

ACTION MINUTES #21

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2006
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

- A. ROLL CALL: Present:** Boardmembers Beales, Doyle and Frymier
Absent: Chair Bird and Boardmember Teiser
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler,
Assistant Planner Phillips and Minutes Clerk Hennessy
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
- D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
1. 1652 Tiburon Blvd. Main St. Properties Signs **APPROVED**
- E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
2. 9 Acela Drive Dietz New Dwelling/Variance **APPROVED**
- F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
3. 220 Blackfield Drive Winters Addition/Variance **APPROVED**
4. 1896 Mountain View Beaudan/Kawawa New Dwelling/Variations/Floor Area Exception
CONTINUED TO 2/1/07
5. 4 Bartel Court Konstin New Dwelling/Variations **CONTINUED TO 1/18/07**
- G. MINUTES OF THE 11/16/06 D.R.B. MEETING - APPROVED AS WRITTEN**
- H. CONSIDERATION OF CANCELLATION OF DECEMBER 21, 2006 AND JANUARY 4, 2007
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETINGS – MEETINGS CANCELLED**
- I. ADJOURNMENT - 8:35 PM**

**MINUTES #21
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF DECEMBER 7, 2006**

The meeting was opened at 7:00 P.M. by Vice-Chair Doyle.

- A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Vice-Chair Doyle, Boardmembers Beales and Frymier
Absent: Chair Bird and Boardmember Teiser
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Assistant Planner Phillips, Associate Planner Tyler and Minutes Clerk Hennessy

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were none.

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the item for 4 Bartel Court has been continued to January 18, 2007 at the request of the applicant.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. 1652 TIBURON BOULEVARD MAIN STREET PROPERTIES, SIGNS

The Tamalpais Bank has recently opened within a building located at 1652 Tiburon Boulevard, and the applicant proposes to modify previously approved signage for the bank. A 2' x 14' sign consisting of an internally illuminated metal cabinet with lighting that would only be visible through openings around the sides of the letters on the sign, using what is known as "push-through halo illumination is proposed to be installed above the entrance facing Tiburon Boulevard stating "Tamalpais Bank," and a 2' x 2' sign with the Tamalpais Bank logo of identical construction would be installed on the east face of the building. The sign allowance for this building would be only 14 square feet. The proposed signage would exceed the amount permitted under the Tiburon Sign Ordinance by 18.0 square feet. Therefore, a sign area exception is required.

Robert Rogers, Barber Sign Company, presented the proposed sign application and used a mockup of a portion of the sign to demonstrate what a halo light would look like after dark.

There were no comments from the audience.

The Board discussed the merits of the proposed halo sign as opposed to a sign illuminated with exterior lights.

Scott Pugh, branch manager for Tamalpais Bank, noted this sign could not be used by future tenants. In response to questions from the Board regarding the need for lighting the sign after bank hours, he stated that the purpose of illumination would be to establish the bank's presence in the community for people arriving home after dark. In response to a suggestion from the Board, Mr. Pugh agreed to install a timer on the sign to turn off its illumination some time after sunset.

Boardmember Beales stated that his first reaction was that the sign was unacceptable, noting that Servino's has a backlit sign that did not require internal illumination. However, he noted that such a sign would not work on the canopy of this bank. He said that the proposed sign would not be a shiny, cheap looking sign, and that the anodized brown metal color would make it not look like a box. He said that he could support the sign as requested.

Vice-Chair Doyle stated that he was also initially opposed to the sign, but found the size and materials to be attractive. He stated that he would like to see a timer installed on the sign so it would not be lit all night. He said that scale of the sign would not be overpowering and would fit the size of the building. He stated that indirect lighting of a sign on this building would result in more illumination, and the proposed sign lighting would be more subtle.

Boardmember Frymier expressed concern with any illuminated sign, as an approval could open up the possibility of other, less desirable signs. She agreed that exterior lighting of this sign would be more obtrusive. She stated that she could support the sign, but would like a requirement that the light go off at a certain time.

M/S, Beales/Frymier (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 condition of approval requiring that a timer shall be installed to turn off illumination for the subject signs one hour after sunset.

E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE ROAD

2. 9 ACELA DRIVE DIETZ, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE

The application for a single-family house was first reviewed at the November 2, 2006 Design Review Board meeting and the Board expressed several concerns about the size and mass of the building. The house design has been modified, with the calculated floor area of the proposed house reduced by 70 square feet from 4,460 square feet to 4,390 square feet, and the size of the proposed basement space reduced by 725 square feet from 1,500 square feet to 775 square feet. The lot coverage has been reduced by 450 square feet from 4,430 square feet (18.0%) to 3,980 square feet (16.2%), which is still more than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. Therefore, a variance is again requested for excess lot coverage.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, reviewed the proposal. He described where floor area had been removed from the house and changes to the exterior materials and the amount of windows. He said that they had addressed a neighbor's concern regarding maple trees by replacing them with Glossy Abelia shrubs with a maximum height of approximately 8 feet.

Boardmember Beales noted they were slightly over lot coverage on a lot that was not substandard and in order to get a variance they need to demonstrate some hardship. Mr. Sadrieh noted there are uphill neighbors looking down on this property and the design guidelines require a stepped home so they had to spread out the footprint of the house slightly more.

In response to Vice-Chair Doyle, Mr. Sadrieh stated the exterior stonework was intended to look as much like a masonry building as possible.

The Vice-Chair opened the public hearing.

Tom Ollendorff asked for clarification about the windows, but stated that he otherwise supported the proposal.

There being no further comments, the Vice-Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Beales stated that he appreciated the roof articulation, which provided a more attractive look for the house. However, he was still bothered by the lot coverage, and felt that the only hardship was self-inflicted to achieve the maximum floor area for the house.

Boardmember Frymier stated that the house was still too big and was not in the direction that the Board wants to take. She felt that the revisions were positive, adding that the stonework and articulation made a difference. She suggested that more floor area should be taken out of the upper level, as the top portion of house looks almost institutional. She said that she could not support the project as currently designed.

Vice-Chair Doyle stated that he did not have a problem with the size of the house, given the size of other homes in the neighborhood. He felt that it would not be difficult to adjust the plans to comply with the lot coverage requirement, noting that the 1% variance amounted to 290 square feet. He stated that the changes to the design were helpful, as the roof level is almost below street level, resulting in no view blockage and support from the neighbors.

Planning Manager Watrous suggested that the Board could approve the project while denying the lot coverage variance, with staff checking the modified plans during the building plan check process for compliance with the lot coverage requirement and substantial compliance with the design of the house submitted.

M/S, Beales/Frymier (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 condition of approval requiring that the house design be modified to comply with the lot coverage requirements, with modifications to be checked by Staff during the building plan check process to ensure the design is in substantial conformance with the design of the submitted plans.

F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

3. 220 BLACKFIELD DRIVE WINTER, ADDITION/VARIANCE

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct additions to an existing two-story single-family dwelling. The total floor area for the home including the expansion would be 2,598 square feet, which is 481 square feet less than the maximum floor area permitted for a lot of this size. The proposed addition would extend to within 11.5 feet of the front property line, in lieu of the 15-foot front yard setback required in the R-1 zone. Therefore, a variance is requested for a reduced front yard setback.

Samantha Winter described the proposed addition and explained why the addition could not be moved toward the rear of the property, where it would intrude on certain existing improvements.

The Vice-Chair opened the public hearing. There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Frymier supported the application and noted for the record that a pine tree will be removed.

Boardmember Beales noted that the property line is set back quite a ways from the street, which would set the addition further back from the roadway.

M/S, Beales/Frymier (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.

4. 1896 MOUNTAIN VIEW DRIVE BEAUDAN/KAWAWA, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCES/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct a new single-family dwelling. The proposed structure would create a lot coverage of 3,265 square feet (15.9%) which is over the maximum permitted lot coverage in the RO-2 zoning district (15%). The proposed structure would create a gross floor area of 4,210 square feet, which is 155 square feet over the maximum permitted floor area for a parcel of this size. The applicant is requesting a variance for excess lot coverage and a floor area exception.

A variance is also requested for reduced rear yard setback.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, reviewed the proposal for the proposed home. He stated that their goal was to protect views of uphill neighbors and that they have made changes to accommodate the neighbors' concerns. He described the existing and proposed landscaping. He stated that they constructed a platform so neighbors could see impact of the second story, and that they have submitted nine (9) letters of support from neighbors.

Mr. Sadrieh stated that the variance was necessary to protect neighbors' views, and they were willing to build a privacy fence to block the view of the pool for the downhill neighbors. He distributed photos taken from the platform, and stated that they felt that judicious plantings would maintain the privacy of the neighbors.

The Vice-Chair opened the public hearing.

John Posin explained they faced similar challenges when they bought their house immediately downhill from this site and wound up with one floor instead of two. He stated that he had no intrinsic objection to a two-story home and no objection to the design and color of the house. He said that their biggest problem was the location of the two-story portion of the house, which would be on the highest point of the lot. He felt that the second story component was very dramatic when viewed from their home and showed photos of the story poles taken from their living room. He said that they have worked very hard with the architect and suggested an alternative of a one-story house. He said that he did not want to depend on landscaping to provide privacy.

Emmett O'Donnell noted the applicants had been working on this project for 6 or 7 months and have thoroughly discussed it with neighbors. He felt that the requested variances were appropriate and that the house design would protect the views of three residences.

Ted Eger stated that he strongly supported project.

Lawrence Pell stated that he had not been involved in the process but thought the house should be one story. He supported Mr. Posin's suggestions to make modifications.

Dr. Michael Beaudan, applicant, thanked the neighbors for working with him and stated that he needed the space for his large family.

There being no further comments, the Vice-Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Beales stated that he had a basic problem with the whole project. Although he appreciated the attempt to protect the neighbors' views, there appeared to be a presumption that they are entitled to a view from every room. He thought that a one-story design could be designed on this lot and suggested the applicant ask for a greater lot coverage variance. He said that the rooms could be rearranged with the house better stepped into the hill. He felt that the house needs to be shifted to better fit within the setbacks and made into more of a one-story design. He stated that the pool could be easily moved to the southeast. He did not approve of the roof deck, noting that parasols and other deck furniture might be placed in the neighbors' line of sight, and activity on the deck would be a potential noise problem. He felt that the project needed major reworking, as the house seemed huge and inappropriate.

Boardmember Frymier stated she was very empathetic to applicants and their efforts to accommodate their family. She noted that the Posins had a difficult time getting approvals in order to appease the same neighbors, with their house designed for privacy, and she did not like the pool looming over them. She said that the proposed house needs to be entirely redesigned. She said that she could support variances if the house did not intrude upon the neighbors. She said that the Posins' house is nicely integrated into the hillside, and this house would loom over it.

Vice-Chair Doyle noted that the Board tries to preserve views which are usually towards San Francisco and the Golden Gate Bridge, and if they tried to preserve uphill views nothing would get built in town. He felt that some of the issues could be addressed with screening. He thought the roof top deck was enormous and would be in constant use, creating too much noise. He suggested that the pool be moved to another location to give a better sense of privacy. He encouraged the applicants to look at the project again to massage certain elements, as he did not have as many issues with the project as his colleagues. He found the overall design style to be attractive.

Boardmember Beales stated that he favored a one-story house. He added that he had a problem with finding a hardship for the setback variance, noting that this is a large property with plenty of space upon which to build.

M/S, Frymier/Beales (passed 3-0) to continue the application to the February 1, 2007 meeting.

**5. 4 BARTEL COURT KONSTIN, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCES
CONTINUED TO JANUARY 18, 2007**

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #20 OF THE 11/16/06 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

M/S, Beales/Doyle (passed 3-0) to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2006 meeting as submitted.

**G. CONSIDERATION OF CANCELLATION OF DECEMBER 1, 2006 AND JANUARY 4, 2007
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETINGS**

**M/S, Beales/Frymier (passed 3-0) to cancel the December 1, 2006 and January 4, 2007 Design Review
Board meetings.**

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 P.M.