



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

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

## ACTION MINUTES #11

### TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

#### CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL *At 7:00 PM*

**Present:** Chair Kricensky, Vice Chair Emberson, Boardmembers Chong and Tollini  
**Absent:** None  
**Ex-Officio:** Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler and Minutes Clerk Rusting

#### ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

**Kricensky elected Chair; Emberson elected Vice-Chair**

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. **1915 STRAITS VIEW DRIVE:** File No. 21101; John Jiang & Ning Lang, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicants propose to construct a 4,099 square foot house with a 3,612 square foot basement, along with an attached two-car garage, swimming pool, spa and new retaining walls and landscaping. The proposed lot coverage of 4,151 square feet (19.1%) would be greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. APN 038-301-35  
**Continued to 7/21/11**
2. **1599 TIBURON BOULEVARD:** File No. 711041; Zelinsky Properties LLC, Owners; Armstrong Development Properties LLC, Applicant; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of exterior alterations to an existing commercial building. The applicant proposes changes to a commercial building to establish a drug store and pharmacy, with a future retail tenant. Exterior changes include a new drive-through pharmacy and canopy, parking lot modifications, two new walls, landscaping, light and storefront changes. Assessor's Parcel Nos. 058-171-88 & 89. **Approved 4-0**
3. **151 LELAND WAY:** File No. 21109; Steven and Nicole Klopukh, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicants propose to construct a 371 square foot addition to the rear of the house for a new study and an expanded great room. The project would result in lot coverage of 34.2%, which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1-BA zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-121-10. **Approved 4-0**

#### MINUTES

4. Regular Meeting of June 16, 2011 **Approved 3-0**

#### ADJOURNMENT *At 7:50 PM*

**APPROVED MINUTES #11  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF JULY 7, 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 Emberson

**Absent:** None

**Ex-Officio:** Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler and Minutes Clerk Rusting

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**

**C. STAFF BRIEFING**

Planning Manager Watrous announced that the application for 1915 Straits View Drive had been continued to the July 21, 2011 meeting.

Planning Manager Watrous also reported that the previous night the Town Council held the hearing for the appeal of 65 Reed Ranch Road. He said that the Council continued the hearing with specific direction to the applicant, including changes to the massing viewed from Reed Ranch Road and further reduction of the window treatments. He stated that Boardmember Emberson made a brief presentation when called upon by the Council and did a good job summarizing the Design Review Board's deliberation.

**D. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

Chair Tollini opened the floor for nominations for Chair. Boardmember Emberson nominated Vice-Chair Kricensky as Chair of the Design Review Board. There were no other nominations. Chair Tollini closed the nominations for Chair.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Emberson/Chong) to appoint Vice-Chair Kricensky as Chair of the Design Review Board. Vote: 4-0.</p>
---

Chair Kricensky opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair. Boardmember Tollini nominated Boardmember Emberson as Vice-Chair of the Design Review Board. There were no other nominations. Chair Kricensky closed the nominations for Vice-Chair.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Tollini/Chong) to appoint Boardmember Emberson as Vice-Chair of the Design Review Board. Vote: 4-0.</p>
---

## E. OLD BUSINESS

1. **1915 STRAITS VIEWDRIVE:** File No. 21101; John Jiang & Ning Lang, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with a variance for excess lot coverage. The applicants propose to construct a 4,099 square foot house with a 3,612 square foot basement, along with an attached two-car garage, swimming pool, spa and new retaining walls and landscaping. The proposed lot coverage of 4,151 square feet (19.1%) would be greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. APN 038-301-35 **CONTINUED TO JULY 21, 2011**

Planning Manager Watrous announced that there was a request to move the item for 151 Leland Way to the beginning of the agenda.

3. **151 LELAND WAY:** File No. 21109; Steven and Nicole Klopukh, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicants propose to construct a 371 square foot addition to the rear of the house for a new study and an expanded great room. The project would result in lot coverage of 34.2%, which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1-BA zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-121-10.

On June 16, 2011 the Design Review Board reviewed an application to construct an addition to the existing single-family dwelling with a variance for excess lot coverage, located at 151 Leland Way. During the meeting, none of the neighbors spoke against the project; however, the adjacent neighbor at 157 Leland Way submitted a letter prior to the meeting, stating concerns with the proposed roof height of the addition. The neighbor's primary concern was that the increase in roof height would block morning sunlight into their breakfast nook, which is the closest primary living space to the subject property.

It was the consensus of the Board that the proposed addition would not add excessive mass and bulk to the existing dwelling as it was located at the rear of the dwelling, and not overly visually prominent from the street. It was also the consensus of the Board that the findings could be made for the variance request for excess lot coverage, as other dwellings in the vicinity had similar requests in order to not build additions as second stories, as second stories are discouraged in the R-1-B-A zone.

The Board did express concerns with the proposed roof height of the addition. The existing structure is 13' 5" at the highest ridge point. The proposed addition would increase the ridge height up to 17' 7" which seemed excessive to the Board, in terms of the height of the dwellings in the surrounding neighborhood. Keeping in mind the concern from the adjacent neighbor at 157 Leland Way, and the surrounding roof ridge heights in the neighborhood, the Board agreed that the proposed roof height needed to be lowered, and that the plate height for the addition should also be lowered, as 10' high ceilings also seemed excessive. The Board continued the project with direction given to the application to lower the proposed roof and plate heights.

Joseph Chiesa, architect, said that they were able to reduce the height of the roof by two feet and reduce the massing by about half. He said that they lowered the plate one foot in the back and moved the roof pitch down in the back. He felt that they had addressed the Board's concerns.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Tollini said that the project was a significant improvement and he did not think that the project was now more proportionately acceptable. He thanked the applicant for working with the Board and said that he was quite satisfied with the revisions.

Boardmember Chong agreed and said that the only item he was concerned about was the roofline, but the applicant had addressed the concerns of the Board.

Vice-Chair Emberson agreed and said that she agreed with staff's recommendations regarding the variance findings and she did not see a problem with the setback.

Chair Kricensky said that the solution would be very compatible with the neighborhood. He described other different roof designs in the vicinity and agreed with the staff findings regarding the variance.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Tollini/Emberson) that the request for 151 Leland Way is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approved the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.

2. **1599 TIBURON BOULEVARD:** File No. 711041; Zelinsky Properties LLC, Owners; Armstrong Development Properties LLC, Applicant; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of exterior alterations to an existing commercial building. The applicant proposes changes to a commercial building to establish a drug store and pharmacy, with a future retail tenant. Exterior changes include a new drive-through pharmacy and canopy, parking lot modifications, two new walls, landscaping, light and storefront changes. Assessor's Parcel Nos. 058-171-88 & 89. [DW]

On June 2, 2011 the Design Review Board reviewed an application for the construction of exterior alterations to an existing commercial building for occupancy by a drug store and pharmacy (CVS/pharmacy), with a drive-through pharmacy and a future retail tenant, on property located at 1599 Tiburon Boulevard. The project involved the construction of a drive-through pharmacy and canopy on the east side of the building and various other exterior improvements to the building and site.

At the previous meeting for this application, the Design Review Board requested more detailed information on the landscaping, railings, equipment screening, and improvements to the Beach Road side wall of the building. The Board also encouraged the applicant to provide better pedestrian access from Tiburon Boulevard to the building and to consider a different exterior color palette. The Board continued the application to the July 7, 2011 meeting to allow the applicant time to address these issues.

The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the proposed project, including more information about the proposed landscaping plan, railing details, rooftop mechanical equipment screening, pedestrian access and exterior colors.

Josh Eisenhut, representing Armstrong Development, said that they had made modifications to the application based on the feedback they received from the Board and the community. He said that they added pedestrian access from Tiburon Boulevard, modified the color of the wall along the rear property line to brown, increased the height of the wall to eight feet, and added more detail to the landscape plan, including groundcover and shrubs. He said that the trees along Tiburon Boulevard had been reoriented to a straight line pattern and the guardrail at the front of

the building had been carried over to break up the façade. He said that they added more planting materials to break up the façade along Beach Road and also added a porch and handrail to break up that façade. He said that they were open to any suggestions the Board or community may have.

Boardmember Tollini asked if the pedestrian walkway includes access to the stadium steps or entrance. Mr. Eisenhut said they are confined by the number of parking stalls, and if they arranged the pedestrian access at that angle to attach to the stairs they would lose stalls. Boardmember Tollini pointed to the left side toward the west where there is a sidewalk and ramp. He suggested a sidewalk could be put on the other side. Mr. Eisenhut said they did look at that option but felt the current proposal was the most direct route. He said there could be a potential to eliminate a tree in the landscape plans.

Boardmember Tollini asked about the improved pedestrian access. Mr. Eisenhut said that they looked at other locations for the pathway but the design and width of the parking stalls were not deep enough. He said that there were foundation vents that would block a pathway closer to the entry.

Vice-Chair Emberson asked if the pedestrian paths would be basically yellow lines on the parking lot. Mr. Eisenhut answered yes, and said they felt there would be settling issues with something more decorative, such as pavers in the parking lot.

Chair Kricensky asked for more explanation of the settling issues. Mr. Eisenhut said the existing parking lot has settled quite a bit and they plan to remedy that by slurry coating. He said that they were concerned that this will become an ongoing maintenance issue if they did something more decorative than painting the yellow lines.

The public hearing was opened.

Cres Van Keulen pointed out an inadvertent discrepancy in the plans, stating that the height of the wall at the property line reads 6 feet, 6 inches when it should be 8 feet. Planning Manager Watrous concurred that the wall was required to be 8 feet tall. Ms. Van Keulen said that her preference was not for the red color alternative, but for the equestrian grey.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice Chair Emberson noted a discrepancy in the screening proposed for the rooftop equipment, as the submittal states that the screening would be louvered but the drawings indicate otherwise. She said that she would rather see the louvers. Mr. Eisenhut said that he had no preference if the Board would prefer the louvers.

Vice Chair Emberson said she liked the equestrian grey color and did not care for the red color or the mayflower color.

Chair Kricensky pointed out that the dark color on the color board was not really a color but was instead a shadow. Boardmember Tollini said that he liked the equestrian grey best and thought that this was the prevailing consensus. Chair Kricensky noted that the Downtown Design Guidelines specify whites, greys, and light colors for body colors, and to avoid the use of beige, earth tones, or pastels. Vice-Chair Emberson said that she preferred the equestrian grey and the palette of Option 1.

Boardmember Tollini said that there was a discrepancy on the cover sheet regarding the height of the wall at the end of the drive-through. He said that the pedestrian corridor was less than ideal but he thought that it was an improvement. He said that the revisions were quite satisfactory, and the detail on the railing and the lighting were both quite attractive. He said that his first preference for the color was equestrian grey. He said that he was satisfied with the application and was looking forward to the new retailer in downtown.

Boardmember Chong said that he agreed what had been said so far. He thought that the equestrian grey would go well with the mayflower color. He felt that the revision addressed most of the issues and the project would make a dramatic improvement to a building that is very weathered.

Vice-Chair Emberson said that she was concerned about the health of the trees and that apparently Ash trees are not best. She said that she likes Strawberry trees and said that they grow well in this area.

Planning Manager Watrous said that the decision about street trees did not need to be made at this time. Vice-Chair Emberson suggested planting some Oak trees to help delineate a walkway to the site. She said that adding those trees would make a more pedestrian-friendly entrance. She suggested placing them on the corner near Beach and Tiburon Boulevard. Planning Manager Watrous said that two Oak trees could be planted at the corner where the pedestrian entrance begins, and then something planted with color at the other side, which would provide more of an entry point. Vice-Chair Emberson said that the Oak trees would be a nice way to set off the entry. Chair Kricenksy said that there are probably a lot of ways to delineate that entry and he was in favor of either option.

Boardmember Tollini said he liked the idea of doing something to signal the entry. He said that it would be nice to have an anchoring device to draw one's vision to the entrance. He said that he would be comfortable with leaving this to staff's discretion.

Boardmember Chong said that he was hesitant to require a specific tree since he is not a landscape architect. However, he favored creating an entrance and said that he was comfortable leaving this decision to staff. Planning Manager Watrous said that staff has some ideas for the entry and they can work something out regarding the specific type of trees or entry details.

Chair Kricensky said the applicant had done a good job of addressing the issues. He thought that there was a lost opportunity to create an entranceway by sacrificing some parking, but noted possible handicapped access issues that might preclude a more direct access.

Planning Manager Watrous summarized that the additional conditions of approval would be to modify the street tree palette to be reviewed by staff; that louvered screening must be used for the rooftop mechanical equipment; that color option 1 was approved; and that the block wall adjacent to the drive-through must be 8 feet high. Boardmember Tollini added that there should be a condition to emphasize the entrance to the pedestrian access.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) that the request for 1599 Tiburon Boulevard is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approved the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional conditions of approval that the street tree palette be reviewed by staff to emphasize pedestrian access, louvered screening be used for the rooftop mechanical equipment, color option 1 be used as the color palette, and the block wall adjacent to the drive-through be 8 feet high. Vote: 4-0.

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #10 OF THE 6/16/11 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) to approve the minutes of the June 16, 2011 meeting as written. Vote: 4-0.

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

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