

**MINUTES #12
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF AUGUST 4, 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 and Cousins

Absent: Boardmember Tollini

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the item for 8 Apollo Road was continued to the August 18, 2016 meeting.

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **65 HARRIET WAY:** File No. 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.

At the July 21, 2016 Design Review Board meeting, the Board considered an application for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, on property located at 65 Harriet Way in the Bel Aire neighborhood. During the meeting, the neighbors at 50 Harriet Way voiced their opposition to the higher rooflines of the addition because the proposed roofline would be out of character with the other homes in the cul-de-sac and in the neighborhood and would have the appearance of a two-story design.

The Design Review Board determined that the roofline needed to be reduced in height to maintain the same scale as the other homes in the Bel Aire neighborhood and the Board and neighbors needed to see the revised story poles before a final decision can be made on the application. The Board provided direction to the applicant to design the home with modifications and continued the project to the August 4, 2016 Design Review Board meeting.

The applicant submitted revised plans for the project which include the reduction of the overall height from 22 feet, 11 inches to 16 feet, 3 inches. All other improvements remained the same as the previous submitted plans.

Mark Labourdette, architect, said that they dropped the roof to a 3:12 pitch and installed story poles. He said that they had not received any feedback from neighbors.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Cousins said that the project was a great improvement from what was presented at the last meeting. The other Boardmembers agreed. Vice-Chair Emberson said that it would be a handsome house and a nice addition to the neighborhood. Chair Kricensky noted that a tall roof can look good, but needs to fit in with the neighborhood.

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Cousins) that the request for 65 Harriet Way is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.

E. NEW BUSINESS

2. **2051 VISTAZO EAST STREET:** File No. DR2016046; David Godfrey, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The project would add a one-story wing to the upper level of the existing house, including a family room, guest bedroom, office, bathroom and powder room. The floor area of the house would be increased by 1,190 square feet to a total of 4,412 square feet and the lot coverage would be increased by 1,310 square feet to a total of 3,913 square feet (9.1%). Assessor's Parcel No. 059-082-26.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 2051 Vistazo East Street. The project would add a one-story wing to the upper level of the existing house, connected to the side by an enclosed corridor. The addition would include a family room, guest bedroom, office, bathroom and powder room. A deck would extend to the downhill side of the addition.

The proposal would increase the lot coverage on the site by 1,310 square feet to a total of 3,913 square feet (9.1%), which is less than the 15.0 % maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. The floor area of the property would be increased by 1,190 square feet to a total of 4,412 square feet, which is 1,888 square feet less than the 6,309 square foot floor area ratio for this site.

Onju Updegrave, architect, said that the owners would like to add an extra bedroom and space for their children to play and looked at several places to position the current addition. She said that they attempted to place the structure low so it would not impact the neighbors. She said that after installing the story poles they realized the structure would block a portion of the neighbor's water view, so they split the roof in two and adjusted the plans to preserve those views. She added that they also agreed to remove all of the uphill windows and would work with the uphill neighbors to plant landscaping to screen the building but still preserve the views.

The public hearing was opened.

Riley Hurd, representing Jessica and Hayes Bernard, agreed that the applicant had worked with the neighbors and this project design was a significant improvement. He asked for the Board's support of the three additional conditions of approval. He expressed concern that the hedge would grow into the view.

Mary O'Donovan said that she lives next door to the property and expressed concern about the impact of the addition on her own property and the neighborhood. She stated that the addition would block the evening sun and cast shadows on her patio. She said that every time she stands at her front door she would see the addition. She questioned whether it was necessary to add this extension to a house that is already 3,200 square feet. She said that there are currently a lot of lights on the house and she hoped that this will not be the case for the addition. She also expressed concern that this house would not fit in with the other houses in the neighborhood.

Boardmember Cousins said that he believed that removing the uphill windows may be going too far to make the uphill neighbor happy. Ms. Updegrave stated that the applicant supported that request.

Vice-Chair Emberson asked what the distance is between the property and Ms. O'Donovan's house. Ms. Updegrave noted that there are existing shrubs and it is hard to measure. David Godfrey, owner, said that he reached out to many neighbors and did not receive a response from Ms. O'Donovan.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said they have done a lot of work to dig in the house for the uphill neighbors. He said that he was unaware of Ms. O'Donovan's concerns until tonight, but he did not think that the addition would cause any problems. He said that this would be a large house but would be well within the allowable floor area and setbacks and would sit extremely low and cut into the hillside. He did not see how it could be made any less intrusive.

Vice-Chair Emberson agreed with Boardmember Cousins. She said that the lot is very large and this would be under the lot coverage, so although it seemed like a big house, it would not be a big house for the lot. She thought that they had gone above and beyond to remove all of the uphill windows. She was unsure about the amount of windows on the front, but noted that this was only a one story addition. She felt that there was enough separation between the two properties that the project would not be impactful.

Boardmember Chong agreed that this was a large lot and that the uphill neighbor would be the most potentially impacted, but they did a good amount of work to make it less impactful. He stated that the primary views look out toward the water and therefore he did not see much impact on the next door neighbor.

Chair Kricensky suggested planting the new landscaping along the contour line, rather than trimming the vegetation at different heights. He said that his main concern was how the house would affect the neighborhood. He said that this would be a good sized house, but was still 1,800 square feet under what its FAR. He said that this was a single story addition, set deep in the

hillside and pushed back. He agreed with the other Boardmembers that the neighboring house is a great distance away and would not be impacted.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) that the request for 2051 Vistazo East Street 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 1) all windows shall be removed from the uphill rear portion of the addition and hallway; 2) no exterior lighting fixtures shall be installed between the addition and the western property line; and 3) landscaping shall be installed on the uphill side of the addition sufficient to screen views of the roof to the satisfaction of the Planning division. Vote: 4-0.

3. **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 726 square feet for a lot coverage of 35.3%, which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage allowed in the R-1 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 038-301-14. **CONTINUED TO AUGUST 18, 2016**

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #11 OF THE JULY 21, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Boardmember Cousins requested the following changes:

Page 3: He would like to add that he liked the lettering on the sides of the sign

Page 4: The Action should have been seconded by Cousins, not Tollini

Boardmember Kricensky requested correcting the following:

Page 10: The vote should be corrected to 4-1 (Kricensky opposed)

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to approve the minutes of the July 21, 2016, meeting, as amended. Vote: 4-0.

G. ADJOURNMENT

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