

From: [Stanley Toal](#)
To: [Tiffany Vien](#)
Subject: Development Review Hearing Item 21-1378 PLN2021-14941
Date: Wednesday, October 20, 2021 8:37:16 AM

21-1378
PLN2021-14941
3885 Baldwin Drive, Santa Clara, CA

Tiffany, morning -

I respectfully have to object to the proposed addition for the following reasons:

Project Description: The project as described in the notice is not consistent with the architectural plans. Based on the plans, the home includes a den (without a closet) and a bonus room. The den is described in the notice as a bedroom and there is no mention of the bonus room.

Finding 1): The proposed size and potential high occupancy load would justify the provision of a three-car garage. While the proposed two-garage and two spaces may accommodate the present owner of the residence, it will not be sufficient to accommodate any future owner, occupants, or change in use under the R1 zoning (e.g., *housekeeping unit*) let alone an AirBnB or residential care home. The street is increasingly becoming off-site parking deficient as most neighbors use their garages for storage or are unable to accommodate two high profile cars i.e., larger SUVs, trucks, and vans. The City recognizes the issue under Conditions of Approval No. 1. If it is in the discretionary authority for the condition of approval that the ... *garage shall be maintained clear and free for vehicle parking use at all times. It shall not be used only for storage.*, the City would have the same authority to condition the approval and require the construction of a three-car garage.

Finding 2): I would respectfully request that the City consider prohibiting the parking of a vehicle along the curve / corner where Baldwin intersects Dawson at the property. This is the current practice. This creates a blind intersection and a dangerous turn. A hazard that is not addressed under this finding or conditions of approval. City may even consider the need to have that curve painted red.

Finding 3) and 5): I respectfully disagree with the narrow focus of the justification. The subdivision was originally single story and over time second story additions have been constructed. So, yes, the proposed second story is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. However, its floor area coverage and square footage is excessive and not compatible in scale and character. I believe there is only one residence located along the north side of Pruneridge that comes close to this square footage. 4147sf is an over improvement and invites a high occupancy load. [Other neighbors have cited the police incident on Lowell Drive.] The residence as proposed is neither compatible in scale and character, and it is specifically not compatible with the recent additions made on Baldwin, Dawson, Giannini at Sullivan, and Grinnell Ct. In addition, it is quite unusual for the size of the residence to have 3.5 bathrooms located on the ground floor and only 1 bathroom on the second floor. It begs the question as to the intended use of the residence. This arrangement combined with a windowless office is quite consistent with that of a residential care home. This use should not be permitted without a conditional use permit. Further, if such a use is permitted, there shall be ADA

improvements made to each bathroom.

Conditions of Approval: I believe the following conditions of approvals are within the City's discretionary authority for the proposed residence:

There shall be no direct exterior access to the second story addition.

Residence shall provide a three-car garage and shall continually provide on-site parking of six vehicles (three-car garage spaces and three open-paved spaces).

The use of the residence shall not be a rooming house where lodging or lodging and meals are provided for compensation.

The use of the residence shall not be a group or board and care home (residential care home) for two or more individuals.

The kitchen as identified in the plans shall be the sole, single kitchen. Without limitation, there shall be no microwaves, toaster ovens, air fryers, cookers, indoor grills, small kitchen appliances, etc. located in any indoor area other than the proposed single first floor kitchen.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted
Stanley W Toal