

**ACTION MINUTES #3**

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2006  
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

---

**A. ROLL CALL:**

**Present -** Boardmembers Beales Doyle and Teiser  
**Absent -** Chair O'Donnell and Boardmember Bird  
**Ex-Officio -** Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Williams

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**

**C. STAFF BRIEFING**

**D. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

- |                            |                     |                     |                           |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1.                         | 735 Hawthorne Drive | Shelhart and Coffin | New SFD/Variance          |
| <b>CONTINUED TO 3/2/06</b> |                     |                     |                           |
| 2.                         | 604 Ridge Road      | Cohan               | Additions/Variance        |
| <b>CONTINUED TO 3/2/06</b> |                     |                     |                           |
| 3.                         | 318 Karen Way       | Leszczynski         | Additions <b>APPROVED</b> |
| 4.                         | 36 Mercury Drive    | Vasquez             | Additions/Variance.       |
| <b>APPROVED</b>            |                     |                     |                           |
| 5.                         | 75 Seafirth Road    | Ng                  | Additions/Variance        |
| <b>APPROVED</b>            |                     |                     |                           |

**F. MINUTES OF THE 2/2/06 D.R.B. MEETING – APPROVED AS AMENDED**

**G. ADJOURNMENT – 9:17 P.M.**

**MINUTES #3**

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 16, 2006**

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

**A. ROLL CALL**

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

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Krasnove and  
Minutes Clerk Williams

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were none.

**C. STAFF BRIEFING**

Associate Planner Krasnove noted that the Town Council considered the appeal of the project at 430 Ridge Road and partially granted the appeal with extra conditions of approval related to skylights and solar panels. The 2 Audrey Court project is on the agenda for the March 2, 2006 Design Review Board Meeting. The Town Council formed a sub-committee to consider the consultant's report on the Community Development Department audit and would like a member of the Design Review Board to volunteer to join.

Planning Manager Watrous noted zoning text amendments that have been brought before the Design Review Board regarding the revised definition of floor area to include crawl spaces and cantilevered spaces, the wet bar definition, safety railing issue and noise generating equipment were given first reading by the Town Council on February 15, 2006; the second reading is scheduled for next week and the amendments will go into effect thirty days after.

**NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

**1. 735 HAWTHORNE DRIVE SHELHART/COFFIN, NEW DWELLING/  
VARIANCES**

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new single-family dwelling on property located at 735 Hawthorne Drive. Approvals had previously been granted for construction of additions to the single-family dwelling on the property. However, as more than 50% of the existing house has now been demolished as part of the construction of this project, an application has now been filed for construction of a new residence. Variances are requested for reduced side and rear yard setbacks.

Suzanne Shelhart & Julie Coffin owners, discussed the project. The owners stated they had met with neighbors to discuss concerns about the project. The neighbor on the north side asked to remove a post that was protruding beyond the house and the owners complied and had the plans altered. The neighbor on the south side was concerned with the windows, so the owner changed the plans so that the windows are frosted and used for ventilation purposes only. The neighbor also wanted the roofline changed and the owners agreed to the change. The neighbor also wanted the driveway not to have so much pavement and the owners changed the plans so that the driveway curves into the garage. There will be more green grass between the two houses. The third neighbor (in

the rear) requested the roof be hipped back on the bedroom, lowered by one foot and the windows removed. The owner agreed to move the roof back and is working on a solution for the windows.

Boardmember Teiser noted that when looking at the story poles, it appears the roof height has changed. Ms. Shelhart replied that the roof height is the same.

Gus Ezcurra noted that he sent a letter to the Design Review Board addressing his concerns about the privacy issue on the south side of the house, the closeness of the fence line, the number of windows on the plan, and the height of the house. Mr. Ezcurra noted that he met with the applicants and believes the concerns have been met by making the windows opaque, curving the driveway into the garage and sloping the roof back. Mr. Ezcurra would like to come to an agreement on the number of windows on the bathroom side.

Jeff Carlin noted that his house shares the back fence with the subject property and is concerned that the approved variance was at a very generous rate of ten feet off of the typical variance, closeness of the house and the height of the roof due to the new foundation which will infringe on their view. Mr. Carlin noted he met with the owners and discussed the issues. The Carlins would prefer to have no windows in the back of the house and a hip roof put in and lowering the roofline at least one foot or more to compensate for the raise of the house. Mr. Carlin noted he would like to see new set of plans and new story poles reflecting the changes.

Lisa Carlin expressed concern about privacy issues and noted that the roofline of the main part of house is two feet higher and will greatly impact the view from their master suite. Mrs. Carlin also requested the rear windows be removed to buffer the sound from the backyard.

Chair Beales asked from where the windows would be visible and Mrs. Carlin stated from the second floor.

Ms. Shelhart stated that the proposed roofline would be the same as what was previously on the house.

Jeff Phillips, Trinity Builders, noted that the original roofline of the house running north to south is the same height of fourteen feet and is not being raised. He said that the roofline facing 730 Hilary Drive is currently at thirteen feet and that the floor elevation has not changed.

Boardmember Teiser asked the applicants if they would like a continuance to finalize the drawings and work out the issues with the neighbors. Boardmember Teiser stated that with so many changes and the neighbors being uncomfortable, the application should be continued and reviewed by Staff.

Boardmember Doyle noted that the design is appropriate for the neighbors, but with so many changes he was unsure what would be approved. He supported a continuance so he could see final plans and story poles.

Chair Beales stated that everything goes much smoother if changes to the drawings are made before the meeting and reminded the Carlins that when living in a two-story house there will be lots of visible windows.

**M/S, Teiser/Doyle (passed 3-0) to continue the matter to the March 2, 2006 Design Review Board Meeting.**

**2. 604 RIDGE ROAD COHAN, ADDITIONS/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION**

The applicant has submitted a request to make additions to an existing single-family dwelling located at 604 Ridge Road. The applicant is requesting to remove the existing detached garage, fill in the space between the guest house and primary structure, and make various landscape improvements. The addition would allow for a new media room on the lower level, and a new playroom and office on the upper level. The roof of the addition would be used as a terrace to be accessed from the new playroom and office. A floor area exception is also requested.

Jamie Cohan, owner discussed the project.

John Winder, architect, discussed the project. Mr. Winder noted that Cohans will move the lighting so the Fletchers are not affected. Mr. Winder also noted that although neighbors were concerned with the roof deck, a trellis and plants will be installed.

Penny Magrane, landscape architect, discussed the project and noted that issues of soil stability and drainage will be addressed. The plan includes the removal of 26 trees to be replaced with 63 trees and the installation of a privacy hedge. Pool equipment will be completely soundproof and the south hedge is four to five lower.

Chair Beales expressed concern about tall trees, and where they will be placed and asked for the maximum height of trees being proposed. Ms. Magrane replied that the current planting plan had been revised and no trees will be taller than 16 feet. She offered to submit a planting plan with conditions which would meet with the approval of the neighbors.

Boardmember Doyle asked about the shrub than can be seen when driving down the driveway on the left (Erigeron Karvinskianus) and if more would be planted, Ms. Magrane replied no.

Chris Craiker, architect working with owner of property immediately to the south, stated that the main trouble is the roof deck as it would add mass to the structure and the tower as it would compromise privacy. Mr. Craiker also noted that his client would like more

ornamental trees to be planted to protect privacy between the neighbors and stated redwood and pine trees are messy and unnecessary.

Boardmember Teiser asked about the impact on neighbors, to which Mr. Craiker replied the tower is very close to the Beckers, privacy will be compromised and the backyard and front yard would be exposed.

Jerry Riessen expressed concern about the trees and lights and requested details on the tree placement as well as species and maximum heights.

Bruce Brightman expressed concern with lighting, privacy, noise, and sounds. Mr. Brightman felt that the plants along Ridge Road should stay and noted that he applied for and received an encroachment permit for them to be there. Mr. Brightman also expressed concern about hooded downlights and visibility of the lights. He stated he would like to know the size of trees and requested the Board to visit his property to view his concerns about the privacy issues. Mr. Brightman noted that the proposed area for the outdoor kitchen is close to the property line. He expressed concern about the fountain and suggested it be set to go off automatically at night. Mr. Brightman also expressed concern about additional hardscape and water issues and requested a lattice covering to protect views of the swimming pool fixtures.

Boardmember Teiser suggested that Mr. Brightman could grow his own landscape screening.

Boardmember Doyle asked if the lights on Mr. Brightman's property were timed. Mr. Brightman replied the timer is set for one minute.

Jeff Fletcher stated that he was very appreciative of what the Cohans have done to meet his concerns and stated he had just reviewed plans of the roof trellis, but was thinking of a wall or something solid. Mr. Fletcher noted concerns regarding lighting and noise coming from the roof terrace and would like to see specific plans regarding the privacy barrier. Mr. Fletcher noted he would like Eucalyptus tree #22 kept in place, but if it needed to be removed, it be replaced by something similar. He said that would also like Eucalyptus trees 1, 2 and 3 removed and replaced with evergreen trees to help with privacy.

Michael Tyler expressed concerns about trees and outdoor lighting. Mr. Tyler noted that he thinks the roof terrace is a terrible idea for the entire town and asked the Board to deny the request.

Boardmember Teiser asked what the deck would be used for and was informed it would be a quiet space for the owner to relax.

Boardmember Teiser stated it was hard to justify roof terraces and that there was really no justification for an occasional place to go out and sit that creates issues for neighbors on both sides. Boardmember Teiser stressed that all applicants are reviewed on a case by

case basis, and being that trees and lighting are such an issue, detailed plans are needed. Boardmember Teiser noted that the building expansion is acceptable and planting hedges will provide privacy, although the hedges would not buffer noise. Boardmember Teiser also noted that people have a right to entertain and that there is limited space on the property for outdoor entertaining.

Boardmember Doyle noted that the landscaping proposal is brilliant and thought that there are ways to alleviate noise issues, but would like to see more detailed landscaping plans. He noted that the Cohans are very flexible. Boardmember Doyle also recalled that a previous deck reviewed by the Board interfered with someone else's privacy and thought the solution of putting in a trellis is a quick fix. Boardmember Doyle noted he had no problem with the deck, as it could just as easily be a room up there and also had no objections to the cooking area as it seems like a great use of space. He requested an updated landscaping plan and different solution for the roof area and noted he would be in favor of the project with some of the concessions.

Chair Beales noted that this is an infill project, but added that the stair tower forces the chimney higher. He supported the enclosed spaces being added, but felt the roof deck is a bad idea. Chair Beales also expressed that the landscaping is going in the right direction, but suggested a continuance to prepare specific landscaping plans. He noted that the issue of downlights being visible from lower properties has to do with placement of lights and is workable, and that people are entitled to use outdoor spaces, but should just be respectful of neighbors.

Ms. Magrane stated that she will submit landscape plans to the Design Review Board on February 21, 2006.

**M/S, Teiser/Doyle (3-0) to continue the application until the March 2, 2006 Design Review Board Meeting.**

**3. 318 KAREN WAY LESZCZYNSKI, ADDITIONS**

The applicant has submitted a request to make an addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 329 Karen Way. A new master bedroom/bathroom and laundry room would be constructed on the main level. A storage mezzanine is proposed as an upper level addition. The proposed floor plan would include 3 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms, with an expanded kitchen, living room, family room area and upper level storage area.

John Leszczyński, owner, discussed the project, noted that the staff report was appropriate and asked for approval.

Dan Roberts noted that the main impact would be the intrusiveness in the pool, patio and backyard area, which would allow a view into the backyard. Mr. Roberts would like the windows removed and a skylight added.

Cleveland Justis noted that the neighbors have reviewed the plans and are in support of the project.

Mr. Leszczynski noted that a skylight was not used as the new structure will be in the sunniest part of the yard, and expressed willingness to change the windows, but would like the airflow to be maintained. Mr. Leszczynski proposed reducing the windows by half and raising them above head level.

Boardmember Teiser asked about the high window placement, and Mr. Leszczynski replied he would like to be able to stand up and look out the windows.

Boardmember Doyle stated that he approved of the window changes as privacy is a big issue in the neighborhood.

Boardmember Teiser said that he had no problem with space being used for storage and had no objections to it being a small office. He noted that the project does not greatly impact the neighbors and there are no privacy issues.

Chair Beales noted that the applicant did mention possibly using the proposed space for a computer room for the children, and that it looks like a second story. Chair Beales noted that he would be happier if addition were at the back of the house as it is a second story and habitable space that counts as square footage. Chair Beales expressed concern about setting a precedent, but noted there were no view impacts.

**M/S, Teiser/Doyle (passed 3-0) 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 requirements that landscape plans be approved by staff, that the addition be classified as a habitable room, and that the west side windows be changed to opaque ventilation to be approved by Staff.**

#### **4. 36 MERCURY DRIVE VASQUEZ, ADDITIONS/VARIANCES**

The applicant has submitted a request to make additions to an existing single-family dwelling located at 36 Mercury Avenue. The applicant is requesting to expand the existing two-car garage and living room and add a new master bedroom and bathroom. The additions would be located at the front and left side of the house. Variances are requested for reduced side yard setback and excess lot coverage.

Mark Vasquez, owner, discussed the project and noted the project has the support of neighbors.

There was no public comment

Boardmember Doyle noted the plans are appropriate as well as a nice solution and he supports the application.

Boardmember Teiser noted that the plans are appropriate and would raise the value of all properties in the vicinity.

Chair Beales noted that the side yard variance was just a continuation of the existing line of the garage.

**M/S, Doyle/Teiser (passed 3-0) 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. 75 SEAFIRTH ROAD NG, ADDITIONS/VARIANCE**

The applicant has submitted a request to convert an existing carport into a two-car garage on the property located at 75 Seafirth Road. The subject project would include installing garage doors and filling in the side openings with glass. The roof and side walls would remain in their current location. The front of the carport would be enclosed with wood garage doors containing a row of windows. The garage door would be located on the front property line and approximately 4 feet, 3 inches from the roadway edge. A variance is requested for reduced front yard setback.

**M/S, Teiser/Doyle (passed 3-0) 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. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #2 OF THE 02/16/06 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Amendments include:

Page 3, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, insert “they would be trimmed” after “replied”

Page 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> Paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, insert “not from the bottom of the foundation” after “grade”

Page 5, 6<sup>th</sup> Paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, change “1<sup>st</sup>” to “first”

Page 5, 7<sup>th</sup> Paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, insert “and is routed away from the Fosters” after “architect”

Page 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, replace “and” with “but”

Page 6, 4<sup>th</sup> Paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, change “Boyle” to “Doyle”

Page 6, 10<sup>th</sup> Paragraph, add “but cautioned about the BBQ built under the eaves and said he supports the application.”

Page 6, last Paragraph, remove “cautioned about the BB built under the eaves and said he supports the application.”

**M/S, Teiser/Doyle (passed 3-0) to approve the minutes as amended.**

**G. ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.