

ACTION MINUTES #22

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2004
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

- A. ROLL CALL:** **Present** - Chair Beales, Boardmembers Bird, Figour, O'Donnell and Teiser
 Absent - None
 Ex-Officio - Planning Manager Watrous, Assistant Planner Krasnove and
 Minutes Clerk Flanagan
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
- D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
1. 7 Hillcrest Drive Strotz New Dwelling **CONTINUED TO 1/20/05**
- E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
2. 561 Silverado Drive McCullough Minor Alteration **WITHDRAWN**
- F. MINUTES OF THE 12/2/04 D.R.B. MEETING – APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- G. ADJOURNMENT – 7:55 P.M.**

**MINUTES #22
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF DECEMBER 16, 2004**

The meeting was opened at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Beales.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Beales, Boardmembers Bird, Figour, O'Donnell and Teiser

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Assistant Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Flanagan

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke during this time.

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the item for 561 Silverado Drive had been withdrawn and the regular meeting of January 6, 2005 meeting will be cancelled.

A question was raised by the Board regarding the construction project at 747 Tiburon Boulevard. Planning Manager Watrous acknowledged the emphasis on the oak tree in front that provided screening during the review of the project. He said that prior to construction, the tree had been trimmed extensively without first obtaining a tree permit, and the owner was fined the maximum amount. He said that the owner has since stated that the construction will damage the tree's roots, and Planning Manager Watrous gave him permission to remove the tree, but required that a 36"-48"-box oak replacement tree be planted.

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

1. 7 HILLCREST DRIVE STROTZ, NEW DWELLING

On November 4, 2004, the Design Review Board reviewed an application for the construction of a new single-family dwelling on the property located at 7 Hillcrest Drive. The property is currently vacant. The project that the Board reviewed on November 4, 2004 consisted of a two-story structure above a two-car garage. The basement level of the building would have been comprised of a garage and various storage and laundry areas where the ceiling height would not exceed seven feet in height. The first floor would have consisted of a living room with a balcony, dining room, guest room, two bathrooms, a family room and kitchen with a shared terrace, and a storage room. The upper level would have consisted of three bedrooms and three bathrooms. At the previous meeting, the Board reviewed the project and considered public testimony. There were several concerns voiced by neighboring property owners and the Board regarding the potentially-significant view impacts that could be caused by the proposed house and the mass and bulk of the structure on the hillside. The Board felt the design was inconsistent with the Hillside Guidelines and suggested the project be reworked. The applicant has now submitted a revised house design.

Gus Strotz, owner, discussed changes made to his project since the last meeting. In response to questions, he stated he tried to keep all retaining walls at six feet at the highest. He said that split face concrete block would be used for the facing of the walls, which would also be covered with plants. He said that there would be a retaining wall behind the house that would support the hillside, another wall along the footpath coming into the property, and walls on either side of the driveway. He said that a two- to three-foot tall retaining wall would be constructed around the southern patio. He described the proposed fencing, stating that he would like the six-foot fence to meet up with the fence for 19 Hillcrest Drive, if possible. He stated that he had changed the color scheme for the house from orange to beige with white trim. He stated that the proposed arbor was intended to provide privacy screening for the home at 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard, and would not be in their view corridor.

Ed McEachron, architect, representing 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard, stated that they are disappointed because instead of a compromise, the revised design is a lose-lose situation. He said that they believed that the Design Review Board encouraged the building to be moved out of the view plane; however, the house has been moved eight feet toward the Poonians and now looms even more over their home. He stated that the submitted plans are out of scale, and he cannot understand how much of the house has been moved out of their view line. He felt that the house should be moved to the west. He added that the house was supposed to be redesigned, but is essentially the same even though one wing has been lowered. He said that the design does not step into the hillside, as directed by the Board. He said that the shape of the building would put two corners into the Poonians' view. He stated that the pergola would be eleven feet tall and on top of a hill, and feels like it would be on top of the Poonians' porch. He said that they do not object to the house being built, but feel that the house should conform to the Hillside Design Guidelines and should be moved out of their bridge view.

Paritem Poonian expressed his frustration, stating that the Board gave clear guidelines at the last meeting, but the applicant has not followed this guidance. He said that this project would be very important to their everyday lives, and he asked the Board to give the applicant clear direction on changes to be made to the house design.

Bill Hartman stated that the project would create a traffic hazard and affect wildlife traveling through the area, and should therefore be subject to CEQA review. He felt that this was not a buildable lot. He said that there are blind curves on Hillcrest Drive and felt that the driveway would be dangerous.

Charles Ray stated that there will be more grading than stated in this application. He showed a photograph indicating the amount of dirt that would have to be removed from the site, and felt that a six-foot tall retaining wall would be inadequate.

Luigi Baker stated that he is concerned about the hill sliding. He said that at the last meeting he was told that the proposed house would be screened from his home by a tree in front of the house. He showed photographs taken from his kitchen and added that he can see every story pole. He said that the house would take away the privacy of his two patios facing the site. He said that it looked like the house had been moved closer to his property. He suggested that the house be moved back and turned a different way. He added that if the house would have a lot of skylights, it would be noticeable from his home.

Bill Bordon stated that the stability of the hillside was raised as a concern at the last meeting and the neighbors requested that a geotechnical report be prepared to give the neighbors a sense of ease that there are not problems in the hillside; however, this report has not been submitted. He added that the applicant was also asked to completely redesign the house, but when the new story poles were put up he barely saw any difference in the new design. He asked the Board to give the applicant clear direction so the project can proceed.

Sophia Kingman stated that the submitted plans were inaccurate, particularly in the location of the proposed fence. She asked that an accurate rendering of the front retaining wall be included in the revised plans.

Chair Beales noted that a geotechnical report will be completed as part of the building permit process after design review, and that detailed renderings are normally not required by the Board.

Mr. Bordon stated the neighbors understand the timing of the geotechnical requirement. He stated that this is still a concern of the neighborhood, and suggested that the applicant may as well prepare the report in advance, since the house has to be redesigned.

Boardmember Figour stated that the key barrier to success on this site is that the lot coverage is not being utilized. He said that a geometric building design does not fit on a lot like this. He suggested that the building should be spread out more on the site and possibly be more free-form. He said that this house design would work elsewhere, but this is a difficult site. He said that the house needs to be looked at anew. He said that the story poles indicate that the house would impact the views of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge from the Poonians' home. He said that these views could be accommodated by a lower building profile. He felt that this was a buildable site, but a different design solution was needed.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that at the last meeting he totally opposed the project, and he remains opposed to the project. He said that some accommodations have been made, but the design falls woefully short of what the Board wanted to see. He said that the building should be spread out across the site, and suggested that the Board might approve variances for lot coverage and setbacks to accomplish this. He stated that the house

should be sited in the northwest corner of the property and stepped down. He felt that the house would loom over the Poonians' and Bordens' homes. He felt that the house should be redesigned to step into the hillside, and that the site is not that difficult.

Boardmember Bird concurred that this is a nice house that would fit nicely onto another site. She said that a lower profile home that is stepped into the hillside would be better. She acknowledged that this was a difficult site, but felt that a house could be built upon this lot. She hoped that the applicant and the neighbors could reach a consensus on the design.

Boardmember Teiser stated that he appreciated the changes made to the house design. He said that the driveway would not create a traffic hazard on the street. He felt that the house should be stepped and moved to the northwest.

Chair Beales stated that he appreciated moving the building. He acknowledged that the Poonians would like to be able to see the entire bridge, the blockage would be at the periphery, and the view of the bridge is along the hillside, so that even a low fence would block some of their view. He felt that the second floor could be moved up the hill and shifted back. He said that the design may not be able to utilize a uniform two-story approach, and that the bottom floor may not be able to be moved.

Mr. Strotz agreed to an extension of the Permit Streamlining deadline.

M/S, O'Donnell/Bird (passed 5-0) to continue this item to the January 20, 2005 meeting.

E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

2. 561 SILVERADO DRIVE MCCULLOUGH, MINOR ALTERATION: WITHDRAWN

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #21 OF THE 12/02/04 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Page 3, 1st line to state, "...would prefer one of the first two species..."

Page 6, 2nd paragraph, 5th line, add after "property," "with the doorway on the guest room facing the house."

Page 6, last paragraph, 1st line, change "they" to "their view."

M/S, Teiser/Figour (passed 5-0) to approve the minutes as amended.

I. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.