

ACTION MINUTES #6

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2005
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

- A. ROLL CALL:** **Present** - Chair Beales, Boardmembers Bird, Figour ,O'Donnell. and Teiser
 Absent - None
 Ex-Officio – Assistant Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Flanagan
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
1. 1887 Centro West Street Horsfall New Dwelling/Variance **APPROVED**
2. 106 Jefferson Drive Tripp New Dwelling **APPROVED**
- E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
3. 65 Harriet Way Jacobs Major Additions **APPROVED**
4. 34 Southridge Drive Singerman Additions/Floor Area Exception **APPROVED**
5. 696 Hawthorne Drive Arbab New Dwelling/Variance **CONTINUED TO 4/21/05**
- F. MINUTES OF THE 3/17/05 D.R.B. MEETING - APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- G. ADJOURNMENT - 7:50 PM**

**MINUTES #6
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF APRIL 7, 2005**

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: Assistant Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Flanagan

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No one spoke during this time.

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Assistant Planner Krasnove reported Item 5, 696 Hawthorne Drive, was continued to April 21, 2005. She will represent Planning Manager Watrous's projects, in his absence.

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

1. 1887 CENTRO WEST STREET

HORSFALL, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling on property located at 1887 Centro West Street. An existing single-family dwelling on the site would be demolished. This application was reviewed at the February 3, 2005 Design Review Board meeting. At that time, concerns were raised by the representative of the owner of the adjacent home at 1891 Centro West Street that the proposed house would block views and sunlight into their rear yard. The Board shared these concerns, and continued the application to allow the applicant time to address these issues.

Mark Grudy, representing the applicant, discussed the change as requested by the Board at a previous hearing. He stated the angle of the building remains because he could not make it work with the topography. The whole building was lowered three feet. The story poles reflect the new design and height.

Brook Halsey stated his mother owns the house next door and he appreciates Mr. Grudy working with him. He stated that the new design does not completely give him back his view but he is glad Jennifer Horsfall will be able to enjoy the hill as he has done for many years. He would prefer the view opened up more, but both concerned parties can be happy and he approves the proposal.

Boardmember Bird stated she is happy they reached a consensus. She stated that the design fits into the hill and is beautifully done. It is a formidable height to Mrs. Halsey, but since she accepts it, Boardmember Bird can support the project.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated he also can support the project. Three feet is helpful to the Halsey residence. It is an attractive design. The variance is almost an existing condition.

Boardmember Figour stated the neighbor is being very generous even though the Board probably would have a hard time protecting the views since the views are not from principal living areas. He stated that the house will help the neighbor's property value since single-family homes enhance the value of the community.

Chair Beales stated he would have appreciated more done for the Halseys but their view impact is a side view.

M/S, Bird/O'Donnell (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.

2. 106 JEFFERSON DRIVE

TRIPP, NEW DWELLING

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 106 Jefferson Drive. As more than 50 percent of the existing residence on the site would be demolished, the subject application is considered to be for a new single-family dwelling on the property. This application was reviewed at the March 17, 2005 Design Review Board meeting. At that time, the applicant submitted plans that showed a revised roofline intended to address issues raised by several neighbors about the visual mass of the house when viewed from the street. At the meeting, concerns were raised by a neighboring property owner about the mass of the proposed house and its potential to block views of the hillsides and ridgelines from the street.

Karen Tripp, owner, described changes since the last hearing. The third bedroom was brought to the front. She rotated the garage, which brings the second story over, taking five feet off the upper story, and which pulls everything back on the property. Elements were stepped back to help the mass impact. This building is

not as tall as the building next door.

Wayne Snow stated at the last meeting that it appeared the project was basically approved with modifications. Staff visited the site and indicated that their concerns about view, ridgeline, scale and mass, if not on this project then about other sites on the street, were the same concerns as his and that buildings should not be allowed to wall up this street. He feels views, ridgeline, scale and mass are not only a neighborhood issue but also community issues, because all citizens hold these in high regard. He stated buildings should be reviewed on an individual basis.

Chair Beales asked if there is an intent to revise the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Snow responded no. This concept was approved at a Council meeting. He shared, in written form, the sense of the General Plan as it relates to views, ridgeline, scale and mass. He would like to think that views are from all roadways.

Chair Beales stated he sees nothing in the document that addresses views. If this were taken to the extreme, no second stories would be allowed anywhere in Town.

Mr. Snow asked that ridgelines be protected throughout the town.

Boardmember Teiser stated this building does block hillside views that neighbors see as they enter from Tiburon Boulevard. Also, there is beginning to be a wall of large houses by the same owner on this corridor. Mr. Snow's concern should be addressed in future applications. The neighbors would not want a wall of houses on the road that would change the character of the neighborhood.

Boardmember Figour stated he understands the concern. Bel Aire and Belveron Gardens are incredibly monotonous. The change in Belveron is generally nice and the area is improving greatly. One must look at zoning. This is medium-high density residential. Pressure to build larger homes in Belveron will be continual. Ridgeline views may be lost but that could be acceptable. He commented that this house is not overly large and there are no floor area exceptions or variances.

Boardmember Bird stated the designs of this and the house next door are very nice. The neighborhood does have a monotony of design. The height does bother her and it would not if the house next door were not so big. The house across the street from this house is more in the scale of a second story that she would like to embrace. She said this project will be more in the scale of that house. She commented that the Board does need to be sensitive to how the whole neighborhood will look. The Design Review Board has responsibility not to allow additional over-sized houses to be built up the hill. She would like the house a little lower.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated, while not at the last meeting, after reviewing documents, he sees applicant has made great strides to adhere to the Board's direction. He supports the project. The Board needs to be mindful of General Plan goals. However, he believes there are substandard properties in town that need to be upgraded and this property does violate the goals of the new General Plan. He would not like a wall of homes on the street. The house will be a big improvement to the neighborhood, which is showing similar changes to east Belveron. He stated that mass, scale and the appearance of a tall building have been modified appropriately.

Chair Beales stated the applicant has done a good job in revising the design. Additional roofing over the first floor breaks up the façade. He appreciates the potential for a line of houses up the street, but noted that second stories are accepted on the perimeter of neighborhoods though not on interior neighborhood homes.

Condition 10E and 10F do not apply to this project.

Assistant Planner Krasnove will eliminate these two conditions.

M/S, Figour/Bird, (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, eliminating Conditions 10E and 10F.

3. 65 HARRIET WAY JACOBS, MAJOR ADDITIONS

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review approval to make an addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 65 Harriet Way. The applicant is requesting a 777-square-foot addition to the existing residence. The subject residence is a 1,334-square-foot one-story structure with four bedrooms, one bathroom, living room and kitchen. The project would include the expansion of the living room and master bedroom and the addition of a family room, master bathroom and deck. The existing kitchen and bathroom would also be remodeled.

Barry Jacobs, owner, described his project.

Boardmember Figour clarified the application is as is and applicant will stick with his original ideas.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember Bird stated this is a nice improvement to the house. It will be quite a new neighborhood in the near future with improvements to neighboring homes.

Boardmember O'Donnell concurred and stated he supports the project. He stated that it is similar to the Rifkin design.

Boardmember Teiser stated the neighborhood is going through great change and upgrades are improving the neighborhood character and being sensitive to neighbor's concerns.

Boardmember Figour stated he sees an erosion of the quality of the drawings in the submissions, and asked that staff ensure they are upgraded in future submissions.

Chair Beales stated this is the fourth modest expansion in the neighborhood.

M/S, Teiser/Bird (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

4. 34 SOUTHBRIDGE DRIVE SINGERMAN, ADITIONS/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTIONS

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct an addition and make exterior alterations to an existing single-family dwelling located at 34 Southridge Drive. The property is located on the corner of Cayford Drive and Southridge Drive. The existing residence is a two-level structure with the garage, laundry room, bedroom and crawl space on the lower level and kitchen, living room, dining room, two bedrooms, one bathroom and master suite on the upper level.

Mark Singerman, owner, discussed his project, and stated all neighbors approve the project.

Boardmember O'Donnell asked if the project had been started already.

Mr. Singerman stated that this project grew from its initial concept, and it was only a retaining wall when it started, during which time he experienced a growing project. That project led to the current application. The bathroom exists on the garage level and there is no change to it. The area will be accessed from the second bedroom, which is as it is now.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated he supports the project.

Boardmember Bird stated she also supports the project. It does not seem like change will occur from the street due to the mass of the building.

Boardmember Teiser stated this is an infill project and does not create more living space as far as he can see. The fire pit is away from the neighbors and should not be a noise problem.

M/S, O'Donnell/Figour (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.

5. 696 HAWTHORNE DRIVE ABRAB, NEW DWELLING/ VARIANCE: CONTINUED

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #5 OF THE 3/17/05 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Amendments include:

Page 5, 1st line, change "buyers" to "applicants."

Page 7, 1st paragraph, last sentence, delete "this was...be dangerous" and insert, "there was the potential to later increase the square footage. The Board approved a similar home next door also owned by the applicant."

M/S, Figour/Bird (passed 4-0-1) to approve the minutes as amended.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.