

**MINUTES #11
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF JULY 21, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Kricensky, Vice Chair Emberson, and Boardmembers Chong, Cousins and Tollini

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner O'Malley and Minutes Clerk Rusting

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous stated that the item for 173 Stewart Drive was continued to the August 18, 2016 meeting.

D. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

| |
|--|
| ACTION: It was M/S (Cousins/Emberson) to nominate Vice Chair Kricensky as Chair of the Design Review Board. Vote: 5-0. |
|--|

| |
|---|
| ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Emberson) to nominate Boardmember Emberson as Vice Chair of the Design Review Board. Vote: 5-0. |
|---|

E. OLD BUSINESS

- 1550 TIBURON BOULEVARD:** File No. SIGN2016002; Belvedere Land Company, Owner; Sign permit for a Sign Program for signage for tenants of a shopping center (Boardwalk Shopping Center). The sign program would allow 6 freestanding signs, multi-tenant, wayfinding and directory signs, and signs for individual tenants. Assessor's Parcel Nos. 060-082-57 and 060-082-58.

The applicant submitted an application for a sign program for the Boardwalk Shopping Center, on property located at 1550 Tiburon Boulevard. The Boardwalk Shopping Center is a multi-tenant commercial center that straddles the corporate boundary line separating the Town of Tiburon and the City of Belvedere.

This application was first reviewed at the May 5, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At the meeting, the applicant indicated that the signage at the shopping center would need to be

modernized and updated for public safety, preserve the character of the building, and to conform better to the Town's sign ordinance. The Design Review Board determined that the proposed sign program would be appropriate to the existing shopping center and have a positive impact to the downtown area and welcomed the proposal in general. However, the Board could not reach a consensus regarding the number of tenant signs, especially whether each tenant could keep their existing wall sign and have a new bracket sign. The majority of the Board determined that the parking signs and freestanding signs needed to be reduced in scale and the number of lighting be reduced.

The application was continued to the June 2, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At the meeting, the applicant stated that there was an-going problem with the parking enforcement at the shopping center, that the scale and size of the signs would fit with the size of the shopping center, and that there is be a need for the large number of lighting fixtures to control low levels of illumination. Several store owners expressed their support of the updated signs at the shopping center, especially for the additional signs to help with visibility from Tiburon Boulevard.

The Design Review Board could not reach a consensus regarding the sign program. There was a disagreement about the appropriateness of the number of tenant signs, scale of the freestanding signs and number of lighting fixtures for each sign. One Boardmember was absent and the Board therefore continued the project to the July 7, 2016 Design Review Board meeting.

Todd Barbee, designer, summarized the changes that were discussed at the last meeting. He showed the height and size adjustments made to the freestanding signs, changes to the Courtyard signage and changes to the parking signage, including the removal of the kiosk. He said that they took a three zone approach to the signage: signs to be seen from the road, signs visible from the parking lot and pedestrian signage. He showed depictions of the signage at each level and stated that they believe the sizes are appropriate.

Mr. Barbee addressed questions about lighting of the courtyard and pylon signs, stating that the number of lights proposed for each sign would allow them to better control the light. He noted that many businesses are open until 9:00 p.m. and at certain times of the year the sun sets at 4:30 p.m. and therefore the lighting is necessary. He said that the merchants of the center support the sign program. He said that they believe that they have created an effective and harmonious sign program that will serve the merchants and the customers.

Vice-Chair Emberson expressed concern that future signs could be replaced in the shopping center and would not have to come back to the DRB for approval. She stated that there was no detail in the sign program as to what is allowed or not allowed when a sign is replaced in the future. She said that she would like to see a program in place that details what will be allowed in the future when a sign is replaced.

Mr. Barbee stated that the only signs that could change as merchants come and go are the directory sign, wall signs, and blade signs. He said that the blade signs would be permanent in terms of how they are constructed and cannot be re-sized. He noted that the wall signs had been a point of contention and said that they were willing to create a sign manual for the wall signs to

detail what is allowed, as a condition of approval. He stated that new tenants would have to follow the sign manual.

Vice-Chair Emberson said that these details should be part of the project and not a staff decision. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the application includes details of the wall signs but did not include any limitations in terms of color, and therefore a future sign could be any color.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Cousins said that the success of the Boardwalk Center is very important to the town, and he felt that the center needs better signage. He thought that it was appropriate that the size of the signs relate to the full 4 acres of the shopping center. He was concerned about the number of light fixtures, but he accepted the applicant's point that light can be better controlled with more fixtures. He believed that the parking signage was reasonable. He felt that it was important for the tenants to have their own individual wall signs with their own character. He suggested a condition of approval for the wall signs stating that the signs for any new tenant should be on a single colored background with just the name of the tenant and their logo.

Boardmember Chong noted that the application had not changed and his opinion also had not changed. He supported matching blade and wall signs with a single color and background.

Boardmember Tollini said that he was sympathetic regarding the freestanding sign heights and taking the entire site acreage into account. He felt that the initial signs were inappropriately tall, but he was comfortable with the reduced height. He believed that the text on the sides of the freestanding signs was overkill and he suggested making the sides of the signs blank. He believed that the current wall signs are oversized and lack cohesiveness and would be inconsistent with the qualities described in the Downtown Design Guidelines. He struggled to support the project nothing had been done to upgrade the aesthetics of the wall signs.

Vice-Chair Emberson agreed with Boardmember Tollini and suggested that approving the large number of signs was too much and more than what was needed. She suggested that the freestanding signs should be 18 feet tall, with fewer lights and no uplighting. She said that she would like to see a sign manual so the Board can see the cohesiveness of the signage.

Boardmember Cousins pointed out this is a retail center and he believed that the businesses should be able to have signs for their stores. He stated that the freestanding signs were more about the entire center and the individual retailers need their own signs and he liked the lettering on the sides of the freestanding signs. He thought that the lighting would look good and that signs should be illuminated when it is dark outside.

Chair Kricensky said that he looked back through the whole application again and believed that the freestanding signs were critical to direct people to the center. He questioned whether the signs needed to be as tall as proposed and compared them to the Cove shopping center sign which is 20 feet tall, noting that traffic in the Boardwalk area goes slower than traffic by the Cove, which means these signs could be a little smaller. He agreed with Vice Chair Emberson that the two signs could both be 18 feet tall. He also noted that the words "The Boardwalk"

would be very dominant on the signs and agreed that signs on the sides were redundant. He agreed there should be more guidelines for the wall signs and that the program was not quite complete.

Boardmember Tollini said that he was sympathetic to the size of the wall signs, but did not think that they were as good as they should be and he did not understand why they could not be replaced with something better.

Vice Chair Emberson stated that the shopping center is very successful and has been there since the 1960s and felt that the signs have not affected its success. She felt that more work needed to be done before she was comfortable with the sign program.

Chair Kricensky stated that commercial establishments need signage, and Vice Chair Emberson said there are a lot of components to making a business successful besides signs.

Boardmember Tollini summarized that there were differences of opinion about the cohesiveness of the wall signs and wording on the sides of the freestanding signs. Boardmember Chong said that the signs were not as dramatic as the original proposal and that the sides of the signs and the lights did not bother him. Chair Kricensky said that he felt strongly about the redundancy of the text on the sides of the signs and would like to see some conditions relative to the wall signs.

Mr. Barbee stated that the sides of the signs were an important design element, particularly at the Tiburon Boulevard and Beach Road intersection. He said that they were willing to reduce that that sign height to 20 feet.

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Cousins) that the request for 1550 Tiburon Boulevard is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional conditions of approval that the wall signs have the same graphic style as the blade sign with a single color background, business name, and logo only; to eliminate the text and lighting on the sides of the freestanding signs; and to reduce the height of the freestanding sign near the Beach Road intersection to 20 feet. Vote: 3-2 (Emberson and Tollini opposed).

2. **173 STEWART DRIVE:** File No. DR2016036; Afie Royo, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story, 2,723 square foot house with a 510 square foot garage. Assessor's Parcel No. 055-101-21. **CONTINUED TO AUGUST 18, 2016**
3. **23 JUNO ROAD:** File Nos. DR2016026; Alicia Hansel/Kibby Road, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The floor area of the proposed house would be 2,104 square feet and the house would cover 2,553.5 square feet (28.7%) of the site. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-271-24.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story single-family dwelling on property located at 23 Juno Road. As more than

50% of the existing dwelling would be demolished as part of this project, the application has been classified as the construction of a new single-family dwelling.

This application was first reviewed at the June 2, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, the owner of the adjacent property at 21 Juno Road raised concerns that the proposed garage addition would block views from her front door. The neighbor also questioned the accuracy of the story poles and requested a survey of the shared side property line. The Design Review Board shared these concerns and directed the applicant to pull the addition back and prepare a property line survey. The application was continued to the July 7, 2016 meeting.

The applicant submitted revised plans and a survey of the side property line. The alignment of the house and additions on the site was changed slightly to reflect the survey results. The westerly addition was moved 1 foot, 4 inches to the east to comply with the side setback from the properly located side property line. The front of the garage was pulled back approximately 2 feet from the front of the site. The length of the addition on west side, facing 21 Juno Road, was shortened by one foot, as the mud room was reduced in size by 2 feet, but the kitchen and dining room were lengthened by one foot. The ridge height of the proposed additions was lowered 3 inches.

The overall size of the addition was reduced by 73 square feet. The floor area of the proposed house would be 2,104 square feet, which is 787 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The proposed house would cover 2,553.5 square feet (28.7%) of the site, which is 119 square feet less than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone.

Scott Landry, architect, highlighted changes made to the project since the last meeting. He said that they obtained a survey and that resulted in some changes to the project. He said that the wall on the west side was moved 16 inches from the property line and the ridgeline reduced by 3 inches. He said that they added 12 inches into the living space and removed 2 feet off the mud room space, which reduced the total floor area to 2,104 square feet, which is 787 square feet less than the maximum allowed. He said that they took measurements of the surrounding properties and had data to support the placement of the garage. He said that roughly 20 properties in the neighborhood currently have their houses or garages closer to the street than they are proposing. He stated that they initially considered a second story addition, but did not pursue it with the neighborhood in mind. He stated that the view from the next door neighbor is from a front door and goes diagonally across the front yard.

Vice Chair Emberson asked if they could move the air conditioning unit away from the kitchen. Mr. Landry stated that they were amenable to moving it closer to the front of the property. Boardmember Tollini also suggested that a sound enclosure could help.

The public hearing was opened.

Ellen Rony said that the current proposal would put too much house onto a small nonconforming lot. She said that this would create 65 linear feet of wall that would block her east-facing view. She stated that additions projecting to the front approved for neighboring properties were now being used as a precedent for this project. She said that this subdivision was designed so that

people could have views on both sides and the houses were stepped back. She said that only two homes on Juno Road have side-facing front doors, including her own, and that the garage addition would be the first thing she sees every time she opens her front door. She felt that all homeowners should be able to enjoy an unimpeded view of the street from their front entry. She stated that the project could be redesigned to reduce the garage by 10 linear feet by removing the mud room and keeping the washer and dryer in the garage where they currently exist. She asked that the water heater be moved away from her home. She stated that the neighborhood is being changed with each development and the reduction of space.

Kristen Fazal, co-owner, stated she also lives in Tiburon and lives in the neighborhood. She said that they were not asking for any variances or exceptions and did everything within the guidelines of the lot size and neighborhood. She said that there are other homes in the neighborhood with two car-garages and that are larger than what they were requesting and with garages that come out a lot further than their proposal. She stated that people are moving to the community because it is a great place to live but they need a place to put their bikes and other belongings. She said that these homes are small and were built 70 years ago and do not fit today's families with kids. She stated that they would not build to the curb or upwards.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice Chair Emberson agreed with staff's suggestions that the addition could be reduced in size and did not see a big problem with shortening the dining room and mud room. She acknowledged that no variances were requested but still felt that the design needed to be changed. She did not think it would take anything away from a lovely house that would suit a family to shorten the house by 2 feet.

Boardmember Tollini said that it would be extremely easy to reduce the length of the house by 2 feet and up to 4 feet could be doable. He said that it would preserve the less closed in feeling for the neighbor. He said that the garage extension would just happen to be impactful on the neighbor and he believed that her concerns were legitimate. He questioned the location of the tankless water heater because it is furthest away from where it is needed, and he suggested the applicant consider relocating it.

Boardmember Chong stated that he hoped that the mud room could be moved back about 3 feet, as the garage would stick out too far. He suggested relocating the water heater as well.

Boardmember Cousins said that he felt that the project was very reasonable and no variances are being requested and the plate height would remain the same. He noted that the neighbor's view is across the neighboring property and that people can build to the setbacks.

Chair Kricensky said that he often sees applications attempting to max out the size of the house and this project requested no variances and would be a modest sized home. He stated that the other garages do not appear to protrude as much because the entire homes are built out to the road, while this house is set back with only the garage protruding.

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) that the request for 23 Juno Road is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval, with the additional conditions of approval to move the air conditioning unit toward the front, to relocate the tankless water heater away from the side of the house, and to pull the front of the garage back from the street by three feet. Vote: 3-2 (Cousins and Kricensky opposed).

E. NEW BUSINESS

- 65 HARRIET WAY:** File Nos. DR2016032; J.R. Begg, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The floor area of the proposed house would be 2,181 square feet and the house would cover 2,650 square feet (29.2%) of the site. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-212-12.

The applicant is requesting to construct additions to an existing single-family dwelling, on property located at 65 Harriet Way in the Bel Aire Neighborhood. The proposal would add 1,079 square feet to the rear of the existing dwelling, which would include 610 square feet of living space and a 469 square foot two-car garage. The additions would include a mud room, expanded kitchen, living room, and a master bedroom suite. Other proposed improvements would include modified windows and doors on all sides of the existing home, and reducing the size of the existing rear deck.

The proposal would result in a gross floor area of 2,181 square feet, which is below the maximum permitted gross floor area for the property (2,907 square feet). The proposal would result in lot coverage of 2,650 square feet (29.2%), which is below the 30.0% maximum permitted lot coverage in the R-1-B-A zone.

Mark Labourdette, architect, said that they are planning to expand the home and noted issues that came up regarding the taller roofline and windows.

The public hearing was opened.

Tiffany Dunn said that she was excited about a remodel for the house, but had concerns about the height of the roof. She said that the roof would look like a second story and be higher than any other structure on the cul-de-sac and 4½ feet taller than the house constructed last year in the area. She requested that the roof be lowered in line with the last house that was constructed.

Mr. Labourdette said that the rest of the homes have very low roofs that he believed are actually too low. He said that this house is at the end of a cul-de-sac and would not affect anyone's view. He believed that a 5:12 pitch roof was reasonable and normal.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Tollini said that there was no reasonable explanation for the roof height, which would be way out of proportion with the neighborhood. He said that 10 feet of space is not

needed for the insulation. He said that he would like to see the project come back with something more in line with the scale of the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Emberson and Boardmember Cousins agreed with Boardmember Tollini's comments

Boardmember Chong agreed that the design was a nonstarter, but said that he was more on the cusp because of its location in the back of the cul-de-sac.

Chair Kricensky also agreed that the roof would be too high and felt that it was mainly because of the length of the span. He suggested that the roof could be more articulated. Vice Chair Emberson and Boardmember agreed about the need for articulation.

Mr. Labourdette said if the Board can provide a height they would approve, he would be willing to design the house to that height. Chair Kricensky said that the Board and the neighbors need to see the story poles and the other Boardmembers agreed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Chong) continue the application for 65 Harriet Way to the August 4, 2016 meeting. Vote: 5-0.

5. **9 AUDREY COURT:** File Nos. DR2016050 & FAE2016004; John Pfeister, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Floor Area Exception. The floor area of the house would be increased by 497 square feet to a total of 4,939 square feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 058-231-07.

The applicant is requesting design review approval for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 9 Audrey Court (formally known as 4 Audrey Court). The property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling with an attached 414 square foot two-car garage. The existing 4,442 square foot home includes a library, kitchen, dining room, formal entry, living room, family room, powder room, two bathrooms, laundry room, two bedrooms, and a master bedroom suite.

As part of an interior remodel and additions to the existing home, the proposal would partially convert 497 square feet of the existing crawlspace into living space for a bathroom, bedroom, and laundry room. The interior remodel would include adding a bathroom and stairway to the main level. Other proposed improvements would include modified windows and doors on south and east sides of the existing home.

The floor area of the property would be increased by 497 square feet to a total of 4,939 square feet, which is 731 square feet greater than the 4,208 square foot floor area ratio for this site. The application has therefore requested a floor area exception. The proposal would result in no change to the lot coverage of 5,179 square feet (23.4%), which currently is above the maximum permitted lot coverage in the RO-2 zone (15.0%).

Marshall Schneider, architect, said that they proposed to add about 500 square feet, all within the existing footprint of the building. He said that they propose to add new windows on the south

half of the east wall. He said that the biggest window opening would be in a stairwell and therefore no one will ever be standing at that window. He stated that there is also quite a bit of vegetative screening in the area of the proposed windows.

Boardmember Tollini asked if that screening is on the property or in the public right-of-way. Mr. Schneider said he believes it is both on the property and on the public right-of-way. He said that there is a fence in that location and the plantings on the inside of the fence are on the property. He added that there is also ample opportunity to provide more screening on both sides of the road if it is required for privacy. He stated that the windows would be in scale with the house. He noted that there is already a tree providing some screening and ample screening between the house and the neighbor to provide for privacy.

The public hearing was opened.

Shirley Mydland said that she lives directly below the east side of the property and felt that the windows would impact her the most. She said that previous owners of the property never saw the need to change these bedroom windows and that any change to the windows of the house would have a tremendous impact on her. She said that she has also been impacted by the construction on her street and has not been able to look out her windows. She stated that all of the bushes would be removed when the windows are put in. She said that all of the neighbors object to the addition if there are any windows or light coming from it.

Gregory Hart said things have drastically changed in the neighborhood and that people are moving in and flipping homes. He listed several homes that have been remodeled and flipped, and described how this impacted them. He suggested that a 4,500 square foot house is large enough for a family of four without any additions and stated that the home is already too large for the lot.

Mr. Schneider said that the house has three bedrooms on the private side of the house and the rest of the home is dedicated to public space, and is therefore the right size for their family. He said they do not plan to remove the bushes under the windows and they are willing to add screening.

Boardmember Tollini asked about the glazing on the second story and if a skylight might be possible in the closet instead of a window. Mr. Schneider said that they were open to that idea.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Tollini agreed that construction is difficult, but unfortunately regulating that is outside of the purview of the DRB. He felt that the only design issue was the glazing on the east elevation. He suggested that the closet window could be replaced by a skylight. He said that the bathroom window would not be visible, but the stairwell window would impact the neighbor and its massiveness could be reduced. He was concerned about light pollution and perceived invasion of privacy from the windows, noting that the light in the stairway window will be on quite a bit.

Vice Chair Emberson noted that a 4,900 square foot house was being proposed and she questioned whether the DRB would approve a new house of that size. She said that she was bothered by the incremental increase in size and said that she could not make the findings to grant the floor area exception and would not usually approve a house so far over the FAR and lot coverage. She felt that the glazing on the stairwell was too large and suggested that some of the glazing on the east side could be reduced and screening landscaping be installed.

Boardmember Cousins agreed that if this proposal came to the Board as a new house they would not approve it, but noted that the addition would be excavated beneath the house. He said that he was not as concerned about the windows because there is a huge difference in elevation between the properties and a lot of screening. He said that the size of the stairway window should be reduced and the closet window eliminated.

Boardmember Chong stated that he would like to see a skylight replace the closet window and a landscape plan that would keep the existing screening in place. He said that he would also like to see about a 25% reduction in the size of the stairway window.

Chair Kricensky said that he has seen too much incremental building in Tiburon and the lot is already overbuilt, and he did not think more was needed. He said that the window in the stairway should mainly let in light and could be designed to frame the view of the hillside and not of the neighbor's house and therefore reduce its intrusiveness.

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) that the request for 9 Audrey Court is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional conditions of approval to submit a landscaping plan to be reviewed by staff with an emphasis on keeping screening from Lyford Drive in place; to reduce the stairway window by 50% and redesign it to frame the hillside view from the top of the stairs; and to replace the closet window with a skylight. Vote: 4-1 (Kricensky opposed).

6. **4 CORTE LAS CASAS:** File Nos. DR2016063, VAR2016016 & FAE2016006; Ben and Kristine Dollard, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for reduced front setback and a Floor Area Exception. The floor area of the house would be 3,640 square feet, which is 605 square feet greater than the 3,035 square foot floor area ratio for this site of the site. The addition would extend to within 28 feet of the front property line, which is less than the 30 foot front setback required in the RO-2 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 038-301-14.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 4 Corte Las Casas. Three bedrooms, two bathrooms and a master bedroom closet would be added to the second floor of the house. On the first floor, a portion of the front porch would be enclosed, a breakfast nook and bay window would be eliminated and a new trellis would be added to the rear. Six new skylights would be installed.

The proposal would increase the lot coverage on the site by 74 square feet to a total of 2,788 square feet (26.9%), which is greater than the 15.0 % maximum lot coverage permitted in the

RO-2 zone. However, as less than 1.0% is being added to the existing lot coverage, which already exceeds the 15.0% maximum in the RO-2 zone, a variance is not required for excess lot coverage.

The floor area of the house would be increased by 916 square feet to a total of 3,640 square feet, which is 605 square feet greater than the 3,035 square foot floor area ratio for this site. The applicant has therefore requested a floor area exception. A portion of one proposed second floor bedroom would extend to within 28 feet of the front property line. As a 30 foot front setback is required in the RO-2 zone, a variance is requested for reduced front setback.

Christie Tyreus, designer, said that they plan to remodel the existing house and are requesting a floor area exception. She said that the 30 foot front setback would clip the front edge of the addition. She said that the owners have 3 small children and would like to have 3 bedrooms and the master bedroom upstairs. She said that the second story would be pulled back from the edges of the first story on all sides to reduce the effect of the massing from neighboring properties. She said that they designed the proposal to be very similar to other two-story houses across the street and next door and that the floor area would also be in line with neighboring houses. She said that they talked with neighbors on all sides and incorporated their input.

Boardmember Tollini asked why the third bedroom needed to come into the setback. Ms. Tyreus said that it was an aesthetic decision to keep the room in the same plane as below.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Cousins said that he struggled with the variance and floor area exception because the house already exceeds the lot coverage and would be 20% over the FAR. He noted that usually variances are granted to keep a house to a single story, yet this is already two stories. He said that the additions would not affect anyone but would almost fill the site. He said that this would overdevelop the site and would be too big.

Vice Chair Emberson agreed with Boardmember Cousins and said that the house is too close to the street and covers too much of the lot. She felt that this would be overbuilt and she could not make the findings for the requested variance or floor area exception.

Boardmember Tollini said that the lot coverage was a non-issue. He agreed with staff's findings for the floor area exception that the project would be consistent with other two-story homes in the area. He said that the redwood trees are massive and the story poles do not make the house feel more vertical. He said that the current layout is impractical for a family with the master suite on the second floor. He believed that the proposal would look more complete and appropriate than what currently exists and look good from an architectural standpoint. He felt that it was a reasonable request to come 2 feet into the setback in order to have a reasonable sized bedroom on the same story as the others. He added that there is a significant buffer between the house and the curb and the house is already in the setback, so he could make the findings and support the project.

Boardmember Chong said that he liked the renderings and how the addition would tie the house together, but he struggled with the numbers provided by staff regarding houses of similar lot size. He said that this would be the second largest home in the area on the smallest lot. He noted that this would be 600 square feet over the floor area ratio and the house felt significantly larger than other homes in the area.

Chair Kricensky said that he went back and forth on this project. He noted that the lot is significantly smaller than others in the vicinity. He said that the proposed house size would be compatible with others in the area, but the lot is smaller and that makes it feel big. He noted that the house would have 27% lot coverage along with a second story.

Boardmember Chong noted that no objections were received from neighbors and said that he supported the project because the new design will be a tremendous improvement from what is existing.

Boardmember Cousins said that when he viewed the story poles he felt that the project would use up the entire lot coverage and it was too much as it is already over the lot coverage and would put a much larger house on a small lot. He believes that the house is already at its maximum size. Chair Kricensky agreed that the lot is overbuilt. The Board suggested reducing the size of the additions substantially so that it would be as close to the FAR as possible.

| |
|--|
| <p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to continue the application for 4 Corte Las Casas to the August 18, 2016 meeting. Vote: 5-0.</p> |
|--|

7. **480 IRVING COURT:** File Nos. DR2016066, VAR2016017 & VAR2016018; Junzhe Miao, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced side setback and excess lot coverage. The floor area of the house would be 2,563 square feet and the lot coverage on the site would be 2,985 square feet (36.1%), which is greater than the 30.0 % maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. The proposed addition would extend to within 7 feet, 8 inches of the right (west) side property line, which is less than the 8 foot side setback required in the R-1 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-251-15.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story, single-family dwelling on property located at 480 Irving Court. The project would expand the house to the front and rear. The project would add a master bedroom suite, one bathroom, a dining room, entry and den, and would expand the great room. A solarium at the rear of the house would be removed. The roofline would be reconfigured, with the maximum height increasing from 13 feet to 17 feet, 6 inches. Three new skylights would be installed.

The floor area of the house would be increased by 1,361 square feet to a total of 2,563 square feet, which is 264 square feet less than the 2,872 square foot floor area ratio for this site. The proposal would increase the lot coverage on the site by 1,281 square feet to a total of 2,985 square feet (36.1%), which is greater than the 30.0 % maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. As a result, a variance is requested for excess lot coverage.

The proposed addition would extend to within 7 feet, 8 inches of the right (west) side property line. As an 8 foot side setback is required in the R-1 zone, a variance is required for reduced side setback.

Junzhe Miao, owner, said that they designed the project to be in line with neighboring homes. He said that the project would be one story, with the addition is entirely in the backyard. He noted that the highest roofline would be in the middle of the house and the roofs next to neighbors would be flat. He said that all of the neighbors support the project.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Tollini agreed with staff's findings and stated that the project was a good design.

Vice Chair Emberson thanked the owner for talking to his neighbors.

Chair Kricensky said that this was a nice looking house and that having the ridgeline perpendicular to the street was a smart design.

| |
|---|
| <p>ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Tollini) that the request for 480 Irving Court is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.</p> |
|---|

G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #10 OF THE JUNE 16, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

| |
|--|
| <p>ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Emberson) to approve the minutes of the June 16, 2016, meeting, as written. Vote: 5-0.</p> |
|--|

H. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.