

**ACTION MINUTES #13**

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2003  
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

---

- A. ROLL CALL:**       **Present** - Boardmembers Beales, Figour, Kunzweiler and Teiser  
                              **Absent** - Chair Comstock  
                              **Ex-Officio** - Associate Planner Lynch and Minutes Clerk Flanagan
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
- D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
1.     111 Sugarloaf Drive   Grudnowski            New Dwelling/Variances/Fl.Area Exception  
**APPROVED**
2.     23 Old Landing Road   Espersen                New Dwelling **CONTINUED TO 8/7/03**
- E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
3.     23 Sutter Court        Joyner                   Hot Tub/Fence/Variances **APPROVED**
4.     301 Karen Way         Twiggs/Valverde        Additions/Variance **CONTINUED TO 8/7/03**
5.     390 Greenwood Bch.   Von Lackum             Modifications/Variances **APPROVED**
- F. MINUTES OF THE 7/3/03 D.R.B. MEETING – APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- G. ADJOURNMENT – 8:30 P.M.**

**MINUTES #13  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF JULY 17, 2003**

The meeting was opened at 7:00 p.m. by Vice-Chair Teiser.

**A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Vice-Chair Teiser, Boardmembers Beales, Figour, Kunzweiler

Absent: Chair Comstock

Ex-Officio: Associate Planner Lynch and Minutes Clerk Flanagan

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

No one spoke during this time.

**C. STAFF BRIEFING**

Associate Planner Lynch reported the Town's employee retreat is tentatively scheduled for August 21-23 and the August 21 Design Review Board meeting may be cancelled. He added, the Town Council adopted guidelines for new secondary dwelling units at its last meeting.

**D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

**1. 111 SUGARLOAF DRIVE GRUDNOWSKI, NEW DWELLING  
VARIANCES/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION**

On May 1, 2003, the applicant requested approval for a 3,749-square-foot home that was comprised of two levels, in addition to a garage, a swimming pool and various landscaping improvements. The proposed home was located in an area of the property that was previously graded flat. The structure was to be recessed into the ground up to nine feet in certain locations. The roof of the structure had a slope of 3 and 12. The proposed home had a Mediterranean appearance with stucco siding, stone accents and pillars supporting the entryway and trellis at the rear of the building.

When the Design Review Board first reviewed the application, there were several concerns regarding the potential view impacts of the project. The project would have appeared to impact the view from several properties in the vicinity, but especially from the property at 120 Sugarloaf Drive. Currently, the owners of 120 Sugarloaf Drive enjoy views to the north, east and west over the San Francisco Bay and in the southeasterly

direction to the City of San Francisco and the Golden Gate Bridge. This southeasterly view would have been significantly impacted by the proposed dwelling. There were also some peripheral concerns about the possible loss of daylight for the properties to the east of the project, and the potential view impacts from the landscaping improvements on the site. Based on these concerns, the Board continued the public hearing to July 3, 2003 so the applicant could make any modifications to address the concerns of the Board. On July 3, 2003, the applicant requested a continuance until the July 17, 2003 Design Review Board meeting. The applicant has now submitted a revised plan for this project that significantly reduces the view impact across the site. This is accomplished by bringing much of the floor area from the second level down to the first level. The floor elevation of the first level is lowered by one foot from the original plan. The roofline has also been flattened and lowered in the revised plan.

Joe Sherer, project manager, stated the neighbors and applicant support the compromises made after their discussions. Changes are reflected in drawings submitted at this meeting and posted on the wall. The house has been lowered nine inches further from the July 3<sup>rd</sup> submittal and rotated in a westerly direction by five feet. The chimney above the roofline was eliminated. The fireplace will be gas. Proposed landscaping is to not block views and to enhance privacy between 111 and 116 Sugarloaf. The landscaping will remain low. Perimeter fence is four feet and of wrought iron, similar to other houses. The landscaping is to preserve views and be low maintenance.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, described the project, and noted 3,100 square feet of the house is buried below the ground's surface to replace the mass and bulk of the hillside. This house will not have any underpinning or visible crawlspace. The goal of landscaping is to be attractive, deer-proof, to thrive on the hillside and to not affect views. The roof of the house will stand two feet above the current grade.

Boardmember Figour asked if there are geotechnical reports that reference cutting into the toe of the cliff. He asked if the patio is possible.

Mr. Sadrieh responded that geotechnical reports are available. There is neighbors' testimony from those who have also constructed on the hill. The patio will have to be worked with as construction continues. Drilled piers will be used under the pool. There will be a concrete retaining wall along the hill and it can be stone-faced. He has worked on a property near this one, and it has been successful.

Boardmember Figour suggested pier and grade-beam construction could resolve the pool construction.

In response to questions, Mr. Sherer stated there will be approximately less than a four-foot retaining wall along the pool side.

Frank Sebastian, 120 Sugarloaf Drive, stated the project is a good plan. The story poles reflect the nine-inch reduction in height which should be considered in granting the variances.

Martin Bloom, 123 Sugarloaf Drive, stated applicants have gone the extra mile to satisfy the neighbors since the first submittal. He recommends the project be approved and fears if this is not approved, a better proposal will never happen.

Alan Lefkoff, 133 Sugarloaf Drive, president of the homeowners association, submitted a copy of a resolution completed in May that asks for tighter enforcement of contractors and additional rules to address the endless construction at the top of the hill.

Associate Planner Lynch stated he will route this to the Planning and Building departments, and while the Design Review Board has no authority for these requests, they contribute to Staff's knowledge. He suggested the conditions of approval require applicants to submit a full set of plans for review by Staff and to certify the story poles.

Mr. Sherer stated story poles on Wednesday night had been relocated to show tonight's plans.

Boardmember Beales stated he is impressed at the amount of work done by the applicant team. He likes the design and supports the project.

Boardmember Figour stated this is an incredible job and a quite nice design in keeping with Tiburon, and retro of the Thirties and Forties. He can also make findings. The floor area exception he can approve because the lot is undersized for RO-2 zoning; there are no basement areas.

Boardmember Kunzweiler concurred and stated the design is fabulous, this is a difficult lot and the project should not be tweaked too much.

Vice-Chair Teiser stated he concurs and the architect designed a spectacular building in response to his request for something special on the site.

Associate Planner Lynch stated, while the Board can accept the project in concept, Staff must notice legally the eleven-foot setback. This would allow continued design development while the project is noticed.

Boardmember Figour suggested that the retaining wall below the swimming pool be faced with stone.

**M/S, Beales/Kunzweiler (passed 4-0, Comstock absent) ; to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and to accept the design in concept as presented at this meeting. The Board suggested that the conditions of approval be revised to ensure that the exposed walls below the swimming pool are to be faced with stone and the revised story poles are to be certified.**

**2. 23 OLD LANDING ROAD  
CONTINUED TO 8/7/03**

**ESPERSEN, NEW DWELLING:**

**E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

**3. 22 SUTTER COURT JOYNER, HOT TUB/FENCE/VARIANCES**

The applicant has submitted a request for the construction of a fence with a variance for excess fence height, and the installation of a hot tub with a variance for reduced side yard setback, on the property located at 23 Sutter Court. The hot tub would be located on the east side of the property, within two feet of the property line. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance of six feet (two feet in lieu of the standard eight-foot side yard setback).

Sydney Joyner, owner, discussed the application, and stated the neighbors like the fence. The hot tub may be seven feet square, not six feet square, and is to be placed on the concrete pad, in the side yard setback.

Boardmember Kunzweiler asked about the hot tub in the setback. Ms. Joyner responded it is a self-contained hot tub.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated he had no issue with the fence; neighbors feel this is an improvement. His concern is the location of the hot tub; it is relatively close to the fence and jetted hot tubs do make noise. He asked what risk the Town creates with approving a hot tub and a new neighbor moving in.

Boardmember Figour stated he has a bit of concern regarding the location of the hot tub, but neighbors have not opposed. A new neighbor would know about the hot tub before purchasing the property.

Vice-Chair Teiser noted those most impacted by the height of the fence are the Joyners.

**M/S, Kunzweiler/Beales (passed 4-0, Comstock absent), to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report**

**4. 301 KAREN WAY TWIGGS/VALVERDE:  
ADDITIONS/VARIANCE: CONTINUED TO 8/7/03**

## **5. 390 GREENWOOD BEACH ROAD VON LACKUM/MODIFICATIONS /VARIANCES**

The applicant is requesting design review approval for remodeling to an existing single-family dwelling and garage on property located at 390 Greenwood Beach Road. The property currently contains a two-story residence and a single-story garage. A previous Site Plan and Architectural Review application (File #20128) was approved by the Design Review Board on August 16, 2001 to 853 square feet of additions to the existing buildings on the site. The previous application also included variances for reduced front and rear yard setbacks and excess lot coverage along with a floor area exception. The applicant now wishes to modify the previously-approved plans for this project. The proposed modifications include an extended deck to the rear of the lower level of the house; a gabled roof for the garage; and a new chimney. The floor area for the property would remain unchanged from the previous approvals. The deck would increase the approved lot coverage on the site by less than one percent.

Bill Von Lackum discussed the project and noted the interior height of the garage is less than six feet with all the items above the garage door opener. He does not want to hip the roof to take care of the height at the rear end, which no one sees.

Boardmember Figour stated he has no problems with the proposed deck and chimney. The profile of the garage will be a nice addition to Greenwood Beach Road.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated the gabling provides symmetry the design did not initially have.

Vice-Chair Teiser stated he can make the findings because it creates a hardship in having to live with an un-attractive design, and a gabled roof provides consistency to the neighborhood. A hip roof at the rear would detract from neighborhood character.

Boardmember Beales stated he does not see the ugliness of an alternative design that does not require a variance as a practical difficulty but it is an unnecessary hardship.

**M/S, Beales/Kunzweiler (passed 4-0, Comstock absent), to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report.**

## **F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #12 OF THE 07/03/03 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Page 1, remove the duplicated last sentence on the page.

Page 8, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, delete "although he still has."

Page 8, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, add "portion" after "two-story."

Page 8, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line to state, "was slid back to the east..."

Page 9, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line to state, "...there are problems with the design on the site."

Page 9, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line to state, "...where the additional lot coverage came from."

**M/S, Beales/Kunzweiler, to approve the minutes as amended.**

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 pm.