

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Associate Planner Tyler stated the meetings on December 17, 2009 and January 7, 2010 have been canceled; the Board will reconvene on January 21, 2010.

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD - None

E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

- 1. 110 Gilmartin Drive Peterson New Single-Family Dwelling/
Floor Area Exception

The applicant is submitting a request to construct a new single-family dwelling and several accessory structures with a floor area exception, on property located at 110 Gilmartin Drive. The property was previously addressed as 350 Round Hill Road. Currently the three-acre property is improved with a single-family dwelling, a secondary dwelling unit, an exercise building, and a tennis court, all of which would be demolished as part of the project. The proposal includes construction of a new single-family dwelling, an exercise studio, a pool house, a three-car garage, and a wet bar, swimming pool and spa, and a tennis court.

The new dwelling would be primarily a single-story structure, but would also have a large below grade basement area and lower level living quarters. The main level of the home would include a master bedroom suite and sitting room, a family room, living room, dining room, kitchen, kitchen nook, three bedrooms with bathrooms and a playroom. Also located at the main level are a three-car garage, a mud/laundry room, an entry foyer and a large linear gallery space. Outdoor patio areas would extend out from the living room areas and master bedroom suite. An office and rooftop deck would be located above the master bedroom suite at a second story level.

The lower level of the home would include a four-car garage, storage and mechanical areas, art storage, a second laundry room, a home theater and lounge area, and two bedrooms with bathrooms.

In addition to the single-family dwelling, several detached accessory structures are proposed. An exercise building located north of the dwelling, would include a free weights room, a cardio room, a yoga platform and a bathroom. A pool house adjacent to the exercise building would contain two changing rooms with bathrooms for those using the pool and tennis courts. A wet bar is also proposed, which is incorporated into a large storage area and a three-car garage, to be located north of the pool house and tennis court. It should be noted that this garage, storage area and wet bar are partially buried into the hillside, and incorporate a "green roof".

The proposed structures combined would result in lot coverage of 19,419 square feet, (14.53%) which is below the maximum permitted lot coverage in the RO-1 zone (15.0%). The proposed structures would result in a gross floor area of 18,593 square feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted floor area for a parcel of this size. The existing floor area on the property is 17,345 square feet. Properties which are greater than 60,000 square feet are permitted 8,000 square feet of floor area, and 750 square feet of garage area (not counted towards gross floor area). As the subject parcel size is 133,600 square feet (3 acres), the applicant is requesting to exceed the maximum permitted floor area by 10,593 square feet. Therefore a floor area exception has been requested.

A color/materials packet has been submitted, which details various materials, textures and colors for the entire project scope. Actual samples of the colors and materials were available for review by the Board at the meeting.

Jim Olsen, Architect, discussed the personality and philosophy of the project, stating it is a comfortable family home for 2 parents, 3 children, a dog, and 2 sets of grandparents that visit. One of the main goals is to have a lot of play area and open space around the house. They have tried to weave the architecture into the landscaping so that it is integrated, including the use of planted roofs. They have used natural materials and tried to take advantage of the views.

Bob Jakubik, Architect, reviewed the property plan. Their strategy was to use the same basic footprint of the existing house and nestle it into the landscaping more than the existing house. There is a garage and swimming pool near the tennis court, an exercise building and they have removed the two-story guest house and replaced it with a garage and storage area tucked underground.

Mr. Olsen reviewed the internal layout of the main house and said basic components include a living/dining/kitchen area, master bedroom suite, and children's bedrooms and guest rooms. There is an open courtyard to the north, surrounded by other areas of the house (powder room, garage, exercise room). The swimming pool and tennis court include changing rooms and there is an outdoor kitchen and storage area. The materials include a variety of stones and woods meant to blend in with existing natural elements of the site. There are grey and bronze metals meant to blend in with the surroundings and the sky. He presented some examples of houses in other areas that his firm has designed.

Martha Rogers, Architect, discussed the sustainability elements of the project. The goals are to reduce the amount of energy and water used and to integrate any sustainable features into the architecture. The roof overhangs keep out the bright summer sun and glare and reduce cooling needed in the house. The house was designed to allow light into the space and windows to create natural ventilation. The house includes green roofs throughout the lower portions. They include solar panels to generate energy and are monolithic black surfaces. They are proposing to store the rainwater that comes off of the roof and reuse it for irrigation and grey water uses. They are looking at using the earth for geothermal storage.

James Lord, Landscaper, said this is an amazing site and they have worked with the architects to come up with a plan that connects to the larger regional context. They have tried to use plant materials that are indigenous to this area and that do not use water. He went over the details of the landscape plan. There is an amazing open space system across the road, and they wanted to take the beauty of that character to create a meadow environment on the property. An olive orchard will be just inside the entrance, then fields of lavender, and a stone path that connects to the courtyard. The courtyard is surrounded by water and will include water lilies, and will help with heating and cooling. It will also work to heat the pool; the heat of the water in the shallow courtyard will be filtered into the pool. The upper portion includes the pool and tennis court. There is a Japanese garden behind the yoga studio. A trail system will wrap around the entire property and enter different garden areas. They will replace the Pine trees on the property with new trees such as Dogwoods, Japanese Maples, and Oak trees. There will be a large lawn space surrounded by deciduous trees. The trees in the meadow will mostly be Coast Live Oaks to fortify the existing Oaks. They will be choreographed to protect views both inside and outside the site. The landscaping is shown together for 2 Gilmartin Drive and for 110 Gilmartin Drive.

Myron Banks, Lighting Designer, said the lighting is very minimal. There are a lot of water features on the property and they plan to light the water using LED lighting, which is energy efficient.

Mr. Olsen said they loved working on this project and they see this as creating a house for the future. This project weaves technology and age-old techniques to create a sustainable living space.

Board Member Wilson asked about the intended use of the orchard, and Mr. Olsen said it will be for the family's use.

Board Member Kricensky requested clarification of fencing and screening. Mr. Lord explained that the screening begins with a hedge at the front of the house and turns into a wall that runs around the property. There is a fire access gate at the top of the property. On the other side there is a wooden fence that is softer and will blend in with the landscaping.

The public hearing was opened.

Public Comments:

Al Anolik said they are probably one of the property owners most affected by this project. Between 350 and 300 Gilmartin, there used to be a road but it was changed. He heard tonight the fence was going to be taken down and neighbors were concerned that would be used as an alternative road. He said it is very narrow, with no sidewalks and dangerous curves. He also expressed concern about the bottom of Gilmartin Court, where he will build his office cabana. That area has been eroded to such an extent that the fence in the area is hanging. He is concerned that water runoff from the project will further erode that area. He spoke with Public Works and they agreed to look at the area in more detail. He owns the lot at 210 Gilmartin and voiced concern with view corridors which now create a small area from the porch to see San Francisco. He loves the project, but does not want to see the previously agreed upon view corridors changed. He is also concerned about future units to be built in the lawn area. He likes the metal fence that currently exists around the property and does not want it to be replaced by a wall.

Yvonne Picard thanked the Board Members and staff for coming to her property to view the impact on her property. She is concerned she cannot determine the impact on the privacy of her property without more information. She would like to see a rendering of what the completed project would look like regarding the trees that will be removed and planted. She has spoken to the landscape architect and he is willing to produce those drawings. She is also concerned about the property line and would like more information about the specific plantings that will replace the tree removals in that area.

Susan Hawkes said she owns the property adjacent to 2 Gilmartin Court, and voiced concern about the 8 large leaf Maple trees and the impact they will have on views from her house. She asked for clarification of the location of planting of those trees as well as their height and width. She also asked that the storm drain not be removed because it drains the entire hill and requested story poles be erected to show the location of the planting of the large leaf Maple trees.

Len Yaffe explained that the view corridor from his house extends over the project and he is concerned the heights of the large leaf Maple trees will block his view of Mt. Tam. He would like to understand where the new Oak trees will be located on the property so he can assess the effect on the view from his house.

Mr. Lord said they have looked at the large leaf Maple trees and acknowledged that the Sunset Garden Book specifies it will grow to 75 feet, but they never grow to that height. However, they would like to be good neighbors and are planning to substitute the large leaf Maple with another species that grows at maximum to 35 feet. The Oak trees are further down the slope and therefore will not impact views. The purpose of the trees is to screen other neighbors from the new construction, while also preserving views. The oak trees that will be planted will be 36 inch boxed trees, which are large. When they are placed they will discuss with neighbors to be sure they are screening the neighbors who need screening and not blocking views of other neighbors. They will be sure all of the neighbors are happy with the placement.

Kathy Kennedy asked if the trees along the wall will be Japanese Maples and questioned their height. Mr. Lord said they are Strawberry trees and their maximum height is 25 feet. They want to be sure they are not obscuring any views and also provide privacy for the courtyard.

Mr. Lord clarified the wall around the property is not concrete, but will be stone. It will blend in with the existing landscape and is earthen colors and made of real stone. Most of it will be screened by plantings.

Board Member Doyle asked if the office is in the middle of a view corridor. Mr. Olsen said they plan to move the office to the area above the yoga studio by extending a walkway from the garage. If they place the office on the top of the building, the height is still lower than the current existing exercise room. Board Member Doyle questioned the timeframe to remove all of the existing materials, questioned how this will affect the neighborhood and how they will move the materials out. Mr. Jakubik said they plan to start construction in the spring. Some of the materials can be crushed and used for backfill on the site, therefore minimizing what will need to be removed from the site.

Judith Thompson, Contractor, said they recycle everything possible. They plan to treat these as two houses with two site crews, and will do them concurrently. They will do the demolishing as quickly as possible.

Board Member Doyle said there was also a concern about lighting, but they have answered it by describing the lighting as subtle.

Board Member Wilson asked if there is any interior screening and light screening for the neighbors. Mr. Olsen said there will be interior screens for sun and privacy.

Board Member Kricensky asked if the landscaping at 2 Gilmartin will be considered temporary, and whether it is being kept separate because it will be built on in the future. Mr. Olsen answered that this is probably the case.

The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Wilson said he inspected the site today, believes the property is gorgeous, and he likes the direction of the project. It is hard to make a decision on things like the fencing on Gilmartin and landscaping without story poles. He is hesitant on the size; in theory it fits on the property, but it allows an opportunity later for development. The request for a variance on the floor area ratio is over 100% and he has never reviewed anything that size. He is concerned that additional acreage could be developed if the variance is granted.

Board Member Doyle said the project seems massive, but it is deceiving. The newer house fits the site better than the existing house, since the existing house is more spread out on the site. He likes the direction of the project. A lot of the house is being put underground and so size is not as much of an issue. He is not as concerned that anyone will build additional structures on the site because of the character of the site. He thinks the project fits very well on the site. If the office is moved so it is not blocking the view, then he supports the project.

Board Member Wilson pointed out the permit is 18 months and he thinks there is no way it will be completed within 18 months. Because they want to move quickly, they will start work at 7am and work on Saturdays, which will bother the neighbors. Board Member Doyle said the hardscaping involves more steel and glass and will not create as much noise.

Board Member Kricensky said he likes the house and the philosophy. Looking simply at numbers, the size of the house on the property is very large. However, if the lot was divided into three lots, and the maximum house was put on each lot, one could place a total of 19,000 square feet on the properties. In terms of the scale, it is within the limits. The houses surrounding it are on much smaller lot sizes and it is a different feel than those neighboring houses. He thinks it is sensitively placed. He thinks moving the office to the second story will help. The theater should be included in the square footage, especially when asking for the variance.

Regarding lighting, Board Member Kricensky said having more fixtures of low lighting are more pleasing than larger floodlights. Most of the lights are low lighting and he is not concerned. He suggested finding out the elevation of the neighboring houses and communicate exactly where the trees will be located and how they will grow. He is concerned about the wall because the neighborhood has CC&Rs to not include walls. The neighborhood feels more open and neighborly because of the lack of such walls, he thinks the wall does not feel welcoming, and believed it would help to have some architectural breakup with some landscaping that becomes part of the wall.

Vice-Chair Tollini agreed with Board Member Kricensky that the wall will create a different feel for the neighborhood. He suggested, given the vast size of the property and project, that having a solid wall with vegetation or architectural breakup, would be a good addition to the property. He pointed out the wall cannot be seen with the landscaping in front of it. Regarding the floor area exception, this is a massive house, but there is an existing house on the site that is already massive. He agreed with staff's conclusion that the variance can be approved because it is consistent with the site and neighborhood. He really likes the design. The amount of glazing and architectural articulation keeps the house from looking monolithic and bulky. He is concerned about the second story office. He thinks that is a great improvement, but he is hesitant to approve it without moving the second story office story poles.

Vice-Chair Tollini also voiced concern about the trees, but noted there are some massive Pine trees that will be removed which will greatly improve the view corridor. He suggested seeing more landscaping in the southwest area of the property to shield the neighbor on that side.

Board Member Doyle questioned what will happen to the chimney in the area where the second story office would go, and Mr. Olsen said they will remove it.

Board Member Wilson said he is convinced on the square footage of the project after listening to other board members. He said the project is fairly doable, but he feels there is not enough information to approve it. He suggested removing the fence and using landscaping to shield the property.

Vice-Chair Tollini said he would like to see the revision showing changes fully documented before approving the project.

Board Member Doyle suggested there may be a way to break up the fence with some wood along the road. Board Member Kricensky supported making the fence more neighbor-friendly and stated that he really likes the house but wants to make sure the items they discussed are documented and that the applicant works with neighbors to settle their concerns.

Board Member Doyle summarized the changes requested of the applicant: Full documentation for the new location of the office, more detail on the fence design, and descriptive renderings of the landscaping from select neighboring viewpoints. Vice-Chair Tollini said he would like to add more landscaping on the southwest side of the property, as well.

Associate Planner Tyler addressed Mr. Anolik's concerns about view corridors and said the new house may be slightly shifted and there may be a different view blockage for 110 Gilmartin once 210 Gilmartin is developed. That will be reviewed again when 210 Gilmartin goes through design review.

ACTION: It was M/S (Wilson/Doyle) to continue the application for 110 Gilmartin Drive to the January 21, 2010 meeting. Vote: 4-0.

2. 2 Gilmartin Court Peterson Fencing and Landscape Improvements

The applicant is submitting a request to construct fencing and landscape improvements on property located at 2 Gilmartin Court. Currently the property is un-improved, and has remained vacant for some time.

The proposal includes constructing a perimeter fence around the property, as well as new access and vehicle entry gates at the front of the property. The majority of the property would be graded and landscaped to tie into the larger landscape development concept for the adjacent property at 110 Gilmartin Drive. No structures are proposed.

The public hearing was opened.

Public Comments:

Mark Singer, 5 Gilmartin Court, asked if the fence will also extend around 2 Gilmartin Court. Mr. Lord said the fence will extend around 2 Gilmartin, as well and they will take into consideration the comments from the DRB about the design of that fence at both 110 Gilmartin Drive and at 2 Gilmartin Court.

Fred Pistilli, 1 Gilmartin Court, asked how much of an offset there will be between the fence and the curb. He is concerned about the collection of leaves, wood, and bark in that area. He also asked for clarification of who is responsible for maintenance of that area. Mr. Lord said the fence will be in the same location as the existing fence on the property line. There is a retaining wall in another area, and they will fix the grading in that area so no retaining wall is needed. It will be much cleaner than what currently exists. It will be located on the property line, set back from the curb.

The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Kricensky asked if the erosion and drainage are Public Works issues. Associate Planner Tyler said Public Works is aware of the drainage issue and will make sure it is adequate.

ACTION: It was M/S (Kricensky/Wilson) to continue the application for 2 Gilmartin Court to the January 21, 2010 meeting. Vote: 4-0.

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #19 OF THE 11/19/09 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Board Member Kricensky noted a change in Item E, paragraph 9: "roof" should be changed to "roofing material."

ACTION: It was M/S (Doyle/Wilson) to approve Minutes #19 of the November 19, 2009 meeting as amended. Vote: 4-0.

H. ADJOURNMENT The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.