



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

Action and Approved Minutes - Regular Meeting
Design Review Board
December 1, 2011
7:00 P.M.

ACTION MINUTES #17 TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

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

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **8 WILKINS COURT:** File No. 21103; Randall Doctor, Owner; Adoption of resolution denying Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of deck additions, with a Variance for reduced side yard setback. On November 3, 2011, the Design Review Board directed Town staff to prepare a resolution denying this application, for adoption at the December 1, 2011 meeting. Assessor's Parcel No. 039-032-10. *Continued to 12/15/11*

OLD BUSINESS

2. **460 RIDGE ROAD:** File No. 711085; Amalfi West, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling, with a Floor Area Exception. The applicants propose to demolish more than 50% of an existing two-story dwelling and construct a new dwelling. The house would have a total floor area of 4,681 square feet, which is 202 square feet greater than the 4,479 square foot floor area ratio for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-082-04. *Approved (4-0)*

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NEW BUSINESS

3. **2308 MAR EAST STREET:** File No. 21116; Peter Wilton, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced side yard setbacks and excess lot coverage, and a Floor Area exception. The applicants propose to construct several additions and expand existing decks to the side and rear of the existing building. The additions and decks would extend to within 6 inches and 4 feet, respectively, of the side property lines, in lieu of the minimum 8 foot setback required in the R-2 zone. The additions would cover 71.1% of the dry land area of the lot, in lieu of the maximum 35.0% lot coverage permitted in the R-2 zone. The project would result in a total floor area of 2,900 square feet, which would exceed the floor area ratio of 706 square feet for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-271-03. *Continued to 1/19/12*

4. **91 SUGAR LOAF DRIVE:** File No. 711085; Amalfi West, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling, with a Floor Area Exception. The applicants propose to demolish more than 50% of an existing two-story dwelling and construct a new dwelling. The new dwelling would result in a total floor area of 4,900 square feet, which would exceed the floor area ratio of 4,548 square feet for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 058-282-04. **Continued to 12/15/11**

MINUTES

5. Regular Meeting of November 3, 2011 **Approved as amended 4-0**

ADJOURNMENT **At 9:05 PM**

**MINUTES #17
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF DECEMBER 1, 2011**

The meeting was opened at 7:04 p.m. by Chair Kricensky.

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Kricensky, Vice-Chair Emberson, Boardmembers Johnson and Tollini

Absent: Boardmember Chong

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

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the item for 91 Sugarloaf Drive was continued to the December 15th meeting.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **8 WILKINS COURT:** File No. 21103; Randall Doctor, Owner; Adoption of resolution denying Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of deck additions, with a Variance for reduced side yard setback. On November 3, 2011, the Design Review Board directed Town staff to prepare a resolution denying this application, for adoption at the December 1, 2011 meeting. Assessor's Parcel No. 039-032-10.

On November 3, 2011, the Design Review Board held a public hearing for a Site Plan and Architectural Review application for the construction of deck additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for reduced side yard setback, on property located at 8 Wilkins Court. At that meeting, the Design Review Board voted (5-0) to direct Staff to prepare a resolution denying the application. The draft resolution has been prepared and was attached.

Chair Kricensky said that he visited the site, entered the house and viewed the deck, which gave him a different view of what the owners are trying to accomplish. He said that the site is very steep with a small patio below linked to bedrooms and the purpose of the deck was for the owners to have a place to

entertain outside. He reviewed the original design and architectural changes previously made and said that the entertainment area is currently very tight, and he came to the conclusion that the proposed extension was what he would have proposed if he were coming to the Board as an architect on this project. He described the other side of the deck as very dark and behind the fireplace, and said that the access to that area is not the same as the other side. He thought that the design of the second proposal was a good design and kept the architectural integrity of the house while also providing an area to entertain.

Vice-Chair Emberson said that she also visited the site and understood that they are constrained by the site, but she questioned whether the deck needed to go that far into the setback. She felt it would be difficult to find evidence of a hardship and asked where the shaded areas were. Chair Kricensky said that the whole house creates a shaded area. Vice-Chair Emberson said that this is the way it was before and she has a hard time making a hardship determination based on aesthetics.

Boardmember Tollini said that the main focus of the Board's discussion of hardship was not centered around the space being tight. He said that most of what they discussed was moving into the view corridor, which does not represent a hardship. He acknowledged that the situation is a little unusual and he would not be against discussing it again. He pointed out that every deck in Tiburon is in a view corridor and felt there was nothing unusual about this property's deck.

Boardmember Johnson said that he personally did not have an issue with reviewing the project again, but since he was not on the Board for the original submission it was difficult for him to comment. He said that he would need to review what was previously approved so he could get a clear understanding of the changes.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Emberson) to continue 8 Wilkins Court to the December 15, 2011 meeting. Vote: 4-0.

E. OLD BUSINESS

2. **460 RIDGE ROAD:** File No. 711085; Amalfi West, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling, with a Floor Area Exception. The applicants propose to demolish more than 50% of an existing two-story dwelling and construct a new dwelling. The house would have a total floor area of 4,681 square feet, which is 202 square feet greater than the 4.479 square foot area ratio for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-082-04.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 460 Ridge Road. This application was first reviewed at the October 6, 2011 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, several neighbors raised concerns about the location of the house in relation to present and future homes in the vicinity; light and glare from windows of the proposed house; potential privacy impact; and the amount of grading and landscaping to be removed associated with the project.

The Design Review Board shared many of these concerns. The Board determined that the project did not reasonably minimize grading on the site and that the landscaping plan was inadequate. The Board determined that the amount of glazing on the house was excessive and would result in nighttime light impacts on nearby residences. The Board also felt that the location of the new portions of the house would be inconsistent with the pattern of development in the vicinity and could affect the placement of a new home or future additions on the adjacent property at 480 Ridge Road.

The application was continued to the November 2, 2011 meeting to allow the applicant time to redesign the proposed project to address these concerns. The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the project, which include the following changes to the project design:

- The master bedroom suite has been modified to reduce the size of the bedroom and bathroom, but to increase the size of the closet. The pantry has been reduced by almost 8 feet and the kitchen

has been reduced in width by one foot. The foyer has been expanded. As a result, the proposed floor area of the house has increased by 91 square feet from the previously proposed 4,340 square feet to 4,431 square feet.

- The floor level of the lower level and basement areas has been raised 3 feet, lowering the ceiling heights in the lower level from 15 feet to 12 feet. The floor level of the garage has been raised 4.5 feet. The roof elevation of the proposed house remains unchanged.
- The windows on the front of the house have been slightly modified. The number and location of the upper floor windows are unchanged, but the windows are somewhat smaller. The lower level windows have been more substantially reduced in size.
- The overall height of the retaining walls along the driveway has been reduced. However, the proposed walls are over 6 feet in height in certain areas within the required side yard setback; these walls would need to be reduced to 6 feet to comply with the maximum wall height allowed within a required setback.
- A new two-car parking bay is proposed adjacent to the driveway within the front yard.
- The terraced patio and lawn areas to the rear of the house have been scaled back to a series of decks that would not extend as far into the rear of the site. A swimming pool and fire pit are now requested. Screened pool equipment would be located on the lower portion of the site.
- More detailed landscaping plans have been provided that would keep much of the existing screening vegetation along the front of the property. A new fenced lawn area is now proposed between the front of the house and the driveway.

The lot coverage for the proposed house has been reduced by 3 square feet to 3,593 square feet (14.5%) of the site, which would be less than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. As noted, the floor area of the proposed house has been increased by 91 square feet from the previously proposed 4,340 square feet to 4,431 square feet, which is less than the floor area ratio of 4,479 square feet for a lot of this size. The size of the basement area has been reduced from 700 square feet to 665 square feet.

Michael Rex, architect, said that they had made significant changes to the project; they removed 500 square feet from the house, removed one of the upstairs bedrooms resulting in the current plan with only 4 bedrooms, and they have shifted the entire house to the west. They removed and changed numerous windows and placed louvers in front of some of them. They also dropped the stair window down 2 feet and will plant a tree directly in front of it. He noted that the house would fit within all setbacks.

Mr. Rex said that they met with Mr. Bernheisel again and he wanted them to completely change and re-orient the design. Mr. Rex said that if they build it in that location there would be no view of the Golden Gate Bridge because they would be behind landscape screening, and they cannot go higher up the hill because they will block views across the street. He pointed out that the second floor of their design would be almost even with the second floor of the existing house. He also said that the roof would be lower than the existing house. He said that the expansion to the east would only be 9 feet beyond the existing house and the furthest extension from the existing house would be 14 feet. He said that the story poles showed that Mr. Bernheisel could expand his house and view over the second floor of the proposed house to a view of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. Rex said that they looked at moving the retaining walls for the driveway further from the Bernheisel property, but were unable to do that because there would not be enough turning radius to back cars out of the garage. He said that they are still confident they can provide enough screening in that area in addition to the existing pine trees. He also said that the patio area would be very close to grade with only three steps down to the meadow.

Mr. Rex said that the views from 465 Ridge Road would only be blocked in the lower corners by the master bedroom. He showed photos to the Board depicting the view of the story poles from the neighboring house. He said he had tried numerous times to meet with the owners and they have not received a response. He noted that they had offered to reduce the proposed building height by one foot at the last meeting in hopes of getting the project approved and would now prefer not to reduce the ceiling height since they believe that they had already mitigated concerns by moving the house.

John Merten, landscape architect, said that they had revised the landscape plan to include lower shrubs at the street and guest parking area that would stay permanently below the roofline. He said that they preserved the original plan in other areas because the plants were low enough. He presented a photo of the prunus caroliniana plant which they are proposing in the retaining wall area in the driveway, characterizing these plants as very reliable and noting that he has used them in various other properties. He explained how they would preserve the acacias. He assured the Board that he had every confidence that they will have large, green, dense vegetation in the front. He pointed out there will be a series of landscape layers between the house and the property above, and the house would not be visible.

Mr. Rex asked the Board to consider amending Condition #12, which relates to the window in the stairwell. He said that removing the window would result in a two-story blank wall both outside and inside. He said they would like to keep that window because it is important to both the exterior and interior. He pointed out that the window would be screened by an evergreen tree and therefore would not affect Mr. Bernheisel. He said that he understood the desire the Bernheisels have to hold on to the value of their property and allow for future expansion. He said that he did not receive any of the late mail until this evening and felt that it was impossible to respond to letters in a meaningful way when they arrive so late.

Chair Kricensky said that the master bedroom closet shows a window on the eastern side in the plans. Mr. Rex said that there is a clerestory window that should be shown but it is not on the elevations. Boardmember Johnson asked for the height of this clerestory, and Mr. Rex responded 18 inches.

Boardmember Tollini asked and confirmed that the louver material would be wood and not aluminum.

The public hearing was opened.

Martin Rabbett said that he came prepared to support the proposal but now had some questions. He said that he can see story poles that would diminish his water view because they are now not being lowered. He asked if the house could be lowered one foot to preserve more of his water view from the main room in his house.

James Bernheisel said he had been unable to submit earlier mail because the drawings were submitted late, and he apologized that his letter came as late as it did. He found it ironic that a house that was supposed to be to the west of his property would instead be in front of him pointing towards him. He was glad that the windows were being reduced towards the north but felt that it was still not enough. He said that louvers or potted plants were not sufficient for screening. He said that his home is to the east of this house and all of the east windows also would shine back into his view. He said that the house was being moved laterally and he felt that was the main problem. He said that the driveway would be very long and the new parking on the other side would create a parking lot in front of his bedroom. He said that other houses have their driveways and garages out on the road, and the garage belongs closer to the road instead of on the other side of the property. He agreed with other neighbors that the roof of the master bedroom needs to drop down a foot. He was also concerned about the vegetation and it was unclear how tall the plantings would be and whether they would be pruned so they do not block his view of San Francisco over the house. He said that he has an acacia tree right on the property line and would like some clarity to discuss those trees if they are to be removed.

Mr. Bernheisel said that he has looked at this property for 11 years and said that the current home on the property proves a house can be built that does not impact any neighboring properties and still has a wonderful view of the Golden Gate Bridge. He did not believe that the neighborhood would be served by

a “flipped” house and expressed concern that the buyer of the property may not want the amenities of the proposed house. He suggested redesigning the current house to avoid a situation where neighboring properties would be affected.

Jerry Reynolds apologized for submitting his letter late, but said that the plans were submitted right before Thanksgiving and he was not back in town until Monday night. He did not feel that it was fair to vote on this project at this time because there has not been enough time to absorb the changes. He also felt that the applicant should be given time to read the late mail submitted by neighbors and respond.

Lowell Strauss, representing Amalfi West, LLC, said that the house would not be a “spec” house but instead would be a custom home. He said that numerous positive things would come out of the project, including increasing the value of the neighborhood. He said that he tried to meet with neighbors over the past week and received no responses to text messages or emails.

Mr. Rex said that the eastern windows would not affect Mr. Bernheisel because his view is parallel to that wall. He said that the purpose of the windows on the east wall was to capture the East Bay view. He also commented on the driveway and pointed out that the garage shifted slightly to the east and would be three feet below grade and not much different from the existing situation. He said that they met several times with Mr. Reynolds who asked if they could shift the house further to the west which they have now done.

Mr. Merten said that they would plant a very slow-growing tree already at maturity, which would reach no more than 14 feet in height. He clarified where the two acacias are located. He pointed out that the property at 450 Ridge Road has a driveway that is 200 feet long in the same location as the proposed driveway.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Johnson said the applicant had gone very far to address the concerns of the Board. He said that pulling 15 feet off the eastern edge, addressing glazing issues, and clarifying the landscape plan were significant changes that addressed his concerns. He liked the design of the house but was still unsure lowering the roof height one foot.

Boardmember Tollini agreed with much of what Boardmember Johnson said. He said that his conclusion last time was that the plan did not strike the right balance. He wanted to see the house pulled toward the west and glazing reduced, and those issues had largely been addressed. He pointed out that this is an older home in a neighborhood where people are concerned with every inch. He said that it is difficult to do any reconstruction of an older home without having some impact, and the Board’s challenge is to be sure those impacts do not infringe on neighboring properties. He thought that the project now had the right balance, with appropriate siting and mass, and would not infringe on the neighbors. He felt that the project had been thoughtfully changed to address concerns. He was not completely comfortable with the glazing and was unsure whether the louvers would cut down on lighting. He shared staff’s concern for relying on a tree to screen the window in the stairwell and wanted to see the glazing cut down a bit more. He said that the view impact from across the street would be fairly minimal, and he was not as concerned about the height of the master bedroom. He said that it would be unlikely that Mr. Reynolds would have a 30 foot tall home below the site. He mentioned that the existing site is so overgrown that it was difficult to assess the privacy impact. He pointed out living in Tiburon is not a remote area and neighboring properties will be noticed. He said that interaction between houses can be addressed with landscaping, including some planting by the neighbors.

Vice-Chair Emberson believed that a one foot reduction in building height was not a lot to ask and would make the neighbor happy. She said that the house would be gorgeous when it is built. She felt that the glazing might still be a problem and she would like to see it reduced a bit, but commented that everyone needs to give and take to make this work.

Chair Kricensky said that looking at surrounding influences is a good thing to do when planning a site, and he thought that the applicant had done a good job addressing concerns. He said that sacrificing a

bedroom was a good solution. He said that he had seen louvers installed for windows and they do work. He agreed that the wall at the stairwell needed an architectural element but suggested the window could be smaller. He noted that there was a verbal agreement on the one foot reduction in height at the prior meeting and he thought that one foot would make a difference for the view from the neighbor across the street.

Planning Manager Watrous said if the Board wishes to reduce the height by one foot they could make it a condition of approval. For the stairwell window, he suggested specifying a percentage to reduce the size. The consensus of the Board was to reduce the building height by one foot and modify Condition of Approval No. 12 to reduce the window size by 30%.

Chair Kricensky and Boardmember Tollini both noted that they agreed with the staff report on the findings needed for the floor area exception.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Emberson) that the request for 460 Ridge Road is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional conditions of approval that the highest point of the house be reduced by one foot and the text of Condition #12 be revised to state that the size of the front stairway window shall be reduced by no less than 30%. Vote: 4-0.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NEW BUSINESS

3. **2308 MAR EAST STREET:** File No. 21116; Peter Wilton, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced side yard setbacks and excess lot coverage, and a Floor Area exception. The applicants propose to construct several additions and expand existing decks to the side and rear of the existing building. The additions and decks would extend to within 6 inches and 4 feet, respectively, of the side property lines, in lieu of the minimum 8 foot setback required in the R-2 zone. The additions would cover 71.1% of the dry land area of the lot, in lieu of the maximum 35.0% lot coverage permitted in the R-2 zone. The project would result in a total floor area of 2,900 square feet, which would exceed the floor area ratio of 706 square feet for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-271-03.

The applicant is proposing to construct additions to an existing single-family dwelling with variances for reduced side yard setbacks and excess lot coverage, and a floor area exception on property located at 2308 Mar East Street. Currently the property is improved with a two-story dwelling which overlooks Raccoon Strait.

The proposal would incorporate small additions throughout the structure as part of an overall interior and exterior remodel to the home. At the main level of the home, the front entry walkway would be partially in-filled for a new interior stairwell, and a small addition is proposed at the rear of the dwelling for an expanded kitchen. A new deck would extend off the rear at this level. At the lower level of the home, the existing rear deck would be partially converted to additional bedroom space and a new larger deck would extend off the existing rear deck. The side deck would also be expanded at the rear, and a new exterior stair/walkway would be incorporated from the front of the property to the side deck for improved functionality.

Tidal lots, such as the subject property, use the area above the mean high tide line (dry land), in determining gross floor area ratio and lot coverage. The proposal would result in lot coverage of 1,434 square feet (71.1%) which greatly exceeds the maximum permitted lot coverage in the R-2 zoning district (35.0%). A variance has therefore been requested for excess lot coverage. The proposal would result in a gross floor area of 2,900 square feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted floor area ratio by 2,194 square feet for a parcel of this size (2,017 sq. ft.). Therefore a floor area exception has been requested.

In addition, the existing left side yard setback is 6 inches, and the right side yard setback is 4 feet. The application proposes minor expansions within both side yard setbacks, and would continue the non-

conforming setbacks of 6 inches on the left side and 4 feet on the right. As the minimum side yard setbacks in the R-2 zone are 8 feet, variances have been requested to continue the reduced side yards.

Mohammad Sadrieh, architect, said that the property is currently unoccupied and the owners live out of town. He said that the plans were presented to neighbors late and they had not had enough time to discuss concerns with neighbors. He said that he would like to work with neighbors more and come back at a later date with changes.

Mr. Sadrieh said that the current residence was built in 1956 and is in need of renovation. He said that they would change the footprint to allow for three bedrooms and a study. They propose to convert the existing lower level to a bedroom and bathroom and the kitchen, second bedroom, and stairs would be expanded. He said that they would add a new deck to the main living area on the upper ground floor entry level. He said that they were attempting to improve the view and lower the height of the front of the structure. He said that the project would dramatically improve the overall appearance of the property by including new extensive landscaping.

Mr. Sadrieh said that it would be premature for him to make changes until they have had the chance to meet with neighboring properties to see the view impacts. He said that they would be glad to discuss the placement of windows to arrive at a mutually agreeable solution. He also said that the lighting on the deck could be moved to the wall and located two feet higher than the existing deck surface. He noted that there also was a suggestion to reduce the size of the decks, but he felt that both decks provide the only outdoor space adjacent to living space and they intentionally kept the decks modest. He said that they would like to work with neighbors to find a way to provide privacy without blocking their own view of the Golden Gate Bridge. He said that they have discussed retaining an existing tree that provides privacy and screening, and they intend to amend their landscape plan to retain that tree and also add other plantings to provide color. He said that the side yard is a dark space surrounded by walls, and would only be used as a landscape area and not for outdoor use. He said that an existing fence in that area provides excellent screening, and they would be glad to discuss any additional screening measures.

The public hearing was opened.

Jim Wickett said that he serves with the California Coastal Commission and he appreciates what the Board does as a community service. He stated that Mar East Street is going through a generational change and new owners are moving in as original owners are passing away. He said that many of the houses are on the water or over the water, yet very close together. He stated that through good design privacy has been maintained. He said that being on the water creates a special situation for lighting where even small lights reflect on the water and at night when looking toward Angel Island it is pitch black, and one light can ruin the whole view for the entire neighborhood. He said that noise is also a big factor and people are very careful about noise in the neighborhood. He said that he was excited to have a new neighbor, but his goal is to share the neighborhood without giving up privacy.

Mr. Wickett added that the greatest violation to privacy would be from the right corner deck that would place the neighbors within feet of his master bedroom. He noted that the new corner deck would violate the setback requirements and could be removed without affecting views. He said that the rear addition extending past the current footprint of the house was overly aggressive and he would like to see the addition cut back significantly. He stated that both decks would see into his master bedroom and right onto his bed. He suggested privacy screens that would allow the applicant to enjoy views without infringing on his privacy. He would also like to see lighting minimized. He said that his house is about 25 feet lower than the entry to the applicant's house and privacy is provided by a tree. He was glad that they will keep the tree, but said he was unclear how that will be accomplished since a deck is proposed in that area. He suggested reducing the deck to a walkway in order to keep the existing tree. He said that changing the functionality of the house to the stairway would convert that area into a lighted space, and he suggested using privacy glass and reducing the size of windows in that area. He requested any lighting utilize low voltage lights and be placed at floor level to reduce light impact to neighbors.

Vice-Chair Emberson asked where the lights are situated on Mr. Wickett's deck. Mr. Wickett said that the only lights on the deck are on the floor, with the tops of the lights covered, and the lights only shine down.

Marsha Handley, trustee of the Hanley Trust, said that her parents built the house 2310 Mar East. She thought that the expansion was significant and she had concerns. She said that views of the Golden Gate Bridge were particularly important to her family because her grandfather helped build it. She said that the extension of the house significantly would affect the view both from upstairs and downstairs.

Peter Wilton, owner, said that he has a similar home in Sidney, Australia, and he would like to see all of the neighbors happy. He said that the home is very old and has had no work since it was built in 1956. He said that the house is recessed far back from the other houses and they are trying to gain some access to outdoor space with a modest deck large enough for a table and a few chairs. He said that he would like to find a solution with neighbors and come back to the Board.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Emberson said that she liked the remodel and felt that it would enhance the neighborhood. She agreed with the neighbors that the right corner deck could be removed without impacting the use of the deck. She said that the decks look pretty large from the neighbor's house and she would like to see some negotiation on the size. She also agreed that perhaps over the front entry the windows could be minimized so they would not intrude on the neighbor's privacy. She also liked the solution to use privacy glass.

Boardmember Tollini stated that he had not visited the site and felt that it was clearly necessary to visit this site to have a meaningful understanding of the impacts. He saw some logic in being able to push the house out to the same degree as others, but said that that would not necessarily mitigate privacy and view impacts. He said that the view impacts on the adjacent properties appeared to be substantial. He was hopeful that the neighbors would be able to work together to come up with solutions.

Boardmember Johnson said that working with neighbors over the next few weeks would arrive at a collaborative solution, and he would like to leave the neighbors to work together and work out solutions. He hoped for a solution that would strike a balance with the neighbors.

Chair Kricensky said that he visited the houses on either side and felt that once the neighbors have a chance to get together and discuss the project, they will come up with solutions. He said that Google Earth clearly shows the view impacts and that the applicant's house is recessed quite a bit. He also felt there was too much glass at the entry. He asked if the deck in front of the kitchen will be used, and Mr. Wilton said that it may not be used. Chair Kricensky said that the structure enclosing the decks could block views as well and asked that to be given some consideration. He also said that the graphics on the plans could be better and recommended enhancing the graphics to make it easier to read.

Boardmember Johnson suggested it would be helpful to show an existing elevation and proposed elevation on the same page to be able to better compare the two.

Boardmember Tollini pointed out that the variance finding that none of the other properties in the vicinity would be affected detrimentally is not usually a stumbling block, but the closeness of the houses in this area may make that finding difficult to make.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) to continue 2308 Mar East Street to the January 19, 2012 meeting. Vote: 4-0.</p>
--

4. **91 SUGAR LOAF DRIVE:** File No. 711085; Amalfi West, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling, with a Floor Area Exception. The applicants propose to demolish more than 50% of an existing two-story dwelling and construct a new dwelling. The new dwelling would result in a total floor area of

4,900 square feet, which would exceed the floor area ratio of 4.548 square feet for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 058-282-04. - **CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 15, 2011**

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #16 OF THE 11/03/11 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Boardmember Tollini corrected a typographical error on page 5, paragraph 2, and line 2: "the planes" should be revised to "the plans".

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Johnson) to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2011 meeting, as amended. Vote: 4-0.

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.