

**From:** Planning Public Comment

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 10, 2026 2:28 PM

**To:** 'huangd@gmail.com' <huangd@gmail.com>; Lakshmi Rajagopalan <LRajagopalan@Santaclaraca.gov>; Lesley Xavier <LXavier@santaclaraca.gov>; Alex Tellez <atellez@Santaclaraca.gov>

**Cc:** 'ssa9711@gmail.com' <ssa9711@gmail.com>; 'hyongk@gmail.com' <hyongk@gmail.com>

**Subject:** PC Meeting Feb 11, 2026 FW: Appeal of Architectural Review Approval – PLN25-00561, 2892 Mesquite Drive

PMM  
PC Meeting 2/11/26  
RTC 26-52  
Item 3

Good afternoon Mr. Huang,

This is to confirm your email has been received in the Planning Division and by way of my reply I have included the appropriate staff for their review of your comments. Please note, your correspondence will be part of the public record on this item.

The February 11, 2026 [Planning Commission Agenda](#) provides details on how the public can participate in the meeting, in person or via Zoom.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

**ELIZABETH ELLIOTT** | Staff Aide II  
Community Development Department | Planning Division  
1500 Warburton Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050  
O : 408.615.2450 Direct : 408.615.2474

---

**From:** Daniel Huang <[huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 10, 2026 2:13 PM

**To:** Planning Public Comment <[PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov](mailto:PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov)>

**Cc:** [ssa9711@gmail.com](mailto:ssa9711@gmail.com); [hyongk@gmail.com](mailto:hyongk@gmail.com)

**Subject:** Appeal of Architectural Review Approval – PLN25-00561, 2892 Mesquite Drive

You don't often get email from [huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com). [Learn why this is important](#)

**To:** [PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov](mailto:PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov)

**Date:** 2/10/2026

**Dear Planning Commission Members,**

I am writing to formally oppose and request reversal of the Development Review Officer's approval of the Architectural Review for the proposed first- and second-floor additions at **2892 Mesquite Drive (PLN25-00561)**.

I am a **directly impacted backyard neighbor**, and my **bedroom and bathroom windows face the rear of this property**. The proposed **second-story expansion** would result in a **severe and irreversible loss of privacy**, which is a substantial land-use impact in a low-density **R1-6 zoning district**.

### **CEQA Concerns:**

The project appears to have been approved as **CEQA-exempt**, which I believe is inappropriate under these circumstances. This project involves:

- A **1,018 square foot expansion** to an existing two-story home
- An increase to **five bedrooms and five bathrooms**
- A substantial increase in **building mass, height, and intensity of use**
- A **rear-yard second-story addition** directly overlooking adjacent residential properties

Taken together, these constitute **unusual circumstances** for a single-family R1 neighborhood and create a **reasonable possibility of significant environmental impacts**, including:

- Loss of privacy to adjacent bedrooms and bathrooms
- Increased noise impacts
- Increased occupancy and parking demand
- Impacts to neighborhood character and residential compatibility

Under CEQA, these factors invalidate a categorical exemption and require, at minimum, preparation of a **Mitigated Negative Declaration**.

## **Existing Noise Impacts (Cumulative Impact):**

This property already generates **recurring noise disturbances** that affect neighboring homes, including:

- Loud drum playing by occupants
- Repeated ball-throwing against shared wooden fencing
- Balls entering neighboring properties
- Prior complaints made to the City by nearby residents
- Direct verbal complaints made by my wife due to ongoing disturbances

The proposed expansion to a **5-bedroom / 5-bath residence** will foreseeably **increase occupancy and noise**, worsening existing impacts. These are **cumulative impacts** that were not adequately considered in the staff approval.

## **Neighborhood Compatibility:**

The scale and massing of the proposed second-story rear addition are **out of character** with surrounding homes and inconsistent with the intent of R1 zoning, which is to preserve **low-density, privacy-oriented single-family living**.

## **Request**

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. **Grant the appeal**
2. **Set aside the CEQA exemption**
3. Require appropriate environmental review; and/or
4. Require substantial redesign, including reduction or removal of the second-story rear addition and meaningful privacy protections

This appeal is supported by **multiple adjacent neighbors** who share the same concerns.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the very real impacts this project would impose on surrounding residents.

Sincerely,

**Daniel Huang**

Adjacent Property Owner

2911 Mauricia Ave, Santa Clara

TEL: (408)-718-8636; Email: [huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Appeal of Architectural Review Approval – PLN25-00561, 2892 Mesquite Drive

**To: PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov**

**Date: 2/10/2026**

**Dear Planning Commission Members,**

I am writing to formally oppose and request reversal of the Development Review Officer's approval of the Architectural Review for the proposed first- and second-floor additions at **2892 Mesquite Drive (PLN25-00561)**.

I am a **directly impacted backyard neighbor**, and my **bedroom and bathroom windows face the rear of this property**. The proposed **second-story expansion** would result in a **severe and irreversible loss of privacy**, which is a substantial land-use impact in a low-density **R1-6 zoning district**.

**CEQA Concerns:**

The project appears to have been approved as **CEQA-exempt**, which I believe is inappropriate under these circumstances. This project involves:

- A **1,018 square foot expansion** to an existing two-story home
- An increase to **five bedrooms and five bathrooms**
- A substantial increase in **building mass, height, and intensity of use**
- A **rear-yard second-story addition** directly overlooking adjacent residential properties

Taken together, these constitute **unusual circumstances** for a single-family R1 neighborhood and create a **reasonable possibility of significant environmental impacts**, including:

- Loss of privacy to adjacent bedrooms and bathrooms
- Increased noise impacts
- Increased occupancy and parking demand
- Impacts to neighborhood character and residential compatibility

Under CEQA, these factors invalidate a categorical exemption and require, at minimum, preparation of a **Mitigated Negative Declaration**.

**Existing Noise Impacts (Cumulative Impact):**

This property already generates **recurring noise disturbances** that affect neighboring homes, including:

- Loud drum playing by occupants

- Repeated ball-throwing against shared wooden fencing
- Balls entering neighboring properties
- Prior complaints made to the City by nearby residents
- Direct verbal complaints made by my wife due to ongoing disturbances

The proposed expansion to a **5-bedroom / 5-bath residence** will foreseeably **increase occupancy and noise**, worsening existing impacts. These are **cumulative impacts** that were not adequately considered in the staff approval.

### **Neighborhood Compatibility:**

The scale and massing of the proposed second-story rear addition are **out of character** with surrounding homes and inconsistent with the intent of R1 zoning, which is to preserve **low-density, privacy-oriented single-family living**.

### **Request**

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. **Grant the appeal**
2. **Set aside the CEQA exemption**
3. Require appropriate environmental review; and/or
4. Require substantial redesign, including reduction or removal of the second-story rear addition and meaningful privacy protections

This appeal is supported by **multiple adjacent neighbors** who share the same concerns.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the very real impacts this project would impose on surrounding residents.

Sincerely,

### **Daniel Huang**

Adjacent Property Owner

2911 Mauricia Ave, Santa Clara

TEL: (408)-718-8636; Email: [huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com)

**Subject:** STRONG OPPOSITION to Agenda Item 2 – Architectural Review (PLN25-00295) at 2892 Mesquite Dr

**To:** PlanningPublicComment@santaclaraca.gov

**Date:** 12/6/2025

Dear Development Review Hearing Members,

I am submitting this comment to **strongly oppose** the proposed expansion at **2892 Mesquite Drive**. After reviewing the plans, it is clear that this project is **overbuilt, invasive, poorly documented, and incompatible** with our neighborhood. Approving it as submitted would set an extremely negative precedent for the area.

Below are the major issues that require the City to **deny or halt** this proposal immediately:

---

## **1. Severe Privacy Violations for Adjacent Homes**

The new second-floor expansion introduces numerous windows pointed directly into neighboring backyards and interior living areas. This is not a minor issue — it is a **major invasion of privacy** that fundamentally impacts livability for nearby residents.

The applicant has made **zero effort** to mitigate this problem. No high sills, no obscure glazing, no repositioning. Nothing.

**This design is inconsiderate and unacceptable.**

A project with this level of privacy intrusion should not move forward.

---

## **2. Excessive Bulk and Visual Massing – Out of Scale and Out of Character**

Increasing the building to **3,599 sq ft** on a modest 7,351 sq ft lot produces an **oversized, boxy, and dominating structure** that overwhelms neighboring homes — many of which are smaller or single-story.

The enormous second-floor addition creates a looming presence over adjacent properties. This is **not compatible** with the established character of the street.

Santa Clara's design guidelines explicitly discourage bulky expansions like this, yet the applicant disregarded these principles entirely.

---

### 3. Unverified or Questionable Setback Compliance

The plans include a **front-yard bedroom** and **rear-yard office**, yet they fail to clearly document required setbacks. The drawings are vague at best and incomplete at worst.

If the applicant cannot provide basic zoning compliance information, the City should not even consider approval.

---

### 4. Inappropriate Front-Yard Bedroom Placement

Placing a bedroom in the front yard fundamentally alters the look and character of the home — and the entire block. This choice is **architecturally disruptive**, unfriendly to the streetscape, and almost certainly out of alignment with neighborhood design expectations.

This should not be allowed.

---

### 5. Incomplete, Confusing, and Low-Quality Plans

Several sheets are marked as “**RESUBMITTAL**”, and the plan set includes conflicting or unclear information regarding roof lines, drainage, elevations, and structural details.

**If this were a commercial project, these drawings would not pass even a preliminary review.**

The City should not approve a project based on documentation that is this sloppy and inconsistent.

---

### 6. Drainage and Runoff Risks to Neighbors

The plan proposes significant new roof area, yet provides no real analysis of how drainage will be controlled or prevented from crossing property lines.

Given the increased massing and lot coverage, this is a real and **unaddressed risk** to adjacent homes.

---

### 7. Construction Impacts Will Be Substantial

This is a tight suburban lot with **no realistic construction staging area**. Without strict controls:

- Building materials will spill into the public right-of-way
- Construction noise and dust will disrupt the neighborhood
- Safety hazards will increase for pedestrians and children

The City should **not** approve this project without requiring a detailed construction and traffic management plan — which is not provided.

---

## 8. CEQA Class 32 Exemption Is Misapplied

Given the clear neighborhood impacts — privacy, visual massing, drainage, and character disruption — the CEQA Class 32 exemption appears questionable. This project is far beyond a simple “infill” addition. It creates **significant adverse effects** that cannot be ignored.

---

# Conclusion: Project Must Be Denied or Significantly Reduced

This proposal is:

- **Too large**
- **Too intrusive**
- **Too careless**
- **Too disruptive to adjacent homes**

I urge the Planning Department to **deny this project outright** or, at minimum, require a complete redesign addressing:

- Privacy
- Massing
- Setbacks
- Drainage
- Accurate documentation
- Construction impacts

Approving this project as-is would be a disservice to the neighborhood and a failure to uphold the City’s design standards.

Respectfully,  
**Daniel Huang**

From: Planning Public Comment  
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 3:46 PM  
To: 김형균 - Hyong Kim <hycgk@gmail.com>; Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santalaraca.gov>  
Cc: huangd@gmail.com; Lakshmi Rajagopalan <LRajagopalan@Santalaraca.gov>; Lesley Xavier <LXavier@santalaraca.gov>; Alex Telez <ATElez@Santalaraca.gov>; ssa9711@gmail.com  
Subject: PC Meeting Feb 11, 2026 FW: Appeal of Architectural Review Approval – PUN25-00561, 2892 Mesquite Drive

Good Afternoon Hyong Kim,  
This is to confirm your email has been received in the Planning Division and by way of my reply I have included the appropriate staff for their review of your comments. Please note, your correspondence will be part of the public record on this item.

The February 11, 2026 [Planning Commission Agenda](#) provides details on how the public can participate in the meeting, in person or via Zoom.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

ELIZABETH ELLIOTT | Staff Aide II  
Community Development Department | Planning Division  
1500 Washington Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050  
O: 408.615.2450 | Direct: 408.615.2474

---

From: 김형균 - Hyong Kim <hycgk@gmail.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2026 3:08 PM  
To: Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santalaraca.gov>  
Cc: huangd@gmail.com; Lakshmi Rajagopalan <LRajagopalan@Santalaraca.gov>; Lesley Xavier <LXavier@santalaraca.gov>; Alex Telez <ATElez@Santalaraca.gov>; ssa9711@gmail.com  
Subject: Re: PC Meeting Feb 11, 2026 FW: Appeal of Architectural Review Approval – PUN25-00561, 2892 Mesquite Drive

Dear Planning Commission Members,

My name is Hyong Kim, one of the affected neighbors at 2921 Mauricia Ave. I was going to send an email separately, but since Daniel put together the message so well, I am replying-all to his message.

First of all, I completely agree with all of his concerns. To add to his noise impacts section, as I shared last time, this neighbor used to neglect their barking dog in the backyard over 30 minutes. When I tried to talk to the owner, she responded that it was her dog and her backyard and that she would let it out any time and as long as she wanted and suggested I call the police if I had complaints.

Also during the last meeting, I mentioned the concern about the new second floor directly looking down to our master bedroom patio glass door. The response from the builder at that time was that they plan to raise the fence to 6 feet, which will take care of the privacy issue, but as you can see from the attached picture, it is not something that can be taken care of by raising one or two feet.

View from inside the master bedroom towards the proposed second floor addition:



Thank you for your time and reviewing all of our concerns to make the decision for this appeal.

Regards,

Hyong Kim

2026년 2월 10일 (화) 오후 2:27, Planning Public Comment <PlanningPublicComment@santalaraca.gov>님이 작성:

Good afternoon Mr. Huang,  
This is to confirm your email has been received in the Planning Division and by way of my reply I have included the appropriate staff for their review of your comments. Please note, your correspondence will be part of the public record on this item.

The February 11, 2026 [Planning Commission Agenda](#) provides details on how the public can participate in the meeting, in person or via Zoom.

Thank you for taking the time to provide your input.

Regards,

**ELIZABETH ELLIOTT** | Staff Aide II  
Community Development Department | Planning Division  
1500 Washington Avenue | Santa Clara, CA 95050  
O: (408) 615-2460 | Direct: (408) 615-2474



---

**From:** Daniel Huang <[huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 10, 2020 2:13 PM  
**To:** Planning Public Comment <[PlanningPublicComment@santacruz.ca.gov](mailto:PlanningPublicComment@santacruz.ca.gov)>  
**Cc:** [sa4711@gmail.com](mailto:sa4711@gmail.com); [huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Appeal of Architectural Review Approval – PLN25-00561, 2892 Mesquite Drive

If you don't often get email from [huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com), [learn why this is important](mailto:huangd@gmail.com).  
**To:** [PlanningPublicComment@santacruz.ca.gov](mailto:PlanningPublicComment@santacruz.ca.gov)  
**Date:** 2/10/2020

**Dear Planning Commission Members,**

I am writing to formally oppose and request reversal of the Development Review Officer's approval of the Architectural Review for the proposed first- and second-floor additions at **2892 Mesquite Drive (PLN25-00561)**.

I am a **directly impacted backyard neighbor**, and my **bedroom and bathroom windows face the rear of this property**. The proposed **second-story expansion** would result in a **severe and irreversible loss of privacy**, which is a substantial land-use impact in a low-density **R1-6 zoning district**.

**CEQA Concerns:**

The project appears to have been approved as **CEQA-exempt**, which I believe is inappropriate under these circumstances. This project involves:

- **A 1,018 square foot expansion** to an existing two-story home
- An increase to **five bedrooms and five bathrooms**
- A substantial increase in **building mass, height, and intensity of use**
- A **rear-yard second-story addition** directly overlooking adjacent residential properties

Taken together, these constitute **unusual circumstances** for a single-family R1 neighborhood and create a **reasonable possibility of significant environmental impacts**, including:

- Loss of privacy to adjacent bedrooms and bathrooms
- Increased noise impacts
- Increased occupancy and parking demand
- Impacts to neighborhood character and residential compatibility

Under CEQA, these factors invalidate a categorical exemption and require, at minimum, preparation of a **Mitigated Negative Declaration**.

**Existing Noise Impacts (Cumulative Impact):**

This property already generates **recurring noise disturbances** that affect neighboring homes, including:

- Loud drum playing by occupants
- Repeated ball-throwing against shared wooden fencing
- Balls entering neighboring properties
- Prior complaints made to the City by nearby residents
- Direct verbal complaints made by my wife due to ongoing disturbances

The proposed expansion to a **5-bedroom / 5-bath residence** will foreseeably **increase occupancy and noise**, worsening existing impacts. These are **cumulative impacts** that were not adequately considered in the staff approval.

**Neighborhood Compatibility:**

The scale and massing of the proposed second-story rear addition are **out of character** with surrounding homes and inconsistent with the intent of R1 zoning, which is to preserve **low-density, privacy-oriented single-family living**.

**Request**

For the reasons stated above, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission:

1. **Grant the appeal**
2. **Set aside the CEQA exemption**
3. Require appropriate environmental review, and/or
4. Require substantial redesign, including reduction or removal of the second-story rear addition and meaningful privacy protections

This appeal is supported by **multiple adjacent neighbors** who share the same concerns.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the very real impacts this project would impose on surrounding residents.

Sincerely,

**Daniel Huang**  
Adjacent Property Owner  
2511 Maricopa Ave., Santa Clara  
TEL: (408) 718-8636; Email: [huangd@gmail.com](mailto:huangd@gmail.com)