

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No one spoke during this time.

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous reported that the appeal for 81 East View Avenue was continued to the November 19, 2003 Town Council meeting.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. 55 MAIN STREET GOLDMAN, SIGN

The applicant is requesting the approval of one sign for the purpose of advertising a business located at 55 Main Street. The subject sign would be located on the wall above the entrance to the building. The sign would be comprised of a wood background with six-inch high brass lettering spelling "Goldman Law Firm." The color of the sign would be brass letters on a black background with hunter green trim.

Ron Goldman, owner of 55 Main Street, stated that a previously proposed sign that had been denied by the Board was in the identical location as this request. He said that the size of the sign would comply with the Sign Ordinance. He stated that the sign fasteners would not be visible, and that the sign would have a prominent hunter green border and a black background. He felt that the black background would complement the polished brass, and noted that the black color is not prohibited by the Town. He said that the sign would not fit in the location previously suggested by the Board. In response to questions, he stated that he has a tenant upstairs who is not allowed to have a sign on the building.

Boardmember Figour stated that the issues discussed at the last hearing have been mitigated and the applicant has worked toward trying to make the sign better. He said that he would have preferred the sign in the transom below the pediment, which is a natural location. He stated that this would be a very prominent sign, but the applicant has done his best to redesign the sign.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated he is not crazy about the sign. He said that this is a law firm that probably does not need a sign like this to attract business. He said that this building is prominent when viewed down Main Street, and the sign would be too prominent at this location. He said that he would like to see a much smaller brass sign located on the side.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated the sign is large and the building prominent; however, the sign complies with the sign ordinance. He would ask the applicant to consider a scaled-back version. He felt that the sign would be visible from most of Main Street, and the approach should be to have signs fit in seamlessly in the neighborhood.

Chair Teiser stated that he would prefer a different sign, but the owner has a right to this sign since it would comply with the Sign Ordinance.

M/S, Kunzweiler/Figour (passed 3-1, O'Donnell dissented) 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.

E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

2. 4 OLD LANDING ROAD NOBARI, NEW DWELLING

The Board reviewed this project at the October 2, 2003 meeting. Following Board direction to reduce the home to no larger than 3,500-square feet (including garage) and to provide a more detailed landscape plan for the Paradise Drive property line, the applicant requested a continuance until November 5, 2003 to prepare project modifications. Staff sent a letter suggesting specific site planning changes that could be considered, given that the redesign residence would be smaller. Revised plans for the house have now been submitted.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, stated the house has been redesigned, and discussed the changes. He added that he had contacted some of the neighbors on Old Landing Road and they are pleased with the changes.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated he was in the audience at the first hearing, and commends the architect for the job done on this project. He said that the reductions to bring the house down to 3,500 square feet are excellent, and the landscaping addresses the previously raised concerns. He said that the house would be handsome, and fits in with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated that he appreciated the changes to the design and supports the project.

Boardmember Figour stated that this is a nice plan, and the street elevation would be more pleasant than the previous submission.

Chair Teiser concurred and commended the owner and architect for taking suggestions and accommodating the concerns of the neighborhood.

M/S, Figour/Kunzweiler (passed 4-0) 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.

3. 20 VIA SAN FERNANDO GROESBECK, ADDITIONS

The applicant has submitted a request to construct additions to an existing single-family dwelling on a property located at 20 Via San Fernando. The property is located at the intersection of Via Los Altos and Paseo Mirasol, has a rectangular shape, and is relatively flat. The additions would include a minor expansion to the garage and dining room on the ground floor of the residence, and a new master bedroom and bathroom on the upper floor of the residence. The additions would be located at the south and north ends of the home. The project would also consist of exterior alterations to the structure where the roofline would be raised by approximately 7'2", and the driveway would be widened to accommodate three parking spaces in the garage.

This application was considered by the Board at the October 15, 2003 meeting. At that time, the applicant indicated that the story poles that had been erected were too short. The Board continued the request to allow the applicant time to revise the story poles, which have now been corrected.

Jared Polsky, architect, confirmed that the story poles are now at the correct height.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated the design is an improvement and blends with the neighborhood. He said that the house is prominent at this location, but the project fits within the guidelines. He asked applicant to

consider adding landscaping or trees on the front corner to soften the appearance.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that this is a handsome project. He was taken by its height, but noted that there is no objection from the neighbors regarding views or sunlight. He thought that this was a great project that would benefit the neighborhood.

Boardmember Figour concurred and stated he tried again to visit with the most potentially affected neighbor, who was not at home. He said that the neighbor apparently has no objections, so he supports the project.

Chair Teiser stated that he did visit with the neighbor up the street who would be most impacted, and she had no real objections. He said that the house would not cast shadows, although it would take away some of her sky view. He supports the project.

M/S, Kunzweiler/Figour (passed 4-0) 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. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

4. 5 GILMARTIN COURT SINGER, ADDITION/VARIANCE

The applicant has submitted a request to construct an addition to an existing single-family dwelling on a property located at 5 Gilmartin Court. The proposal consists of a 325-square-foot greenhouse at the rear of the residence. Although the greenhouse would function more as a covered patio area than an extension to the living area of the home, the greenhouse would be covered and mostly enclosed, which technically qualifies the space as additional floor area. A variance would be required for excess lot coverage, along with a floor area exception.

Mark Singer, owner, introduced James Benjamin, architect, who discussed the project.

Boardmember Figour asked about the roofing material. Mr. Benjamin stated he is working with two manufacturers to make the curved barrel roof. To cut down heat gain and allow light to come in, he said that he would perhaps use laminated glass with insulation on the inside. He said that he does not want to make a lantern of the roof that would create more light for the neighbor than the existing house.

Chair Teiser stated he sees two light issues with this project: the neighbor at One Gilmartin Court is concerned about light pollution at night, and the glass material is reflective and could reflect sunlight to uphill homes. He suggested that perhaps the application should be conditioned to allow non-reflective roofing material.

Mr. Benjamin stated the glass could be sandblasted to reduce the reflectivity, though it may stain over a period of time. He stated that he is still pursuing options for the materials. He added that the addition would not be heated.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated that the design makes sense, but that he understands the concerns of the owners of One Gilmartin Court regarding the lighting. He said that he is struggling with the reflection of light during the day and the light radiation in the evening. He felt that it was difficult for the Board to make a decision when there is uncertainty about how well the building materials would mitigate the concerns.

Boardmember Figour stated that the project will be difficult to construct. He felt that Staff could review the level of reflectivity of the roofing materials, that the level of illumination should be limited in this space. He noted that one light source from the existing house would be removed with the addition. He thought that the addition might glow at night.

Planning Manager Watrous noted Staff reviews plan checks for permanent light fixtures. He noted, however, there is nothing that prevents an owner from installing plug-in lamps that could increase the illumination, after the project has been approved.

Chair Teiser stated his judgment is that the owner is a considerate neighbor, and he urged the owner to consider subdued lighting. He agreed that the Town could not regulate plug-in lighting.

Boardmember Figour noted that the lot is undersized, which could support the request for both a lot coverage variance and floor area exception. Chair Teiser added that this is an outdoor space and the applicant would be making it more of a covered outdoor space.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated he sees no problem with this application. He said that the addition would have no impact on neighbors, with the exception of the lighting. He said that he likes the design and could approve the project as it is, but hoped for accommodations to be made with the neighbors with respect to lighting emanating from the building.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated he no problem with the variance, as the lot is undersized and the project affects hardly anyone. He said that he still has a concern about giving guidance regarding acceptable lighting levels.

Boardmember O'Donnell noted that the project would eliminate some of the existing light sources from the house.

Chair Teiser stated the lot coverage and floor area exceptions are unique and do not increase the occupancy or the intensity of the house. He said that the project would fit in with the profile of the house. His only remaining issue was the lighting. He would have Staff review the project for subdued lighting and less reflective roofing materials.

Boardmember Kunzweiler asked how much light is needed. Mr. Singer responded that the addition would not be lighted at night, as the light would interfere with the blooming season for his plants. He said that he would prefer a translucent roofing material that does not reflect, like a rice paper.

M/S, Kunzweiler/Figour (passed 4-0) 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, and with the additional condition that Staff review the plans with consideration made to an appropriate balance of non-reflective surfaces and subdued light for the roofing materials, with the intent to accommodate the growth of plants during daylight hours and not to be obtrusive to the neighbors at night.

5. 70 PASEO MIRASOL NORRIS, FENCE/VARIANCE: CONTINUED TO 12/4/2003

6. 761 HLARY DRIVE ST. HILARY CHURCH, FENCE/GATE

The applicant requests design review approval for the construction of a security gate and fence on property owned by St Hilary Church at 761 Hilary Drive. The wood and wire fence would extend from the western end of the property line on either side of Hilary Drive, gradually following the line of the street in a stairstep design. A metal security gate would extend across the street 28.5 feet from the property line. An additional turning bay would be installed on the north side of the street close to the property line. All improvements would be located on private property, without encroachment onto Town right-of-way.

Bill Tiedje, business manager for St. Hilary Church, stated that the gate would be only six feet high, contrary to what one neighbor had believed. He stated that this gate had been inadvertently left out of the original application, while two other gates have been approved. He noted that Staff had recommended a condition of approval that the gate not be installed until the other access onto Rock Hill Drive is available, but they would like to construct the gate at the same time the other gates are installed.

Chris Henry, 720 Hilary Drive, stated he believes the gate was left out because it was purposefully turned down by the Town Council. He said that he had reviewed the minutes of the Town council meetings at which Councilmember Gram had mentioned concerns of the neighborhood regarding a gate on Hilary Drive. He was concerned that cars would not be able to turn around when the gate was closed. He said that if the gate would be further back on the St. Hilary property, people would not have to turn around on the street. He felt that there should be more than adequate signage to ensure people use the Rock Hill Drive entrance.

Planning Manager Watrous clarified that the comments in the Town Council minutes to which Mr. Henry had referred had to do with entry monuments proposed at one time, and not with an entry gate.

Bill McLaughlin, representing St. Hilary Church, stated they had discussed potential signage with the Tiburon Traffic Safety Committee, and had requested a sign at Rock Hill and Hilary Drives stating that Hilary Drive is a dead-end street, but the Committee did not approve this. He stated that the reasons for the gate are safety and keeping children inside the area. At night, when the gate is closed, he said that the gate would keep cars off of Hilary Drive.

Planning Manager Watrous asked if the issue of the potential gate was brought up during the discussion with the Traffic Safety Committee. Mr. McLaughlin responded that the gate had not been discussed at that time. Planning Manager Watrous suggested returning to the Traffic Safety Committee to request a sign to direct St. Hilary traffic up Rock Hill Drive.

Mr. McLaughlin described the church's programs and activities, and the various times when traffic would use the different entrances to the property. Mr. Tiedje noted that the gates onto Rock Hill Drive would be closed at times during the school day to use the parking area as a playground. Mr. McLaughlin added that the gate would be set back to create a turnaround area on St. Hilary property.

Planning Manager Watrous stated that the Board could recommend to the Traffic Safety Committee that appropriate signage be installed to reflect when the gates are closed.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated the design of the gate structure accomplishes its stated purpose. He said the design of the gate is attractive and provides adequate turnaround space.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that the gate fits the community and provides appropriate turnaround area.

Chair Teiser stated that the design of the gate is attractive, and the turnaround is well designed.

M/S, O'Donnell/Kunzweiler (passed 4-0) 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, with the modified condition of approval that the gate is not to be operational until permanent access is available for the driveways leading directly onto Rock Hill Drive.

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #18 OF THE 10/16/03 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Changes include:

Mr. McLaughlin stated, regarding the St. Hilary Church item, the morning after the last hearing, the neighbors put up a sign to sell their house. He was approached by the realtor and the buyers wanted to proceed with St. Hilary's proposal. At the last minute, Staff decided the item should go to Council on appeal and the item be handled in that manner.

Page 2, 6th paragraph, 6th line to state, "Privacy is a two-way street."

Page 4, 2nd paragraph, should be "...defended the elimination of the mansard roof."

Page 4, last sentence, change "clients" to "applicants."

Page 6, 5th paragraph, 1st line to read, "...the issue is the neighborhood; the walls and the construction and the topography is the neighborhood."

Page 7, 5th paragraph, last sentence to state, "...warned the owner not to return...exception to infill that area."

M/S, Kunzweiler/Figour (passed 4-0), to approve the minutes as amended.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.