

ACTION MINUTES #7

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 2007
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

- A. ROLL CALL: Present:** Boardmembers Corcoran, Frymier, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: Chair Doyle
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Associate Planner Tyler
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
- D. CONSENT CALENDAR**
1. 1599 Tiburon Blvd. Zelinsky/Delano Sign Permit **APPROVED**
- E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
2. 1893 Centro West Harb New Dwelling/Variance/Floor Area Exception
CONTINUED TO 5/3/07
- F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
3. 30 Mark Terrace Sams Additions/Variance/Floor Area Exception
CONTINUED TO 5/17/07
4. 673 Hawthorne Drive Young Addition/Variations **CONTINUED TO 5/3/07**
5. 594 Virginia Drive Wood Additions/Variations **APPROVED**
- G. MINUTES OF THE 4/5/07 D.R.B. MEETING - APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- H. ADJOURNMENT - 9:40 PM**

**MINUTES #7
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF APRIL 19, 2007**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Vice-Chair Frymier, Boardmembers Corcoran, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: Chair Doyle
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Associate Planner Tyler

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

David Eklund asked the Board to be cognizant about approving variances which set precedents for other properties in the neighborhood without sufficient consideration for the consequences on other houses. He asked what the Board is doing to reduce the risk of such unintended consequences. In response to Boardmember Teiser, Mr. Eklund stated that he is also concerned that story poles and notices often do not give neighbors enough time to respond to applications if they are out of town.

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous announced that the 673 Hawthorne Drive application had been continued to the May 3, 2007 meeting. He announced that the Town Council had denied the two appeals on the DRB decision regarding 2135 Vistazo East. He noted that the Boardmembers had received new maps showing all properties within 500 feet of their individual homes. He also reminded the Board of the Town Council/Design Review Board workshop to be held on Tuesday, May 22.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. 1599 TIBURON BOULEVARD DELANO, SIGN PERMIT

There has been a change in name of the existing grocery store within a building located at 1599 Tiburon Boulevard. As part of this change, the applicant wishes to install new signage for the market. A 2' x 16' sign is proposed to be installed above the entrance facing Tiburon Boulevard stating "Delano's IGA MARKET," consisting of internally illuminated acrylic channel letters. The total signage proposed for the market would be 32 square feet. As the subject building has 158 feet of frontage facing a public street, the sign allowance for this building would be 39.5 square feet. The proposed sign does not exceed the amount permitted under the Tiburon Sign Ordinance.

Haley Delano, owner of the Delano's IGA Market, explained the details of the proposed sign. In response to a question from Boardmember Teiser, Mr. Delano stated that the existing sign would be removed and the new sign placed in an area below the roof.

Boardmember Glassner asked if the same signage would be installed at the market in the Cove Center. Mr. Delano responded that the other market would have just a flat sign on the building. He noted that the proposed sign would be internally illuminated with LED's.

Vice-Chair Frymier asked if the sign on the corner of Beach Road and Tiburon Boulevard counted toward the total sign area. Planning Manager Watrous replied that the total sign area for the site was consistent with the Sign Ordinance.

Vice-Chair Frymier asked if the corner sign was necessary. Mr. Delano replied that it replaced a previous sign, and that they had simply covered the outline of the old sign. He stated that the corner sign could be removed if so desired by the Town.

Boardmember Teiser stated that both signs are tasteful. He said that the new sign would be less obtrusive than

the previous sign and located under the roofline. He said the signage would be an improvement and thought that the corner sign was informative.

Boardmember Glassner noted that the sign area would be reduced and the new sign would be more energy efficient.

Boardmember Corcoran stated that the new sign sends a good message about using less electricity and looks great.

Vice-Chair Frymier stated that she was glad that the sign area is less than the maximum allowed. She added that the second sign is functional and somewhat covered by trees.

M/S, Teiser/Corcoran (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.

E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

2. 1893 CENTRO WEST HARB, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE/ FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

The applicant submitted a request for construction of a new single-family dwelling with a variance for reduced side yard setbacks and a floor area exception, on the property located at 1893 Centro West Street. A duplex previously existed on the property, which was in the process of being renovated for conversion into a single-family dwelling. The applicant subsequently demolished over 50% of the existing walls of the structure. By demolishing more than 50% of the structure, the project is therefore classified as “new construction.”

The project was previously reviewed at both the March 1, 2007 and March 15, 2007 Design Review Board meetings. Concerns were raised by the neighbors below the site regarding the amount of windows and exterior lighting proposed at the front of the home and from the owner of the adjacent homes at 1895 Centro West regarding possible view impacts. The Board concluded that the item should be continued, and that the architect should work on the design of the home, specifically the roofline, and the possibility of stepping the house further back into the hillside, to lessen the impact on the viewshed for the adjacent neighbor, and to reduce the visual bulk of the home from below.

The applicant has now submitted revised drawings of the proposed home, which indicates a shift of the second floor, 42 inches to the rear (towards the hillside), and 10 feet 8 inches to the west (toward the shared driveway). The lower level of the home would remain in the same location the previous submittal. A row of mature trees at the rear of the property would continue to shield the dwelling from the uphill neighbor, resulting in a natural privacy screen. Additional excavation into the hillside would be required as part of the second floor shift and re-incorporation of the entry walkway and patio area.

Luis Baez, project manager, and Ricardo Royo, designer, reviewed the changes made to the previous application. They stated that the revisions comply with the previous recommendations of the Board regarding view blockage and visual mass and bulk. They stated that they shifted the house 42 inches into the hillside, and

further moved the second story 10'8" west away from 1895 Centro West. They stated that this opened up a panoramic view from the adjacent lower level unit. They noted that the roof pitch had been revised in conformance with the Hillside Guidelines, which eliminated most of the upper windows on the south elevation. They said that they would also change the center roofline to create a continuous gabled roof. Mr. Royo described the changes that would result for the view at 1895 Centro West.

There was a general discussion by the Board to attempt to understand the design changes and discussions with the neighbors.

The Vice-Chair opened the public hearing.

Gerald Hines stated that he was taken aback by the new story poles. He said that the revised roof design would detract significantly from his views. He suggested that moving the house further up the hillside would mitigate his concerns. He was unsure whether the additional roof change would improve his views and suggested that the application be continued to create a more suitable design.

Vice-Chair Frymier asked if the previous house on the site blocked views before it was demolished. Mr. Hines stated that it did not.

Boardmember Corcoran stated that he had visited the adjacent lower unit and the tenant told him that the previous house blocked the harbor view. Boardmember Teiser stated that the tenant told him the same thing.

Bill Lukens stated that although there was no agreement between the applicant and the neighbors there have been conversations. He said that he and several other neighbors had objected to the size and bulk of the house, and felt that the revised design is an improvement.

Helen Lindqvist, Lyford Cove Old Tiburon Homeowners Association, wondered why a new dwelling needs variances for reduced side yard setback and excess lot coverage. She noted that many people are replacing duplexes with single-family homes in Old Tiburon.

Mr. Baez stated that he and the owner are trying to work with the neighbors to mitigate impacts. He stated that Mr. Hines is trying to maintain the view that he has with no house on this site, whereas the previous house impacted that view. Mr. Baez reiterated that the changes to the house design pulled much of the second floor out of the neighbors' view and that the major bulk of the house does not affect views. In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Baez stated that moving the house further back would eliminate the rear yard. He stated that the revisions had improved the views for the adjacent lower unit from what had previously existed.

The Vice-Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner stated that the latest plan revisions were unclear. He felt that the neighbors' opinions had not been accurately represented by the applicant. He noted that the chimneys have also been changed for the project. He said that he would like to see revised plans showing the continuous gabled roof.

Boardmember Corcoran stated that the applicant has made an effort to make changes and that the house had needed a lot of work. He felt that the house would be beautiful when finished and that changing the roof

would satisfy the downhill neighbors. He noted that if the floor area exception was no longer requested, the changes to the house could restore more of the neighbors' views.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the applicant had done what the Board had requested. He noted that the homes at 1895 Centro West used to have fireplaces in the corners, which have since been removed, and now have panoramic views. He said that the proposed house would not block the Golden Gate Bridge or most of the bay from the lower unit next door. He acknowledged that the house would block a little more of the harbor view for the lower unit than was previously blocked, but that the upper level unit would not be affected by this house. He noted that the project was originally intended to be a remodel and the footprint represents that of the original house. He said that the continuous gabled roofline would eliminate the upper windows and satisfy the downhill neighbors. He stated that Mr. Hines would not have a significant view blockage and that the Hillside Guidelines do not say that no view blockage is allowed. He stated that the requested side yard setback is that of the original house and that the Board looks at the practicalities of rebuilding on an existing footprint. He felt that pushing the house further back would result in substantial excavation. He said that he could support the project with the revised roofline.

Vice-Chair Frymier agreed that the applicant has done what has been suggested by the Board. She said that the project has been difficult to follow, and that she needed to see the story poles again. She said that the applicant also needs to provide clear plans and accurate indications of any support from the neighbors. With the requested variance and floor area exception and the concerns of the neighbors, she felt that it is important to make sure that everything requested is clear.

M/S, Frymier/Corcoran (passed 3-1, Teiser dissenting) to continue the application to the May 3, 2007 meeting.

F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

3. 30 MARK TERRACE SAMS, ADDITIONS/VARIANCES/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

The applicant has submitted a request for additions to the existing single-family dwelling, with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception on the property located at 30 Mark Terrace. Currently the existing dwelling is undergoing extensive renovations. The proposal seeks to expand the entry foyer at the lower level; add a family room, game room and wine cellar at the main level; and add a new master bedroom, bathroom and study room at the upper level. The existing decking across the front of the home would continue on the main level to the new addition. Additionally, a small deck would be located on the upper level at the front of the home, accessed by the master bedroom.

The proposed structure would create a lot coverage of 2,920 square feet (11.6%) which is below the maximum permitted lot coverage in the RO-2 zoning district (15%). The proposed structure would create a gross floor area of 4,874 square feet which exceeds the maximum permitted floor area for a parcel of this size (4,524 sq. ft.). The applicant is requesting a floor area exception, along with a variance for reduced front yard setback.

Geoff Butler, architect, reviewed the project design and project history, including work currently under construction. He stated that the site topography and landscaping make the house fairly private.

The Vice-Chair opened the public hearing.

Barry Thornton and Karen Land commended the applicants for repairing an eyesore of a house. They were concerned with the requested setback from the street and described the increase in house size as massive. They noted that other homes on Mark Terrace are not as large as the requested house size. They objected to the mass of the deck extension. They felt that the project would make the lot feel like it is full of house and would force the play areas on the site closer to their home.

Mr. Butler stated that the deck extension would follow the line of the previously approved deck. He said that moving the addition further back would require extensive grading. He stated that the deck extension is quite a distance away from the neighbors' home. He summarized the sizes of other homes in the vicinity, stating that the proposed house size would be similar to that of other homes in the neighborhood. He stated that the deck extension would be close to the property line, but would be buffered from the driveway and cul-de-sac. He presented a preliminary landscape plan which would include screening that would help with privacy concerns.

The Vice-Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner stated that the applicant had done a great job with the design. He said that the project works well with the site and the privacy issues would be addressed with landscaping.

Boardmember Corcoran stated that this is an unusual site at the end of a cul-de-sac. He said that he was struck by the massiveness of the house when viewed from the street, and felt that the addition would make it more massive. He said that on the whole, it was a good project, and that the landscaping would help the privacy issues. However, he said that he was not inclined to support the floor area exception, as he felt that he could not make the required findings.

Boardmember Teiser agreed that this was a massive looking house when viewed from the street. However, he felt that the project would not really increase the mass for the neighbors, who would only see a little more house. Although the deck extension would go further into the setback, he noted that the deck would actually be further back from the street. He said that most other homes in the neighborhood are much smaller, with none close to the requested house size. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the subject lot was also larger than most lots in the vicinity. Boardmember Teiser asked the applicant to reduce the floor area of the addition and move it further back from the street, which would provide articulation from the front.

There was discussion between the Board, Staff, applicants and neighbors regarding the distance of the proposed deck extension and the neighboring house.

Vice-Chair Frymier stated that the deck extension may make the front of the house appear more massive. She said that she liked the project, which was an enormous improvement for the house. She said that she has a problem with the floor area requested, as the house already appears massive. She felt that the additions would create a continuous line of structure too close to the street.

M/S, Teiser/Corcoran (passed 4-0) to continue the application to the May 17, 2007 meeting.

- 4. 673 HAWTHORNE DRIVE YOUNG, ADDITIONS/VARIANCES
CONTINUED TO 5/3/07**
- 5. 594 VIRGINIA DRIVE WOOD, ADDITIONS/VARIANCES**

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 594 Virginia Drive. A small addition and bow window would be added to the existing kitchen. An existing carport in front of the house would be demolished and replaced with a new two-car garage. The slope of the current driveway would be reduced to bring the level of the garage closer to that of the street.

The proposed additions would add 60 square feet of floor area to the house, resulting in a total floor area of 2,421 square feet, which is less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The proposed project would add 142 square feet of lot coverage to the site, resulting in total lot coverage of 36.5%, which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. Therefore a variance is requested for excess lot coverage. Variances are also requested for reduced front and side yard setbacks.

Robert Wood explained the project design. He said that the neighbors are concerned about view blockage and he was willing to cut off the eave at the rear of the storage area roof. He also offered to cut down a Monterey Ash tree on CalTrans right-of-way to restore the neighbors' views. He stated that the storage space is intended to meet his professional needs. In response to a question from the Board, he stated that the storage roof would be 2 feet higher than the existing roofline.

William Wuerthner, architect, answered questions about the clerestory windows and described details of the storage area.

The Vice-Chair opened the public hearing.

John Suen stated that he was concerned about losing part of his water view. He stated that the story poles have been inaccurately placed on the site and do not clearly show the extent of view obstruction. He said that he did not object to the garage extension, but the storage structure would block much of their view. He suggested that the rear portion of the storage area eave be cut off and the storage area roofline lowered by one foot to make his viewline collinear with the view across the existing roofline. In response to a question from the Board, Mr. Suen stated that the trees on the site should be cut down anyway and that the proposed structure would be permanent. He requested that fewer clerestory windows face toward his uphill home.

Mr. Wood disagreed with Mr. Suen's assessment of view impacts, stating that removing the tree would better improve the view.

The Vice-Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Teiser stated that he could support the project with the removal of the rear storage area eave and reduction of the storage area height by one foot. He felt that it was unnecessary to have all of the clerestory windows along the front of the storage area, and suggested substituting windows on the sides.

Boardmember Corcoran agreed that the eave and height changes were reasonable. He said that there are other ways to light the storage space.

Boardmember Glassner stated that lowering the height of the storage area would be a minor concession, particularly for storage space.

Vice-Chair Frymier stated that she could support the project with the described changes.

M/S, Frymier/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 that the height of the storage area be reduced by one foot; that the rear eave of the storage area be eliminated; and that the front clerestory windows for the storage area be eliminated, allowing replacement with similar windows on the sides or rear of the storage area.

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #6 OF THE 4/5/07 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Page 3, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence to read "...by removing the *north* spar..."

Page 5, 7th paragraph, second sentence to read "...the second story would *be* completely *out of* character with the rest of the neighborhood."

Page 6, 5th paragraph to read "...that he had talked to the *impacted* neighbors who *do not object* to the request."

Page 8, 4th paragraph to read "...including moving the upper story back over the garage *and revising the garage design to provide for proper headroom.*"

Page 10, 6th paragraph, 2nd sentence to read "...the roofline *design* was *not* particularly attractive, *and* he would like..."

M/S, Teiser/Frymier (passed 4-0) to approve the Minutes of the April 5, 2007 meeting as amended.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 P.M.