

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous reported that the sign permit applications for 1 and 9 Main Street have been withdrawn, and Planning staff has been working with the applicants to form a proposal for staff level review. He also noted that the application for 22 Mercury Avenue has been continued to the March 5, 2009 meeting.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. 1 MAIN STREET CAFFE ACRI, SIGN - WITHDRAWN

2. 9 MAIN STREET SERVINO RISTORANTE, SIGN - WITHDRAWN

E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

**3. 5 ROLLING HILLS ROAD WESTERN LIABILITY INSURANCE,
ADDITIONS/VARIANCE**

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story, single-family dwelling on property located at 5 Rolling Hills Road. The project would involve modifications and additions to expansion plans previously approved for this property. Variances for reduced front yard setback and excess lot coverage were requested, along with a floor area exception. The application was first reviewed at the December 18, 2008 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, the Design Review Board had concerns with the overall size of the project, particularly the combination of a request for a lot coverage variance and a floor area exception. The application was continued to allow the applicant time to address these concerns. The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the proposed project that reduced the size of the dining room addition and upper level decks and modified the lower level addition. As a result, the subject application no longer requests additional floor area or lot coverage beyond that previously approved for this property, and a variance for excess lot coverage and a floor area exception are not required for this application.

Hank Bruce, architect, said they have revised the proposal and now stay within the lot size and floor area ratio of the original proposal.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember Tollini said that he appreciated that the lot coverage and floor area ratio have now been reined in. He felt that the deck was well-placed and does not impinge on any of the neighbors' views.

Boardmember Wilson agreed, noting that this is a difficult site with the limited area caused by the Rolling Hills Road frontage.

Vice-Chair Chong agreed with Boardmember Tollini and stated that he was glad to see the floor area and lot coverage reduced to what was previously approved.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Wilson/Tollini) that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approved the project subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 3-0.</p>

4. 22 MERCURY AVENUE DIBBLE, NEW DWELLING - CONTINUED TO 3/5/09

F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

5. 42 REED RANCH ROAD TRUSHEIM, ADDITIONS/VARIANCES/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

The applicant has submitted a request for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with variances for reduced front and side yard setbacks, excess lot coverage, excess fence and wall height, and a floor area exception. Currently the property is improved with a single-family dwelling. The proposal incorporates a new two-story addition to the right side of the home, which would include a guest bedroom and bathroom on the main level and a third bedroom with bathroom on the upper level. New decks would extend off both of these rooms, and would be integrated into the existing decks on both levels of the home. A new swimming pool and spa are also proposed, as well as new fencing and walls and overall landscape improvements to the front and right side of the property. The swimming pool would be situated within the front yard setback and the spa would be located within the side yard setback. Several of the proposed fences and walls exceed the maximum wall height of six feet (6') within the required setbacks.

Bob Stadelman, designer, noted that the house already exceeds the maximum lot coverage. He said that the owners would like to increase their usable outdoor space by enlarging the two smaller decks and adding a pool, spa, outdoor recreation space, and security fencing to the front yard. He said that they recognize that a pool is an amenity, but note that other homes within the Reedlands neighborhood have front yard pools. He said that the pool in the front yard was buffered from the neighbors' living areas. He said that they prepared 13 different schemes and have compromised some of their original plans in working with Planning staff to arrive at the current proposal. He said that they met with the neighbors who are most affected by this application, and the neighbors below and to the west are supportive of the project. He acknowledged that the neighbor across Reed Ranch Road have concerns and have requested replacement trees to buffer the project from her home. He said that they have compromised with both staff and with neighbors to arrive at a project that best addresses everyone's concerns.

Lisa Trusheim, owner, said that her father bought the house in the early 1970s and her family moved into it in August, 2008. She said that they have three children and plan on staying a long time in the home. She stated that Reed Ranch Road is a busy thoroughfare and this does not allow for play in the street, and so they want to increase usable outdoor space in the front yard.

The public hearing was opened.

Ann Solomon stated that she did not understand where the proposed overheight fences would be located and she was concerned because her view of Blackie's Pasture was completely obliterated by a previous project involving a fence. She was concerned that her view of the hills would be blocked and she asked to see story poles for the fencing. She agreed that Reed Ranch Road is a very busy street and suggested putting the pool lower on the site.

Ron Brown said they bought their house in 1996, spent a year remodeling it and have lived there since 1997. As a result of this experience, he said that he was well aware of slopes and the difficulties of the lots in the neighborhood, but he felt that remodeling projects rejuvenate the neighborhood. He said that he was generally happy with the project and in favor of removing the trees in front of the property. He said that he wanted to see more vegetation cover the wall and fence on the side facing his property, but this has now been addressed and he is therefore perfectly happy with the project.

Farideh Petri said the proposed two-story addition to the existing house would block her view of Blackie's Pasture. She opposed the removal of the trees in front of the home as these trees currently block her view of the house and would provide screening to the proposed addition. She requested that the color of the roof be changed to grey so that it will match a neighboring property and blend in better with the horizon. In response to a question from Boardmember Tollini, Ms. Petri said that the addition would block the view from her living room. She also objected to the proposed trees A and B and requested changing them to lower height trees.

Ms. Trusheim submitted a photograph taken from the front of Ms. Petri's property that shows the view of the story poles for the proposed addition.

Boardmember Wilson asked Mr. Stadelman to address the location of the overheight walls and/or fences. Mr. Stadelman indicated the wall location near the proposed spa on the left side of the site. He said that the wall and fence would be 11 feet high at the highest point and reduces to 6 feet in the front of the property. He explained that the fences were required because the Building Code requires a safety railing or fencing by the spa and pool. He said that the spa would be 10 feet off the ground, to make it level with the main level of the house.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Wilson stated that he inspected the property did not mind the proposed brown roof color. He said that he appreciated the effort made by the applicant, but the requests for variances and exceptions are numerous. He felt that the view blockage was not an issue but the project seemed to be a significant endeavor to try to put everything into the front yard. He suggested that coming up with a way to move more of the project to the rear of the house might reduce the number of variance requests. He said that he leaned toward a continuance to explore moving the pieces of the project around and to allow the Board to more easily make the variance findings.

Boardmember Tollini agreed with Boardmember Wilson, noting that there was a long list of variances, some of which are recreational and not needed for the house and all of which needed findings. He stated that it would be difficult to grant all of the variances for recreational uses, which would be akin to a grant of special privileges. He said that putting a large recreational complex in the front yard was a self-created hardship and he encouraged the applicant to explore placing some of the improvements in the rear of the site. He found it difficult to figure out what the walls and fences would look like from the neighboring properties because of the plans and story poles were insufficient. He said that he would like to see story poles showing the walls and fences in their entirety. He said that the view impact on Ms. Petri's home was inconsequential in terms of her existing view from Sausalito to Treasure Island.

Vice-Chair Chong said that he inspected the property and agreed with Boardmembers Tollini and Wilson. He said the roof color was fine and that the addition would intrude into a minor portion of the view from Ms. Petri's home. He said that it was very hard to make the hardship findings for so many variances and that the need for the walls and fences is a circular problem with the Building Code and the request for the pool and spa. He said that there were definitely options to explore moving some of the project pieces around on the site.

Boardmember Wilson noted that a nearby neighbor had filled in the back slope and put the pool there and that there are many positive aspects of putting the pool in the back instead of the front.

Boardmember Tollini also pointed out that the floor plan of the existing house is upside down, with the bedrooms on the first floor and main living area above. He acknowledged that it would be less than ideal to access the pool from downstairs. He also noted that the Board has to make the findings for practical hardship or unnecessary difficulty for the proposed addition and he was unsure about making those findings even without the pool or spa. He felt that the floor area exception was not that large, but minor changes might need to be made to the lot coverage.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Wilson) to continue the application to the March 5, 2009 meeting. Vote: 3-0.

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #1 OF THE 1/15/09 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

No changes were requested by the Board.

ACTION: It was M/S (Wilson/Tollini) to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2009 meeting as written. Vote: 3-0.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.