



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

Action and Approved Minutes - Regular Meeting
Design Review Board
April 21, 2011
7:00 P.M.

ACTION MINUTES #6

TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL At 7:00 PM

Present: Chair Tollini, Vice Chairman Kricensky and Boardmembers Chong and Weller
Absent: Boardmember Emberson
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

OLD BUSINESS

1. **65 REED RANCH ROAD:** File No. 711011; James Parsons & Andrea Hong, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of an addition to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to demolish an existing detached garage and construct a new 1,436 square foot, two-story addition including a new three-car garage, a workshop, guest bedroom and a train hobby room. APN 038-301-35 Continued to 5/5/11

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NEW BUSINESS

2. **705 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. 21106; Moe and Kowkab Shafaghi, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a fence, with a Variance for excess fence height. The applicants propose to reconstruct an existing 8 foot tall fence and replace it with a fence with a height of up to 9 feet tall. The fence would exceed the maximum fence height of 6 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 055-222-11. Approved 4-0
3. **215 BLACKFIELD DRIVE:** File No. 711030; Congregation Kol Shofar, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a classroom addition to an existing religious facility and day school (Congregation Kol Shofar). A new 3,231 square foot, 20 foot tall classroom addition would be constructed to the side of the existing main building on the site. The classroom addition would be identical to the design of the addition previously approved by the Town Council in 2008. APN 038-351-34. Approved 4-0

MINUTES

4. Regular Meeting of April 7, 2011 Approved 4-0

ADJOURNMENT At 8:25 PM

**APPROVED MINUTES #6
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF APRIL 21, 2011**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Tollini, Vice-Chair Kricensky, Boardmembers Chong and Weller

Absent: Boardmember Emberson

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING - None

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **65 REED RANCH ROAD:** File No. 711011; James Parsons & Andrea Hong, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of an addition to an existing single family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 953 square foot addition including a new garage, laundry room, bathroom, & storage loft. APN 038-301-35

On March 17, 2011 the Design Review Board reviewed an application for construction of an addition to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 65 Reed Ranch Road. At that meeting, the owners of the adjacent home to the west at 67 Reed Ranch Road raised objections to the proposed project. They were concerned about the proximity and visual mass and bulk of the proposed addition, along with potential noise and privacy impacts. The Design Review Board shared many of these concerns, particularly regarding the visual mass of the building and its proximity to the home at 67 Reed Ranch Road. The Board suggested that the height of the addition possibly be reduced, that the applicant consider other less sensitive locations for the addition, and more be done to properly attach the addition to the main building. The Board continued the application to the April 21, 2011 meeting to allow the applicant time to redesign the proposed addition.

The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the proposed project. The proposed addition has been moved to the east, away from 67 Reed Ranch Road. The existing detached garage at the northeast corner of the lot would be demolished and replaced with a new three-car garage, with a workshop space at the rear of the garage. The upper floor of the addition would include a guest bedroom and a model train room.

The upper level of the addition would be situated at the same level as the existing deck in front of the house. The upper level would connect to the interior of the main level of the house at the family room, with an interior stairway leading down to the lower level of the addition. The workshop space would be separated from the western side of the addition by a doorway and hallway area.

Jeffrey Wong, architect, thanked the Board for the continuance on the project and noted that the plan had been redesigned in accordance with the Board's suggestions. He said that they relocated the proposed addition from the western side of the property to the east and moved the structures 40 feet away from the neighbor's house, which was an increase from 25 feet in the previous proposal. He said that this would allow mature landscaping to remain on the eastern portion of the site. He said that the proposed addition would now be situated on the higher part of the property as a solidly integrated addition. He said that the new garage would feature a smaller workshop space in the rear. He said that they also included a hallway and stairs leading up to the second level. He stated that the hallway would be a heated and enclosed interior space that would act as a buffer for the neighbor on the west.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that draft Condition of Approval #11 was a holdover from the previous proposal and was not pertinent to the revised application.

Mr. Wong said that the existing house is a post and timber structure with an open floor plan. To ensure a seamless transition to the new addition, he said that a wall would be removed and the rooflines of the existing spaces would be reduced and matched to the addition. He said that they had reduced total lot coverage and reduced visual impact by stepping the massing back and only the second level of the addition would be visible from the neighboring property. He stated that the neighbor's house at 63 Reed Ranch Road is far to the south of their proposed addition and the impact would be only to their driveway and the street.

Mr. Wong noted the neighbors' assertion that the proposal would include more than 100 windows. He stated that many of these would be individual glass blocks and he did not see those as windows. Similarly, he noted that the neighbor across the street has 42 pieces of glazing on one façade but these are not windows. Mr. Wong addressed the concern about proposing a three-car garage and said that he walked around the neighborhood and counted 10 nearby houses with three-car garages.

Boardmember Weller asked if the smaller windows would be translucent but not transparent. Mr. Wong answered that they would let in light but one cannot see through them.

Vice-Chair Kricensky asked if the story poles conform to the height of the addition and noted that there were several mistakes on the plans. Mr. Wong apologized for the error and agreed that the elevation numbers shown on the plans were incorrect but that the story poles were set correctly.

Vice-Chair Kricensky questioned and confirmed that the trees to the west are owned by that property owner and all of the landscaping on the west will remain. Mr. Wong stated that one tree would remain and one would be transplanted to the other side.

Chair Tollini noted that one letter still raised an objection to the proposed fence. Mr. Wong replied that the new fence was no longer part of this project.

Chair Tollini asked about the proposed second story ceiling heights. Mr. Wong stated that the ceiling height of the bedroom and hobby room would be 10 feet, but the height would rise up to 16 feet in the monitor.

The public hearing was opened.

Dan Mihalovich stated that the Reedlands is a large neighborhood, mainly comprised of original developments that were built in the 1950s and 1960s, and that the three-car garages nearby are part of a later development where the lots are larger. He referred to the 100 windows or glass blocks proposed and voiced concern with the amount of light that would be generated from the addition when lights are on, as well as pathway lighting from the front door. He did not see how it would be possible to maintain all of the trees on the side of the property when a pathway needed to be cut from the front door to the street.

Christopher Wand said that he lives above the applicant and the lots in this subdivision were created to maximize views. He said that he had received many calls from neighbors who had seen the story poles and had expressed concern that this would set a precedent for very large alterations. He suggested reducing the addition in scale, including the ceiling height, and recommended excavation for the garage. He said that there are a lot of newer larger homes nearby and he agreed with Mr. Mihalovich about three-car garages in the neighborhood.

Mr. Wong clarified that a lot of the proposed openings would be all on the garage level which is not living space, and therefore the amount of time that lighting will be on in those areas would be fairly limited. He said that the owners have installed electric panels on the roof and are very sensitive to energy conservation. He said that all of the lighting in those spaces would be downlighting and the windows were intended to allow natural light through. He addressed the issue of closeness to the street and noted

that the addition would be behind the front setback line and would not be not any closer to the front than homes on adjacent properties. He cited several three-car garages on Indian Rock, Mariposa Court, and Reed Ranch Road, and said that he did not think that the development in which the homes are located was material. He said that the landscaping would be protected because the owners put many of the plants in themselves and it is in their interest as well to protect them during construction. As far as this project setting a precedent, he noted that this was a fully conforming project and he did not think that that would qualify as setting a precedent.

Boardmember Chong questioned and confirmed with Mr. Wong that the existing roof material is cement. Mr. Wong stated that the new structure will have copper sheeting and they intend to salvage some roof material from the existing garage to match the roof of the house.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Kricensky commended the architect and owner for addressing many of the issues brought up by the Board in the previous meeting. He noted that there would now be 38 to 40 feet between the addition and the home on the west side. He said that attaching the addition more solidly to the house reduces the impacts and that keeping existing landscaping would help act as a buffer. He said that the width of the proposed driveway was not out of character with its surroundings, as the proposed driveway would be narrower than the existing driveway. He said that stepping the building also worked very well. He was concerned about the main entry and stairway and how public that area would be open to the neighbors to the west. He was also concerned about the height and volume of the structure, especially looking at the east elevation when coming down Reed Ranch Road. He said that the difference in architecture between the existing building and the addition also concerned him. He stated that looking at the amount of glass area was more relevant than counting the number of windows. He said that he has seen many houses with more glass area than this one and felt that the eight-inch glass blocks are an architectural feature.

Boardmember Weller also commended the applicants for responding to the concerns expressed at the last meeting, particularly separation of the addition from the house and preservation of landscaping. He agreed with Vice-Chair Kricensky that the number of windows was irrelevant. He was concerned about the monitor that would be virtually all glass, as this would be a source of light for the neighbors. He agreed with the applicant that one cannot distinguish between the larger newer houses and the older ones within the neighborhood and that three-car garages are common in the area. He agreed with the concern about visibility of the entryway from adjacent properties. He said that if the light and privacy could be addressed then he could support the project.

Boardmember Chong said that no precedent was being set by the garage since the buildings would be behind the setback. He said that the windows and overall glazing did not concern him, but thought that interior light fixtures might be a potential concern. He did not think that the front stairs were as much of a concern because the entry would be simply used to get a person quickly in and out of the house. He was concerned about the difference in architecture of the addition versus the existing house and said that they would look like two different homes. He felt that the applicant was being squeezed by the setbacks of the neighbors' homes. He said that he could support the project if some limits could be established regarding the lighting, but he was unsure about the overall design.

Chair Tollini said that the footprint of the house was quite consistent with the neighborhood and the immediately adjacent neighbors and, if anything, would be set back more than a fair number of others in the neighborhood. He did not see the project as being inconsistent with the neighborhood and the three-car garage did not concern him because there were ample precedents for three-car garages in close proximity to the site. He was concerned with the height, volume and general prominence of the addition. He was less concerned about lighting and the windows and saw the windows as a design element that would tie together the old and new portions of the house. He commented on the fact that five rows of windows may make the addition look larger than it is. He said that the addition would be somewhat polarizing, with more and smaller windows instead of fewer, larger windows. He said that the stairs and entry would be close to their current location, a good distance from the neighbors and screened by

vegetation. He said that he was not concerned with the different architectural designs, but was more concerned about the height of the structure.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he was struggling with the massing of the building. He said that the footprint of the home would be almost identical with its neighbors, but the volume would be larger because the extra space would be more vertical.

Planning Manager Watrous suggested that if the monitor above the hobby room was reduced it would eliminate one row of the smaller windows.

Chair Tollini agreed that the tallest portion of the addition was the main focal point, but would eliminate the row of windows that help tie the addition to the main house. However, he felt that eliminating this would reduce the height of the back portion of the addition and might help the Board approve the project.

Boardmember Weller believed that the addition would be better tied in without the monitor because the structure would be lower. He also thought that light would be reduced by eliminating the row of windows.

Chair Tollini suggested other windows could be revisited and encouraged some discretion in the design.

Boardmember Chong questioned and confirmed that the ceiling height in the guest bedroom is 10 feet and total height with the monitor is about 12 ½ feet. Mr. Wong said that this was driven by the interior of the existing structure. He said that the existing house is not very attractive and they are trying to create something more visually interesting.

Vice-Chair Kricensky suggested pulling in the monitor walls, reducing it, and stepping it back. He said that that would create the same design rhythm and reduce the volume and windows.

Boardmember Chong said that some work could be done on the upper area to solve the light issue and to help the two structures come together better. He also felt that some of the six rows of windows could be reduced.

Chair Tollini said he would be interested in seeing revised plans to address the monitor and windows. He did not think that any redesign or substantial work should be done to make the new addition look more like the existing house because the existing house is aesthetically challenged. Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he did not think that the addition needed to look like the existing house, but rather some elements could be pulled together. Chair Tollini suggested possible alterations to the existing structure to tie in some of the elements of the addition.

Boardmember Weller encouraged the applicant to reduce the rows of windows, perhaps removing the row of windows in the garage, to mitigate the “747” or “cruise ship” look of the design. Chair Tollini agreed that the structure would be more attractive without the extra row of windows in the garage doors.

Mr. Wong pointed out that the north elevation was somewhat deceiving and that no one would ever see all six rows of windows at one time because of the eaves and deep setbacks. Chair Tollini agreed. Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he could go either way on the windows on the garage and that it would depend on the design of the garage doors. He suggested some wording regarding exterior lighting around the stairs and entry.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Kricensky) to continue 65 Reed Ranch Road to the May 5, 2011 meeting. Vote: 4-0.</p>

E. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NEW BUSINESS

- 705 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. 21106; Moe and Kowkab Shafaghi, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a fence, with a Variance for excess fence height. The applicants propose to reconstruct an existing 8 foot tall fence and replace it with a fence with

a height of up to 9 feet tall. The fence would exceed the maximum fence height of 6 feet.
Assessor's Parcel No. 055-222-11.

The applicant is requesting to construct a fence with a variance for excess fence height on property located at 705 Hawthorne Drive. Currently the property is improved with a single family dwelling. The fence would be located on the left side (north) of the property, facing Rock Hill Drive and is proposed at a maximum height of nine feet (9'). The pre-existing fence was damaged by winter storms, and therefore there is currently no fence. The property owner has installed a temporary six foot (6') high fence for safety and privacy. The maximum permitted fence height in any zone is 6 feet. The applicant is therefore requesting a variance for excess fence height, in order to construct a 9 foot high fence.

Moe Shafaghi, owner, stated that their fence was damaged by a storm and they want to replace the existing fence.

Boardmember Weller asked if any neighbors would be affected by the fence. Mr. Shafaghi answered no because the fence would face Rock Hill Drive.

Chair Tollini asked if the existing fence was 8 feet high. Mr. Shafaghi said that when they measured it was 9 feet, 2 inches. Vice-Chair Kricensky asked if the total height would vary, and Mr. Shafaghi said it would vary between 7 and 9 feet and would step with the slope. Vice-Chair Kricensky asked for clarification of the height on the low end, and Mr. Shafaghi said the lower height would be 5 feet plus 2 feet of lattice. Boardmember Weller clarified that 12 feet of the fence would 7 feet high and the remaining portion would be 9 feet high.

There were no public comments.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said he viewed the fence and he agrees with the staff's findings for the variance. Boardmember Weller agreed and stated that there is a need for a higher fence in that location. Chair Tollini said that Rock Hill Drive has a lot of traffic due to the churches and schools on the street, and the higher fence is a necessity. Boardmember Chong agreed with the other Boardmembers.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Weller) that the request for 705 Hawthorne Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.</p>
--

3. **215 BLACKFIELD DRIVE:** File No. 711030; Congregation Kol Shofar, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a classroom addition to an existing religious facility and day school (Congregation Kol Shofar). A new 3,231 square foot, 20 foot tall classroom addition would be constructed to the side of the existing main building on the site. The classroom addition would be identical to the design of the addition previously approved by the Town Council in 2008. APN 038-351-34

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new one-story classroom addition to an existing religious facility and day school (Congregation Kol Shofar). The floor area of the proposed addition would be 3,231 square feet, which is less than the 3,662 square foot classroom addition approved for the site by a conditional use permit governing this property. The addition would increase the lot coverage on the site by 3,231 square feet to a total of 35,035 square feet, which would be less than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-1 zone. The 20 foot height of the proposed addition would be the maximum height permitted by the conditional use permit.

On February 21, 2007, the Town Council approved on appeal a conditional use permit (Resolution No. 15-2007, attached as Exhibit 3) to remodel and expand the facilities and operations of the existing synagogue (Congregation Kol Shofar) and private day school uses on property located at 215 Blackfield Drive. Condition No. 1 (A) of Resolution No. 15-2007 allowed "construction of a new one-story, 3,662 square foot, 20-foot high classroom building consisting of four (4) classrooms and a service building." One November 15, 2007, the Design Review Board approved a Site Plan and Architectural Review

application (File No. 707122) to construct additions and renovations to the property, including a 3,920 square foot classroom building. The Tiburon Neighborhood Coalition, a group of nearby property owners, filed an appeal of the Board's decision to the Town Council. On March 19, 2008, the Town Council adopted Resolution No. 12-2008 partially granting the appeal and approving the project with revised conditions of approval. The approval period for the classroom addition expired on March 19, 2011. The applicants have now submitted the subject application for the classroom addition to maintain their ability to construct this addition under the terms of their conditional use permit.

Joshua Steinhauer, member of the Board for Kol Shofar, said that there were no changes in the project whatsoever. He said that they were unable to proceed with construction of the classroom and were essentially asking for an extension of time to complete that portion of the project.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Weller said the applicant was only asking for approval of something that had already been thoroughly vetted and approved and he supported the request. The other Boardmembers agreed. Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he visited the site and the addition would not affect anyone.

ACTION: It was M/S (Kricensky/Weller) approving the request for 215 Blackfield Drive, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.
--

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #5 OF THE 4/7/11 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S (Kricensky/Weller) to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2011 meeting as written. Vote: 4-0.
--

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.