



TOWN OF TIBURON
Tiburon Town Hall
1505 Tiburon Boulevard
Tiburon, CA 94920

Action and Approved Minutes - Regular Meeting
Design Review Board
July 15, 2010
7:00 P.M.

ACTION MINUTES #11 TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Present: Chairman Chong, Vice Chairman Tollini, Boardmembers Kricensky & Weller
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF BRIEFING (if any)

NEW BUSINESS

1. **144 AVENIDA MIRAFLORES:** File No. 21009; Stephanie and John Plexico, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of an addition to an existing single-family dwelling, with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception. The applicants propose to enlarge an existing garage and construct an addition to the lower level of the house. The additions would extend to within 23' 11" of the front property line, in lieu of the minimum 30' front yard setback for this property. The proposed floor area of 3,622 square feet would exceed the floor area ratio for this lot of 3,514 square feet. **Approved 4-0**
2. **680 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. 709044; Colleen Mahoney, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 1,072 square foot second story addition to add a larger master bedroom suite, two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, and a guest suite for the existing dwelling. Four new skylights would be installed. **Continued to September 2, 2010**
3. **2312 SPANISH TRAIL:** File No. 710021; Bill and Joy Norris, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a detached two-family dwelling, with a detached two-family exception. The applicants propose to construct a 1,180 square foot detached dwelling below the existing house on the site. **Continued to September 2, 2010**

MINUTES

4. Regular Meeting of July 1, 2010 **Approved 4-0**

ADJOURNMENT 9:25 PM

**APPROVED MINUTES #11
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF JULY 15, 2010**

The meeting was opened at 7:03 p.m. by Chair Chong.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Chong, Vice-Chair Tollini, Boardmember Kricensky and Boardmember Weller
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous announced that Linda Emberson had been appointed by the Town Council to fill the vacancy on the Design Review Board and will be present at the next DRB meeting.

Planning Manager Watrous also reported that the Town Council considered and granted the appeal for 1490 Vistazo West Street. He stated that the Council determined that the orientation and the amount of glass of the proposed house were inharmonious with the surrounding neighborhood and the remaining trees would not provide sufficient privacy. He expected the applicant to submit a redesign in the future.

D. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

1. 144 AVENIDA MIRAFLORES: File No. 21009; Stephanie and John Plexico, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of an addition to an existing single-family dwelling, with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception. The applicants propose to enlarge an existing garage and construct an addition to the lower level of the house. The additions would extend to within 23'11" of the front property line, in lieu of the minimum 30' front yard setback for this property. The proposed floor area of 3,622 square feet would exceed the floor area ratio for this lot of 3,514 square feet.

The applicant is submitting a request to construct additions with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception, on property located at 144 Avenida Miraflores. The proposal would slightly enlarge the existing garage for additional space and to accommodate a new garage door, and would also add a minimal amount of floor area to the lower level for expansion of a mudroom and the addition of a small closet. A new wood trellis would be added at the entry area, and new windows and doors would be installed throughout the home. Three new skylights are also proposed, as well as reconstruction of the existing wood deck off the living room at the main level.

The proposed structure would result in a lot coverage of 2,915 square feet (19.2%) which exceeds the maximum permitted lot coverage in the RO-2 zoning district (15.0%). As the existing structure currently exceeds the maximum lot coverage, and the request to expand the garage is a less than 1% increase, a variance is not required for excess lot coverage. The proposed structure would result in a gross floor area of 3,622 square feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted gross floor area for a parcel of this size (3,514.2 sq. ft.). Therefore, a floor area exception has been requested.

The existing garage currently encroaches into the front yard setback a distance of three feet, seven inches (3'7"), for a reduced front yard setback of 26'5". The proposal would expand the garage an additional two feet, six inches (2'6") into the setback, for a further reduced front yard setback of twenty-three feet, eleven inches (23'11"). As the minimum required front yard setback in the RO-2 zone is thirty feet (30'), a variance for reduced front yard setback has been requested.

David Holscher, architect, said that this was a small revision to the residence, with the only major change being the 2'6" extension of the garage into the front yard setback. He noted that they had worked with the Fire Marshall to remove some trees on the property.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Kricensky said that the addition was modest and since the roof already overhangs the extension area, he saw no problem with it.

Boardmember Weller said that this was a straightforward application and agreed with Boardmember Kricensky.

Vice-Chair Tollini and Chair Chong both stated that they visited the site and concurred with the other Boardmembers.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Weller/Kricensky) that the request for 144 Avenida Miraflores is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.</p>

2. 680 HAWTHORNE DRIVE: File No. 709044; Colleen Mahoney, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 1,072 square foot second story addition to add a larger master bedroom suite, two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, and a guest suite for the existing dwelling. Four new skylights would be installed.

The applicant has submitted a request for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, located at 680 Hawthorne Drive. The current structure is a partial two-story structure. The proposal aims to remodel a majority of the existing dwelling, and incorporate a full second story. The new lower level would still maintain a two-car garage, living, dining and family rooms and a kitchen. The two bedrooms would be removed and a new home office would be incorporated with a bathroom and a larger interior stairwell. The upper level would now include a larger master bedroom suite, two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, and a guest suite.

The proposed structure would create a lot coverage of 2,016 square feet (20.6%) which is below the maximum permitted lot coverage in the R-1 zoning district (30.0%). The proposed structure would create a gross floor area of 2,958 square feet, which is below the maximum permitted floor area for a parcel of this size (2,976 sq. ft.).

Planning Manager Watrous distributed another section from the Hillside Guidelines that might be pertinent to the discussion of this application.

Colleen Mahoney, owner/architect, said that she has two children and the goal of the project is to add onto the house to provide living space for her family. She stated that she tried to make the project a remodel rather than a tear-down and reconstruction, but it was a challenge to keep the remodel to less than 50% of the current floor area. She stated that the house is set back from the street, and they are proposing that the addition remain within the footprint of the existing house and centered more on the property.

Ms. Mahoney said that she chose to do a simple remodel with an architectural style in keeping with the neighborhood and the existing home with low ceiling heights. She understood that neighbors would be concerned with setting a precedent in the neighborhood regarding two-story homes, but she noted that there are several two-story houses above hers. She noted that this house is at a bend in the road where Tiburon Boulevard rises above her home. She said that there are also large, mature trees between her property and Palmer Court and that she had removed one redwood tree. She said that she knows the neighborhood well and thought that other solutions would not be as successful as the proposed plan. She presented photographs of the trees surrounding her property and said that she has worked with neighbors

in the past regarding windowing trees but had a problem with the arborist who never met with her and removed some of the fence boards, and this has set up an antagonistic relationship that she regrets. She asked that if the Board felt that the project design was not the appropriate direction for this property, then she wanted to hear what the Board would propose.

The public hearing was opened.

Mariana Longstreth said that she has lived in her house since 1977 and represents the homeowners association. She stated that many homes in the neighborhood have a modest view of the bay, Sausalito, and the Golden Gate Bridge. She said that the addition to this property would not affect her view, but she was concerned that second-story additions in this area would set a precedent in the neighborhood. She said that she would support a variance for lot coverage to create more space for a family, but there was substantial controversy in the neighborhood around views and trees.

Robert Van Blaricom said that he lives directly across the street from the property and has lived there for 44 years. He said that he had a panoramic view when he arrived in Tiburon, but his view is now blocked by trees. He wanted to keep what view he has and hoped that some of the trees in the neighborhood will be removed to regain his view. He said that the proposed second story would block that potential view forever and he was concerned that it would affect the value of his house. He felt that the second story would also be very large and obtrusive and out of character with the rest of the neighborhood.

Elena Stephens opposed the plan because it would block her neighbors' views and set a precedent. She also thought that the size of the proposed plan was too large for the neighborhood.

John Hermansky said that he lives about five houses away from the subject property, so the proposed addition would not block his view. However, he opposed the design because he was concerned about second story additions in the neighborhood. He said that there are very few second stories in the neighborhood, and the sentiment of the neighborhood is opposed to major second story additions. He said that most recent additions have been placed to the rear of the property and some discretion was used in determining their design. He felt that the current project was different from other two-story additions, was dramatic and needed to be modified to be acceptable in the neighborhood. He voiced concern about the seismic strength of the structure unless there was major reconstruction of the first floor and felt that the project was an entirely new house and not a remodel.

Linda Wishart said that the addition would be very massive, extending out onto the property and also up to the second story. She said that she would be looking at a very large house and she thought that it was too massive.

Ms. Mahoney said that she was not surprised that the second story was controversial. She noted that the existing garage is in the side yard setback. She said that her goal was to try to keep the house back from the street and to change materials and add trellises to break up the mass so it would not seem imposing. She said that she had consulted a structural engineer and they plan to add steel to strengthen the existing frame. She did not want to tear the house down and thought that the existing trees screen the house and create a significant back wall to the building. She stated that the house would barely be seen from the street because it would be so well screened by the trees that surround it. She said that over the years she has had arborists trim the trees and keep them healthy, but the trees were there when she bought the property and no one in the neighborhood has ever approached her about the trees. She said that she would be willing to look at another course of action, but anything else would require a larger, more dramatic structure that would be closer to the street, and that would become a new home and no longer a remodel.

Vice-Chair Tollini asked what portions of the existing structure would be salvaged, and commented that this seems like a tear down. Ms. Mahoney said that she looked at this closely with an engineer and they would put two new steel frames in the center of the home and attempt to keep the lower floor intact as much as possible.

Vice-Chair Tollini asked if the drainage easement is within the setback, and Ms. Mahoney answered yes.

Chair Chong asked what other options were explored for a one-story design. Ms. Mahoney said that she did not explore a one-story version because it would not work for their family. She said that moving the garage over would push the house too far forward because of the wedge-shape of the property. She looked at the possibility of a one-story house but did not pursue it in as much detail as the current plan. She said that an option would be to have no garage, but most people want a garage so they can have a secure place to park off the street. She said that a one-story home would be such a sacrifice that she would not be able to have a garage on the property, and she said that she cannot afford a completely new home. She said that such a design would require a major variance and take up most of the lot. She said that she had explored this for a few years and did not think that she would be able to come up with a different solution.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Kricensky said that he was sensitive to the needs of the applicant, but a massive house cannot work well on a small lot and the project must adhere to the Hillside Guidelines regarding the neighbors' views. He said that he was having a hard time supporting the project and felt that the size of the addition means that the project must become a rebuild.

Vice-Chair Tollini said that he visited the site and found the project to be quite massive, tall and wide. He said that this was one of the most buildable lots he had seen in a while. He described the lot as wedge-shaped, but not pie-shaped, with a lot of room to maneuver on the site. He said that he could possibly support a design that included lot coverage or setback variances if it were one-story. He said that although the design met the basic zoning standards, it did not work for the neighborhood and was an inappropriate result for the site.

Boardmember Weller agreed with Boardmember Kricensky and Vice-Chair Tollini and that the design was inappropriate for the site. He said that he visited the site and the potential for precedent concerned him, adding that it was a slippery slope toward allowing more second story construction in this neighborhood. He noted that the trees in the back constrained the ability to develop in the area. He suggested removing the trees to allow construction in that area and to reduce the second story so that it would not affect the neighbors.

Chair Chong said that his largest concern was the view impact on the uphill neighbor. He noted that trees can die or be removed, but the addition would remain. He stated that the Board has supported two-story designs in flat neighborhoods that do not affect neighbors' views, but the Board has also supported variances so construction can occur in setbacks to avoid blocking views with two-story additions. He supported a continuance to allow the applicant to explore a one-story addition, with possible variances.

Boardmember Kricensky said that a partial second story addition that would be located so that it did not impact neighbors could possibly be approved. Boardmember Weller said that he understood the need for more space in these relatively small houses to accommodate a family, but this would be a radical change to the neighborhood and he would be open to variances that would permit construction in setbacks. Chair Chong noted that other recent additions on Hawthorne Drive had been one-story projects to avoid these problems.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Weller) to continue the application for 680 Hawthorne Drive to the September 2, 2010 meeting. Vote: 4-0.
--

3. 2312 SPANISH TRAIL: File No. 710021; Bill and Joy Norris, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a detached two-family dwelling, with a detached two-family exception. The applicants propose to construct a 1,180 square foot detached dwelling below the existing house on the site.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new detached two-family dwelling on property located at 2312 Spanish Trail. The proposed structure would have one level of living space and an overall height of 21 feet, 5¾ inches. The dwelling would include a great room, kitchen, a master bedroom suite, one additional bedroom and bathroom and a pantry/laundry room.

The proposed dwelling would increase the lot coverage on the site by 1,509 square feet to 3,495 square feet (30.1%) of the lot, which is less than the 35.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-2 zone. The proposed 1,180 square foot dwelling would increase the floor area on the site to 3,115 square feet, which is 13 square feet less than the 3,128 square foot floor area ratio for a lot of this size. Section 16-21.030 of the Tiburon Zoning Ordinance requires that a detached two-family dwelling in the R-2 zone obtain a detached two-family dwelling exception.

Planning Manager Watrous noted two typographic errors in the Staff Report. First, the surname of the applicant should be “**Norris**” and not “Harris.” Second, the top of page 9 should read “...**insufficient** evidence to support the exception” instead of “...sufficient evidence to support the exception.”

Roger Hartley, designer, described the project as a modest proposal for a 2-bedroom 2-bath house, with an efficient design with no hallways and little storage. He said that they considered attaching the dwelling to the existing building, but there were several impediments to doing that. He said that the existing landscaping on the downhill side is quite mature and large and much of it would need to be removed. He said that the existing house is barely visible currently from Vista Del Mar, and so they chose to maintain landscaping and move the proposed structure as far away as possible, which would also provide usable yard space for both properties.

Mr. Hartley disputed several items in the staff report. He stated that there are four legal parking spaces on the property, along with two additional spaces. He stated that the parking would not become any less convenient by building the second unit. He did not believe that neighbors would be negatively impacted and that there would be more of an impact on homes above the site if the second dwelling was moved uphill. He said that they reduced the height of the building by three feet to reduce the impact on the neighbor above. He presented photographs showing the original location of the story poles and the new location when they moved the structure down. He disagreed that the neighbors have a slot view that would be affected by the project as a hedge already blocks those views. He stated that it would be very difficult to attach the second unit to the existing building because it would seriously impact the floor plan of the existing building, cutting off light and access to the lower floor. He said that the existing house is in poor condition and adapting that lower floor would require massive floor plan changes and trigger a lot of additional construction. He did not want to render the existing house a teardown which could require moving a new house down the hill. He said that he studied this thoroughly and tried a number of different ways of locating the structure on the property. He stated that the existing second unit on the site was immaterial and does not address the hardship question. He felt that there would be no additional impact on parking because there are already two families living on the property. He disagreed that it would be a preferable solution to move the structure uphill and attach it to the existing structure. He believed that the project meets all of the necessary criteria, would have no view impact, have enough parking, and there would be practical difficulties with attaching the structure to the existing house. He said that they are proposing two very small buildings that are in keeping with the neighborhood and would keep the landscaping in place to provide screening, which would change if the buildings were attached.

William Norris, owner, said that the purpose of the proposed dwelling is to provide a home for his oldest daughter and family. He expressed concern that the staff report does not mention the uphill home at 2356 Spanish Trail. He said that that is the only home that would have a primary view of the proposed dwelling, while the other homes have side views of the project. He said that the proposed home would be small and he was offended seeing the words “mass” and “bulk” pertaining to this home. He was concerned that a supporting letter from the owner of 2356 Spanish Trail was not mentioned in the staff report. He said that they had trimmed a tree on their property that blocked a view of Angel Island for a neighbor and agreed to prune another tree to provide a neighbor with an East Bay view. He said that the property has a three car garage and two adjacent spots that provide enough parking, and he felt that the fact that they have more off-street parking than most people in the neighborhood was significant. He said that they never park their cars on Vista Del Mar. He felt that young people today cannot afford to live in Tiburon and he thought the Town should be pleased that he wants to build a one-level two bedroom home that would comply with the zoning standards.

The public hearing was opened.

Eugene Aureguy said that he owns a duplex on Paradise Drive that also fronts on Vista Del Mar. He said that he fought for years for two separate dwellings and everyone in the neighborhood was against it, but he felt that his neighbors would now agree that it was good planning and improved the neighborhood. He said that the existing garage structure is unattractive and adds nothing to the neighborhood, while a very attractive house in that location would enhance the value of his own and the neighbors' properties. He has been through many meetings and has seen many objections in his time as a developer and felt that this would be a very attractive house and would not impact views or traffic. He suggested that the old garage be demolished and incorporated within the building.

Terry Schwakopf said that she has never objected to anything in Tiburon, but no one approached her to try to discuss this project or show her options. She said that Vista Del Mar is very narrow and compact. When viewing the story poles, she said that she would be quite concerned with the houses on either side. She felt that the house would be very visible and have a large footprint. She thought it would seem possible to design an attached second home.

Gary Glover said that it was refreshing to see a proposal without variances that would be in scale with their neighborhood. He felt that a detached second unit would be far better than a large duplex. He said that the size of this lot could easily accommodate more cars than is proposed. He thought that the scale and aesthetics of the design were in keeping with the neighborhood.

Robin Moore agreed with Ms. Schwakopf's comments. She said that her house is across the street from the lower portion of the proposed structure. She stated that parking has always been an issue and that she has five parking spaces, but people always park on her property, even without an additional home on the street. She said that the proposed home would have the same floor area as her house. She thought that the proposed structure would be way too big for the neighborhood.

Teri Glover said that only one car can fit down Spanish Trail and the parking is terrible in the area because the roads are very narrow. She said that the proposed house would be smaller than any house on the whole block of Spanish Trail and surrounding streets. She stated that the houses next to this are huge and it did not seem fair that one cannot build on one's own property even when the codes are met.

Celia DeMartini represented Ann DeMartini and said that her concerns were to preserve her mother's property value. She said that if her mother's tenant feels that their privacy is impacted, then that would reduce their ability to rent that unit. She did not think that detached units were the way to go on these streets.

Wally Quinn said that he lives in a legal duplex about 30 feet from the applicant's property. He did not believe that the exception should be granted for this property. He stated that one of the garage spaces is being used to store a boat. He said that the applicants' five cars are being spread throughout the neighborhood, and he believed that staff did an excellent job reviewing this application.

Shelley Brown said that she lives directly west of the applicant's property. She opposed the project due to the mass and bulk, as well as privacy issues and view impediments. She said that as she walks up the front stairs of her home the story poles indicate a massive building that would look right into her front yard and onto her deck, which she uses often. She values living on the lane, including the open feeling and views, and the proposed house would make her feel very claustrophobic and uncomfortable.

David Kirchhoff said that he cannot see the proposed house, but he represents Mr. Wittingham, and questioned and confirmed that the Board received his letter. Mr. Kirchhoff said that he is a realtor and he represented the subject property when the Norris's purchased it. He said that one of the reasons the Norris's were selected as buyers was that they said that they would not tear down the house. He said that other prospective owners wanted to tear down the house and build a 3,200 square foot house in its place. He said that a new house would have to be moved downhill to conform with the setbacks, which could affect Mr. Wittingham's property.

Mr. Kirchhoff asked why Mr. Wittingham's house was excluded from the analysis. Planning Manager Watrous said it was never brought to their attention until after the report had been prepared, and the letter was delivered with the report as late mail to the Design Review Board and the Board has read it. Mr. Kirchhoff said that Mr. Wittingham would like his house to be included in the evaluation of this project.

Boardmember Weller said the Board cannot work with hypothetical situations, and if another proposal were presented for consideration that included a structure that would affect his house, then the Board would welcome that discussion. Mr. Kirchhoff said that Mr. Wittingham is very much in favor of the detached structure because an attached structure would have a significant impact on his property.

Sue Zimmerman said that she lives in a duplex on Paradise Drive at Vista Del Mar and was asked to help draft the detached two-family dwelling ordinance. She said that the vision for the R-2 zone was different than for the R-1 zone and used impromptu models to demonstrate the differences in mass and bulk between two detached homes and one attached duplex. She said that it would be visually dense to have two detached structures as opposed to having one attached structure with two units. She noted that the zoning ordinance has been revised to establish criteria for detached units in the R-2 zone and she did not feel that this is a lot that qualifies to have two structures because it does not meet these criteria. She hoped that the Board would protect the R-2 zone and deny the project. She also urged the Board to look at this application as a whole, noting that the property already has a shed and garage and they are now asking for another structure on the lot.

Joy Norris said that she loves the massive magnolia tree in the yard, and she did not want to remove it to construct an attached duplex. She said that there have only been five cars on the site recently because they have not yet had time to sell one that they recently replaced.

Mr. Hartley said that it would be a poor solution to try to create an attached structure, as there are numerous design impediments to try to attach the second unit to the existing home.

Boardmember Kricensky asked how the parking is conforming. Mr. Hartley answered that four parking spaces are available in the garage. Boardmember Kricensky said the space is not big enough to park cars if the doors of the garage are closed. Mr. Hartley said the 18 foot depth was measured with the doors opened. Planning Manager Watrous noted that a suggested condition of approval would require the applicant to remove the garage doors to make those adequate parking spaces. Mr. Norris said that there is a huge stone wall with beams inside the garage and he would not like to tear that down, but he was willing to remove the doors.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Weller said that when he visited the site it became clear that this house is being built on Vista Del Mar and not on Spanish Trail. He said that the house would affect other homes on Vista Del Mar but not any homes on Spanish Trail. He said that he could not conclude that preservation of a magnolia tree would justify the radical change to the area that would result from this plan. He objected to the overhang of the porch which would extend the view impediment on the neighbors. He stated that the effect on people is more important than preservation of existing landscaping. He agrees with staff's analysis that the application has not met the criteria that the ordinance requires for a detached two-family dwelling exception. He said that the intent of the ordinance was to discourage building two separate structures. However, he said that would not necessarily be against two separate structures on this site, but this particular application does not meet the criteria.

Vice-Chair Tollini agreed with Boardmember Weller. He noted that the procedure for a detached two-family dwelling exception sets up a rigorous set of hurdles and he felt that the project as proposed clearly does not meet two of the five criteria. He said that the project could not demonstrate the practical difficulty of attaching two units on the site or the superiority of the detached unit project design, nor could the project demonstrate that the design would reduce impacts on the neighbors. He concluded that the project therefore fails based on the zoning criteria alone. He said that he also did not necessarily have a problem with a detached unit on this site. He felt that parking may also be an issue. He said that the proposed unit would be very high with a vaulted roof and he could not say that this detached house would

have less impact than an attached unit. He said that he has seen larger homes with less visual impact than the proposed dwelling.

Boardmember Kricensky said that the physical conditions of the site include an existing residence and the whole upper part of the lot is very difficult to build upon. He stated that a future home on the site would likely be pulled down the hill, but would not be much larger than the existing house on the site. He said that he could rationalize the zoning requirements either way. He said that the impact of the second house would be greater than the existing house. He said that a more cottage-style house that was set further back, which also dealt with the parking issues, might be easier to consider. He said that a detached second unit might work on this site, but would likely have more impact on the homes on Vista Del Mar.

Chair Chong said if one were starting with a blank slate without an existing house, the units would be built in the center of the lot. He agreed with Boardmember Kricensky that the criteria could be rationalized either way. He liked the design of the house, although there was room for improvement regarding its height. He would like to see the applicant remove the wall in the garage so there are not so many structures on the lot. He agreed that the home at 2356 Spanish Trail was the most potentially impacted, but felt that the homes on either side of the property would have only minor view impacts.

Boardmember Weller said that the ordinance is pretty clearly against the idea of two detached residences. However, the thought that if the proposed structure was moved back to lessen the impact on the Vista Del Mar neighbors and offered a better parking solution, the project might work. He did not think that the current proposal would allow him to conclude that the requirements have been met.

Vice-Chair Tollini agreed that a "cottage" design might work and agreed that the proposed house would have more mass than the existing house on the site.

Chair Chong said that a more modestly proportioned house moved further up the hill might be acceptable.

Vice-Chair Tollini said that an improved parking solution would also be necessary, possibly combining the parking structure with the proposed dwelling.

Boardmember Kricensky said that pulling the house back would better align the structure with other homes on Vista Del Mar. He said that, as proposed, the house has too much volume and that a smaller house would work better. He said that he would like to see the applicant look into providing some parking on the Spanish Trail side of the property.

ACTION: It was M/S (Weller/Kricensky) to continue the application for 2312 Spanish Trail to the September 2, 2010 meeting. Vote: 4-0.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #10 OF THE 7/1/10 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S (Kricensky/Tollini) to approve the minutes of the July 1, 2010 meeting as written. Vote: 4-0.
--

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.