

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 8:11 AM
To: 'Srinivas Rao'
Subject: RE: Public Hearing #11220

Srnivas,

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review.

1. Per the County's zoning ordinance requirements, structures within 100 ft. of scenic roads are allowed to be processed through a Design Review application. See code provisions quoted below:

Zoning Ordinance§ 3.30.030 Setbacks and Design Review

A. Requirement for Design Review. On scenic roads other than US 101, any structure, including signs, that is located within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a designated scenic roadway shall be subject to design review, as described in Chapter 5.50 of this zoning ordinance. Structures in the -sr combining district that are not within 100 feet of a scenic roadway do not require design review, except as otherwise required in the base district or other combining districts applied to the subject property.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Senior Planner
Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Please visit our [website](#).

Click [here](#) to look up unincorporated property zoning information.

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

From: Srinivas Rao <srinivastrao@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 5:20 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: Re: Public Hearing #11220

Dear Colleen,

Thank you for sharing details on the upcoming Design Review set on APN 51733015 set for Thursday, Feb. 7, at 9:30 AM.

It is truly remarkable that Sanborn Road has managed to preserve much of its natural splendor over the years. We are very pleased to hear from the County urging our participation to review activities on APN 51733015..

In review of property and shared files:

- We note there are small flags on strings that are anchored to trees that indicated what I thought was the proposed home elevation line.
- But now, in review of the drawings shared in the folder I note I maybe mistaken:
 - The placement of the new home on the parcel is way too close to the edge of Sanborn Road.
 - The elevation of the proposed home is too imposing, driven largely by its proximity to the street.
 - Placement of the home at a distant, in compliance with what we have in guidelines today would preserve the natural feel and experience of of Sanborn 'surroundings'.

Best wishes,
Srinivas

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 8:09 AM
To: 'Paul Baclace'
Cc: Jacque Baclace
Subject: RE: Public Hearing for file# 11220

Paul:

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review.

1. Per the County's zoning ordinance requirements, structures within 100 ft. of scenic roads are allowed to be processed through a Design Review application. See code provisions quoted below:
Zoning Ordinance§ 3.30.030 Setbacks and Design Review A. Requirement for Design Review. On scenic roads other than US 101, any structure, including signs, that is located within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a designated scenic roadway shall be subject to design review, as described in Chapter 5.50 of this zoning ordinance. Structures in the -sr combining district that are not within 100 feet of a scenic roadway do not require design review, except as otherwise required in the base district or other combining districts applied to the subject property.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Senior Planner
Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email. Please visit our website.
[Click here to look up unincorporated property zoning information.](#)

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Baclace <paul.baclace@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 11:06 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Cc: Jacque Baclace <jacque@baclace.net>
Subject: Public Hearing for file# 11220

Ref: https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/11220_Plans.pdf

We live on Sanborn road (20 years now) and would like to express our objection to how close to the road the house is in the plan for file# 11220. The variance to allow the house to be less than 100ft from the road edge will diminish the natural setting of our road that is it's main attraction.

Please keep our neighborhood uncrowded.

Paul and Jacque Baclace

16505 Sanborn Road

Saratoga, CA 95070

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 12:58 PM
To: Fletch Parsons
Cc: Lee, Darrin; Baker, Jim; Namit Gupta; Romain Curtis; Sterling Consultants; Shivi Agarwal
Subject: RE: Sanborn Road Planning Record Number 11220-188-18G-I8DR

Importance: High

Fletch,

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review.

1. Per the County's zoning ordinance requirements, structures within 100 ft. of scenic roads are allowed to be processed through a Design Review application. See code provisions quoted below:

Zoning Ordinance§ 3.30.030 Setbacks and Design Review

A. Requirement for Design Review. On scenic roads other than US 101, any structure, including signs, that is located within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a designated scenic roadway shall be subject to design review, as described in Chapter 5.50 of this zoning ordinance. Structures in the -sr combining district that are not within 100 feet of a scenic roadway do not require design review, except as otherwise required in the base district or other combining districts applied to the subject property.

2. The purpose of the 6 ft. debris wall was a recommendation and condition of the geologic report. The County Geologist does require the debris wall to be installed in the location as shown on the plans as was recommended in the report. Not sure what else Jim Baker can respond to this issue – but ccd him in case he can provide further information in response to your concern.

3&4. Land scape plans are required to be implementing in screening the residence, debris wall and water tanks. Thank you for bringing up your concern regarding visibility. Final landscape plans are to be approved prior to building permit issuance. The applicant can also respond to your concerns in regards to screening proposed to address your concerns – I have ccd them on this email to provide further information.

5. The septic location was approved by Dept. of Environ. Health (DEH). Geotechnical report was submitted regarding septic system. I have ccd DEH staff in case they have further information to respond to your concern.

Darrin, and Jim – Not sure if you are available. But the Zoning Admin. hearing is on Thursday of this week. Would greatly appreciate you attending the hearing in case the Zoning Administrator wants to ask technical questions of you related to the debris wall and septic system. Let me know if you able to make it. Or simply send a response to this email chain, that I can clarify in the record for the hearing. I know both of you are not in the office on Thursdays.

Thanks,

Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Senior Planner
Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Please visit our [website](#).

Click [here](#) to look up unincorporated property zoning information.

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

From: Fletch Parsons <fparsons@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 6, 2019 8:48 AM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: Sanborn Road Planning Record Number 11220-188-18G-l8DR

Hi Colleen. I reviewed the staff report for the subject property and have a few comments:

1. Setback. The proposed 30-foot setback will put this new house significantly closer to the street than any other house on Sanborn Road. The proposed proximity to the street is not in keeping with the neighborhood character and should be increased.
2. Debris Wall. The debris wall is a 6-foot concrete structure placed 1-foot behind the right-of-way. This is essentially a 6-foot solid fence that, again, is completely out of character with the neighborhood. The staff report does not indicate why it is needed or how it will function, but does condition wall screening with landscaping. Any screening will be located in the public right-of-way and out of the owner's control. While I don't know the specific purpose of this debris wall, the general purpose of a debris wall is to catch material on

the uphill side of the wall. That places the catchment area in the public right-of-way. In other words it places a private use on public property. That is not right. If the material to be caught is liquid, the debris wall will deflect this material towards the downhill neighbor. The wall should be eliminated or moved and a cutoff constructed to protect the downhill neighbor.

3. Landscape Screening. Condition of approval #35 calls for landscape screening of the water tanks, debris wall, and residence. While the water tank screening can be provided within the property, any screening for the residence and debris wall would need to be provided in the public right-of-way. The right-of-way is maintained by County Roads/Airports. Every couple of years the County uses a flail mower to remove all but the stoutest of vegetation within the right-of-way. It is highly likely that any landscape screening provided in the right-of-way as part of this project would be obliterated by County crews before it ever matured. The debris wall should be set back further from the right of way to allow landscape screening to be on private property. Residence screening should also be provided to protect the neighbor's back yard privacy from the north side second floor balcony.
4. Water Tanks. Condition of approval #8 requires water tanks to be "at least 30-feet from the front yard setback". That amounts to 60-feet from the right-of-way. This is a nice concession, as code merely calls for the tanks to be placed outside the front setback of 30-feet. This additional setback is especially appropriate if the tanks are to be placed on the downhill neighbor's property line. Tank placement should take neighbor's views into account.
5. Slope Setback. The back side of the residence is set at the top of a 58-foot high 1.2:1 major slope. This is a very steep slope. The septic leach-field is located about 30-feet from the top of this slope. The septic system is adding water near the top of this steep slope, which further destabilizes it. The plans call out a 25-foot setback "from top of steep slope". The slope within this setback area is still 2:1, i.e. still quite steep. This strikes me as unusual. I placed a call to Mr. Baker, the County Geologist for clarification, but have not yet spoken to him. I would have expected a setback with a more gradual slope than the 2:1 provided.

This appears to be a case of the applicant trying to get an urban density development approved in a hillside setting. The development area utilized amounts to less than 17,000 SF, or about 0.3-acres. Yet the residence size proposed is compatible with the neighborhood with much larger development areas available. This applicant is asking for more development than the lot can support. And it impacts the immediate neighbors the most, but also the general public. In designating Sanborn as a scenic road, the County made a commitment to maintain the rural character of the neighborhood by imposing 100-foot setbacks. What was the point in this scenic road designation if the associated setback requirements are so completely disregarded? The applicant is ignoring this intent and, in fact, asking for a setback smaller than had been previously approved prior to the scenic designation. The requested setback is not only counter to the County's intent, but is smaller than any setback previously approved. A fair compromise would be to allow the setback to be reduced from the scenic road requirement to the smallest setback of an existing house on Sanborn Road. By applying such a standard, the applicant is not changing the character of the neighborhood, and is not getting rights not previously granted to others.

I am also concerned about the precedent that an approval of this application would set. There are several other properties on the road with similar geometries and constraints. The owners of these properties will be lining up to submit applications with similar small setbacks proposed. This is the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

I implore you to reconsider your proposed approval of this application.

Sincerely,

Fletcher Parsons

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 11:28 AM
To: 'Aram Compeau'
Cc: Romain Curtis; 'Sterling Consultants'; 'Namit Gupta'; shivi6357@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Public Hearing for file# 11220

Aram,

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review.

Per the County's zoning ordinance requirements, structures within 100 ft. of scenic roads are allowed to be processed through a Design Review application. See code provisions quoted below:

Zoning Ordinance § 3.30.030 Setbacks and Design Review

A. Requirement for Design Review. On scenic roads other than US 101, any structure, including signs, that is located within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a designated scenic roadway shall be subject to design review, as described in Chapter 5.50 of this zoning ordinance. Structures in the -sr combining district that are not within 100 feet of a scenic roadway do not require design review, except as otherwise required in the base district or other combining districts applied to the subject property.

The water tanks are required by County Fire Marshal and CalFire emergency water standards. I am ccing the architect and engineer on this email chain so that they can respond to your questions regarding the height of the water tanks and platform.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Senior Planner
Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Please visit our [website](#).

Click [here](#) to look up unincorporated property zoning information.

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

From: Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 3, 2019 8:40 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Cc: Laiman, Clara <Clara.Laiman@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: Re: Public Hearing for file# 11220

Hi Colleen,

I just noticed those two water towers on the far north end of the map. Can you tell me how high they are planned to be on the proposed platforms above grade? It's very difficult to see on the plans. Are they trying to achieve water pressure with height instead of a water pressure pump arrangement? If so, then the platforms would have to be rather high. I'm pretty sure I object to those also, considering their placement would be right in front of our house and their height and weight + location would represent a huge topple hazard for our home in case of a powerful earthquake. They'd also look pretty awful from the street, as they would be well inside the 100' setback.

I plan on attending this Thursday's meeting (Feb 7th). Fortunately, it was not last Thursday as I had mistakenly thought.

Can you tell me why a project is even being considered inside the 100' setback, by the way? I thought that ordinance was pretty clear.

Thanks,

Aram

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Hettenhausen, Michael
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 2:44 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Subject: RE: 11220-18B-18G-18DR question

Hi Colleen,

The Boundary and Topographic Survey in the Building Site Approval/Grading Permit/Encroachment Permit plans application provided the information I needed to ascertain the proposed development will not encroach on the adjacent parcels.

Thank you for the quick reply and information.

Michael

Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner
Santa Clara County Parks | 298 Garden Hill Drive | Los Gatos, CA 95032
(408) 355-2362 | parkhere.org



Follow Santa Clara County Parks News!
www.facebook.com/SantaClaraCountyParks

NOTICE: This email message and/or its attachments may contain information that is confidential or restricted. It is intended only for the individuals named as recipients in the message. If you are NOT an authorized recipient, you are prohibited from using, delivering, distributing, printing, copying, or disclosing the message or content to others and must delete the message from your computer. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return email.

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 2:28 PM
To: Hettenhausen, Michael <michael.hettenhausen@PRK.SCCGOV.ORG>
Cc: Romain Curtis <romain@polygondesignstudio.com>; Sterling Consultants <dilip@1sterlingconsultants.com>; Namit Gupta <namit.gupta@synopsys.com>; shivi6357@gmail.com
Subject: RE: 11220-18B-18G-18DR question

https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/11220_ZA_20190207_Item2_StaffReport.pdf

Michael,

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review. See above weblink to the staff report for the hearing. The plans are included in the staff report packet – see the site plan in Exhibit C. The house footprint, driveway and leachfield does not encroach on neighboring parcels. I've ccd the applicant on this email as they may be able to provide further information in response to your concern.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Senior Planner
Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Please visit our [website](#).
Click [here](#) to look up unincorporated property zoning information.

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

From: Hettenhausen, Michael <michael.hettenhausen@PRK.SCCGOV.ORG>
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 1:45 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: 11220-18B-18G-18DR question

Good afternoon Colleen,

Do you have a map/exhibit that shows the relationship of the proposed house and all its improvements to the entire parcel? The reason we are interested is the parcel to the south is owned by County Parks and we want to make sure the proposed house, leach field, and any associated improvements will not encroach onto the adjacent parcels. The site plan I can access does not show the entire parcel.

Thank you,

Michael

Michael Hettenhausen, Associate Planner
Santa Clara County Parks | 298 Garden Hill Drive | Los Gatos, CA 95032
(408) 355-2362 | parkhere.org



Follow Santa Clara County Parks News!
www.facebook.com/SantaClaraCountyParks

NOTICE: This email message and/or its attachments may contain information that is confidential or restricted. It is intended only for the individuals named as recipients in the message. If you are NOT an authorized recipient, you are prohibited from using, delivering, distributing, printing, copying, or disclosing the message or content to others and must delete the message from your computer. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return email.

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 5:07 PM
To: Namit Gupta
Cc: Romain Curtis; Tsuchimoto, Colleen; Sterling Consultants; shivi6357@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Public Hearing for file# 11220

Hi Namit,

thanks for reaching out.

We have a water tank, but it is situated behind the house. In the event of a severe earthquake, the only place it could fall down is into the creek. In the case of the two proposed water tanks on your plans, they are upslope from our house. So if shaken loose, they would go down into our house. I'm not saying you shouldn't have water tanks, it is their proposed location that is a concern. There's just not much land available on the road side of the river, so everything is crammed in there to avoid the expense of building on the other side.

That said,, the water tanks are a lesser issue than the location of the home. That 100' setback ordinance exists for very good reasons, and I don't believe any amount of landscaping will mitigate this concern. I know the cost of building across the river would be very expensive, but that's why the cost of the lot was so very low even though purchased recently. I understand you would like to get around the setback requirement, but I am firmly opposed.

Best,

Aram

On Tue, Feb 5, 2019 at 9:14 AM Namit Gupta <namit.gupta@synopsys.com> wrote:

Hi Aram,

My name is Namit Gupta, I am the owner of land next to you. First of all please accept my apologies that this proposed plan cause inconvenience to you and you got disturbed.

On water tank, fire deptt asked us to propose 2 tanks 5000 gallon and 3000 gallon and they can't be underground, if I may ask how are you managing it for your house, in case there is some other way which I am not aware of?

I saw your other emails, and honestly we explored other side of creek but due to county guidelines with steep slopes and grading requirements it was impractical, that is the reason we proposed the way it is.

On your concerns on house closer to road and your property, landscaping plan will mitigate this concern and trust me will address your concern as we want to be very collaborative as you are closest neighbor of ours.

Feel free to ask any questions or share concerns, we can even discuss also on phone if you like.

Best

Namit

From: Romain Curtis <romain@polygondesignstudio.com>

Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 2:48 PM

To: Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com>

Cc: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>; Sterling Consultants

<dilip@1sterlingconsultants.com>; Namit Gupta <namit.gupta@synopsys.com>; shivi6357@gmail.com

Subject: Re: Public Hearing for file# 11220

I'll be happy to explain the plans further more during the design review.

Regards.

Romain Curtis

Architect #C-35019 / LEED AP

367 Civic Dr, #3

Pleasant Hill CA 94523

510.612.0345

www.polygondesignstudio.com

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 2:46 PM Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com> wrote:

Great, thanks very much.

Cheers,

Aram

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 2:42 PM Romain Curtis <romain@polygondesignstudio.com> wrote:

It will be a few feet above grade.

Compare grade height shown, the the height of the platform.

Been that we are on a slope terrain, this dimension will vary.

Romain Curtis

Architect #C-35019 / LEED AP

367 Civic Dr, #3

Pleasant Hill CA 94523

510.612.0345

www.polygondesignstudio.com

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 2:29 PM Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Romain,

Can you confirm (without simply repeating that the information is on the plans - my question here has to do with translating plan jargon into plain english) that the tanks will be resting on the ground, or slightly above it (to achieve a minimum absolute elevation of 476' above sea level)? Or have I failed to translate the plan jargon correctly?

Thanks,

Aram

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 2:12 PM Romain Curtis <romain@polygondesignstudio.com> wrote:

See previous response:

Romain Curtis <romain@polygondesignstudio.com>
to Colleen, Aram, Sterling, Namit, shivi6357@gmail.com

1:

All,

Heights of the water tank platform is indicated on the plans.

The height of the tank will vary depending on vendor specification. We estimated that it should be around 5'-0" high.

Romain Curtis

Architect #C-35019 / LEED AP

367 Civic Dr, #3

Pleasant Hill CA 94523

510.612.0345

www.polygondesignstudio.com

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 1:53 PM Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Romain,

the absolute elevation of the water tank is indicated on the plans. The height above grade at their location is not. Do you know what that will be?

thanks,

Aram

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 1:15 PM Romain Curtis <romain@polygondesignstudio.com> wrote:

All,

Heights of the water tank platform is indicated on the plans.

The height of the tank will vary depending on vendor specification. We estimated that it should be around 5'-0" high.

Romain Curtis

Architect #C-35019 / LEED AP

367 Civic Dr, #3

Pleasant Hill CA 94523

510.612.0345

www.polygondesignstudio.com

On Mon, Feb 4, 2019 at 11:28 AM Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org> wrote:

Aram,

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review.

Per the County's zoning ordinance requirements, structures within 100 ft. of scenic roads are allowed to be processed through a Design Review application. See code provisions quoted below:

Zoning Ordinance§ 3.30.030 Setbacks and Design Review

A. Requirement for Design Review. On scenic roads other than US 101, any structure, including signs, that is located within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a designated scenic roadway shall be subject to design review, as described in Chapter 5.50 of this zoning ordinance. Structures in the -sr combining district that are not within 100 feet of a scenic roadway do not require design review, except as otherwise required in the base district or other combining districts

applied to the subject property.

The water tanks are required by County Fire Marshal and CalFire emergency water standards. I am ccing the architect and engineer on this email chain so that they can respond to your questions regarding the height of the water tanks and platform.

Thanks,

Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto

Senior Planner

Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor

San Jose, CA 95110

Phone: (408) 299-5797

Fax: (408) 288-9198

Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Please visit our [website](#).

Click [here](#) to look up unincorporated property zoning information.

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

From: Aram Compeau <aram.compeau@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 3, 2019 8:40 PM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Cc: Laiman, Clara <Clara.Laiman@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: Re: Public Hearing for file# 11220

Hi Colleen,

I just noticed those two water towers on the far north end of the map. Can you tell me how high they are planned to be on the proposed platforms above grade? It's very difficult to see on the plans. Are they trying to achieve water pressure with height instead of a water pressure pump arrangement? If so, then the platforms would have to be rather high. I'm pretty sure I object to those also, considering their placement would be right in front of our house and their height and weight + location would represent a huge topple hazard for our home in case of a powerful earthquake. They'd also look pretty awful from the street, as they would be well inside the 100' setback.

I plan on attending this Thursday's meeting (Feb 7th). Fortunately, it was not last Thursday as I had mistakenly thought.

Can you tell me why a project is even being considered inside the 100' setback, by the way? I thought that ordinance was pretty clear.

Thanks,

Aram

Tsuchimoto, Colleen

From: Tsuchimoto, Colleen
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 8:55 AM
To: 'tony heyer'
Subject: RE: Opposition to variance for 11220-188-18G-18DR

Tony,

In response to your email, see the below response. NOTE: As the staff report has already been published, this is considered to be a supplemental public comment letter which I will have administration add to the record by posting online and adding to packet for Zoning Administrator to review.

1. Per the County's zoning ordinance requirements, structures within 100 ft. of scenic roads are allowed to be processed through a Design Review application. See code provisions quoted below:

Zoning Ordinance§ 3.30.030 Setbacks and Design Review

A. Requirement for Design Review. On scenic roads other than US 101, any structure, including signs, that is located within 100 feet of the right-of-way of a designated scenic roadway shall be subject to design review, as described in Chapter 5.50 of this zoning ordinance. Structures in the -sr combining district that are not within 100 feet of a scenic roadway do not require design review, except as otherwise required in the base district or other combining districts applied to the subject property.

Thanks,
Colleen

Colleen A. Tsuchimoto
Senior Planner
Santa Clara County Planning Dept.

70 W. Hedding St., E. Wing, 7th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110
Phone: (408) 299-5797
Fax: (408) 288-9198
Email: Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Please visit our [website](#).
Click [here](#) to look up unincorporated property zoning information.

On December 18, 2018 the Department of Planning and Development launched InSite, our new digital permit system. What to expect: initiate request or apply for a permit online or on site; check the status of your project, submit digital documents, and make payments online or on site; get better customer service through smooth & efficient internal routing

From: tony heyer <tony@heyerperformance.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 7, 2019 8:50 AM
To: Tsuchimoto, Colleen <Colleen.Tsuchimoto@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: Opposition to variance for 11220-188-18G-18DR

Hello Colleen,

We are residents of Sanborn Road.

Just recently we had learned that the owners of the lot 51733015 applied for variance approval for a building a large house withing 100 foot scenic road setback area (actually whole development would be within the scenic road setback).

This should be absolutely unacceptable. The Scenic road 100 foot setback was put in place for a reason.

Sanborn Park area and Sanborn road should be protected from developers like this and it is your responsibility to do so.

The owners of said property acquired undervalued 5 ac land with this restriction and should not be allowed to disregard it.

We can not even imagine how troublesome, invasive and disrespectful this situation is for the direct neighbor, the owner of the 16345 Sanborn Rd.

We all came here to live in harmony with the nature, not to be bullied in accepting unacceptable.

Please protect our bellowed Sanborn road, Sanborn Park area .

Sincerely,

Tony Heyer and Lara Kriz

16456 Sanborn Rd, Saratoga