

**MINUTES #5  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF APRIL 7, 2016**

The meeting was opened at 7:00 p.m. by Vice-Chair Kricensky.

**A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Tollini (arrived late), Vice Chair Kricensky, Boardmembers Cousins and Emberson

Absent: Boardmember Chong

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 4000 Paradise Drive was continued to the April 21, 2016 meeting.

**D. NEW BUSINESS**

2. **4000 PARADISE DRIVE:** File Nos. VAR2016005/DR2016017; Bruce and Donna Block, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for reduced front setback. The addition would extend to within 20 feet of the front property line, which is less than the 30 foot minimum front setback required in the RO-2 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 039-091-09. **CONTINUED TO APRIL 21, 2016**

3. **47 SOUTHRIDGE WEST:** File Nos. VAR2016006/VAR2016007/DR2016025; Geoff and Marjorie Baylor, Owners; 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 applicant proposes to add 466 square feet of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The addition would extend to within 9 feet, 8 inches of the side property line, which is less than the 12 foot minimum side setback required in the RO-2 zone. The project would result in 2,644 square feet (17.1%) of lot coverage, which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-400-10

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 47 Southridge West. The living room, dining room and master bedroom would be expanded on the upper floor and the existing upper level deck would be expanded to align with the dining room and living room walls. The family

room and entry would be expanded on the lower floor and a new exercise room would be created. The roof over the eastern portion of the house would be removed and reconfigured, increasing the maximum roof height by more than a foot. A trellis would be attached to the side of the entry. A new stairway would lead from the lower level deck to the rear yard. An existing spa to the rear of the house would be relocated and a fire pit and several sections of new fencing would be installed.

The proposed floor area for the project would be 3,540 square feet, which is 10 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The house would cover 2,644 square feet (17.1%) of the site, which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. A variance is therefore requested for excess lot coverage.

The landing for the stairway leading to the lower level deck would extend to within 9 feet, 8 inches of the right (east) side property line and a corner of the expanded upper level deck would extend to approximately 10 feet, 6 inches of the property line. As a 12 foot side setback is required for a deck in the RO-2 zone, a variance is therefore also requested for reduced side setback.

Jared Polsky, architect, said that this project presented design challenges with the entry, stairway to the living room and the façade. He stated that they plan to raise the front walkway, re-landscape the front entry stairs, add another gable, and add south facing windows and trellises to the façade. He explained the side setback variance for expanding the existing deck that protrudes into the setback and the lot coverage variance needed because the lot is sloping and it is undersize. He said that the additions would not affect any neighbors, and all neighbors have signed off or written letters of support for the project.

Marjorie Baylor stated that they have lived at the house for 23 years and were informed by a realtor that her house had no curb appeal, and that is what started this process. She said that the entry staircase has been a problem and she believed that the changes would enhance the home.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Emberson said that the project was within reason and that staff wrote a great report. She agreed with the variance findings proposed by staff and supported the project.

Boardmember Cousins agreed with Boardmember Emberson and stated that the deck was appropriate for the scale of the project, and that the stairway change would not affect other surrounding properties. He felt that they did a good job of working with the existing building.

Vice-Chair Kricensky agreed with the other Boardmembers and said that the fenestration would actually reduce the overall mass of the house. He agreed with the findings in the staff report.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) that the request for 47 Southridge West is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 3-0.</p>
--

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #3 OF THE MARCH 3, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Boardmember Emberson requested the following change on Page 5, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: "...basement did so in this design" should be changed to "...basement and they did so in this design."

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2016 meeting, as amended. Vote: 3-0.

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #4 OF THE MARCH 17, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Boardmember Emberson noted following corrections:

Page 2, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: "The lot coverage of proposed house..." line 4 should be corrected to "The lot coverage of the proposed task."

Page 7, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: "...photo-simulation of what the existing..." should be corrected to "...photo-simulation of the existing..."

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to approve the minutes of the March 17, meeting, as amended. Vote: 3-0.

Boardmember Emberson recused herself from the following item and Chair Tollini arrived to the meeting.

**G. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **681 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. DR2015151; Bahram Seyedin-Noor and Maysa Namakian, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,850 square foot house with 2,880 square feet (29.9%) of lot coverage. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-091-55.

At the March 3, 2016 Design Review Board meeting, the Board considered an application for the construction of a new single-family dwelling, on property located at 681 Hawthorne Drive. During the meeting, the neighbors at 678 Hilary Drive stated their opposition to the higher rooflines of the new single-family dwelling because the new home would potentially block views of the bay. Other neighbors voiced support for the original proposed design.

The Design Review Board determined that the proposed home would be consistent with the character of the updated homes in Hawthorne Terrace neighborhood because the home would be a split level home with an excavated garage, and would appear as a one-story design from the rear and a split level from the front. However the consensus of the Board was that the roofline needed to be reduced in height to limit the view blockage for the uphill neighbors on Hilary Drive and the overall size of the new home needed to be reduced. The Board provided direction to the applicant to design the home with modifications that would limit the potential of blocking

views for the uphill neighbors and continued the project to the April 7, 2016 Design Review Board meeting.

The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the project which include the following modifications to the project design:

- Reduced the overall height from 23 feet, 7 inches to 20 feet, 6 inches
- Moved the location of the entire footprint 1 foot, 6 inches further from street
- Reduced the size of the front terrace and moved it 6 feet further from the street
- Lowered all ridgelines by a minimum of 12 inches
- Reduced the overall house footprint by 136 square feet (from 3,016 square feet [31.4%] to 2,880 square feet [29.9%]). A variance for excess lot coverage is no longer requested.
- Reduced the floor area ratio by 99 square feet (from 2,949 square feet to 2,850 square feet)
- Reduced the amount of glazing in the breakfast nook area above the garage

Jared Polsky, architect, stated that at the last hearing they asked for a lot coverage variance and a higher and larger house than they are now. He said that they trimmed the house footprint and no longer required a lot coverage variance, and also reduced the floor area of the house by 100 square feet, lowered the house and redesigned the front gable. He described how the roofline was lowered in various areas. He said that the front terrace was 17.5 feet further back from the street than it was in the original design. He summarized that they were not asking for any variances, were below the height limit, and would not block any views.

The public hearing was opened.

Marianna Longstreth stated that she lives next door and she fully supported the application.

John Hermansky said that this was a nice design. He appreciated the reduction in the floor area and the height of the house and felt that keeping it to one level would make it more visually comfortable. He also appreciated the landscaping.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that the changes addressed the Board's previous concerns regarding the amount of glass and the height. He noted that stretching the house from setback to setback is acceptable on this particular property because it is a larger, shallow lot. He supported the project.

Boardmember Cousins agreed with Vice-Chair Kricensky and said that the reduction of the roof was significant and setting the house back from the street went a long way toward addressing his concerns.

Chair Tollini said when he visited the site and saw the story poles it appeared to be a more substantial change from the last meeting than he expected. He believed that the house would fit in with the neighborhood and he supported the project.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Kricensky/Cousins) that the request for 681 Hawthorne Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 3-0 (Emberson recused).

## **H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.