

**MINUTES #8  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF MAY 19, 2016**

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

**A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Tollini, Vice Chair Kricensky and Boardmembers Cousins

Absent: Boardmembers Chong and Emberson

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Planning Manager Watrous stated that the application for 2225 Vistazo East Street was withdrawn, and the resolution of denial no longer needed to be considered. He also noted that the item for 2 Audrey Court was continued to the June 2, 2016 meeting and that the appeal for 65 Ranch Road was also withdrawn.

**D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

1. **2225 VISTAZO EAST STREET:** File No. DR2015145; Shor Capital, LLC, Owner; Adoption of resolution denying Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-091-55. **WITHDRAWN**

**E. OLD BUSINESS**

2. **2 AUDREY COURT:** File Nos. DR2015139/VAR2015021/FAE2015013; Arvand Sabetian, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling and secondary dwelling unit, with a Variance for excess lot coverage and a Floor Area Exception. The applicant proposes to add 1,649 square feet of additions to an existing single-family dwelling and secondary dwelling unit for a total of 5,279 square feet, which is 1,421 square feet greater than the 3,858 square foot floor area ratio for this lot. The project would result in 3,835.5 square feet (20.6%) of lot coverage, which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 058-231-10. **CONTINUED TO JUNE 2, 2016**

**F. NEW BUSINESS**

3. **65 REED RANCH ROAD:** File No. DR2016009; Andrea Hong and James Parsons, Owners; Dan Mihalovich and Judy Stern, Appellants; Appeal of a Site Plan and

Architecture Review conditional approval for construction of a new fence for an existing single-family dwelling. Assessor's Parcel No. 038-301-35. **WITHDRAWN**

4. **686 HILARY DRIVE:** File Nos. DR20160028/VAR2016008/VAR2016012; Kenneth Weil, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced front setback and excess lot coverage. The applicant proposes to add a 226 square foot addition to an existing single-family dwelling, for a total house size of 2,623 square feet. The addition would extend to within 11 feet, 7 inches of the front property line, which is less than the 15 foot front setback required in the R-1 zone. The project would increase the lot coverage on the site by 226 square feet to a total of 2,623 square feet (34.5%), which is greater than the 30.0 % maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 055-182-15.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story, single-family dwelling on property located at 686 Hilary Drive. The project would add a master bedroom suite to the front of the house. Two new skylights would be installed. The floor area of the property would be increased by 226 square feet to a total of 2,034 square feet, which is 726 square feet less than the 2,760 square foot floor area ratio for this site. The proposal would increase the lot coverage on the site by 226 square feet to a total of 2,623 square feet (34.5%), which is greater than the 30.0 % maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. As a result, a variance is requested for excess lot coverage. The proposed addition would extend to within 11 feet, 7 inches of the front property line. As a 15 foot front setback is required in the R-1 zone, a variance is required for reduced front setback.

Matthew Waitkus, designer, said that they proposed a 226 square foot addition to the house and he recapped the statistics of the property and the request. He said that they would keep the house to one story, as is often done in this neighborhood to avoid blocking any views. He displayed photographs of the story poles and stated that there would be no view issues.

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Kricensky said that this was similar to other projects in the area and under the FAR, so he could support the project.

Boardmember Cousins agreed and said that he visited the site. He said that the project would be kept to a single story and the relatively minor extension would have little impact on neighbors.

Chair Tollini agreed with the other Boardmembers. He said that the only thing that gave him pause was that there was no compelling reason for the length of the addition, but he felt that it fit in with the neighborhood. He noted that the lot size was substandard and the front property line is substantially off the curb. He felt that this honored the spirit of the front setback.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Kricensky/Cousins) that the request for 686 Hilary Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 3-0.</p>
---

5. **173 STEWART DRIVE:** File No. DR2016036; Afie Royo, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story, 2,723 square foot house with a 510 square foot garage. Assessor's Parcel No. 055-101-21.

The applicant is requesting to construct a new two-story single-family dwelling. The existing single-family dwelling on the site shall be demolished. The main level floor of the house would be expanded on all sides from the footprint of the existing house. The main floor would include a living room, dining room, kitchen, family room, three bedrooms, two bathrooms and a powder room. The lower garage level would include a two-car garage, laundry room, mud room and storage space. A new 6 foot tall wooden fence and gate would be installed along the right side of the lot facing Stewart Drive. Several mature Pine trees would be removed along the lower portion of the lot facing Sierra Court.

The proposal would increase the floor area on the site by 885 square feet to a total of 2,723 square feet with a 510 square foot garage, which would be 32 square feet less than the maximum floor area allowed for a lot of this size. The proposal would result in lot coverage of 2,264 square feet (30.0%), which is 2 square feet less than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone.

Joe Farrell, architect, stated that this project came before the Board several times and each time its size and scope was reduced. He stated that the project previously requested a floor area exception and a coverage variance, but now it met the development standards. He said that they met with the neighbors and reviewed the project and the story poles, but they were now unsure whether the story poles were correct and will meet with the surveyor next week to confirm the elevation of the poles.

Mr. Farrell reviewed the changes made to the previous project, including removing the large addition at the northwest side of the building, which now extends only slightly at the upper level. He described changes to the fence, patio area and driveway. He said that they tried to put all of the living area in the upper level of the home, with the laundry and mud room area on the lower level where the existing garage is located. He said that they studied the possibility of putting the living area on the bottom floor, but putting living space on that floor would require major excavation and was not feasible. He said that they reduced the height of the structure by several feet and the overall height was lower than the previous design. He noted that they also added significant landscaping to screen the building.

The public hearing was opened.

Bibi Assad said that she was very happy with the new design because it was a big change from previous designs, which involved a taller building that would have blocked her views. She said that she was concerned that the story poles that were put in two days ago look very high and do not look right and she hoped that that would be resolved.

Laurie James said that she met with applicants regarding the story poles which went up last week and were then readjusted on Monday, and she felt that this did not provide enough time to give

thoughtful feedback to the Board. She said that her main concern was the height of the story poles, as they looked taller than shown on the plans. She wanted to see the corrected poles and be sure that nothing was approved until the story poles were verified. She raised concerns about possible glare and privacy issues from the new glass panels around the patio.

Vivien Jacobs said that she had a lot of questions from the last meeting in February. She stated that the story poles indicate that the house would not step up the hill. She said that the most glaring issue was the height and she said that there were several errors in the measurements and questioned the trustworthiness of the plans. She said that the story poles make the house look much higher and appear blocky.

Mr. Farrell stated that the submitted plans and project data accurately show the building height. He said that they were willing to extend the fence out further to achieve more privacy for the neighbors and were open to considering different fence designs and materials. He said that they had a neighborhood meeting and will meet with their surveyor to correct the story poles, as he felt that they were too high.

Afie Royo, owner, clarified the story pole situation, stating that a contractor installed them and the surveyor said they were too short, so the contractor came out and made them taller. She said that the poles now appear to be too high. She said that she was willing to consider an opaque fence to avoid the problems noted about the glass panels.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said that he appreciated what the applicant did, but on this site there is a problem with having all of the living area on the upper floor without extending the lower floor, which was contrary to the Hillside Design Guidelines. He said that the house is currently screened by pine trees, and once that screen is gone the house would be visible, particularly the cantilevered element on the upper floor. He said that not much had been changed much from the previous designs. He said that in order to achieve the desired floor area, the project may have to excavate to accommodate more living space on the lower floor and possibly dig down for the garage. He noted that the raised ceiling of the living room also pushes up the roof and he suggested keeping the eaves at the same height without raising the roof height.

Vice Chair Kricensky agreed with Boardmember Cousins' comments. He felt that the plans made sense on their own, but do not take the site into account and were contrary to the Hillside Design Guidelines. He agreed that it would take quite a bit of work to place floor area on the lower level. He thought that this design was better than the previous one because it did not push out on the northwest side, but with the trees removed it would open up views of a very tall facade.

Chair Tollini said that his view on the project had not changed from before. He said that he was more focused on the challenging site and he was not sure how to best solve the problem. He said that the shape and size of the lot are challenging. He said that this would be a tall house and although it is currently behind pine trees, when those trees are removed it would be very visible. He said that placing virtually all of the improvements on the top floor may not be possible. He

said that the cantilevered portion would be in one of the more sensitive areas. He felt that the project was inconsistent with the Hillside Design Guidelines and with other homes in the vicinity and would have a dramatic impact on Sierra Court. He said that developing floor area in the crawl space was not attractive, but would be the path of least resistance for adding floor area to the house. Planning Manager Watrous confirmed that the primary problem visually was from the side facing Sierra Court.

Planning Manager Watrous indicated that the project could be continued to the June 16 meeting. The applicant indicated a preference to continue to the meeting after that. Mr. Watrous indicated that the applicant would need to agree to an extension of the Permit Streamlining Act deadline to accommodate a continuance to a date in July. The applicant agreed to an extension.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Cousins/Kricensky) to continue the application for 173 Stewart Drive to the July 7, 2016 meeting. Vote: 3-0.</p>
--

- 6. 101 HOWARD DRIVE:** File No. DR2016038; Chris and Kenna Norris, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review to legalize as-built construction of a fence for an existing single-family dwelling. Assessor's Parcel No. 039-133-09.

The applicant is requesting design review approval to legalize as-built construction of a wooden fence for an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 101 Howard Drive. The property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling. The fence is situated near the front and side property lines on the corner of Howard Drive and Hilary Drive. The as-built wooden fence replaced an existing wooden fence covered with overgrown landscaping. The as-built fence would appear to be in the same location and height as the previous existing fence. The as-built fence would have a maximum height of six feet (6'). The property owner proposes to stain the fence a slate gray color and plant 30 inch tall landscaping in front of the fence along Howard Drive and Hilary Drive.

This application was first submitted for staff-level design review. During the review of this application, an adjacent property owner raised objections to the design of the as-built fence. As a result, the Community Development Director referred this application to the Design Review Board for action.

Chris Norris, owner, distributed renderings of the proposed project showing the fence from the surrounding streets and the corner. He said that the fence would be stained and landscaped. He said that the project would improve the visual appeal of their home, as well as the safety and visibility when turning onto Howard Drive from Hilary Drive. He stated that the previous fence was overgrown and dilapidated. He said that they received strong positive feedback from all neighbors except for one and that every home that has a direct vantage point of the new fence has indicated their approval. He stated that other fences in the neighborhood have the same height and aesthetics as this fence.

The public hearing was opened.

Douglas O'Connor said stated that a custom open lattice fence was approved three years ago and a permit was issued and its 6 foot height was the only similarity to what was built. He said that the 4 x 4 horizontal sections of the fence were more unattractive than the intended vertical fence and had this been submitted it would have been approved. He said that the fence is bulky, with nothing breaking up its 120 foot length on Howard Street. He said that the 30 inch tall vegetation would leave most of the 6 foot fence uncovered. He said that the fence is painted a dark slate grey, which is not the color submitted to the Town.

Mr. Norris said that the fence is built out of redwood material, as was the original fence. He stated that Mr. O'Connor has had ongoing complaints throughout the process and has complained about every project in the neighborhood. He said that homeowners in this neighborhood take pride in their properties and want their neighborhood to look nice and improve property values.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice Chair Kricensky stated that the fence is somewhat nondescript, but appears as a major element on the site. He said that the fence design is monotonous, with no delineation for the entry. He noted, however, that this is a busy intersection with a lot of traffic and he understood the need for privacy.

Boardmember Cousins stated that there are more hedges than fences in this area, but many fences as well. He noted that the corner lots at Avenida Miraflores have similar fences. He said that the proposed landscaping would look nice, but he suggested that it would work better if it was greener and higher to screen the fence more and be more similar to other fences in the neighborhood. He suggested that lattice sections would also help break it up visually, but he understood the need for a solid fence.

Chair Tollini said that he visited the site and drove around the neighborhood and there is a lot of greenery and hedges and there are definitely other examples of 6 foot fences. He characterized the fence design as minimalist, but he did not have a problem with it from an aesthetic standpoint. He said that he hoped for more landscaping to cover the fence.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the fence is in the Town right-of-way and there are limitations on landscaping near the street corner because of visibility. He said that any additional landscaping for the fence would be subject to review by the Public Works Department.

Vice-Chair Kricensky suggested adding panels to break up the long fence. Chair Tollini suggested some selective plantings to break it up, but he believed that the fence is attractive enough and could be left as is.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Cousins/Kricensky) that the request for 101 Howard Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional condition of approval that the landscaping outside the fence shall utilize plantings of increased height subject to the approval of the Planning Division and the Public Works Department. Vote: 3-0.</p>
---

**G. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #7 OF THE MAY 5, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Vice-Chair Kricensky noted the following correction on page 3, fifth paragraph, first sentence: Change "...his main concerns" to "...her main concerns."

Chair Tollini requested the following change on page 14, first paragraph, fifth sentence: Change the sentence to: "...he encouraged the wall signs to follow that format, along with the blade signs."

ACTION: It was M/S (Cousins/Kricensky) to approve the minutes of the May 5, 2016, meeting, as amended. Vote: 3-0.
---

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20.m.