

ACTION MINUTES #19

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2007
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

- A. ROLL CALL: Present:** Chair Doyle, Boardmembers Corcoran, Frymier, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler, and Assistant Planner Phillips
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
- D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
1. 275 Diviso Street Wilsey/Ron New Dwelling **APPROVED**
- E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
2. 2096 Paradise Drive Ware Decks/Variances **APPROVED**
3. 111 Lyford Drive Purdy Spa/Addition/Variance **APPROVED**
4. 695 Hawthorne Drive Chan New Dwelling/Variance **APPROVED**
5. 675 Hawthorne Drive Reichenbach New Dwelling **APPROVED**
6. 3 Southridge Drive Peitz New Dwelling **CONTINUED TO 12/6/07**
7. 21 Gilmartin Drive Doone New Dwelling **WITHDRAWN**
- F. MINUTES OF THE 10/18/07 D.R.B. MEETING - APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- G. ADJOURNMENT – 9:50 P.M.**

**MINUTES #19
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 1, 2007**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Doyle, Vice-Chair Frymier, Boardmembers Corcoran, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler and Assistant Planner Phillips

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous reported that the application for 21 Gilmartin Drive has been withdrawn and the appeal for 9 Burrell Court has been scheduled for the November 7, 2007 Council meeting. He added that the Kol Shofar Synagogue project will be the sole item on the November 15, 2007 agenda.

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

1. 275 DIVISO STREET WILSEY/RON, NEW DWELLING

The applicant had not yet arrived and Chair Doyle tabled the item.

E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

2. 2096 PARADISE DRIVE WARE, DECKS/VARIANCES

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of deck additions to an existing two-family dwelling on property located at 2096 Paradise Drive. A lower level deck would extend to the rear of the existing duplex on the property. A deck would be added to the lower level at the rear of the accessory building near the front of the site. A third deck would be added to the front of this accessory building near the front property line. Variances are requested for reduced front, side and rear yard setbacks.

Ernest Ware, owner, briefly described the project and said that he was available to answer questions.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember Glassner and Chair Doyle said they were somewhat concerned with the proposed setbacks and potential privacy issues; however, they acknowledged there was no neighborhood opposition.

Boardmember Corcoran said the project was consistent with other surrounding homes, many of which have similar decks.

Vice-Chair Frymier supported the project and said she felt it was a nice improvement to the neighborhood.

Boardmember Teiser agreed and said his only initial concern was parking for the property but he confirmed that there is a two-car garage.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Corcoran) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the project with the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.</p>

1. 275 DIVISO STREET WILSEY/RON, NEW DWELLING

On October 4, 2007, the Design Review Board reviewed an application for construction of a new single-family dwelling on property located at 275 Diviso Street. During the meeting the adjacent neighbors expressed concerns with the overall height of the structure, and more significantly with the central element of the home, which served as a green architectural element. This central element would provide natural lighting and cooling for the home, but would also block views of the San Francisco skyline for the neighbor at 295 Diviso Street, as well as block water views for the neighbors across the street at 280 Diviso Street and 2040 Vistazo East Street. The issue of light pollution was also expressed relative to the amount of windows proposed throughout the home, facing uphill. Many of the adjacent neighbors were confused by the modified story poles. Additionally, members of the Board did not all have an opportunity to view the revised poles before the meeting to determine if view blockages would be reduced by the two foot drop. Overall, the Board was pleased with the design of the home, but determined that the applicant should work with the neighbors in reducing the extent of view blockages. The project was continued so that both the neighbors and Boardmembers had more time to review the revised story poles before making a final decision.

The applicant has now submitted revised drawings for the proposed new single-family dwelling. The proposed project would still result in a two-story structure with a Mediterranean architectural theme. The upper level would include a living room, dining room, kitchen, breakfast nook, and a three car garage. A deck would extend off the dining room and connect with a larger main deck at the rear of the home, accessed by the breakfast nook, kitchen and living room. The lower level would include three bedrooms, two bathrooms, laundry room, and master bedroom suite. A smaller deck would extend toward the rear of the home with access from the master bedroom suite and two bedrooms. In addition, a five to six foot high entry fence would extend across the front of the property along Diviso Street.

Dean Jones, architect, presented the revised plans showing the lowered elevations and said they lowered the upper structure so the ridge height was now 15 feet from the floor to the bottom of the ridge beam. He said the Maddens' still had concerns with too many windows facing them and the resultant light. Therefore, they turned two of the windows around to the back side with dormers facing the bay. He said that the window that face the uphill neighbors are 2' x 2' and no direct light would shine up. He presented a 3-D model showing various elevations and views from neighbors. He noted the dormers on the front of the house with exposed glass had been moved to the other side of the ridge and no longer faced the Maddens' home.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Margaret Patton said she lives across the street from the proposed home, and said that although there was a lot of discussion regarding the Maddens' and Leas' views, the project would also obstruct their sunset views. She also voiced concerns relating to drainage but acknowledged that the Public Works Department would review and approve drainage plans. She wondered why an EIR was not prepared for this project.

Planning Manager Watrous said staff is able to exempt projects from the environmental review process unless the Town has substantial evidence there will be a significant environmental impact on the property. He also noted that the fact that animals do live on the site is not necessarily a significant impact unless they are endangered species.

Ms. Patton said there is an underground source of water on the property and they hear frogs in the evening.

She was not sure what evidence was needed to mandate an environmental study, but said there seemed to be a lot of wildlife in the area. She objected to the size of the project, wanted to keep the neighborhood quaint and said the home would not fit well in the area.

John Madden said he and his wife, Francesca live across the street from the proposed home. After reviewing the story poles they submitted a letter voicing outstanding concerns and they believe the changes have addressed some, but not all their concerns. He strongly disagreed with the staff report stating that there are minimal remaining impacts, although he acknowledged that the changes do make a difference to the south side of the house. He said the height of the tower was lowered slightly less than 2.5 feet. He said that the Hillside Design Guidelines state buildings should be cut into the hillside and he felt the revised design should have been proposed originally. He noted Belvedere Cove is specifically mentioned in the Hillside Guidelines as an important object to be protected from view blockage. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the Hillside Design Guidelines in this matter refer to blockage of important objects in the view such as Golden Gate Bridge, Belvedere Lagoon, Sausalito and Angel Island and does not call out Belvedere Cove as an important object.

Mr. Madden said no other structure on Diviso Street has this type of massive tower and their other major issue is the light issue and pollution from the proposed tower. He said the windows in the tower open, which would subject all neighbors to glare during the day and light pollution at night. He suggested that the windows conform to the guidelines for skylights such as non-reflective glass, tinting or bronzing. They also want to make sure the chimney on the south side of the property is low and as narrow as possible.

Robin Lea said felt the home was proportionately larger than other homes in the area. She acknowledged that her home was of similar size but sits on a lot twice the size of the applicant's. She still felt the house would be out of scale with the neighborhood.

Mary Foree voiced opposition to the home's size, particularly since it would be lowered further into the ground. She wanted to see soils testing be done prior to construction, as she felt the proposal could have an effect on landslides. She also voiced opposition to the removal of trees on the site.

Mr. Jones said the tower windows were a very important element for their design, as they provide daylighting and ventilation of the entire upper level. He said the windows would be operated by electric motors and there would be no lights shining up into the window areas.

Boardmember Corcoran asked Mr. Jones if tinting could be used which he felt would not significantly affect the building's green design. Mr. Jones agreed to put some tint on the windows without affecting the natural lighting. He felt the eave that would stick out 2-3 feet would actually cut off part of the Madden's view to the windows. Boardmember Corcoran suggested the 3 front windows be tinted so as not to affect the natural lighting.

Mr. Jones said the drainage concerns have been addressed by staff and they will have catch basins on the property, with water carried to the drainage system at the bottom of the site. He reiterated he did not apply for any variances for the project, and the house would be slightly under 3,800 square feet.

Chair Doyle confirmed with Mr. Jones that the lower left side would be stucco broken up by metal railings

and horizontal planes and confirmed the house's base area would incorporate stone.

Boardmember Corcoran said one issue which had not been addressed was the path across the property and confirmed the Community Development Department had submitted a letter to the owner. Mr. Jones noted that the owner is in conversation with the Community Development Director and they are trying to work out an arrangement whereby a path can be accommodated. He confirmed the path would be located on the south side and that the house plans would not need to be changed if the path were implemented.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner felt that a remarkable amount of work had been done to the house design. He said that the view blockage would not be significant as it would not affect primary views. He thought the tower and the chimney could possibly be lowered, but supported the project.

Boardmember Teiser felt that although the home was beautifully designed, it does not fit the character of the neighborhood. He felt the house was unduly ornate, and said that there were not many Mediterranean style homes in the area, and felt this would be stuck in the middle of other older homes in the neighborhood. He acknowledged that no variances were required, but noted that that does not mean that someone can build to the maximums. He said that the tower was inappropriate and added nothing to the character of the house. He noted that the design still causes the neighbors a lot of concern and suggested the tower be redesigned and lowered, which would still allow for ventilation without harming the design of the house.

Boardmember Corcoran felt Ms. Patton's home would have the most view impact. However, the lot is vacant and in order to address any view impacts the house would need to be moved too far back on the lot. He stated that the primary view of most of the nearby homes is toward Belvedere and the Golden Gate Bridge. Without being disrespectful to the neighbors, he felt that losing some water views was a natural consequence of developing this empty lot. He thought the applicant and architect did a tremendous job of trying to work with the neighbors and coming up with a good design. He said that the tower design is not perfect, however, he agreed with the need for green design, said the home was within the zoning requirements and does not require any variances. He said that although there were no Mediterranean designs in the immediate vicinity there were plenty elsewhere in Old Tiburon. He felt tinting on the front windows would be a reasonable accommodation.

Vice-Chair Frymier said she still could not support the project. She believes the tower should be removed, and felt that it would block too much of the Madden's views. She agreed that the architect had done a great job on everything else, but still felt that there should be less articulation on the house. She said that the house does not belong in the area, with a larger house-to-lot ratio than other homes in the area, and would be too visually prominent.

Chair Doyle said there was a similar style house on St. Bernard and noted there were a variety of home designs in the area. He felt that the plans were deceiving and almost an optical illusion, as the house would be only 3,800 square feet, which is not a huge house in Tiburon. He said the house has large deck areas and follows the design guidelines by stepping down the hill. He said that a smaller house on this site would face similar challenges. He said if house were moved further down the hill it would impact Ms. Lea's view. He did not feel the tower was too tall and was not overdone.

Boardmember Corcoran said at the last meeting he felt the house looked so large because the drawings were so detailed, and that less detailed plans would not seem so massive.

Boardmember Teiser said he was not so much opposed to the square footage of the house as much as to its ornate design and poor fit in the neighborhood. He felt the tower could still be lowered with smaller, horizontal windows, and was more opposed to the style of the house.

Vice-Chair Frymier felt the design was visually complicated. She agreed that the plans make it look like there is a lot going on with the design. Chair Doyle felt the design was very deceptive which would reveal different shadows of the design in daylight and actually look smaller. Vice-Chair Frymier disagreed and referred to a gorgeous, gold, Mediterranean house in Town which has little articulation and it is over 3,800 square feet, with very little “movement” in the façade.

Chair Doyle said if the house was lowered there would be a very little difference in the amount of water view and he was not sure what that would accomplish.

Boardmember Corcoran said the Board could ask to lower the tower slightly, but even if it went down 10 inches, the fact is that this has been a vacant lot and another house could have been built long ago which would have blocked these views. He felt the design was reasonable, as it is a very difficult lot to build on with all of the homes nearby.

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Glassner) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the project with the attached conditions of approval, with the additional condition that the front three windows on the front of the home be tinted, and for Staff to review the trees on the side of the house. Vote: 3-2 (Frymier and Teiser voted no).

3. 111 LYFORD DRIVE PURDY, SPA/ADDITION/VARIANCE

A request has been made to construct an attached solarium in the rear of the existing single-family home located at 111 Lyford Drive. The existing spa in the rear yard would be relocated to inside of the proposed solarium. The existing home exceeds the maximum allowed lot coverage and floor area and the applicant has requested a variance for excess lot coverage and a floor area exception.

Ron Wager, architect, said the addition would not be visible from neighboring homes and he felt it was a minor application.

There was no public comment.

It was the consensus of the Board to support the project.

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the project with the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.

4. 695 HAWTHORNE DRIVE CHAN, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE

A request has been made for construction of a new single-family dwelling on the property located at 695 Hawthorne Drive. Currently the property is improved with a single-family dwelling receiving an extensive remodel. New construction would include a two-car garage and master bedroom, as well as the expansion of the existing living room, kitchen and laundry area, totaling 1,097 square feet. The proposed dwelling would result in a gross floor area of 2,332 square feet, which is below the maximum floor area ratio permitted. The proposed new dwelling would result in a lot coverage of 2,773 square feet (37%), which exceeds the maximum permitted lot coverage in the R-1 Zoning district (30%). The rear of the dwelling would encroach nine feet (9') into the rear yard setback, resulting in an eleven foot (11') rear yard setback. Variances are requested for excess lot coverage and reduced rear yard setback.

Mohammad Sadrieh, architect, said the applicant had previously received approvals for an addition to a single-family dwelling with a variance for excess lot coverage. However, the contractor subsequently removed the roof and the Building Inspector issued a stop work order due to unpermitted demolition without the proper approvals. The applicant was then advised to seek approval from the Board for demolishing more than fifty percent of the walls of the structure and removing the roof, which now classifies the project as "new construction", which is what is being proposed as part of this application. Mr. Sadrieh said that they had spoken with Mr. Merritt about the letter which was contained in the packet and would be cleaning up the site.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Mark Gineris said that he was unaware that there had been a previous application approval. He said the addition would be close to their property line and he hoped an important vegetation line with 20-30 foot trees could continue to provide a buffer to their large deck. He asked that some agreement be in place limiting the removal of the vegetation.

Max Agajan said he was speaking on behalf of his elderly mother whose concern is that the project is going to the Board as a new house and she was concerned about setbacks.

John Hermansky said he had no objections to the design of the house, felt the requests were within reason and that the variances that have been requested have either not been fully explained to the neighbors or they may not understand them. He voiced concerns about the appearance of the construction site which he felt has an impact on the appearance of the street and asked that it be cleaned up immediately.

Alice Cannistraci said she lives directly across the street and thought that the plans described to her by the applicant did not seem like those proposed as part of this application. She voiced concerns at the removal of the vegetation.

Cynthia Hawkins said she lives slightly across from the site and is in favor of the home but wanted to make sure that what is approved is what is built.

Boardmember Teiser said he also wanted to ensure that the construction complied with building plans and wondered if a landscape plan was needed due to the proposal being considered new construction. Mr. Sadrieh agreed that a landscape plan be developed and reviewed by staff so the owners could move forward with construction. Associate Planner Tyler noted that a condition of approval had been included requiring staff

review and approval of the landscape plan.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chair Frymier noted neighbors have been vocal and involved about the project, and she encouraged the architect and contractor abide by the neighbors' concerns. She asked that the sofa sitting in the front yard be removed and supported the project.

Boardmember Glassner stated that staff could review the landscaping and he was confident that the project would be built according to the plans. He agreed that the site needed to be cleaned up soon and the project completed as soon as possible.

Boardmember Corcoran also agreed that the site should be cleaned up. He said that it was understandable that the applicant wanted to get rid of the flat roof and its attendant problems. He said that a brand new house would likely have the same lot coverage, and that it was preferable to spread the house out on the site on one level and not block views.

Chair Doyle said that he was bothered by the fact that homes are being torn down without permits in Town and said this unfortunately was not always under the Board's control. He agreed that the site condition was unacceptable and that the owner has to take responsibility for this, as it affects the neighbors.

ACTION: It was M/S (Frymier/Teiser) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the project with the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.

5. 675 HAWTHORNE DRIVE REICHENBACH, NEW DWELLING

A request has been submitted for construction of a new single-family dwelling on the property located at 675 Hawthorne Drive. Currently a single-family dwelling occupies the property. The proposal calls for the demolition of more than 50% the existing walls of the home. The proposed project would maintain a two-level home design. The proposal would enlarge the home on the second floor on the east side above the existing garage and deck and expand the lower level behind the garage. The expansion would include a new bedroom, media room and garage in the lower level and reconfiguration of the upper level floor plan. The upper floor would include the addition of a master bedroom suite and great room with four new skylights.

John Swain, architect, said that by demolishing more than 50% of the structure, the project is therefore classified as "new construction." He said they were going to preserve as much of the existing house and the idea is to create a family home with a contemporary floor plan. Their goal is to maintain the cottage charm, have it continue to fit within the neighborhood and reconfigure the existing floor plan. He said they have worked with the neighbors and the neighbor whose view would be most impacted has written a letter of support.

Erich Reichenbach, owner, said he met with the neighbors early on to determine if they had any concerns, and they had no problems other than the impact of general construction activity. He said that the owners at 666 Hilary and 670 Hilary have asked to reduce the chimney as much as possible, which they have agreed to do.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Teiser said he visited two neighbors on Hilary Drive and he felt the owner and architect worked well with the neighbors.

Vice-Chair Frymier echoed Boardmember Teiser's comments, adding that this is a great street with nice houses. She appreciated that the architects were accommodating to the neighbors and their views.

Boardmember Glassner acknowledged there were potential view issues that were addressed through discussions between the owner and the neighbors. He asked if the chimney would have a non-particulate burning fireplace.

Boardmember Corcoran said he visited the owner at 670 Hilary Drive who could not be present tonight, who had asked that the issue of the skylights be addressed. Boardmember Corcoran felt they the skylights made the most sense where they were proposed. He said if the skylights were moved to the left, they would face up toward the hillside and might affect people more, but with the standard conditions of approval on the skylights, it would not be much of an issue.

Chair Doyle agreed and supported the project and said he liked the use of materials in breaking up the exterior of the house.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Glassner/Teiser) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the project with the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.</p>

6. 3 SOUTHRIDGE DRIVE PEITZ, NEW DWELLING

Boardmember Corcoran recused himself from this item.

A request has been submitted for the construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on an a currently vacant in-fill lot, which was formerly owned by the neighbor next door, located at 3 Southridge Drive. The main level the proposed house would include a great room, family room, kitchen, dining room, breakfast nook an office/bedroom and one bathroom. The upper level would include a master bedroom suite, three more bedrooms, two bathrooms and a laundry room. A two-car carport would be situated near the front of the main level. Two skylights would be installed on the roof of the house.

Ron Wager, architect, described the design of the proposed house and efforts made to fit the house properly between the neighboring homes.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Barbara Linn stated that the CC&R's of the Tiburon Highlands Homeowners Association require approval of a house by their Architectural Control Committee, which has been extremely effective in resolving neighborhood concerns prior to projects coming before the Design Review Board. She said the Association

meeting would not be held until November 9. She said that she was concerned with the overall mass and height of the house, the number and/or size of the south facing windows; and the lack of landscaping. She said that she had researched the Town's files and discovered that none of the adjacent homes have a height above 20.5 feet and that many homes had had their heights reduced through the review process. She was also concerned with drainage, as she did not want water to flow down to their property. She also had concerns with the roof material.

Robert Jarett, counsel for Ms. Linn, reiterated that the CC&R's of the Association require a design review process which had not yet occurred. He said the CC&R's also indicate that site preparation is limited from May to October, whereas the contractor has indicated there would be construction over the next several months. He stated that Ms. Linn's most serious concern is the 29'10" building height with a 10 foot setback. He stated that at least 5-10 feet of fill has been placed on the property without any permits. He asked that the project be tabled and that the Homeowners Association should be allowed to review the project.

Boardmember Glassner asked when the CC&R's were adopted, and it was noted they were adopted in 1981 and have not been updated in the last 5 years.

Cindy Fenner said she sent a letter regarding drainage concerns, a request for landscaping to create a hedge, privacy issues, and requesting a reduction in the building mass and height. She also had concerns with the roofing materials and noted that the Architectural Controls Committee had previously changed its roofing materials policy to encourage tile roofs. She cited previous Homeowners Association letters regarding 6 Southridge Drive which indicates that the Association no longer allows any composition shingle type roofing material and supports concrete, shake, tile or slate roofs. She therefore requested that the roofing material be reconsidered to conform to the neighborhood.

Chris Ventris said they live directly across the cul-de-sac and feel that their views would be impacted. He asked the Town to review the original grade of the site and stated that the proposed house would be taller than any other home in the area. He felt that it was strange that the house would cover only 17% of the lot and asked that the house be spread out more to reduce its height. He distributed photographs to the Board of the original grade of the lot and their views across the site, stating that the house would tower over the other homes on the cul-de-sac. He asked that the house be lowered and set back further from the street.

John Van Hooser said their issue is a desire to maintain their view. He said that the trellis would stick out further from the building and rise to a height above that of the first floor, which would impact the main view from their living room. He added to the Hillside Guidelines analysis in the staff report, the house would block views of Mt. Tam and Ring Mountain which are important objects, as well as impacting their horizon and center views from both their living room windows. He said that they are sensitive to the suggestion of pushing the house back further down the hill, as it would worsen the impact on their view, and suggested potentially shifting the house about 5 feet further north on the lot. He said that they are working with the owners, who have indicated a willingness to move the trellis back from their view.

Robert Margolin said he was the owner of the lot and sold it. He said they were happy with the plan which he felt would be sensitive to the neighbors' views. He stated that the proposed house would be placed an equal distance between their home and the neighbor's house and he asked that it not be moved closer to their home.

Mr. Ventris stated that he was also representing another neighbor at 6 Southridge Drive. He said that parking is a concern on the cul-de-sac, and he suggested moving the house further away from the cul-de-sac in order to create an extra parking space. He said all the neighbors feel the house would be very tall, very close to the street and loom over the cul-de-sac. He stated that the home would be the tallest in the cul-de-sac and with the higher elevation of the lot, it would be even taller and visually overpowering.

Tom Peitz, owner, said when he purchased the property he acknowledged they were the last undeveloped lot in the subdivision. He acknowledged that the neighbors have been there for a long time and he wanted to see a house put on the lot that would have the least impact on all neighbors. He felt his architect did a great job and the design is the best possible for this lot. He said that they wanted a two-story house because all of the surrounding homes have two stories, but acknowledged that it would be a big house surrounded by big houses, and he therefore did not feel it would be out of character with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Teiser noted that this is a two level lot and suggested that if the site was excavated down several feet, the fill could be used to raise the back portion of the lot. Mr. Peitz said they would consider this, but felt there was a certain location a house could be placed on the lot and felt the current proposal was the best design. He said that they hoped to preserve the play area in the back yard for their children. Boardmember Teiser suggested lowering the house and the fill generated could be put in the rear to make it a more level lot.

Mr. Peitz said they were sensitive to drainage issues and had put up story poles for the trellis, adding that they wanted the trellis to have some shade which other neighbors have. He also said that they have looked at moving the trellis over which would preserve their shade and address view impacts.

Dan Weiss, builder for the project, said he has been working with the architect on the project to address all issues and acknowledged that the situation was challenging. He felt that they had designed a home using appropriate materials, appropriate design and one that it fits with the neighborhood. He said that they were sensitive to issues raised by the neighbors, but he noted that many issues were conflicting, in that if they satisfied one neighbor, they would affect another. He felt that they did not want to favor one neighbor over another in the placement of the house, and the placement is exactly between the adjacent homes at their closest points. He said that moving the house over five feet would not be agreeable to the other neighbor, and moving the house back would further affect the other neighbor's views. He said that the placement of the house would give the owners at 1 Southridge the most advantage of the view through to Mt. Tam and beyond. He said that parking was a major issue and they are happy to accommodate the neighbors. He said that they had tried to minimize grading for one neighbor while making the house as low as possible. He described how drainage would be handled on the site. He said that he met with the neighbors regarding landscaping and asked them for suggestions on providing privacy with landscaping. He said that some neighbors have also requested they remove existing vegetation and they have proposed a variety of hedge materials. He said that although he felt the trellis would not impact the neighbors' views of Mt. Tam, they propose to move the trellis out of the sight line. He said that they would gladly follow any Homeowners Association requirements for tile roofing if they could be shown where in the CC&R's there is a requirement for tile roofs. He said that composition shingle roofs are a fantastic product to comply with fire and earthquake standards, for water-proofing, and are handsome. He asked what building height would be reasonable to the neighbors.

Chair Doyle felt the height issue was of concern to all the neighbors. He asked if there was any way to drop

the back part of the house two steps down so the kitchen, dining room and breakfast nook would be lowered. Mr. Wager said they were already cutting into the fill on the site. Chair Doyle responded that he felt the excavated fill could be built up somewhere else on the site. Mr. Weiss said lowering the house two steps down would not accomplish much because the house is two stories. He said if they are asked to lower the height, they would agree to work on this, but asked for direction from the Board.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner felt it was a good project, but that lowering the roof height and moving the trellis would be positive changes. He stated that slate roofs add a lot of weight to a house and may require significant structural changes, adding that there have been technical and litigation issues with concrete roofs in the past. He felt that there were composite roof materials that were beautiful, including some in the neighborhood. He was unsure whether it would be possible to reposition the house, and felt that the big issue was the height and elevation of the house.

Vice-Chair Frymier said she could not support the project in its current state. She said that it would be a beautiful house and acknowledged the owner's objectives and the site constraints, and noted that the lot has been vacant for a long time and anything proposed will be controversial. However, she did not think that this house fits the lot. She said that she would like to see the house moved forward and lowered or possibly tiered. She felt that the house would loom too much from any angle, and feels too large as a two-story house right on the cul-de-sac. She said that the height of the house should be brought down significantly, possibly as much as 6 feet. She said that the house feels like a behemoth square box on a hill and should be redesigned to fit in better with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Teiser said he liked the idea of stepping the back of the house down and leaving the garage where it is. He felt there was an opportunity to lower the house and raising the rear of the lot. He looked at the site from other homes in the area and felt that the house would be too tall. He understood trying to keep the natural drainage, but suggested that some of the water could drain to the rear. He was unsure whether the location of the house should be moved, but said that the design needs a lot of re-thinking. He said that a 2 to 3 foot height reduction would accomplish a lot.

Chair Doyle said that the inside of the house has a classic feel. He said that dropping the rear of the house would do a lot for the design and the neighbors. He felt the roof could be lowered a little bit, but he liked the design and felt it was well thought-out. He said the elevations appear flat, but actually are not. He loved the west elevation and his main suggestion was to lower the roofline several feet. He felt that the house was located in the best location without affecting views or being too close to other homes.

Boardmember Teiser also suggested that the owners take the opportunity afforded by a continuance to meet with the Homeowners Association and go through their review process.

ACTION: It was M/S (Glassner/Teiser) to continue the matter to December 6, 2007. Vote: 4-0.

7. 21 GILMARTIN DRIVE DOONE, NEW DWELLING - WITHDRAWN

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #18 OF THE 10/18/07 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Planning Manager Watrous read into the record amendments provided by Boardmember Corcoran:

Page 2, last paragraph, last word should be “compromise” instead of “compromised” and change “design to the original proposal.”

Page 3, first paragraph, 4th line, to read, “Boardmember Teiser...that the fact that the Kell’s had enclosed their patio was unfair to other neighbors.”

Boardmember Teiser asked for the following amendments:

Page 2, third line; “Boardmember Teiser believed people would not understand the stairs.”

Page 3, top paragraph, third line down; replace the word “patio” with “deck”.

Page 3, third paragraph; “Chair Doyle....11 feet high and therefore it would not be that long of a stairway.”

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) to approve the Minutes of the 10/18/07 Design Review Board Meeting, as amended. Vote: 4-0.</p>

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.