

**MINUTES #15
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Associate Planner O'Malley

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING - None

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. 8 APOLLO ROAD:** File Nos. DR2016080 & VAR2016021; Cedric Barringer, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The floor area and the lot coverage of the house would be increased by 755 square feet for a lot coverage of 35.7%, which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage allowed in the R-1 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 038-301-14.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story single-family dwelling on property located at 8 Apollo Road. As more than 50% of the existing structure would be demolished as part of this application, the project has been deemed to be construction of a new single-family dwelling.

The application was first considered at the August 18, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, several neighboring property owners expressed concerns regarding the height of the rear portion of the house and potential view and light issues from higher portions of proposed windows. The Boardmembers shared these concerns and felt that the height of the rear portion of the house, including the ceiling and window heights, were excessive and would create massing, privacy and light issues for neighbors. The Board also noted that the subject property is situated at a higher elevation than some neighbors, making the building volume and windows more visible above fence lines. The Board continued the application to the September 15, 2016 meeting.

Revised plans were submitted for this project, which included the following changes to the project design:

- The height of the rear portion of the house was lowered. The previous roofline sloped and had a height of 14 feet, 10 inches on the side and 16 feet toward the center of the lot. The new roof would be flat and have a height of 13 feet, 10 inches.
- The rear portion of the house was pulled back further from the west side property line, while this wing would be 10 inches wider than the previous design. The windows on the rear of this wing were lowered 6 inches.
- The east side of the house was pulled forward approximately 5 feet toward the front.
- One additional skylight was proposed, bringing the total number of skylights to 4.

The floor area of the proposed house would be 2,125 square feet, 50 square feet greater than before. The garage has been reduced in size by 21 square feet to 375 square feet. The proposed house would cover now 2,500 square feet (35.7%) of the site, 29 square feet greater than before and in excess of the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. A variance is still therefore requested for excess lot coverage.

Cedric Barringer, owner and architect, said that after hearing the Board's feedback about the design being too bulky for the neighborhood, he researched projects in the neighborhood and revised the design to be more consistent. He displayed photographs of similar homes in the neighborhood and pointed out the similarities with his design. He noted other approvals by the Board that were similar to the proposed house, including similar roof heights, setbacks, clerestory windows, and plate heights. He said that the house at 12 Apollo Road is very similar to the proposed design and he did not see any mass issues that would impact the neighborhood.

Mr. Barringer went over the revisions to the design, including reducing the height of the rear volume, with a flat roof and plate heights of 12 feet, which would be 8 inches lower than the existing ridgeline. He said that he pushed back the corner of the structure from the property line to create a better buffer for 6 Apollo Road. He reduced the windows in the bedrooms to 8 feet in height, which would be the same as many of the neighbors. He reduced the height of the windows in the rear to 10 feet 5 inches and reconfigured the interior spaces. He said that the square footage of glazing was reduced by 21% to 202 square feet. He reduced the eave overhangs on the taller portion to reduce the mass and added a third citrus tree to the area between neighboring houses to reduce concerns about light pollution. He believed that he had effectively addressed his neighbors' concerns and that the house would fit in with other projects that have been approved in the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Emberson asked about the overhangs and questioned the purpose of the eaves. Mr. Barringer said that it was a design element and would provide sun shade on the south side. Vice Chair Emberson asked why he did not just reduce the windows. Mr. Barringer said that the windows were part of what he felt was appropriate for the design of this house.

The public hearing was opened.

Melissa Hopps said the project would still be massive in size and block her entire back view. She stated that some of the other houses Mr. Barringer listed were on the outer portion of the neighborhood.

Mr. Barringer said that he understood that the building might look more massive to the neighbors that are lower, but said that he cannot do anything about the grade change. He said that this lot only shares 6 feet of fence with Ms. Hopps' property.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Tollini said that he felt the same about the project because not much was changed. He said that much of the applicant's presentation was about a neighborhood that the Board already knows very well and that many applicants push the envelope in this neighborhood. He felt that not enough was done on this project for him to support it. He stated that some of the larger houses work in their particular locations. He believed that the mass of the house viewed from the street was not an issue, but the issue was solely the back mass that would affect the neighbors in the back and on both sides. He believed that the house was still too tall and that the 10.5 foot tall windows would upset the balance of the neighborhood and could probably be addressed with some screening, but the citrus trees in planters did not address it.

Vice Chair Emberson agreed with Boardmember Tollini's comments. She stated that there is a difference between a maximum height of a flat roof, and a maximum height of a ridgeline. She felt that the 10.5 foot height of the windows was too high. She did not believe that it was appropriate to compare the flat roof height to shed roofs and gabled roofs. She pointed out that the houses the applicant presented are unique situations and locations that are not comparable to the current project. She said that she likes flat roofs, but not when the windows are so tall.

Boardmember Cousins agreed with the other Boardmembers. He said that the view of the house from the street would be fine, but the Board is also concerned about the impact on surrounding neighbors. He did not think that the height reduction was sufficient and that not enough was done to reduce the impact on the neighbors.

Boardmember Chong said that his only concern was the impact on 6 Apollo Road. He said that the changes did not feel substantial enough and that the landscaping had not been fully addressed. He said that if there was mature landscaping around the perimeter of the property, he probably would have a different opinion, but the landscape plan did not address this enough.

Chair Kricensky said that he liked the house and it was a great design, but he did not appreciate the comparison of this house to the others in the neighborhood. He said that the volume created by the continuance of the high flat roof was the problem, as it would create a very different feeling of mass. He stated that all of the houses cited as comparisons have gable roofs. He said that the position of the house in relation to 12 Apollo Road would make the house loom even more and the high windows would add to that feeling. He believed that the design was close in many areas, but it would look very big when viewed from the neighbor's yard and house.

Boardmember Tollini said that he had the same experience standing in the neighbor's backyard in that same location and felt that the house seemed disproportionate to the lot.

Mr. Barringer said that he understood the guidance on the mass and asked if it would make the project acceptable if the plate height was reduced in that area to 10 feet. Chair Kricensky said that that would help but he did not want to dictate the design. Boardmember Tollini said if that area's plate height was brought down to match the rest of the house and the glazing was reduced it would be easier for the Board to support it. Boardmember Chong said that he would like to see the trees in the ground instead of planters, since planters are removable. Boardmember Tollini pointed out that citrus trees generally are not used for screening and suggested more typical screening plantings.

| |
|--|
| <p>ACTION: It was M/S (Cousins/Emberson) to continue the application for 8 Apollo Road to the October 6, 2016 meeting. Vote: 5-0.</p> |
|--|

- 2. 488 WASHINGTON COURT:** File No. DR2016069/VAR2016019; Matthew Mesa, Owner; Site Plan and Architecture Review for construction of a fence for an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess fence height. A new fence in the rear property would be 8 feet tall, in lieu of the maximum fence height of 6 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-251-29.

The applicant is requesting design review approval for construction of a fence for an existing single-family dwelling, with a variance for excess fence height, on property located at 488 Washington Court in the Belveron West neighborhood. The property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling.

The proposed redwood fence would be located near the rear property line towards Tiburon Boulevard and would have a maximum height of eight feet (8'). The existing 5 foot tall wooden fence would be raised to the proposed height of 8 feet. The existing vegetation along the rear of the property would remain on the inside of the fence. An existing second wooden fence is located on the outside of the existing 5 foot tall fence and it is unclear if that fence would remain or be removed from the property.

The proposed eight foot fence would connect to the remaining perimeter six foot (6') fence along the other property lines with the exception of the proposed 8 foot tall fence would extend a small portion on the east side property line instead of the 6 foot tall wooden fence.

The maximum permitted fence height within a required setback in any zone is six feet (6'). The applicant is therefore requesting a variance for excess fence height, in order to construct an eight foot fence near the rear property line and a small portion on the east side property line.

Arin Mesa, owner, said that they hope to increase the size of the fence of their house from 6 feet to 8 feet. She said that the house is across from Blackie's Pasture and headlights shine into the house. She said that by increasing the size of the fence, that light would be blocked and additional privacy would be provided for the rear of the residence.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Chong stated that he drove by the site and he supported the request and agreed with staff's findings regarding the variance.

Boardmember Cousins agreed and said that he believed that this was a practical thing to do.

Vice Chair Emberson said she drove back and forth and although Tiburon Boulevard creates challenges she did not believe that the fence would help with noise reduction. She stated that the house is higher than other houses in the area and she was concerned that this was a self-created hardship. She suggested that a 7 foot fence would be high enough. She agreed that headlights could be a problem.

Boardmember Tollini stated the story poles seemed to show that the height of the fence would be lower than the existing vegetation. He believed that the fence would help with the light pollution. He said that he had no problem supporting the fence and could make all of the variance findings.

Chair Kricensky asked the applicant if they intend to remove the existing vegetation. Ms. Mesa answered that they will not remove it. Chair Kricensky agreed that the site is noisy and the lights are impactful, and he acknowledged a fence would feel more enclosed and make it feel further from the traffic. He also believed that a 7 foot fence would be sufficient.

Boardmember Cousins noted that the Board approved an 8 foot fence for the house on the corner, but the other Boardmembers noted that the street is lower in that location. Boardmember Tollini stated that this was no different from homes on Juno Road along Trestle Glen Boulevard where the Board has approved 8 foot fences.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Chong) that the request for 488 Washington Court is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.

3. **12 VENUS COURT:** File No. DR2016086/VAR2016023; Sarah Bowen, Owner; Site Plan and Architecture Review for construction of a fence for an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess fence height. A new fence in the rear property would be up to 9 feet tall, in lieu of the maximum fence height of 6 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-281-12.

The applicant is requesting design review approval for construction of a fence for an existing single-family dwelling, with a variance for excess fence height, on property located at 12 Venus Court in the Belveron East neighborhood. The property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling.

The proposed fencing would be located along the property lines around the perimeter of the property and would vary in height from 5 feet to 9 feet tall. The proposed fencing towards Trestle Glen Boulevard would have a maximum height of nine feet (9') and would be a solid redwood material. The proposed nine foot fence would connect to the remaining perimeter five to six foot tall fence along the other property lines. The majority of the fencing would be utilize

solid materials with the exception on the north property line, where an open wood and wire fence would be located. The majority of the existing fencing would be removed.

The maximum permitted fence height within a required setback in any zone is six feet (6'). The applicant is therefore requesting a variance for excess fence height, in order to construct a nine foot fence near the rear property line towards Trestle Glen Boulevard.

Sam Bowen, owner, said that they would like to put up a fence around the back yard of the property, mainly for privacy. He said that their property borders Trestle Glen Boulevard and a lot of people walk by and peer into their property. He said that the contractor's recommendation was for a 9 foot fence, but he believed that an 8 foot fence would be fine. He passed around photographs showing how an 8 foot or 6 foot fence would look.

Boardmember Chong asked about story pole locations, particularly the pole at the corner. Mr. Bowen clarified that the story pole designated the corner area where the fence would step down.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Chong said that he had no issue with a 9 foot fence height until the point where it would drop to 6 feet. He said that he could support the application if the fence went from 6 feet and slowly stepped to the 9 feet in height. Boardmember Cousins clarified that the top of the fence would be level and the lower part would expand from 6 feet to 9 feet.

Boardmember Tollini agreed about that location and also suggested that 8 feet would be a sufficient height. He said that it would be nice to preserve the distant view on Trestle Glen Boulevard as much as possible.

Vice Chair Emberson agreed with Boardmember Tollini's comments. She believed that a 9 foot fence would be too tall. Boardmember Cousins said that he would be comfortable with 8 feet.

Chair Kricensky noted that the area down the hill might need a taller fence and wanted to be sure the height was enough in that area.

Boardmember Tollini said that he would support an 8 foot fence.

| |
|---|
| <p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) that the request for 12 Venus 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 that the fence begin at 6 feet in the upper corner rising to 8 feet in the lower corner near the barn, and that the fence not exceed 8 feet in height. Vote: 5-0.</p> |
|---|

E. ACTION ITEMS

- 173 STEWART DRIVE:** File No. DR2016036; Afie Royo, Owner; Adoption of resolution denying Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. Assessor's Parcel No. 055-101-21.

Following a public hearing and discussion at its September 1, 2016 regular meeting, the Design Review Board directed to staff to prepare a draft resolution denying a Site Plan and Architectural Review application for construction of a new single-family dwelling on property located at 173 Stewart Drive. The resolution was to be considered for adoption at the next regular meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to adopt the draft resolution denying the application for 173 Stewart Drive. Vote: 5-0.

5. **MINUTES:** Consider adoption of minutes of meeting of September 1, 2016

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Chong) to approve the minutes of the September 1, 2016, meeting, as written. Vote: 5-0.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.