

Response to Planning comments

8/13/2020 Mark J. Connolly's comments

Project Plans

1. The modified Site Plan dimensions are inaccurate through the width of the driveway and parking area. The site is 50 feet wide and the dimensions equal 33 feet 10 inches. Please submit a revised site plan with the correct dimensions.

RESPONSE:

Architect has corrected the dimension and it is reflected in the new Site Plan A-1.

2. Please update the site plan to demarcate the playground area, its size in square feet, and identify the height, materials, and design of proposed fencing surrounding it.

RESPONSE:

The playground area and its size has been noted on the new Site Plan A-1. The existing wooden fence on 3 sides (north, west, and south) of the playground is 7' in height, with the rear building west side wall as the east side fence.

Parking and Loading

3. As previously requested, please identify the proposed drop-off and loading area pursuant to Table 4.30-2 of the County Zoning Ordinance and van. Also provide the circulation plan demonstrating the turning movement of the proposed pick-up/drop-off van.

RESPONSE:

According to Table 3.30-2, Extended Community Care needs 1 parking stall for staff and 1 parking stall for 15 people. We also provided 1 ADA parking stall. Drop-off/pick-up zone and the in-backup-out route (with arrow indicating the headward and backward direction) for pick-up/drop-off van by using the on-site ADA parking stall as the turning point is shown on the new Site Plan A-1.

Buildings

4. Provide the proposed materials and color palette following combining the two buildings.

RESPONSE:

Currently both the front and the rear buildings have the same stucco wall and the same “pearl brown” wall color and “dark brown” trim color (please see photos in the Project Description). So, when they are combined the resulting one building will have consistent color and siding material.

FIRE MARSHAL

Contact Alex Goff at (408) 299-5763 or alex.goff@sccfd.org for more information regarding the following items:

- 5. Clarify the Occupancy Type discrepancy in the plans.

RESPONSE:

The previous occupancy was retail. During the prescreening process we have identified the future occupancy to “B” due to the nature of the community service being independent living skill training.

- 6. Prior plans stated fire sprinklers would be installed, current plans state fire sprinklers are not installed. Cover page to clarify if fire sprinklers are proposed (sprinklers to be labeled as a deferred submittal if proposed). Fire Protection Information section of the Project Description Packet is unclear. The packet states that fire sprinklers will be installed, but it's unclear if sprinklers are only proposed in the back part of the building or the entire building. Sprinklers are not to be partially installed in parts of a structure. The Cover Page of the plans and the Fire Protection Information section is to clarify the intention of fire sprinklers. What is the current building occupancy type and what is the proposed building occupancy type?

RESPONSE:

In previous review the front building was waived from fire sprinkler installation due to the size of the building, and the rear building was proposed to have fire sprinkler installation because the 2nd floor was planned to be used as office.

With the new proposal to combine the 2 buildings in one and eliminate the 2nd floor office usage, hence the new design propose no fire sprinkler installation to the combined building. However, just as we have done while we were in Cupertino City, we will strictly follow the building code to install proper fire separation between the 1st and 2nd floor.

This change is clarified in the new Site Plan A-1 under Type of Construction.

End of response

8/13/2020 Mark J. Connolly's Area of Concern

The proposed merging of the single-story stucco and gable-roofed building with the rear two-story flat roof building leads to an incompatible roof design. Staff recommends that the single-story building's roof profile also be a flat roof to match the larger building.

RESPONSE:

From architect's point of view, a gable-roof is more people friendly in appearance, verses a flat roof, which is more common in commercial shopping mall or warehouse. From time and budget's point of view, keeping the existing front building as is is more budget friendly to OSF's current budget situation. After careful study, OSF Architect has come up with a very neat design, which is to build a pitched roof with composite shingle matching the gable-roof of the existing front building (see A-4 East Elevation). This pitch roof gives the merged building a sense of continuity and coherence in design.
