

Daryoush Marhamat

627 Sleeper Avenue • Mountain View, CA 94040

Mail: daryoush@marhamat.com • Cell: 408.898.6465

March 28, 2018

Steve Le, Assistant Planner
Community Development Department
1500 Warburton Avenue
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Subject: 1075 Pomeroy –Response to Comments from ARC

Dear Mr. Le

In response to the ARC revisions and conditions request of the 3/21/18 meeting,
I am forwarding the following:

Since the meeting with the ARC, I have spent many hours with my design team, considering all the comments. This is in addition to the countless hours we have spent in neighborhood meetings listening to the comments and revising the architecture. I felt that throughout the process most of their concerns have been addressed. Many significant changes have been made while keeping the concept of quality contemporary design and following the City's existing zoning (R3-18). I was therefore surprised to receive a different list of concerns and comments at the ARC meeting.

After considering these last comments, we propose to make the following revisions to the architectural designs.

1. The comment was to remove the sliding door in the rear of the Garage.

To meet this we are proposing to remove the sliding glass door and replace it with a standard single door. However, the sliding door allows for more interior natural light, and ease for moving furniture and accessories to and from the garden.

2. The comment was to eliminate the egress window on the second floor.

To meet the concern for privacy, we propose that the 2nd floor plan be redesigned to remove the windows on the north and south sides. This redesign is not as pleasant and puts the master bedroom windows facing the parking area. Egress and other code requirements have been addressed.

3. The comment was to restrict use of garages only for parking automobiles.

We propose to meet with a land use attorney to create CC&Rss designed to address this concern.

4. The comment was to increase setbacks to 20' north and south sides.

We do not accept this change. The current setbacks comply with City requirement and guidelines. The map has been approved by the Santa Clara Planning Commission.

5. The comment was to increase the side setbacks.

We do not accept this change. The setbacks meet the City requirements and guidelines.

6. The comment was to replace the horizontal cedar siding with vertical siding. The areas of siding are not visible from the neighborhood homes.

We propose to change the horizontal siding to vertical siding. However, the proposed use of this small section of horizontal siding is preferred, and is more appropriate, and complimentary to the contemporary architectural design. This area siding will not be visible from neighboring buildings.

7. The comment was to lower the height of the slanted roof to 19 feet.

We cannot agree to this comment. The proposed maximum height at the leading edge of the slanted portion of the roof is 24'1". The roof has already been lowered when requested by the neighbors from 24 feet 9 inches . Most of the roof height has always been 20 feet, particularly adjoining the neighbors. All the roof heights are less than the 25 feet allowed by City regulations.

8. The comment was to eliminate the divided light windows. The divided light windows on the architectural plans are not visible from any of the neighboring homes.

Although none of these windows is visible from the neighboring homes we propose to eliminate the divided light windows. In doing so, we believe the design is not as attractive as with divided light windows.

9. The comment was to change the enclosed garages to open carports.

We do not agree with this comment and cannot to change the garages to carports. Both the Santa Clara Planning Commission and City Council expressed preference for garage due to security concerns. We believe the single-family homes require a private and secure garage. In addition, garage doors contribute to an uncluttered contemporary design for the single-family detached homes.

10. The comment was to redesign the window size and shape.

Most of the windows are not visible to the neighbors. However, the window sizes and shapes can be made more uniform and less attractive. We are willing to make this change.

11. The comment was to remove the pitched porch roof for a flat front porch roof.

Although none of the neighboring townhouses can see the porch roof, we agree to change the roof system from a column supported roof over the porch to one without columns.

12. The comment was to remove the stone veneer from the buildings.

Although none of the neighboring townhouses can see the stone veneer, we agree to remove the stone from the sides of the buildings.

13. The comment was to remove the stone from the chimney and wainscoting.

The stone was an added element to enhance the contemporary design. It is an added expense and we agree to eliminate the stone veneer throughout the design.

This completes my design team's response to the comments from the ARC and all other meetings. We have submitted the revised drawings that incorporate the above stated changes. I hope these changes and revisions to the 4 houses will finally gain the approval of the City Council.

Best regards,

Daryoush Marhamat