Garage facing front projecting from front of house face 3
Garage facing front recessed from front of house face 0
Garage in back yard 0
Garage facing the side 3
Number of 1-car garages $\underline{0}$; 2-car garages 5 _ ; 3-car garages 1

## 4. Single or Two-Story Homes:

What \% of the homes in your neighborhood* are:
One-story $\frac{50 \%}{50 \%}$
Two-story $50 \%$

## 5. Roof heights and shapes:

Is the overall height of house ridgelines generally the same in your neighborhood*? №
Are there mostly hip $\square$, gable style $\square$, or other style $\square$ roofs*?
Do the roof forms appear simple $\qquad$ or complex $\qquad$ ?
Do the houses share generally the same eave height Yes ?
6. Exterior Materials: (Pg. 22 Design Guidelines)

What siding materials are frequently used in your neighborhood*?
$\underline{\boldsymbol{V}}$ wood shingle $\underline{\boldsymbol{V}}$ stucco $\underline{\boldsymbol{V}}$ board \& batten _ clapboard
_ tile $\underline{\boldsymbol{v}}$ stone __ brick _ combination of one or more materials (if so, describe) $\qquad$
What roofing materials (wood shake/shingle, asphalt shingle, flat tile, rounded tile, cement tile, slate) are consistently (about $80 \%$ ) used? Wood shake/shingle If no consistency then explain:
7. Architectural Style: (Appendix C, Design Guidelines)

Does your neighborhood* have a consistent identifiable architectural style? $\square$ YES $\square$ NO

Type? $\square$ Ranch $\square$ Shingle $\square$ Tudor $\square$ Mediterranean/Spanish $\square$ ㅁ Contemporary $\square$ Colonial $\sqcap$ Bungalow ㅁOther

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

Does your property have a noticeable slope? №
What is the direction of your slope? (relative to the street)

## Towards the road

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

## 9. Landscaping:

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

How visible are your house and other houses from the street or back neighbor's property?
Partially visible since there are large trees in the front setback/public right of way

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

## 10. Width of Street:

What is the width of the roadway paving on your street in feet? $25^{\prime}$ Is there a parking area on the street or in the shoulder area? No Is the shoulder area (unimproved public right-of-way) paved, unpaved, gravel, landscaped, and/or defined with a curb/gutter? Paved

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

Such as roof material and type（hip，gable，flat），siding（board and batten， cement plaster，horizontal wood，brick），deep front yard setbacks， horizontal feel，landscape approach etc．：
M ostly Gable roof with Intersecting／overlaid hip．
M ost houses have deep front setbacks with landscaping．
Board and battern，Wood，Stucco and cement board sidings

## General Study

A．Have major visible streetscape changes occurred in your neighborhood？
$\square$ YES $\square$ NO

B．Do you think that most（ $\sim 80 \%$ ）of the homes were originally built at the same time？$\square$ YES $\square \mathrm{NO}$

C．Do the lots in your neighborhood appear to be the same size？
$\square$ YES 囚 NO

D．Do the lot widths appear to be consistent in the neighborhood？
$\square$ YES 『 NO
E．Are the front setbacks of homes on your street consistent（ $\sim 80 \%$ within 5 feet）？図 YES ■ NO

F．Do you have active CCR＇s in your neighborhood？（p． 36 Building Guide）
$\square$ YES 区 NO

G．Do the houses appear to be of similar size as viewed from the street？
凹 YES $\square \mathrm{NO}$

H．Does the new exterior remodel or new construction design you are planning relate in most ways to the prevailing style（s）in your existing neighborhood？

凹 YES ■ NO

## Summary Table

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

| Address | Front <br> setback | Rear <br> setback | Garage <br> location | One or two stories | Height | Materials <br> (simple or <br> complex) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 389 Cypress Dr, Los Altos | $\sim 30^{\prime}$ | $\sim 20^{\prime}$ | Front | One | $\sim 15^{\prime}$ | Wood, Stucco | Simple |
| 384 Warec Way, Los Altos | $\sim 30^{\prime}$ | $\sim 40^{\prime}$ | Front | One | $\sim 15^{\prime}$ | Board \& battern | Simple |
| 333 W Edith Ave, Los Altos | $\sim 25^{\prime}$ | $\sim 20^{\prime}$ | Side | One | $\sim 15^{\prime}$ | Stucco | Simple |
| 355 Warec Way, Los Altos | $\sim 25^{\prime}$ | $\sim 25^{\prime}$ | Front/Side | One | $\sim 15^{\prime}$ | Wood, Stucco | Simple |
| 366 Warec Way, Los Altos | $\sim 30^{\prime}$ | $\sim 25^{\prime}$ | Front/Side | One | $\sim 16^{\prime}$ | Stucco | Simple |
| 2 M IDDLEBURY Ln, Los Altos | $\sim 25^{\prime}$ | $\sim 30^{\prime}$ | Front | Two | $\sim 22-25^{\prime}$ | Wood, brick | Simple |
| 364 W Edith Ave, Los Altos | $\sim 30^{\prime}-40^{\prime}$ | $\sim 30^{\prime}-35^{\prime}$ | Side | Two | $\sim 22-25^{\prime}$ | Stucco, wood | Simple |
| 374 W Edith Ave, Los Altos | $\sim 40^{\prime}$ | $\sim 30^{\prime}$ | Front | Two | $\sim 22-25^{\prime}$ | Brick, Wood | Simple |
| 384 W Edith Ave, Los Altos | $\sim 40^{\prime}$ | $\sim 30^{\prime}$ | Front | Two | $\sim 22-25^{\prime}$ | Wood | Simple |
| 394 W Edith Ave, Los Altos | $\sim 40^{\prime}$ | $\sim 65^{\prime}$ | Front | Two | $\sim 22-25^{\prime}$ | Wood, stone | Simple |
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* See "What constitutes your neighborhood", (page 2).
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## Property Located at

## 363 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022



Addresses of the property analyzed in the neighborhood:

> 333 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 389 Cypress Dr, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 384 Warec Way, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 355 Warec Way, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 366 Warec Way, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 2 MIDDLEBURY Ln, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 364 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 374 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 384 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022
> 394 W Edith Ave, Los Altos, CA 94022




Views of the neighbor on the right from the property
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Views of the neighbor on the left from the property





| From: | Anand S |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Sean Gallegos |
| Cc: | Malavika Rao; Ramya |
| Subject: | 363 EDITH AVENUE (Application No. SC22-0027) - Community outreach |
| Date: | Thursday, December 1, 2022 9:52:51 AM |

Sean Gallegos,
Senior Planner
City of Los Altos

As part of the community outreach, I have notified my neighbors (i) the three houses that are right across the Edith Avenue, ii) the two houses behind my house in Warec Way, were duly notified about the upcoming renovation of my house.

I communicated to the above mentioned neighbors regarding the addition of second floor, which will have two bedrooms and an office room, and a significant renovation to the first floor. They were also made aware that right now I am in the process of a Planning Design Review to obtain a Planning Permit from the Planning Division, and will potentially commence construction in the next 2-4 months once I receive Permits from both Planning and Building Divisions.

I also made them aware that we will do our best to limit the noise and disruption throughout the construction.

## Regards,

Anand Sankaralingam

[^2]| From: | Malavika Rao |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, December 23, 2022 12:51 PM |
| To: | Planning Services; Sean Gallegos |
| Cc: | Anand S; Ramya; Yvonne Dupont |
| Subject: | Re: Proof of Public Notice Posting for 363 W. Edith Avenue |

Hello Sean,

The public meeting notice has been attached to the sign board as of Friday morning 23rd December at 12:30pm. Please confirm receipt of email and attached image.



Thank you.
Regards,

Malavika Rao, Designer

## MAVIN INNOVATIVE DESIGNS


$M A V I N$
■■■■■■■■■
w: mavindesigns.com
m: 312-661-2024

On Thu, Dec 22, 2022 at 8:01 AM Sean Gallegos [sgallegos@losaltosca.gov](mailto:sgallegos@losaltosca.gov) wrote:

Good Morning,

As a reminder, the notice must be posted by Sunday, December 24, 2022. You must send an email by Sunday, December 24,2022 with a photograph confirming the posting. If we do not receive the proof of posting email by Sunday, December 24,2022 , your project will be continued to the next meeting.

Thank you,
Sean Gallegos
Senior Planner


Sean K. Gallegos
Senior Planner, City of Los Altos
(650) 947-2641 | www.losaltosca.gov

From: Yvonne Dupont [ydupont@losaltosca.gov](mailto:ydupont@losaltosca.gov)
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2022 9:23 AM
To: Malavika Rao [malavika@mavindesigns.com](mailto:malavika@mavindesigns.com)
Cc: Anand S [anand.sank@gmail.com](mailto:anand.sank@gmail.com); Ramya [ramyakamalam@gmail.com](mailto:ramyakamalam@gmail.com); Sean Gallegos
[sgallegos@losaltosca.gov](mailto:sgallegos@losaltosca.gov)
Subject: RE: Proof of Public Notice Posting for 363 W. Edith Avenue
Importance: High

Hello Malavika,

Your property posting for 363 W. Edith Avenue for the January 4, 2023 DRC meeting is ready for pick-up here at City Hall. Your property posting is located in the black handout rack that is attached to a steel beam to your right as you walk up the ramp to our front doors. It is printed on white cardstock, is laminated, and has a yellow post-it with the project address on it. I have attached a picture of the pick-up location.

Please note, this posting must be posted no later than Saturday, December $24^{\text {th }}$ in order to meet the 10-day posting requirement prior to the meeting date. Thanks and have a wonderful day!

Yvonne (D. Dupont, Management Analyst I

Development Services Department
City of Los Altos
One North San Antonio Road
Los Altos, CA 94022-3088

Phone: (650) 947-2643
Fax: (650) 947-2733
Email: ydupont@losaltosca.gov
*City offices will be closed December $26^{\text {th }}$ - December $30^{\text {th }}$. For additional information visit Building Services City of Los Altos California

NEW! Sign-up to receive City of Los Altos news delivered right to your inbox! www.losaltosca.gov/enotify

From: Malavika Rao [malavika@mavindesigns.com](mailto:malavika@mavindesigns.com)
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2022 2:06 PM
To: Planning Services [planning@losaltosca.gov](mailto:planning@losaltosca.gov)
Cc: Anand S [anand.sank@gmail.com](mailto:anand.sank@gmail.com); Ramya [ramyakamalam@gmail.com](mailto:ramyakamalam@gmail.com)
Subject: Re: Proof of Public Notice Posting for 363 W. Edith Avenue

Hello,

We were waiting on information from the City regarding the public notice letter to be posted on the sign board. Please let us know when we need to collect it or will it be sent to the owners via mail.

Regards,

Malavika Rao, Designer
MAVIN INNOVATIVE DESIGNS



w: mavindesigns.com
$\mathrm{m}: \underline{312-661-2024}$

On Tue, Dec 6, 2022 at 4:00 PM Malavika Rao [malavika@mavindesigns.com](mailto:malavika@mavindesigns.com) wrote:

Hello,

Please see attached image showing Public Notice sign posted at the property on 12/06/2022 morning.


Regards,

Malavika Rao, Designer

## MAVIN INNOVATIVE DESIGNS



w: mavindesigns.com
m: 312-661-2024
--
Malavika Rao, Designer
MAVIN INNOVATIVE DESIGNS



w: mavindesigns.com
m: 312-661-2024















TREES PROPOSED
*ALL DATA BELOW IS IDENTIFIED AS BEST POSSIBLE

| EXISTING | TREE SPECIES | HEIGHT | DRIPLINE | PROPOSED | TREE SPECIES | HEIGHT @ MATURITY | WIDTH @ MATURITY | RATE OF GROWTH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T1 | BUR OAK | 40 FT | 30 FT | NT1 | PODOCARPUS GRACILIOR | 20-60 FT | 5-10 FT | $1-3 \mathrm{FT} / \mathrm{YR}$ |
| T2 | MARITIME PINE | 60-70 FT | 40 FT |  |  |  |  |  |
| T3 | ISLAND OAK | 35 FT | 30 FT |  |  |  |  |  |
| T4 | COAST LIVE OAK | 40 FT | 40 FT |  |  |  |  |  |
| T5 | ISLAND OAK | 20 FT | 15 FT |  | +x+3, ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
| T6 | MARITIME PINE | 60-70 FT | 40 FT |  | - 5 cos ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |
| T7 | MARITIME PINE | 60-70 FT | 40 FT |  | 4ix |  |  |  |
| T8 | COAST LIVE OAK | 60 FT | 50 FT |  |  |  |  |  |
| T9 | TOYON HOLLY | 15 FT | 10 FT |  |  |  |  |  |
| T10 | JAPANESE PAGODA TREE | 20 FT | 15 FT |  |  |  |  |  |





DATE: January 4, 2023
AGENDA ITEM \# 4

TO: Design Review Commission
FROM: Sean K. Gallegos, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: 2023 City Council Meeting Schedule

## RECOMMENDATION:

Review the 2023 City Council Meeting Assignments for Design Review Commission

## DISCUSSION

The proposed City Council Meeting Assignments for this year:

| January 10, 2023 | Samuel Harding |
| :--- | :--- |
| January 24, 2023 | Chepe Mantica |
| February 14, 2023 | Stuart Klein |
| February 28, 2023 | David Blockhus |
| March 14, 2023 | Michael Ma |
| March 28, 2023 | Samuel Harding |
| April 11, 2023 | Chepe Mantica |
| April 25, 2023 | Stuart Klein |
| May 9, 2023 | David Blockhus |
| May 23, 2023 | Michael Ma |
| June 13, 2023 | Samuel Harding |
| June 27, 2023 | Chepe Mantica |
| July 11, 2023 <br> (only one regular meeting scheduled in July) | Stuart Klein |
| August 22, 2023 <br> (only one regular meeting scheduled in August) | David Blockhus |
| September 5, 2023 | Michael Ma |
| September 19, 2023 | Samuel Harding |
| October 10, 2023 | Chepe Mantica |
| October 24, 2023 | Stuart Klein |
| November 14, 2023 | David Blockhus |
| November 28, 2023 | Michael Ma |
| December 12, 2023 <br> (only one regular meeting scheduled in December) | Samuel Harding |

The City Council holds its regular meetings on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month beginning at 7:00 p.m. in the Community Meeting Chambers. Staff requests the Design Review Commission review and approve the above Council Meeting Assignment schedule for 2023.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Due to technical issues, a video recording is not available for the Design Review Commission meeting of November 2, 2022.

[^1]:    * To best meet the City fencing requirements, specifically recommend using five-foot (5') chain link fence as standard tree protection. The fence is most secure when mounted on 2 -inch diameter galvanized posts and driven into the ground to a depth of at least 2 feet at no more than 10 -foot spacing. In lieu of a diagram provided by the City, I have attached a diagram TPZ fencing diagram published by the County of Santa Clara to serve as an example of a standard, best-practice TPZ

[^2]:    IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This email is from Evercore. For further information about the particular Evercore entity which has sent you this email, please click here. The information in this email (and any attachment) is confidential, is intended only for use of the intended recipient(s) and must not be used by any other person. If you have received this email in error, please inform Evercore immediately and delete the original. The security, accuracy and timeliness of electronic communications cannot be assured and Evercore does not accept any liability for any virus, malware or similar. If you do not wish to receive certain communications from which you are entitled to unsubscribe under applicable law, please contact the sender of this email to unsubscribe.

    DISCLAIMER: Evercore does not provide tax advice and does not provide services to retail customers. Evercore reserves the right to monitor and record electronic and telephone communications made by or to its personnel for regulatory or operational purposes.

    PRIVACY: The personal information contained in this email and any attachment, including the names and email address of any and all recipients, and any personal information provided in response to this email, is, to the extent applicable, handled by Evercore in accordance with its Privacy Notice which can be found here. Thank you.

