

The applicant has submitted a request to construct a new single-family dwelling, detached studio, detached pool house, ground-mounted solar panels, and a swimming pool on the property at 121 Barn Road. The project would also include significant landscape improvements throughout the site. The project site is a three-acre parcel adjacent to the Cypress Hollow Subdivision. The site is bounded to the east and south by the residences along Rancho Drive, and is bounded to the north and west by the residences along Cypress Hollow Drive. The property itself is irregularly shaped and relatively flat. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing facilities to build the new residence and accessory structures. The residence itself would be a two-story building, approximately 8,700 square feet in size. The detached studio would be 740 square feet and the detached pool house would be 1,262 square feet in size, resulting in a total of 10,697 square feet for the project. Since the floor area limit for the property is 8,000 square feet, the applicant is requesting a floor area exception of 2,967 square feet. The proposed lot coverage would be 8.7 percent, which would comply with the lot coverage limit of 30 percent.

Ian Altman, owner, introduced the project.

Ron Sutton, architect, discussed the project. He noted he designed the project following an analysis of the site from neighbors' properties. He installed preliminary story poles and responded to twelve neighbors' concerns by rotating the house and adjusting rooflines. He redesigned the house; erected a second set of story poles, and made final adjustments in the landscaping. The attic space was also minimized to ensure a low roof height. In respect to the floor area exception, the house is not massive and not one large building. Subdividing the property would allow two houses and a garage, a square footage of 17,000 square feet, so the impact on the property is less by developing a single-family dwelling. There will be flat photo voltaic panels on the trellis. The ground-mounted solar panels would be installed at a 40 degree angle and would be 6.5 feet in height .

Dave Melchert, Stroudwater Design Group, landscape architect, stated he will meet with neighbors when the landscaping will be installed, and will cooperate with their desires. View windows will be opened in the vegetation; other areas will be well screened. Some unhealthy trees will be removed.

John Giffin, 60 Cypress Hollow Drive, stated Mr. Altman talked to him about screening, and the development of the property is fine but he has not received confirmation of the fencing that will be used. No one has talked to him about screening and plantings that will screen his house. He wants a proper fence and to be ensured the owner will clean up this area and continually maintain the area. Three trees have fallen on his property. He wants to ensure the detached studio is screened and lighting does not interfere with the use of his property.

Dan Weiss, 30 Cypress Hollow Drive, stated he appreciates Mr. Altman's efforts of working with him. His one concern is the impact of the parking lot, which will impact his privacy. He hoped the screening could be on site prior to construction as there will be much impact during construction.

Mark Coopersmith, 30 Monterey Drive, stated his is the most impacted property with a small view to the city. The story poles obliterate his view. The vegetation must also be maintained below a portion of the proposed roofline.

Terrance Andrews, 87 Rancho Drive, stated he appreciates the sensitivity given to the site. He suggested moving some trees around. He can see the top of the story poles.

Bill McLaughlin, on behalf of the owner of 99 Rancho Drive, stated the solar panels, privacy issues from the master bedroom site and the pool were concerns, but an agreement has been reached, and landscaping will be

installed to ensure privacy. He feels the proposed landscaping is in keeping with the previous owners' landscaping. The floor area exception is justifiable because there will be no negative impacts to anyone. The issue of the fence behind 87 Rancho Drive is a civil issue which shouldn't be addressed by the Board. There was a lease with the prior owner of the property that ended two years ago.

Mr. Sutton stated he is in agreement to slightly modify the fence to be installed behind 87 Rancho Drive. The yoga studio would be screened from the neighbors, and the lighting and windows would be on the opposite side of the building. The trees will be thinned and trimmed. The fence will be maintained and kept up as the project continues. He will discuss with the neighbors the type of fence and the color of the fence they wish. He has worked out issues with Mr. Weiss, and will install landscaping as soon as possible. He tried to provide the residents of 30 Monterey Drive with a view expanded to Sausalito and as the trees are modified; other neighbors will have a view in the other direction also. He discussed ways to modify landscaping for the neighbors views and privacy.

Boardmember Beales stated he visited the site. Regarding fencing and screening, applicant intends to work with each of the neighbors to make some modifications to meet the neighbors' needs. He likes the project. Regarding the floor area exception, it is large; however, the property could be divided and more building could be on the site.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated he visited the site and neighbors. This is an impressive project, an architect's dream in its magnitude. He is concerned about the floor area exception, but would not like the site divided into two or three parcels. Mr. Giffin will benefit by the new owners who will take greater care of the property and maintenance of the landscaping. This is a beautiful design and it will enhance the neighborhood.

Boardmember Kunzweiler stated he can support the project. The house takes advantage of the site. Landscaping is very critical to make the project work both for the owners and neighbors, and he appreciates the time and thought by the landscape architect. He will count on the landscape architect doing what he said he would.

Boardmember Figour stated he likes the design; it is one of the most significant pieces of architecture he's reviewed while on the Board. He likes the campus setting. Form does follow function in the design of the project. The solar panels are acceptable; they will not be viewed from offsite. When the trees are trimmed, some views will be opened.

Chair Teiser stated the design is outstanding, integrating the house design with nature. As to the floor area exception, the Design Review Board is to evaluate exceptions on their merits and this is a case that can be made because the house's scale fits with the property. The request for the floor area exception is not unreasonable.

Boardmember Beales stated he agrees that Condition 7 should include the requirement that undesirable trees are removed from the plan and replaced with different species, and suggested a condition to require that Staff review the up-lighting of the landscaping as it is developed to ensure there are no undesirable effects on the neighbors.

M/S, Beales/Kunzweiler (passed 5-0) 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 additional condition that up-lighting in the landscaping area be reviewed by Staff to ensure it has no negative impact on neighbors.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #19 OF THE 11/10/03 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Changes include:

Page 1, last line, change “above” to “below.”

Page 2, 2nd paragraph, last sentence to state, “. . . a much smaller brass sign located on the side.”

Page 4, 1st paragraph, 6th line, last word, change “he” to “the.”

Page 5, 3rd paragraph, last line, make this a new paragraph and change “He said” to “The architect said. . .”

Page 6, 3rd paragraph, last line, add at the end of the sentence, “with respect to lighting from the addition.”

Page 6, 7th paragraph, last line, delete “or lanai.”

Page 9, 3rd paragraph, 2nd line, change “fate” to “gate.”

M/S, Kunzweiler/O’Donnell (passed 4-0-1, Beales abstained) to approve the minutes as amended.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 pm.