

**ACTION MINUTES #7**

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 2005  
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

---

- A. ROLL CALL:**       **Present** - Chair Beales, Boardmembers Bird, O'Donnell and Teiser  
                          **Absent** - Figour  
                          **Ex-Officio** – Assistant Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Flanagan
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING** - DRB Roster has been updated; Available DRB position has not been filled by the Council yet
- D. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
- |    |                   |                   |   |
|----|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1. | 27 Juno Road      | Thor              | Major Addition - <b>APPROVED</b>                              |
| 2. | 145 Esperanza St. | Veneziano/Swanson | Major Additions - <b>APPROVED</b>                             |
| 3. | 7 Hillcrest Road  | Strotz            | New Dwelling - <b>APPROVED</b>                                |
| 4. | 6 Audrey Court    | King              | Additions/Variances/Floor Area Exception -<br><b>APPROVED</b> |
| 5. | 696 Hawthorne Dr. | Arbab             | New Dwelling/Variance – <b>CONTINUED TO 5/19/05</b>           |
| 6. | 689 Hilary Drive  | Tsang             | Major Additions/Variance – <b>CONTINUED TO 5/19/05</b>        |
- E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #6 OF THE 4/7/05 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- F. ADJOURNMENT – 10:27 PM**

**MINUTES #7  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF APRIL 21, 2005**

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

**A. ROLL CALL**

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

Absent:               Boardmember Figour

Ex-Officio:   Assistant Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Flanagan

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one spoke during this time.

### **C. STAFF BRIEFING**

Assistant Planner Krasnove noted she is representing Planning Manager Watrous' projects in his absence. She added that Staff had updated the Design Review Board roster. Also, the Planning Commission/Design Review Board workshop is on Monday, May 2 and the Council/Design Review Board workshop on May 17, both at 6:00 p.m.

### **D. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

#### **1. 27 JUNO ROAD THOR, MAJOR ADDITION**

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review approval for an addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 27 Juno Road. The applicant is requesting an increase of the size of the existing residence by constructing an addition that would mirror the existing master bedroom extension. The subject residence is a 1,500-square-foot L-shaped one-story structure with three bedrooms, two bathrooms, living room, kitchen and two-car garage.

Ed Thor, owner, discussed his project.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Bird stated that no variance is required and that the applicants have a beautifully-landscaped home and will do a great job with the proposal.

Boardmember Teiser stated that this would be a modest addition and a continued improvement to the Belveron neighborhood.

**M/S, O'Donnell/Bird (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.**

#### **2. 145 ESPERANZA STREET VENEZIANO/SWANSON, MAJOR ADDITIONS**

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review approval for additions to an existing duplex to be converted in to a single-family residence located at 145 Esperanza Street. The applicant is requesting the addition of 492 square feet of living space and 589 square feet of garage to the existing structure. The subject residence is a 2,644-square-foot two-story structure with two units, each containing two bedrooms, one bathroom, kitchen and living room.

George Bevan, designer, discussed the project. He distributed a materials board. In response to questions, he responded they are not married to the colors and will take into consideration reflectivity, downlighting and colors. He stated that he has no problem with staff's recommendation to darken the color.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Bird stated that this was nice project and would be a fine improvement for the owners and

neighborhood.

Boardmember O'Donnell added that converting the duplex into a single-family dwelling residence would be a plus for the neighbors. He commented that the design was fine.

**M/S, Teiser/Bird (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 additional condition of approval that the final colors are to be reviewed by Staff.**

### **3. 7 HILLCREST ROAD STROTZ, NEW DWELLING**

The applicant has submitted a request to construct a new single-family dwelling located at 7 Hillcrest Drive. The previous application (File No. 704150) for this property was withdrawn by the applicant after several continuations by the Design Review Board. The subject project has now been submitted as a new application with an updated design. The proposed home would be a two-story structure above a three-car garage and basement. The basement level would include a laundry room, workshop, garage and un-excavated crawl space. The first floor would consist of a living room and terrace, office, bathroom, dining room, kitchen and family room. The upper level would consist of three bedrooms and three bathrooms.

Gus Strotz, owner, stated that he gave permission to the sanitary district to use his land to repair the slide promulgated by the sanitary district. He commented that after finishing stabilization of the house, the owner of One Hillcrest Road dug away the hillside without a permit. He stated that an engineer had looked at the hillside and suggested that a stabilization report be completed. He stated that the owners of One Hillcrest Road planted twelve trees along Mr. Strotz's eastern boundary line, which would block the view of 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard and take away more than one-half of their water view. He distributed photographs of the neighbors' homes to show the types of buildings in the neighborhood, and stated that the proposed house would be in keeping with the neighborhood. He said that he did not want to build into the hillside because he believes such houses eventually experience mold and dry rot. He stated that he tried to move the building as far as possible, but that he cannot move it any further because he wants vehicles to exit the property by driving forward. He stated that the house would be stepped, though he did not want to, and would now be 25 feet from the property line. He stated that he did not want a hall on the bedroom level, but had to include one when he modified the building. He stated that the building cannot be stepped any more. He stated that homes are different than 24 years ago, and now every bedroom has a bathroom, and that he had done as much as possible to design to meet today's standards while also being compatible with the neighborhood. He said that he did not want to move the driveway gate. He commented that because of the curvature of the road, a visitor coming down the road might think his driveway is a continuance of the road.

Chair Beales noted the Town's objective is to have space between the road and the gate. Mr. Strotz responded that he would have to remove the gate because he cannot move the house further.

Sophia Kingman asked about a light tunnel in the roof plan and whether it will be reflective. She stated that the proposed fence was inaccurately drawn. She stated that there is no drawing showing the retaining wall in front and she would like to know what the height and color of those walls would be.

Paritem Poonian stated that the new design was an improvement for his views compared with the previous design. He acknowledged that the site is a difficult place to engineer. He stated that he had contacted Mr. Strotz via his architect, whose recommendations may not be significant but are important to him. He stated the view is very important and he agreed with the neighbors about the twelve trees being planted. He stated his architect had tried to resolve concerns with Mr. Strotz before this meeting.

Ed McEachron, architect, stated he is not here to object to the building, and agreed that the house had been pushed as far as possible into the hillside, which was a significant improvement. He stated that the bedroom could be pulled back to make it flush with the edge of the family room over the tool shed and eliminate the loggia, which would loom over the Poonians' house, and reduce the mass. He said that the trellis would loom over the deck and they would like it removed. He suggested that the trellis could be attached to the building and give light to the bedroom. He hoped that any new landscaping will not block the Poonians' view, and noted that a tree was proposed to be planted that would grow into their view plane. He said the third parking spot in the garage would still block their view of the bridge and he would like the corner angled so that it does not block the view.

Bill Bordon stated he is confused by Mr. Strotz's statement about the hillside and the relationship to One Hillcrest Drive. He stated that the story poles show how the house would not be integrated into the hillside and would be a looming structure.

Boardmember O'Donnell noted that the hillside stability is a building department concern.

Mr. Borden commented that it is important not to confuse four months of time as progress. He said on an absolute basis, there has not been any great improvement.

Mr. Strotz stated the garage would already be too close to the street. He said that trees could be more of a detriment to the water views from 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard than his building. He said the retaining wall would have a stone facing and would be no higher than six feet, and can be split into two walls if needed. He stated there is a lot of bedrock and he must be sure he can excavate into the bedrock. He said he is happy with the current design, though he preferred the previous design because it was more compact. He commented that a downhill neighbor cannot avoid having another building above. He asked the Board to remember that the house 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard is 130 feet away from his property.

Boardmember Teiser stated that he appreciated that Mr. Strotz took the Board's recommendations into consideration, and he felt that this was a much improved design. He said he walked the property of One Hillcrest Drive and saw that any structure will pose some kind of mass above that home, but that is the nature of the topography and the neighborhood. He stated that he stood on the deck at 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard, and the view corridors would be adequate, with minimal interference of what should be considered to be a borrowed view. He stated that the applicant had done a reasonable amount of shifting the house and accommodating the neighbors.

Boardmember Bird stated that she also appreciated the applicant's efforts; however, she felt that some problems still exist. She said while this was a beautiful home design, and she understood the desire to preserve the integrity of the house, the design had been pushed into the hill more than stepped into the hill. She stated that the house still looked very large. She felt that improvements could still be made to the house.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that this was a great example of how the Design Review Board works. He said that the applicant had been a bit combative in these meetings, and if he had been more collaborative, a very fair compromise would have been reached. He said Mr. McEachron's suggestions are very well taken but pushing in the corner bedroom, while improving the situation for the Poonians, would eliminate the views from that bedroom. He felt that the trellis and redesign of the bedroom were not that important. He said the Board should require that the landscaping on the southern side of the property not impede the view of the Poonians, and that this should be reviewed by Staff.

Chair Beales noted that the Board had not suggested that the house be dug into the hill, but that the Hillside Guidelines state houses should be stepped into the hill, which has been done. He noted that the Town has a view ordinance and trees can be trimmed, but a building is permanent. He said that the view impact for the Poonians would be on the periphery of their view and almost qualifies as a borrowed view in that it looks across a low level on a hillside. He said there would be a new building on the site, with homes below and above, which is how it is for everyone in Tiburon. He said that the Hillside Guidelines policies about stepping a house into the hillside is intended to reduce the looming nature of homes.

**M/S, O'Donnell/Teiser (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 additional conditions of approval requiring that landscaping be reviewed by Staff to minimize view blockage for the home at 305 Trestle Glen Boulevard, and that the driveway gate is not approved.**

#### **4. 6 AUDREY COURT KING, ADDITIONS/VARIANCES/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION**

The applicant is requesting design review approval to construct a two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 6 Audrey Court. The ground floor of the addition would include a two-car garage, an exercise room, a half bathroom and an addition to an existing den. The upper floor would consist of a new master bedroom suite. A deck would extend to the front of the master bedroom. A new entry porch would also be added to the existing residence. Variances are requested for reduced front yard setback and excess lot coverage, along with a floor area exception.

Mark Groody, designer, discussed the project. He stated the owners feel that it would be too expensive to lower the building one foot when this would not be a significant improvement for the uphill view. He said that trees and a large house on the corner already block the views of uphill neighbors, and added that the applicant cannot currently see San Francisco or Sausalito. He said that he had not visited the neighbors' house.

Boardmember O'Donnell asked about the possibility of lowering the addition to help the neighbors. Mr. Groody responded that the existing roof and floors would have to be lowered and he thought that the upper floor could be redesigned.

Chair Beales stated that while a flat roof on the addition might not be attractive, it could mitigate the neighbors' view concerns. Mr. Groody concurred.

Randy Higashida stated that the second-story master bedroom would be directly in front of his house, and would block many significant views. He said that his slot view of Richardson Bay would be lost. He said that his view of the mountains and horizon from the patio to the deck and pool would be impacted and the addition would intrude onto the privacy of his pool. He stated that his ceremonial rooms face the bay and the family room's view of the bay and city would be blocked. He stated that the project would violate the principles of the Hillside Guidelines. He stated that the addition would provide the applicants with views while blocking his views. He felt that the requested variances and floor area exception were not reasonable and that the required findings could not be made. He stated that the Board had previously recommended hiring an architect, and he felt that the current plans may not be accurate. He suggested an alternative solution to extend the house into the rear yard to reduce the impact on views from his home and those of the neighbors. In response to questions, he stated that his family room is on the lower level in the center of the home, and that the living and dining rooms are upstairs.

Boardmember O'Donnell asked about the extensive clearing of the lot. Mr. Higashida responded that he is in the process of landscaping but first wanted to see how the project would impact him. He said that the applicant had asked him to trim these trees and repair the fence.

Boardmember O'Donnell asked if he is amenable to the applicant reducing the height of his tree to open the view corridor to the south in exchange for approval of this project. Mr. Higashida stated that he has views because the trees were trimmed, and described the history of tree trimming issues between himself and the applicant.

Boardmember Bird asked if flattening the roof would help. Mr. Higashida stated he would have to see that reflected in story poles. He said that he could not tell if the story poles were accurate and felt that the story poles should be lower.

Assistant Planner Krasnove indicated that the story poles for this project had not been certified.

Jeannie Higashida stated reiterated her husband's concerns about the potential view impacts that would be caused by the proposed addition. She said that she had told the applicant two years ago that such an addition would block the views from her home. She said a large portion of their views has been taken away since they bought their property seventeen years ago, and said that it was the applicant's responsibility to trim their trees.

Boardmember O'Donnell explained that residents have a right to have trees trimmed under the View Ordinance. Mr. Higashida stated he is in the process of doing this.

Tom Fall stated that he was concerned about light pollution. He said that the addition would not impede his view but he would see the side and rear windows, which would be in line with his direct view to the Golden Gate Bridge. He said that lighting could impede his view of the bridge. He asked that if the project is approved, that the applicant should be required to keep his trees at or below the roofline. He said there are trees on the side, front and rear of the subject property.

Michael King, owner, stated that he was dismayed at the Higashidas' comments, some of which he felt were exaggerated. He stated that he annually trimmed the trees for many years. He noted that at the last meeting Boardmember Figour stated that the Higashidas' views did not seem to be quite as blocked as they had indicated. He stated that he had reduced the encroachment into the front yard setback by at least half, and that the second story was pushed back to the side yard setback. He stated there would be three new windows on the rear elevation, but that he could do without them.

Chair Beales stated that the issue is people do not want to see the lights in the windows, but that the windows did not have to be removed. Mr. Groody stated that the windows would be small and not in a living area. He said there would be no uplighting in the rear or in the garden. He said that the tapes with the story poles reflected the roofline, but the top of the story poles did not.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that this lot is undersized for the zone and the building envelope is toward the front because of the topography of the site. He said that he could support a variance for excess lot coverage since it would be less than one percent along with a minor floor area exception. He said that the requested front yard setback is almost an existing condition so there is not much of a variance there. He stated that view blockage is the issue, and felt that the project was a minor impingement. He said that the modified design has been reduced in scale. He stated that the Hillside Guidelines emphasize views from the primary living area, and that the Higashidas' primary living areas are upstairs where there would no view blockage. He recommended flattening the roof to bring it down nineteen inches to lessen any view impacts.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the pictures presented by the Higashidas with blocked out images were misleading because they did not take into account the existing view blockage. He said that the addition would not significantly worsen views. He stated that people have the right to expand their property in a modest way. He agreed that flattening the roof would help the views.

Boardmember Bird stated she visited the site several times. She said that while the Higashidas call the downstairs family room a ceremonial room, their primary living areas are upstairs. She stated that she would not support this project if the view from the primary living area would be blocked. She recommended flattening the roof, and she stated that the variances are not excessive.

Chair Beales stated that he agreed that the Higashidas' primary living areas are on the upper floor. He said that technically, a family room is a ceremonial room, but in this instance, that serves as an excuse to maintain the views from the deck and bedrooms. He said that gaining views from bedrooms at the expense of another's view from the primary living areas would not be approved by the Board. He said that the extra height of the roof ridgeline was unnecessary.

**M/S, Teiser/Bird (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 additional condition of approval to require that the roof be flattened to eliminate the roof ridgeline.**

#### **5. 696 HAWTHORNE DRIVE ARBAB, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE**

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 696 Hawthorne 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. The house would continue to have a one-story design. The existing living room would be converted into a family room, and the existing kitchen would be expanded. A new dining room and a new living room would be added to the front of the house. The existing three bedrooms and two bathrooms to the rear of the house would be expanded, resulting in four bedrooms and three bathrooms. A variance is requested for excess lot coverage.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, discussed the project. He stated that he tried to preserve the uphill neighbors' views with the one-story building and low, flat roof. He said that he tried to speak to the neighbors who wrote letters of concerns, but he learned only last week of their concerns and has not heard back from three neighbors. He said that the chimney would be two feet above the existing roof height. He said that he would make every effort to keep the magnolia tree.

Ardi Arbab, owner, stated that the story pole is six feet away from the center of the tree. He said that he will cooperate with whatever the neighbors want.

Peter Shannahan stated that he lives directly across the street and was concerned about the view blockage from his deck, where he spends a lot of time.

Alice Cannistraci stated that she was taken back by the story holes. She said that the home would be too large for the area. She said that she did not want to deny neighbors anything, but felt that the home should be scaled back. She said this is an older neighborhood with personal space for the neighbors.

Boardmember Bird asked if she objected to the proposed lot coverage. Ms. Cannistraci responded that the lot is over-covered and the height is a concern. She stated that the building feels close to her. She said that the architect said he could put bushes on the side but she wants less, not more.

Mr. Sadrieh stated that he would be glad to alleviate any view impacts and other concerns. He felt that this would be a borderline situation.

Boardmember O'Donnell suggested that the project be continued, and stated that this was a classic example of an overbuilt lot. He noted that the application requests a 42 percent lot coverage, while the property is zoned for a maximum of 30 percent. He said that the feeling of this mature neighborhood is that of a seaside cottage community. He said that this would be too much house on too little space, and an imposing structure on a small lot. He stated that the applicant is trying to squeeze too much on this lot despite allowances often given to one story designs when a second story is not a possibility. He said that there is not too much of a view blockage from the Shannanans' deck, and the current height is all right.

Boardmember Teiser stated that he also stood on the Shannanans' deck and did not see a real view blockage, even from a sitting position. He agreed that this project represented overbuilding on a small lot and needed to be rethought.

Boardmember Bird stated that she also looked across from Mr. Shannanan's deck, and the design makes the project look very blocky, and raising the height makes it less palatable. She said that the home would be too big for the lot. She stated while she appreciates wanting to improve the house, respect must be paid to the neighbors on both sides and the applicant must consider the precedent-setting capability of this house.

Chair Beales stated that the house would be too tall and makes the house look massive. He said that the 9.5 foot ceiling height would be a luxury, but noted that the current roof peak is just a small section of the house, and that an entire roof at this height would become a block. He said that the ceiling height should be lowered. He felt that the Shannanans would have a modest view blockage. He said that lowering the height would make the view issues go away. He said that there also is a problem with lot coverage, noting that the floor area ratio is a guideline to keep the mass of a building under control and is not an entitlement. He said that the Board is often willing to look at lot coverage variances to allow for expansions of homes without going to a second floor, but only within reason.

**M/S, Bird/O'Donnell (passed 4-0) to continue this item to the May 19, 2005 meeting.**

## **6. 689 HILARY DRIVE TSANG, MAJOR ADDITIONS/ VARIANCE**

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 689 Hilary Drive. The property is currently developed with a one-story residence. The proposed project would include the construction of a new upper floor to the house and significant renovations to the ground floor. Much of the interior of the ground floor would be demolished, with four bedrooms eliminated and new configurations for the living room, family room, kitchen, dining room and entry. Much of the existing family room and a portion of the existing living room would be demolished as well. The new upper floor would hold a master bedroom suite, three additional bedrooms and bathrooms and a second family room. A variance is requested for reduced side yard setback.

Ignatius Tsang, owner and architect, stated that the house is not in good condition and could have been demolished. He acknowledged that most homes along Hilary Drive are single-story but there are second-story homes nearby. He said that he designed a four bedroom home due to the proximity of the site to St. Hilary

and Del Mar Schools. He explained meetings he had with the neighbors to discuss the project design, and has proposed modifications in response to their comments. He said that he could have added to the front of the house, but it would block the view from his neighbor's window. He said he wanted to add a trellis to break the verticality of the building in front. In reference to the four bedrooms upstairs, he stated that young children should be on the same floor. He said windows on the second floor would not be massive, and that the family room in the rear would respect privacy. He said the existing house was built with a six-foot side setback before the town was incorporated. He said that the ground floor ceiling height would be nine feet. He said that the house would have a 6:12 roof slope, which could be reduced to a 4:12 slope, which is the minimum for non-tar and gravel roof, and the height would become 27 feet. He said that he would remove the window that a neighbor complained about.

Boardmember O'Donnell asked if it was necessary to have four bathrooms on the second story. Mr. Tsang responded that it was, but that he could remove a bathroom and enlarge a bedroom. Boardmember O'Donnell stated that he mentioned this in terms of reducing the floor area of the second floor.

Jocelyn MacDonald stated that she was concerned about the second story design. She said that she had asked the applicant to eliminate the upper story, submit a lighting plan, and attend a Design Review Board meeting to understand building in Tiburon. She said that the house would be out of character with the neighborhood. She said that seven directly-affected neighbors had discussed their concerns with Mr. Tsang and he had stated that he would withdraw his design, but he had not. She said that neighbors have asked him to expand horizontally. She said that there is a drainage problem from the hill that should be addressed. She asked the Board to consider the integrity of the single-story neighborhood and keep it that way. She said that she represents the Hawthorne Terrace Homeowners Association.

Robert Chandler stated he and neighbors have raised children in their small houses. He said that he saw this as a developer building a multistory home in his neighborhood to make money. He said that homes in Hawthorne Terrace are small and that this house would be increased to a size far beyond that of the neighbors'. He said this structure would not be in harmony with its surroundings, as required by the original CC&Rs for this subdivision. He asked that this massive structure not be developed in his neighborhood.

Jennifer Isaac showed a photograph of how a similar house affects her. She explained how that owner cannot sell the house, and suggested that the applicant consider this. She stated that she would not be directly impacted by the project.

Steve Bendinelli stated that a two-story home would not fit with the character and scale of the neighborhood. He stated that privacy factors are a concern, and that the overall height of the structure would dominate other houses. He said that every letter on record opposes the project, which reaffirms the spirit and code of Tiburon. He stated Hawthorne Terrace is an area of homogeneous, simple, single-story homes, and should be left that way.

Allan Honda, representing Hardy Honda, stated that the project would have many impacts on surrounding properties. He said that the house would be out of character with other homes in the area, which are ranch style. He commented that privacy and looming impacts should also be addressed.

Jennie Kreines stated that a key factor is the way the house sits on the land, about ten feet above street level, so this would appear to be a four-story building that she will have to look at. She said that the story poles show that this would be a massive structure. She asked that the Board consider asking the applicant to create a different footprint for the house. She recommended that only a partial second story be built or set the house back into the hill. She said that the current design would be an eyesore to the neighborhood.

Eric Hestenes stated that the scale of the building and privacy issues are his concerns. He said that it is important that the community invest and improve their properties, but he felt that the house could be better designed to address the concerns of the community.

Judy Agajan stated that the applicant showed her the plans and she did not think it would affect her because her living areas are directed toward the water; however, she believed that if one house this size is built, more would be built. She said that other neighborhoods have large homes and people who want to live in large homes should live in those neighborhoods. She said that the large amount of lights in the house would affect a lot of neighbors.

Mr. Tsang said that the opposition expressed at the neighborhood meeting came as a surprise to him. He stated that this lot is larger than neighboring lots to the west, and that expanding on the ground floor would not be that easy. He said that he believes in children playing in yards, and from the kitchen and dining room, he can watch his children in the yard. He said he could reduce the size of windows or plant trees.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the neighbors understand the story poles, and he felt that this would be a large project for the neighborhood. He stated that the project would be at the maximum floor area, and that the floor area ratio is not a right, but rather a guide to control the massiveness of a house. He said that in other neighborhoods like Bel Aire, second stories can work, but only when they are pulled in or set back so they do not present such a mass at the front of the house. He said that the house needs to be scaled down.

Boardmember Bird stated that this would be a beautiful house and she appreciated that the applicant addressed concerns about changing the roof. She said that the height of the house in the setting of the neighborhood was the concern. She stated that the neighbors are saying they do not want a large two-story structure in their midst and are not willing to have such a precedent set in the neighborhood. She said the house would be out of character with the neighborhood. She said that a second story that would be pushed back or a 1.5-story house might be acceptable, but this design would be too large for the neighborhood. She agreed that there are other areas in Tiburon where such a large house would be compatible. She recommended that the application be continued to allow work to be done so that everyone would be happy with the project.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that precedent and scale are the issues with this project. He said that this house is out of scale with the lot. He said that the height of the house must be reduced. He said that a second story could be appropriate because it is a narrow lot that extends to the back. However, he stated the second story should be small and stealthily designed. He said there is extra room that does not need to be there.

Chair Beales concurred, adding that the house would be maxed out in floor area, which is not an entitlement. He said there are other homes in Belveron on Juno Road where the second floor was centered over the middle of the house and there is a fair amount of space on the sides, which makes the houses less looming for neighbors. He said that a second floor could work but must be made much smaller with less height. He said that making the second floor smaller would solve a lot of problems.

**M/S, Bird/McDonnell (passed 4-0) to continue this item to the May 19, 2005 meeting.**

#### **E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #6 OF THE 4/21/05 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Amendments include:

Page 1, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line to state, "...because he could not make it work. The whole building..."

Page 1, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, insert “completely” between “not” and “give back.”

Page 2, 1<sup>st</sup> line, change “if” to “and.”

Page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line to state, “. . .but their view impact is a side view.”

Page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, change “space” to “bedroom.” 4<sup>th</sup> line, change “volume” to “mass impact.”

Page 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line, change “mass” to “wall.”

Page 3, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, change “the document” to “Mr. Snow’s document.” At the end of the paragraph, add, “anywhere in town.”

Page 3, 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph, change “watched” to “protected.”

Page 3, 8<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, change “watched” to “addressed in future applications.”

Page 4, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, change “than” to “in.” Delete “started with.”

Page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line, delete “She hopes.” Add “is” after “project.” 7<sup>th</sup> line to state, “a responsibility not to allow additional oversized houses to be built on the hill.”

Page 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line, after “upgraded,” add “and this project does not violate the goals of the new General Plan.” 6<sup>th</sup> line to state, “. . .showing similar changes to east Belveron.”

Page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, change “which raises the fact” to “and noted.”

Page 5, 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line to state, “. . .upgrades are improving the neighborhood character and being sensitive to the neighbors’ concerns.”

Page 5, 9<sup>th</sup> paragraph, change “third” to “fourth.”

Page 6, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line to state, “. . .in the back, and the project grew from its initial concept and needed a variance.” Change “realized the massiveness of such a project” to “experienced a growing project.”

**M/S, Teiser/O’Donnell (passed 4-0) to approve the minutes as amended.**

## **F. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.