

**MINUTES #1
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 4, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Boardmember Chong

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous stated that the items for 2235 Centro East Street and 85 East View Avenue have been withdrawn.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **2235 CENTRO EAST STREET:** File No. DR2015103; Lucy Zhang, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing two-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a 496 square foot detached guest house, and modify windows, and doors of the existing duplex. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-141-13.

WITHDRAWN

2. **85 EAST VIEW AVENUE:** File No. VAR2015019; David and Tandy Ford, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced front and side yard setbacks, excess lot coverage and excess building height, and a Floor Area Exception. The applicant proposes to construct a new four-story, 2,593 square foot house, which would result in a floor area ratio of 103.1%, which is greater than the 35.0% maximum for a lot of this size. The front yard setback would be 5 feet, 9 inches in lieu of the minimum 15 feet and the east side yard setback would be 5 feet, in lieu of the minimum 8 feet. The lot coverage of the house would be 1,332 square feet (53.0%), which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. The house would be 42 feet tall, in lieu of the maximum building height of 30 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 060-105-67. **WITHDRAWN**

E. NEW BUSINESS

- 3. 2370 PARADISE DRIVE:** File No. VAR2015023/DR2015148; Richard Grey, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with Variances for excess lot coverage and excess fence height. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,838 square foot house. The lot coverage of the house would be 3,182 square feet (37.3%), which is greater than the 35.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-2 zone. A new fence in the front yard would be 7 feet tall, in lieu of the maximum fence height of 6 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-191-05.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new single-family dwelling on property located at 2370 Paradise Drive. The subject property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling, which would be demolished.

The proposed house would include one main level that would include a living room, kitchen, dining room, a master bedroom suite, one additional bedroom, a bathroom, powder room, pantry and a study. Parking would be provided by an attached two-car garage below the main level, with a driveway leading to the rear and accessed from Linda Vista Avenue. A series of fences and retaining walls would be installed or reconstructed on the site.

The floor area of the proposed house would be 2,838 square feet, which is 16 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The proposed house would cover 3,182 square feet (37.3%) of the site, which is greater than the 35.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-2 zone. A variance is therefore requested for excess lot coverage.

A new wooden fence is proposed to be constructed near the front property line. The fence would have a maximum height of 7 feet, which is taller than the 6 foot maximum fence height in the R-2 zone. A variance is therefore also requested for excess fence height.

Mary Griffin, architect, stated that most of the houses in the area are two stories and the current house is one of the only one-story structures. She said that there is a public utility easement with parking at the front of the lot and the driveway down into the property is quite steep. She described the current house location, which has a nonconforming structure in the side yard setback and said that the existing house does not take advantage of the views, is in poor condition and is older. She showed photographs of views across the site from neighboring houses. She stated that they propose to move the driveway to the garden location and hope to preserve the large screening hedge as much as possible. She stated that the existing house aligns with the house to its east and they propose to angle the house toward the west. She said that the proposed house would be 6 inches below the elevation of the existing house. She said that the driveway off Paradise Drive would be eliminated and access would be from Linda Vista Avenue below. She displayed a depiction of the orientation of the new house relative to the old house, and noted that it would increase the distance between both neighbors on either side. She said that the roof would tip up slightly to the north on the Paradise Drive side where the solar panels are located and also tips up to the south over the living room. She said that the garage would be under the house, with an elevator and stairs connecting it to the main level.

Stefan Hastrup, architect, displayed the site plan and noted that the house would hug the setback line toward the west but exceed the setbacks on the other three sides. He stated that the existing wood retaining wall on Paradise Drive is failing, and they propose to rebuild it. He noted that this application included a small variance for lot coverage, which was significantly less than the lot coverage of the previously approved application and mainly due to the deck. He added that they have also applied for a variance for a 1.5 foot height increase to the fence to provide privacy for the house. He showed the materials palette, which was intended to be consistent with the feeling of a beach cottage. He said that the proposed house would remove a large section of roof bulk in the middle compared to the existing building.

Ms. Griffin said they reached out and met with neighbors and the main topic was that the neighboring homes look over the property from their side windows. She showed their initial proposal and stated that it was revised after viewing the site from the neighboring house to pull the house back and move it away from that view. She said that they considered a flat roof to lower the profile toward the sensitive view and erected story poles so the neighbors could see the impact of the project on view. She said that based on that feedback they then revised the proposal before submitting it. She showed views of the proposed property from several angles and said that the proposed house would be smaller than the neighboring house on the uphill side.

Richard Grey, owner, said that they have tried hard to be sensitive to the concerns of others by making changes over a series of meetings with neighbors and they believe that this proposal was a reasonable accommodation and would be a good addition to the neighborhood.

Boardmember Cousins asked about the lack of a railing for the deck above the garage. Ms. Griffin stated the deck was designed with a garden bench which meets the code by being more than 3 feet out from the deck. Boardmember Cousins questioned whether that is allowed since one could easily fall over from the bench.

Vice-Chair Kricensky noted that the hedges may be an issue because they can grow tall. Ms. Griffin noted they would have to be maintained so they do not grow up to block views.

Vice-Chair Kricensky asked about the new fencing along the property line with the neighbors, and questioned whether some of the screening shrubs would also be removed along with it. Ms. Griffin said that the fences are in bad shape but they would work to preserve as much of the shrubbery as they can. Mr. Hastrup said that they did not consider this to be a central feature of the design and they would replant anything needed, but they want to preserve the vertical ivy hedge as much as possible.

The public hearing was opened.

Pete Tymstra said he is the neighbor to the east of the proposed property and he welcomed the owners to the neighborhood. He said that the applicant has been very gracious and communicative with their plans. He stated that his letter focused on privacy for him and for them.

Tyler Bartlett said that he had some minor concerns, including the fence and hedges between the properties. He was also concerned about the large window above the staircase and the overhang over that window.

Theresa Harrelson welcomed the owners and said that their drawings were beautiful. She said that she lives below Linda Vista Avenue near the new garage location and stated that this is a private road that is very narrow. She was concerned about increasing traffic on the street and asked what would happen to the existing landscaping facing the street. She wanted to know how the project would look on the garage side, stating that she currently has total privacy in her garden and that she could not tell if they will be able to see into her property from the deck.

Ms. Griffin said that they were very happy to work with all neighbors on any conditions that might affect their properties. She said that the deck would be 6 inches lower than the existing deck and would impact privacy less. She said that they would work with neighbors regarding the fences and landscaping.

Boardmember Emberson suggested that the revised parking area on Paradise Drive would make it harder for the neighbor to get in and out of their driveway because of the eventual height of the proposed pittosporum. Mr. Griffin said that they would be happy to adjust the plantings and the driveway to maintain privacy yet not have such an impact on the neighbors.

Boardmember Cousins noted that the retaining wall in the street right-of-way would require a separate permit process. Planning Manager Watrous stated that the Public Works Department has generally encouraged improvements to add parking spaces. He said that he heard two suggestions in Boardmember Emberson's comments: 1) to reduce landscaping to reduce view blockage, and 2) to pull back the retaining wall. Ms. Griffin said that they would be happy to work with the Town on the parking spaces.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said that this was a handsome design. He felt that rotating the house made a lot of sense and would open up views for the neighbors. He said that the one-story design was beneficial and that creating access and parking off Linda Vista Avenue rather than Paradise Drive was appropriate. He said that the roof overhang would be very close to the view of the Golden Gate Bridge from the neighbor's kitchen. He stated that the overhang would not provide much shading and suggested that the corner be revised so the overhang would not affect the Golden Gate Bridge view. He said that the fences would look the same and he had no objection to the increased fence height.

Vice-Chair Kricensky agreed with Boardmember Cousins. He pointed out that the Golden Gate Bridge is the most iconic view in the bay area and he shared Boardmember Cousins' concern that the overhang would extend into that view. He suggested that the height of the wraparound portion of the living room window needed to be reduced because the top of it would be visible at night time and impede the neighbor's view. He felt that the garage design would work well. He did not think that the deck would impact the downhill neighbor. He appreciated the work the applicant did to accommodate the neighbors. He said that he was hesitant to approve the fence

and shrub removal if there was not a resolution about its location on the eastern property line and due to potential disruption of the neighbors' landscaping.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the fence goes in and out of the property line at that location. Boardmember Cousins added that the fence is mostly inside the property line and that the issue was the disruption to existing plantings and suggested a condition that the plantings be maintained. Chair Tollini stated that if the existing plantings are destroyed then they need to be replaced to the satisfaction of the neighbors. Boardmember Emberson suggested pittosporum would be inappropriate because it grows too tall. Chair Tollini said that that was not his experience with pittosporum in this area and suggested this should be deferred to staff to work with the applicant on a species that would not grow more than 15 feet. Planning Manager Watrous said that pittosporum is used commonly as a thick screen on the peninsula but usually does not grow more than 10-15 feet tall in Tiburon.

Boardmember Emberson said that this was a handsome design. She said that she had issues with the size of the skylights and the roof eaves. She said that the skylight appeared to be 8 feet long, which she felt was very big for a skylight and could be reduced in size. Boardmember Cousins pointed out that the roof would be flat in that area and the skylights would be behind the sloping roof and would not be visible because the neighbors would look straight across from eye level. Boardmember Emberson agreed that bringing the roof overhang back would make the neighbors happy, and she agreed with Boardmember Cousins and Vice Chair Kricensky that this was worth revising because of the impact on the view of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Chair Tollini agreed with the other Boardmembers and stated that the house was thoughtfully designed. He liked the idea of placing the garage off Linda Vista Avenue because it would improve circulation and the doors would be well set back. He appreciated that the solar panels would be thoughtfully concealed. He believed that the skylight requests were modest given the amount of roof and there less visible location on a flat portion of the roof. He said that he was less concerned about the fence, but more concerned about loss of screening when the fence is removed, and he would like to see a condition of approval requiring any screening damaged during construction be replaced as soon as possible. He agreed with staff's findings regarding the variances. He agreed with Boardmember Kricensky's suggestion to reduce the height of the living room window to avoid light issues. He said that he was torn about the eave near the neighbor's view of the Golden Gate Bridge, acknowledging that this would be a real impact, but since the eave was aesthetic and not functional he felt that it should be pulled back. He encouraged the applicant to look at that area and diminish the impact of the eave on the neighbor's view of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Planning Manager Watrous noted another issue that was mentioned was reducing the size of the Paradise Drive parking area to 2 spaces instead of 3. The consensus of the Board was that should be done.

Ms. Griffin presented a drawing pulling back the overhang by 2 feet. Chair Tollini suggested that this was a good place to start, but felt that story poles were needed. Planning Manager Watrous said that therefore the item would need to be continued.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Kricensky) to continue the application for 2370 Paradise Drive to the March 3, 2016 meeting. Vote: 4-0.

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #21 OF THE DECEMBER 17, 2015 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2015 meeting, as written. Vote: 3-1 (Kricensky abstained).

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.