

**MINUTES #2
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 18, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Associate Planner O'Malley

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous stated that the item for 681 Hawthorne Drive was continued to the March 3, 2016 meeting.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. **2225 VISTAZO EAST STREET:** File No. VAR2015022/DR2015145; Shor Capital, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicant proposes to construct a new 5,830 square foot house. The lot coverage of the house would be 6,795 square feet (16.3%), which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-091-55.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 2225 Vistazo East Street. The upper floor of the house would include a living room, dining room, kitchen, family room and a master bedroom suite, along with a mud room and an additional bathroom. The lower floor would include four more bedrooms and bathrooms, along with a media room, laundry room, wine cellar and storage room. Decks would extend off both floors to the east and patios would be located at ground level on several sides of the building. A roof deck would cover much of the southern portion of the upper floor. A swimming pool would be situated off the upper floor. A 6 foot tall wood and wire deer fence would surround most of the lot. An attached three-car garage would be situated on the uphill side of the house. Vehicular access to the house would be provided by a long driveway leading uphill from the street below, bordered by retaining walls up to 6.5 feet in height. A driveway gate would be installed near the bottom of the site.

The floor area of the proposed house would be 5,830 square feet, with 860 square feet of garage space, which is 84 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The proposed

house would cover 6,795 square feet (16.3%) 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.

Scott Couture, architect, said that when they first started the project they reached out to neighbors with a letter and they met with several residents and corresponded with others by email. He said that they took the neighbors' advice to not block views or create a design similar to the Frankovich project that was previously proposed on the property that was denied. He noted that the roadway is about 10 feet wide and very narrow and the neighbors have told them that they like that and did not want the road widened or connected through to Paradise Drive. He stated that because this is a steep hillside lot, there were only a few options for the fire truck turnaround, so a turnaround at the base would require extensive retaining walls 12-15 feet tall, but a turnaround in the corner of the property near the existing acacia trees was the best solution. He said that they were able to tuck the driveway up and around the house and locate the garage underground without requiring extensive retaining walls, which was a good solution to reduce the visual mass of the house. He said that the house was designed around the location of the driveway and garage. He said that the fire district required that the roadway be widened to 12 feet and that a fire hydrant be installed.

Mr. Couture stated that the house would be well below the height limit, with only one section that would touch the 30 foot height limit. He said that the garage would be fully buried and be landscaped on top. He said that no skylights were proposed to eliminate uphill glare issues. He described the landscape plan and pointed out existing trees and proposed trees to be planted for screening. He stated that this would be a low profile house that would step up the hillside. He felt that they had addressed the neighbors' screening concerns by planting trees and hedges.

Boardmember Emberson asked Mr. Couture to explain the difference between placing the garage under the house and digging into the hillside since each would require excavation. Mr. Couture said that it was a matter of appearance and described the impact of placing the garage in both locations.

Chair Tollini asked if the 1997 "Frankovich" project was ever approved. Planning Manager Watrous said that it was denied, then denied on appeal.

The public hearing was opened.

Carol McKegney said that she owns the vacant lot adjoining the site and said that she did not receive any contact until she contacted the applicant. She stated that the homes on Vistazo East Street are all under 4,000 square feet and she believed that this larger home would set a precedent. She also noted that there are some live springs in that area.

Lawrence Stotter said that he has lived in his home since the 1960s and almost everyone in the neighborhood is very pleased with the natural atmosphere. He said that he was very concerned that other improvements in the area have all been within the 3,500 to 4,500 square foot range. He stated that the previous application was rejected in 1997 when the Town found that the mass, bulk, and size of the proposed home was incompatible with the character of the Old Tiburon

neighborhood. He said that this proposed project would be totally different and he was concerned that the property was not being developed by someone living in the neighborhood. He requested the Board take the same action as on the 1997 project, for the same reasons.

James Bernhisel said that this property is incredibly steep. He was struck by the appearance of the solar panels which would be visible from his property. He noted that a rooftop deck and putting green was proposed at the highest point of the property, so he would be looking down on chairs, people, and noise, and he suggested moving the deck space to an area that is more private. He felt that the house should be moved downhill to be consistent with other houses in the area. He was also concerned about the height of the plantings if allowed to grow to full height.

Alison Swearingen said that she rents a home on Carol McKegney's property. She said that she has gotten to know the character of the neighborhood and felt that there is something special about it and the people. She characterized building a large mansion on this property for profit as out of place and greedy.

David Peterson said that Vistazo East Street consists of two dead end roads, one of which is gravel. He said that the houses in the Hillhaven neighborhood are similar in scale to the proposed house, but there is nothing like this proposed house on Vistazo East. He characterized the project as a "trophy" house that would be inconsistent with the neighborhood. He felt that the amount of decking would invite parties and there is no parking or ability to accommodate that amount of cars on the road. He had noise and light concerns for the deck. He noted that the site is in an RO-2 zone but it is served by a road that serves R-1 zoned dwellings.

Ann Diemer said that she was just learning about the project and she was concerned how the logistics would be handled on this road during the construction phase. She was also concerned with light pollution from the structure and the effect it would have on the neighborhood.

Mr. Couture agreed with the residents that developers can be difficult and described how he has worked in his practice with developers to be sensitive to the neighbors. He explained their neighborhood outreach efforts and said that they tried to be as forthcoming as possible. He stated that this lot has been vacant for a long time and the neighborhood may have gotten used to it as open space, but it is the property owner's right to be able to develop their property. He said that they utilized the Hillside Design Guidelines to the fullest and minimized the appearance and mass of the building. He thought that the home would fit nicely in the neighborhood and was designed with a lot of screening without creating any view blockages. He said that the solar panels would be well hidden on the site by existing landscaping and this seemed like the best location for them. He said that the developer wants to build a high quality house and wants it to fit in with the neighborhood. He said that construction parking would be on site.

Chair Tollini asked if any calculations were done to determine the net off haul of dirt. Mr. Couture stated that it would be just over 6,000 cubic yards.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Chong asked if the State of California prevents the Board from discussing solar panels. Planning Manager Watrous said that the Board cannot discuss solar panels or suggest moving them.

Boardmember Emberson said that the house design was gorgeous, but it is not appropriate for the site. She said that the home would be appropriate for Ridge Road, but inconsistent with the smaller and less impactful houses on Vistazo East. She suggested that the house was positioned to capture views and not to avoid retaining walls. She said that the windows would be massive and the south facing windows would face the sun all day long. She agreed with the neighbors that the road is small and the house is too big and it does not fit on this street. She thought that the decking was massive. She said that she could not make the findings for the variance and suggested reducing the size of the house.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he liked the design of the house and that it was worked into the hillside. However, he felt that the house was not compatible with the neighborhood. He said that maximizing the floor area would make the house loom over the other homes below. He felt that placing the house lower on the site may not help, but that better colors might help. He thought that the house was too big and that a variance was not needed on such a large lot. He thinks the rooftop deck and putting green are inappropriate. He noted that large overhangs are necessary to shade the large windows, but was concerned with the amount and height of glazing.

Boardmember Cousins said that he liked the design of the house and he understood why the owner was requesting to build a house of this size. He said that he would not support a variance but found the floor area to be acceptable. He felt that moving the garage above the house made it less visible from the top and that the driveway was less intrusive. He said that there was a tremendous amount of exterior decking. He said that he would like to reduce the apparent mass of the house, possibly by reducing the decks and eliminating the rooftop deck. He also requested a reduction or some screening of the large windows on the eastern side.

Boardmember Chong said that he visited the site and said that he could have possibly supported the variance, as the outdoor space requires more lot coverage. He noted the list of concerns from the neighbors and agreed that the rooftop deck should be eliminated. He stated that the Fire District required widening the road. He said that a small house at the bottom of the lot is not appropriate for such a large site. He did not think that the project would fundamentally change the character of the neighborhood.

Chair Tollini noted that there are different zones for properties across the street from each other and there will be different houses on different sized lots. He said that the only recently developed lot on the uphill side has a very large house. He stated that this is a huge lot and will have a large house one way or another, but there are things that can be done to make the house feel smaller. He said that he could not support the variance and noted that the roof would be almost 30 feet tall at one point. He said that he would like to see the height of the roof brought down, and louvering or cutting down for the glazing on the east side. He agreed that the rooftop deck did not work. He believed that expanding the road to 12 feet would make it safer and not take away from its charm. He stated that mounding up the grade below the pool represented an artificial approach to developing the site.

Boardmember Chong and Chair Tollini summarized the Board's concerns that 1) variances should be avoided as a starting point for size reduction; 2) no rooftop deck; 3) reduce the glazing on the downhill and east sides; and 4) lowering the roof height.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) to continue the application for 2225 Vistazo East Street to the March 17, 2016 meeting. Vote: 5-0.

2. **4030 PARADISE DRIVE:** File No. FAE2015014/DR2015142; Taylor Lembi, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Floor Area Exception. The applicant proposes to add 1,601 square feet of basement and a 214 square foot ground level addition to the existing house. The project would result in 5,283 square feet of floor area, which is greater than the 4,800 square foot floor area ratio for a lot of this size. Assessor's Parcel No. 039-091-11.

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a floor area exception, on property located at 4030 Paradise Drive. The existing 3,468 square foot single-family dwelling includes a dining room, kitchen, living room, family room, and a bathroom on the main level; and a master bedroom suite, bathroom, and two bedrooms on the upper level. There is also an existing multi-level detached accessory structure with a 492 square foot garage in the front property and wooden decks to the sides and rears of the site.

As part of an interior remodel and additions to the existing home, the proposal would add a 1,601 square foot lower level, which includes a playroom, gym, laundry room, bathroom, and master bedroom suite. A 214 square foot addition to the main level would include a great room and library. Other improvements include new wooden decks with glass railings at the main level and lower level; a rooftop deck over a portion of the new addition; four new skylights; a new chimney; and solar panels on the roof of the main structure and accessory structure. A new pool, spa, BBQ area and retaining walls would be located in the rear adjacent to the lower level deck.

The proposal would result in lot coverage of 4,115.5 square feet (14.7%), which is below the maximum 15% permitted lot coverage in the RO-2 zone. The proposal would result in a floor area of 5,283 square feet, which is 483 square feet above the 4,800 square foot floor area ratio for the property. A floor area exception is therefore required.

Taylor Lembi, owner, introduced his architect who will make the presentation.

Yakuh Askew, architect, said that the owner wished to update the house and they tried to be as respectful of the existing house as possible. He said that this is a steep site and said that they wanted to provide additional outdoor space, so the remodel includes a pool which terraces down to meet the landscaping and some "pocket" outdoor spaces. He said that they wanted to bury the addition below the residence to allow better open space off the main area. He said that they were also updating and improving the design of the residence. He reviewed the materials and showed additional images of the residence.

Mr. Lembi said they met with the neighbors on both sides of the house and noted that one of the neighbors made comments about fencing and decks and they plan to meet to discuss those concerns. Mr. Askew said that the issue raised by the neighbor involved stairs and an old wooden gate that would be removed.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Emberson said this is a great design. She really liked the way they updated the house and went underneath the building and not out.

Boardmember Chong said that he visited the site and the vegetation would screen the house from the neighbors. He thought that this was a nice design he could make the floor area exception findings. He said that if the addition was in a different location it would require removing mature trees.

Boardmember Cousins and Vice-Chair Kricensky agreed with the comments of the other boardmembers.

Chair Tollini agreed with the other boardmembers and stated this is a modest addition with a thoughtful series of retaining walls that would soften its impacts. He questioned whether fences were requested as part of the application. Associate Planner O'Malley stated they would need to work with staff if the fence is taller than 42 inches. Mr. Askew stated that both parties felt it was appropriate to bring back a separate application if the fence is over 42 inches.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Kricensky) that the request for 4030 Paradise Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.</p>

3. **681 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. VAR2015024/DR2015151; Bahram Seyedin-Noor and Maysa Namakian, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,960 square foot house. The lot coverage of the house would be 3,016 square feet (31.4%), which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-091-55. **CONTINUED TO MARCH 3, 2016**

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #1 OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Kricensky) to approve the minutes of the February 4, 2016 meeting, as written. Vote: 4-0 (Chong abstained).</p>

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.