



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 02/10/2021

ITEM NO: 2

DATE: February 4, 2021
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Joel Paulson, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Requesting Approval for Demolition of an Existing Single-family Residence, Construction of a New Single-family Residence, Removal of a Large Protected Tree, and Site Improvements Requiring a Grading Permit on Property Zoned R-1:12 Located at 62 Ellenwood Avenue. APN 510-20-068. Architecture and Site Application S-20-008. Property Owners: Lisa and Case Swenson. Applicant: Lisa Nichols, Arcanum Architecture, Inc. Project Planner: Sean Mullin.

BACKGROUND:

On December 9, 2020, the Planning Commission considered the application and continued the matter to January 27, 2021. The Planning Commission directed the applicant to consider the comments of the Planning Commission, including:

- Incorporate softer materials;
- Utilize materials that are age compatible within the architecture and the surrounding neighborhood;
- Articulate the two-story mass by stepping it in at the front elevation;
- Reduce the driveway width; and
- Revise the fence design to be more compatible with the neighborhood.

Following the December 9, 2020 meeting, the applicant requested that the application be continued to a date uncertain to allow additional time to prepare revised materials. The applicant later requested a hearing date of February 10, 2021. The Town completed noticing for this hearing including publishing notices in the newspaper, posting agendas throughout the Town, and mailing notice cards to all property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the subject property. Additionally, the story poles have been updated and an updated project sign has been posted in accordance with Town policy.

PREPARED BY: SEAN MULLIN, AICP
Associate Planner

Reviewed by: Planning Manager and Community Development Director

DISCUSSION:

The applicant has revised the development plans in response to the comments received from the Planning Commission and provided a summary of the revisions to the development plans (Exhibits 16 and 19). The architecture of the main residence has been revised to a cottage vernacular, incorporating painted horizontal wood siding, split-faced stone veneer siding, a wood shingle roof, metal clad wood divided lite windows, steel divided lite windows and doors, stained cedar garage doors, reclaimed solid wood lintels, wood trellis and columns, and copper gutters, downspouts, and flue enclosures (Exhibits 17 and 19). The Residential Design Guidelines discourages the use of architectural copper due to concerns with its potential to contribute pollution to surface waters and the San Francisco Bay through runoff. In response to this concern, the applicant has indicated to staff that the copper will not be used and will be replaced with painted bonderized metal. Staff has included elimination of the architectural copper as a Condition of Approval (Exhibit 15).

The footprint and floorplan of the proposed residence and garage have both been maintained as previously proposed with only minor updates to the fenestration. The roof of the two-story portion of the residence has been changed from a hip roof to a gable-end roof with the plate and ridge heights consistent with the previous proposal. The two-story portion of the residence now includes a change in materials from stone siding to horizontal wood siding to break up the two-story massing and provide visual relief at this street-facing two-story wall.

The ridge and plate heights of the revised residence and garage remain consistent with those of the previous proposal with the exception of the single-story portion on the north side of the residence. The ridge height of this portion has been reduced by eight inches and the plate height has been reduced by 12 inches to align with the eave above the adjacent front entry. Other updates to the residence include the removal of the front entry trellis, small front balcony, and awning on the north section of the residence. Additionally, the front door has changed from steel and glass to wood, and proportional shutters have been added to the second-story front window.

In addition to the revisions made to the residence, the applicant has also responded to the direction of the Planning Commission by reducing the width of the proposed driveway from 18 feet to 14 feet in the interior of the property. The design of the front fence has been updated by eliminating the stone and metal accents and simplifying the materials to a vertical weathered wood picket. The siting of the front fence has also been simplified to a simple linear configuration paralleling the front property line and turning into the property with increasing setbacks as it traverses from south to north. The proposed pedestrian and northern vehicular gates have also been revised to a rectangular wood frame with vertical wood paneling and inset hog wire. The vehicular gate on the south side of the property has been updated to match the revised vertical wood picket fence proposed along the front of the property. The applicant

DISCUSSION (continued):

continues to pursue a fence height exception for the front fence and gates and includes additional written justification on Sheet L5.4 of the revised development plans (Exhibit 19).

STORY POLES:

The installed story poles have been maintained and updated to reflect the change from a hip roof to a gable-end roof on the second story and the lowering of the roof ridge and plate heights of the single-story portion on the north side of the residence. The applicant communicated to staff that the six poles representing the north portion of the residence were installed just prior to a final height adjustment being made on the plans to match the eave line at the entry. As a result, these six poles are approximately three inches taller than the heights indicated in the plans. The story poles have been certified by a licensed surveyor who indicated that they accurately reflect the height and location of the proposed residence, with this exception.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

At the time of this report's preparation, the Town has not received any public comment.

CONCLUSION:

A. Summary

The applicant has submitted revised development plans responding to the Planning Commission's direction (Exhibit 19).

B. Recommendation

Should the Planning Commission determine that the revised project meets the direction provided at the December 9, 2020 meeting, the Commission can take the actions below to approve the Architecture and Site application:

1. Make the finding that the proposed project is categorically exempt pursuant to the adopted Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15303: New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures (Exhibit 2);
2. Make the findings as required by Section 29.10.09030(e) of the Town Code for the demolition of existing structures (Exhibit 2);
3. Make the findings as required by Section 29.10.0992 of the Town Code for the removal of protected trees (Exhibit 2);

CONCLUSION (continued):

4. Make the finding that the project complies with the objective standards of Chapter 29 of the Town Code (Zoning Regulations) (Exhibit 2);
5. Make the finding that due security concerns a Fence Height Exception as allowed by Section 29.40.0320 of the Town Code is appropriate (Exhibit 2);
6. Make the finding required by the Town's Residential Design Guidelines that the project complies with the Residential Design Guidelines (Exhibit 2);
7. Make the considerations as required by Section 29.20.150 of the Town Code for granting approval of an Architecture and Site application (Exhibit 2); and
8. Approve Architecture and Site Application S-20-008 with the conditions contained in Exhibit 15 and the revised development plans in Exhibit 19.

C. Alternatives

Alternatively, the Commission can:

1. Continue the matter to a date certain with specific direction; or
2. Approve the application with additional and/or modified conditions; or
3. Deny the application.

EXHIBITS:

Previously received with the December 9, 2020 Staff Report:

1. Location Map
2. Required Findings and Considerations
3. Recommended Conditions of Approval
4. Color and Materials Board
5. Project Description and Letter of Justification
6. Consulting Architect's Report, dated May 19, 2020
7. Applicant's response to the Consulting Architect's Report, dated August 18, 2020
8. Consulting Arborist's Report, dated June 3, 2019
9. Applicant's response to the Consulting Arborist's Report, dated August 18, 2020
10. Fence Height Exception Letter of Justification, dated August 17, 2020
11. Applicant's neighbor outreach efforts, dated August 18, 2020
12. Applicant's neighbor outreach efforts, dated November 18, 2020
13. Public comments received by 11:00 a.m., Friday, December 4, 2020
14. Development Plans, received November 20, 2020

Received with this Staff Report:

15. Revised Recommended Conditions of Approval
16. Applicant Response Letter

PAGE 5 OF 5

SUBJECT: 62 Ellenwood Avenue/S-20-008

DATE: February 4, 2021

EXHIBITS (continued):

17. Revised Color and Materials Board
18. Exterior light fixture
19. Revised Development Plans, received January 27, 2021