



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 06/09/2021

ITEM NO: 2

ADDENDUM

---

DATE: June 8, 2021  
TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: Joel Paulson, Community Development Director  
SUBJECT: Requesting Approval for Demolition of an Existing Single-Family Residence and Construction of a New Single-Family Residence with Reduced Front and Side Setbacks on Nonconforming Property Zoned R-1:8. Located at 102 Alta Heights Court. APN 532-29-045. Architectural and Site Application S-20-029. Property Owner: Bo Development, LLC. Applicant: Eric Beckstrom. Project Planner: Ryan Safty.

REMARKS:

Exhibit 12 includes the applicant's response to parking and front setback concerns raised by neighbors. Exhibit 13 includes additional public comment received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, June 4, 2021 and 11:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 8, 2021.

EXHIBITS:

Previously received with the June 9, 2021 Staff Report:

1. Location Map
2. Required Findings and Considerations
3. Recommended Conditions of Approval
4. Project Description and Letter of Justification
5. Consulting Arborist's Report, dated November 3, 2020
6. Consulting Architect's Report, dated October 6, 2020
7. Applicant's response to the Consulting Architect's Report, received February 11, 2021
8. Applicant's neighborhood outreach efforts
9. Public Comments received prior to 11:00 a.m., Friday, June 4, 2021
10. Color and Materials Board, received December 16, 2020
11. Development Plans, received May 9, 2021

PREPARED BY: RYAN SAFTY  
Associate Planner

---

Reviewed by: Planning Manager and Community Development Director

---

PAGE 2 OF 2

SUBJECT: 102 Alta Heights Court/S-20-029

DATE: June 8, 2021

Received with this Addendum:

12. Applicant's response to parking and front setback concerns, received June 7, 2021

13. Public comments received between 11:01 a.m., Friday, June 4, 2021 and 11:00 a.m.,  
Tuesday, June 8, 2021

**Beckstrom Architecture + Interiors**

PO Box 1317, Los Gatos, CA 94030, 650 847-8351, E: [Eric@BeckstromArchitecture.com](mailto:Eric@BeckstromArchitecture.com)

June 7, 2021

TO: **Los Gatos Planning/Building Dept**

Project: 102 Alta Heights Court, Los Gatos, 95030; APN: 532-29-045, Zoning: R:1-8

**Construct New 2-story Residence in R:1-8 Zone – Parking pictures and additional notes**



From 102 Alta Heights Court - View looking North West, 175 Loma Alta in background.

**A 9' x 18' parking area is the universal code across the USA.** The driveway is 20' wide x 18' deep, behind the sidewalk/property line. Please note that 175 Loma Alta's roof appears to be approx. 1' higher than 102 AHC.



Looking straight at the proposed garage front (see orange netting). There is room for 2 cars and a Vespa.



View looking west at 175 Loma Alta. Note the +3' space between cars and garage front story poles.



View West showing that the proposed front elevation is nearly the same as the existing house front porch. The second story pole on the left is the cantilevered front bay.



View looking SouthEast at 175 Loma Alta. The parked cars at 102 AHC are just visible behind the 175 LA garage (4.75' driveway) which projects into the setback. Note the large canopy of the Oak over the roof and side of the 175 LA house which blocks the view of 102 Alta Heights Court.



View looking East at 175 Loma Alta on the left and 116 Alta Heights Court on the right. The parked cars at 102 AHC are just visible behind the 175 LA garage (4.75' driveway) which projects into the setback. Note the large canopy of the Oak over the roof and side of the 175 LA house which blocks the view of 102 Alta Heights Court. Please also note that 116 Loma Alta on the right projects approx. 12-14' into the front yard setback (11' driveway).

Additional Notes:

<b>4 Houses around 102 Alta Heights Court</b>			<b>% over Setbacks</b>
<b>Alta Heights Court Street Setbacks</b>			
175 Loma Alta Ave. (next door)	4.6	ft	42%
104 Alta Heights Court (next door)	25	ft	
116 Alta Heights Court	11	ft	20%
112 Alta Heights Court	25	ft	
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>65.6</b>	ft	
Houses	4		
<b>Average Setback from Alta Heights Court</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>ft</b>	
<b>102 Alta Heights Court Footprint change</b>			
Proposed footprint	1,594	sf	
Existing footprint	1,345	sf	
<b>Total footprint increase</b>	<b>249</b>	sf	

Sincerely,



Eric A. Beckstrom  
Architect/Owner



Catherine DuBridge  
Designer/Owner

6/7/2021

Mr. Ryan Safty  
Associate Planner  
Town of Los Gatos  
CC: Ms. Jennifer Armer, Los Gatos Planning  
RE: proposed project at 102 Alta Heights Court, Los Gatos

Dear Mr. Ryan Safty,

We are the owners and residents of the neighboring house at 104 Alta Heights Court, Los Gatos.

We have reviewed the applicant's description of conversations with us in the "Neighbor Communication Timeline" portion packet prepared for Los Gatos Planning commission review and have found several inaccuracies, mischaracterizations and misunderstandings.

We wish to relate our understanding and recollection of those discussions on 5/11/21 herewith for the record.

- 1) **The applicant states** *"We went door to door to 8 neighbors to introduce ourselves and show them the house plans, which included an accurate 3D rendering of a BIM model, floorplans and a 3D model view of the street (see attached)."*
  - a. **This is incorrect in our case.** We were only shown **one** 3D rendering (which we don't see in this packet) and a letter of approval to be signed. We signed this letter as a gesture of good faith and were initially supportive of the design. **However, upon reviewing the detailed plans (from the LG Planning website) and the story-poles, we have subsequently rescinded our approval of the design** after gaining a clearer picture of the proposed setbacks and massing. These issues were not apparent from the initial materials supplied by the applicant but were obtained from the LG Pending Projects page.
- 2) **The applicant states** *"Moving the house back on the lot would block Ms. Shah and Mr. Parihar's view of the mountains".*
  - a. We note that most of the view of the mountains is impacted by the **current** proposed design and frankly moving the house back somewhat will not really make that significantly worse. This is apparent from the pictures out of our windows on the west side of our home, provided in our previous letter regarding our concerns about this project. The applicant is likely doing this not to preserve our views but in fact to maintain their backyard.
  - b. In passing we further note that several of our large windows facing the applicant's backyard are translucent precisely to provide privacy.
- 3) **The applicant states** *"They also did not seem to grasp any of the points, and seemed unwilling to compromise"*
  - a. **This is simply false.** We simply made the applicants aware of our concerns and specifically asked them to make proposals for changes. The applicants were intransigent and refused to make any changes.

- 4) **The applicant states in the Conclusion:** *“We are frustrated, as there appears to be no way to appease these people, short of scrapping the project altogether.”*
- a. We are surprised by this response given our request for proposals from the applicants given our concerns.
  - b. **We specifically requested that the applicants consider doing the following:**
    - i. **Restore side setbacks to 8’ given the size of the house.**
    - ii. **Remove cantilever projection of 1’9” on the east side of the house which reduces the 5’6” setback even further to 3’7”**
    - iii. **Reduce the height of roof**

The applicants claimed it was impossible to do any of these things and flatly refused to consider any changes claiming that the design was too intricate and “like a piece of origami”. **The unwillingness of the applicants to even consider the requested changes was deeply disappointing.**

- 5) **The applicant states in the Conclusion:** *“Both neighbors, at 104 Alta Heights Ct and 175 Loma Alta seemed to demand that we redesign our house exactly as they wished without compromise”*
- a. **As explained above, this is simply incorrect.** We stated our concerns and asked for proposals to address them. **The applicants were intransigent and refused to make any concessions.**
- 6) **The applicant states in the Conclusion:** *“It is absurd that Mr. Parihar and Ms. Shah, who have the most radical, modern, boxy house in the neighborhood, say that our design is not compatible with the neighborhood.”*
- a. **Our concern about incompatibility centers around the size of the house for the size of the lot, reduced setbacks being requested, and the excessively tall roofline, not the aesthetics of the design.**
  - b. **We further point out that our house design, though modern, won the approval of every neighbor on the cul-de-sac and was approved by LG Planning at the DRC meeting. We adhered to all setback requirements and worked with our neighbors transparently to address their concerns.**

**In comparison, the applicant’s proposed design does NOT have the support of several of the neighbors on the cul-de-sac.**

Sincerely,

Raj Parihar & Swati Shah, 104 Alta Heights, Owners and Residents