

**MINUTES #3  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF MARCH 3, 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 180 Gilmartin Drive was continued to the March 17, 2016 meeting.

**D. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **2370 PARADISE DRIVE:** File No. VAR2015023/DR2015148; Richard Grey, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with Variances for excess lot coverage and excess fence height. The applicant proposes to construct a new 2,838 square foot house. The lot coverage of the house would be 3,182 square feet (37.3%), which is greater than the 35.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-2 zone. A new fence in the front yard would be 7 feet tall, in lieu of the maximum fence height of 6 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-191-05.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new single-family dwelling on property located at 2370 Paradise Drive. This application was first reviewed at the February 4, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, the owners of the adjacent home to the east at 2380 Paradise Drive raised concerns about potential view impacts from their kitchen and dining room, the size of a potential on-street parking pad and possible impacts on existing property line landscaping. The Design Review Board shared these concerns and determined that the roofline of the proposed house would extend too far into the Golden Gate Bridge views from the neighboring dwelling. The Board also directed that the parking pad be reduced in size, an east-facing living room window be reduced in height and that efforts be made to ensure that the neighbors' property line vegetation not be disturbed during construction. The application was then continued to the March 3, 2016 meeting.

The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the project that recued the roof overhang above the living room, shortened the height of a living room window and modified the parking

pad on Paradise Drive and landscaping to be planted along the eastern side property line. Other elements of the proposed house design, including the floor plan, floor area, lot coverage and other building elevations, remain unchanged from the previously submitted plans.

Mary Griffin, architect, introduced herself and her partner, Stefan Hastrup. She described the history of the site and explained how they arrived at the current project design. She described how they responded to the various issues from the last meeting. She said that the parking area on Paradise Drive was modified to handle two cars instead of three and provide a buffer against the Tymstra's property. She said that they met with the neighbors about the roof and now proposed to cut the overhang back by about two feet as they wanted to preserve the overhang to protect the house from the weather. She said that they also reduced the height of the living room window to eight feet instead of ten feet. She stated that they worked hard to design a house that responds to their clients' needs and also responds to the concerns that were raised.

Richard Grey, owner, said he believes the process involves looking at the total project and making the best decision based on taking everything together. He stated they do not want a house designed by a committee. They designed the house the way it is because they like it. He feels they have made every effort to be sensitive to the neighbors' concerns.

The public hearing was opened.

Peter Tymstra stated that they hired Michael Rex, architect, who wrote and submitted a letter to the Board. Mr. Tymstra stated that their two major concerns were the raised roof extending into their views of the Golden Gate Bridge and the amount of light emanating from skylights. He said that although there have been some improvements made to the project they still have the same concerns. He said that the Greys' architects are creative and talented and he hoped that they would come up with a design that would meet the Greys' needs and not be so impactful to his own property. He requested that the eaves be cut off so they do not block the shoreline and ridgeline views from his home, stating that the eaves will have no impact on the weather. He was pleased that the parking area was cut back to two spaces and he hoped that the Public Works Department would look at the proposed boulders. He stated that the overhang would block his view of Lyford Cove.

Tyler Bartlett displayed a photograph taken from the window of the master bedroom of 2360 Paradise Drive and noted that the story pole was higher than the existing hedge. He said that he was also concerned about the fence along the shared property line.

Ms. Griffin said that they did not intend to take down any hedges or fences unnecessarily and if anything damaged during construction will be fixed. She noted that the proposed house was well separated from 2360 Paradise Drive.

Mr. Grey said that any impact this project would have on the Tymstras' views would be minor. He said that they have a 180 degree view and the view of the Golden Gate Bridge from the kitchen sink and is not really a primary view location in the house, as they have completely unobstructed views of the bridge from the other rooms of the house. He felt that the Tymstras'

concerns had to do with having a new home on the site, and he felt that the benefits of having the new home would outweigh the minor impact on the neighbor.

Caroline Grey, owner, said they purchased the home in 2014 and like its location in Old Tiburon. She said that they have made many changes to the design without satisfying their neighbors. She felt that the Tymstras do not spend much time at the kitchen sink looking out at the view. She stated that the plantings would not be visible because they will be covered by fences. She felt that the Tymstras would not be happy about any plans that they submitted because the past 10 years the house has been empty and therefore any change due to the development of the lot would seem like a big change. She said she and her husband have thought about abandoning the project because they feel “beat up” and unwelcome and if they sell their property, the Board and the Tymstras will have another applicant going through the same process, because any new house will have some minor impacts on the views.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said that the house has a lot of good design elements. He said that he hoped that there more would be done to the eaves to satisfy everyone. He stated that the neighbors had a small amount of borrowed view across the site. He said that the revised roof would keep the impact clear of the bridge view, and he believed that just about enough was done to satisfy his concerns.

Boardmember Chong stated that he was not present at the first meeting and when he went to the site yesterday it was foggy, so he must depend on the submitted photos. He said that he was most concerned with the kitchen view and he felt that the changes addressed the view minimally. He said that he would like to see a little more of the view of the bridge preserved.

Vice Chair Kricensky agreed with Boardmember Cousins that it would be nice to preserve all of the views, but acknowledged that this was a borrowed view across the neighbor’s lot. He said that views of the Golden Gate Bridge would be preserved from the majority of the house. He said that the tinted skylights would not be a problem and the parking can be handled by the Public Works Department. He noted that the height of the fixed window on the east elevation was reduced and he wondered if the height of the west-facing sliding glass door should be reduced as well. He agreed that there should be a height limit imposed on the pittosporum.

Boardmember Emberson agreed with the other Boardmembers and felt that it was too bad the view could not be preserved more completely. She felt that the roofline was back far enough to reduce view impacts and eliminated her initial concerns. She agreed with Vice Chair Kricensky that the height of the ten foot sliding glass door should be reduced to match the window on the other side. She said that the skylights would not be a problem.

Chair Tollini agreed and said that the ten foot sliding glass door should also be reduced to eight feet to match the other side. He felt that he did not have a good grasp of the height of the existing hedge and suggested a condition of approval that any replacement match the existing hedge height. He felt that the applicant put a lot of thought into this design and the view intrusion would be minor in the context of the entire view.

Emberson asked about the boulder as a barrier in a parking area and whether Public Works can require a boulder to deter parking in a particular area. Planning Manager Watrous said that they would not require it but can review it and determine whether it is appropriate or not as a barrier.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) that the request for 2370 Paradise Drive 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 west-facing kitchen sliding glass door shall be reduced in height to 8 feet, the Pittosporum species to be planted along the east side property line not exceed the height of the existing hedge, and any landscaping on the west side property line that is disturbed during construction to be replaced to provide sufficient screening. Vote: 5-0.

## **E. NEW BUSINESS**

Boardmember Emberson recused herself from the following item.

- 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 2,949 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.

The applicant is requesting design review approval to construct a new single-family dwelling, with a variance for excess lot coverage on property located at 681 Hawthorne Drive. The property is currently developed with a one-story single-family dwelling. The existing dwelling includes 1,341 square feet of floor area. The applicant intends to demolish the existing structure and build a new partial two-story dwelling.

The proposed 2,914 square foot home would include an entry foyer, living room, office, dining room, kitchen, breakfast nook, family room, two bathrooms, two bedrooms, laundry room, and a master bedroom suite on the main level. An 836 square foot basement level addition would include a media room, exercise room, bathroom, mechanical room and a two-car garage. Other improvements include a covered front entry, front view terrace with glass guardrails, trash enclosure, a trellis over the garage and a rear terrace with fire pit and BBQ island. Both terraces would extend off the living room and dining room to provide an outdoor living space. Four new skylights would be installed on the roof; one above the hallway and the other three above the entry foyer, along with solar panels.

The proposal would result in a floor area of 2,949 square feet, which is below the maximum permitted floor area for the property (2,960 square feet). The proposal would result in lot coverage of 3,016 square feet (31.4%), which is approximately 134 square feet (1.4 %) above the maximum permitted lot coverage in the R-1 zone (30.0%). A variance for excess lot coverage is required.

Jared Polsky, architect, stated that they worked hard to design a home that takes advantage of views, provides a nice façade on the street, and protects neighbors' views. He felt that the house would appear as a one-story home with a small basement. He said that they were advised by Town staff to minimize the basement and they did so in this design. He felt that the basement would not make the house feel like a two-story structure and would fit in well with the design of other houses on the street. He said that they asked for a small lot coverage variance to allow them to design a one-story house and they had to count a portion of the front deck as lot coverage because it is slightly above grade. He said that they were very careful in designing the house to break it into small masses with low slope roofs. He said that all of the roof ridges would be at or below the height of the existing ridge, except one over the kitchen and family room that would be 7 inches higher than the existing house and another ridge 14 inches higher. He stated that they reached out to neighbors and the neighbor at 678 Hilary Drive expressed some concern about view blockages and requested a line between the story poles. He said that they were unable to put up the line because of the number of story poles, but it seemed clear that the house would not block any views. He said that they talked with the neighbor to the west about view blockage and he was in full support of the project.

Maysa Namakian, owner, said that she was born and raised in Tiburon and was very excited to move back. She said that they tried to follow staff's advice and she thanked the neighbors and those who supported the design. She said that they made some changes to the landscaping to minimize the potential heights so they would not block any views.

The public hearing was opened.

Marianna Longstreth said that she lives next door to the project and they have seen the neighborhood start to change in the past few years and so far she is delighted to see the changes. She supported placing the garage underneath the house, stating that it is important to have garages, and this location would provide more space for the home. She appreciated that the owners spent the time talking with neighbors and taking their views into account in designing the home.

Robert van Blericom stated that he had no objections to the proposed house. He noted that the story poles were not visible from any of his west-facing windows.

Tony Hooker said this was a great design and would add a lot to the neighborhood. He stated that it was not easy to understand the roof design and ridgelines without lines between the story poles. He was concerned about a significant change in the minor ridgelines and shifting the roof peak. He presented a picture showing where he thought the roof would be located and asked that a story pole be put in to better illustrate the roof configuration. He said that the roof mass would be quite substantially increased and he questioned whether the roof needed to go up that high since the ceiling height inside the house is 9 feet 3 inches before the vault, which he suggested could be reduced. He asked that the rear exterior lights be shielded downlights.

Mr. Polsky said that he understood the concern about the location of the roof ridges. He explained that the new ridge would be at the height of the existing ridge, and he clarified the

location of the roof ridge on the drawing. He said that the ridge that would be higher than the existing ridge is 14 inches higher, not 3 feet higher and would not block any water views.

Vice-Chair Kricensky asked if the finished floor is at the same elevation as the existing upper floor, and the applicant confirmed that it would be the same.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins stated that the ridge height was confusing. He noted the figures in the submitted plans and stated that the applicant related all comments about the proposed ridge height to the maximum ridge height of the existing house, but most of the house would be 2-3 feet taller than the existing house. He believed that placing the garage underneath was a great idea. He was concerned that the minimum ceiling height would be 9 feet and go up to 14 feet. He believed that the ridge heights could be lowered to less impact on the uphill neighbors' views. He said that he would like to see some changes to minimize the impacts on neighboring homes.

Boardmember Chong said that the lot coverage guidelines are intended to prevent overbuilding on a lot and he felt that the guidelines were being stretched in this case. He said that the tradeoff of putting the garage on the bottom instead of going up to two stories was done more often and he said that he could support the lot coverage variance. However, he felt that there was room for improvement on the roof height to reduce the impact on the Sausalito, shoreline and Richardson Bay views of the uphill neighbors.

Vice-Chair Kricensky noted the Board has given variances before to keep a house to a one-story design on smaller lots, but this is a larger lot with a larger house that would affect neighbors. He agreed with the comments about the roof and said that it was difficult to see its location. He said that the house was pushing out to all the setbacks, the kitchen would loom out and the ceilings might be even higher than shown on the plans. He felt that bringing down the roof height could solve the view issues.

Chair Tollini said that most of the roof would be 2.75 feet above most of the existing roof and he felt that the height had been increased too much. He encouraged tucking the garage below, but said that the upper floor would sprawl to every setback. He felt that this pushed the envelope of bulk in the neighborhood. He added that the amount of glazing and the projected kitchen did not help the design. He felt that it was hard to support the lot coverage variance when the design was so impactful.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Chong/Kricensky) to continue to continue the application for 681 Hawthorne Drive to the April 7, 2016 meeting. Vote: 4-0 (Emberson recused).</p>
--

Boardmember Emberson returned to the meeting.

3. **17 ACELA DRIVE:** File No. DR2016002; Miraj and Nisha Shah, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to add a 2,012.5 square foot second story addition and a rooftop

deck to an existing one-story house. The project would result in a 4,550.5 square foot dwelling. Assessor's Parcel No. 058-231-16.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story single-family dwelling on property located at 17 Acela Drive. The project would create a new second story to the house. The second story would include a family room, three bedrooms, three bathrooms and a laundry room. A partially covered rooftop deck would extend above the existing attached garage on the first story.

The floor area of the would be increased by 2,012.5 square feet to 4,550.5 square feet, which is 81 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The second story project would not extend beyond the footprint of the existing home, which currently covers 4,147 square feet (15.8%) of the site, which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone.

Linda Massey, architect, said that the proposed project was to add a second story to the existing home and add a little over 2,000 square feet, which would bring the floor area to 5,550 square feet. She said that the project fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood where the majority of homes have multiple stories and include elevated decks or raised patios. She said that the existing home is small compared to the neighboring homes. She stated that they worked hard to minimize the impact of the second story on the neighbors in their initial design and are open to making alterations, but they want to be sure any potential changes come from a clear understanding of what views would be blocked and what would not be blocked. She said that the existing house is below street level and cut into the hillside and there is a large amount of vegetation between the house and the street. She said that their plan was to move the mass as far to the east as they could, and leave the northwest area as the open roof deck because it would have the least impact to the neighbors. She displayed diagrams of the view impacts on neighboring properties. She said that the home across the cul-de-sac at 14 Acela Drive enjoys a panoramic view from both the living area and the master bedroom. She said that the majority of the lagoon would be visible but a portion would be blocked by the addition, but only about 5% of the view would be impacted.

Vice-Chair Kricensky asked for clarification of why only a sliver of the view would be affected if the second story is on the existing footprint of the house. Ms. Massey stated that a portion of the view is already blocked by existing trees, and therefore the addition would not impact as much of the view.

Ms. Massey said that the house at 16 Acela Drive has its main living area slightly below street level and none of the proposed project would affect views primarily toward Richardson Bay and Mt. Tamalpais from this home. She said that the home has second story views of the lagoon and the Golden Gate Bridge that would be affected. She said that the view of the San Francisco skyline is at an extremely acute angle and that is the portion of the view that would be blocked by the proposed addition. She said that there was no feasible way to construct a second story addition and maintain that view.

The public hearing was opened.

Fariba Shamsian said that she lives directly across the cul-de-sac from the proposed addition, which would significantly obstruct their view and reduce the value of their home. She said that this would place a massive structure in front of their home that would be visible from all windows. She said that they made adjustments when they went through the same design review process for their home. She said that the addition would also block neighbors' views.

Teri Jacks said that she lives next door to the proposed addition. She said that over the years neighbors have done a good job of preserving views, often building down rather than up when homes have been renovated and updated. She said that when they did their own renovation, they talked with neighbors and worked with staff to come up with designs that did not impact neighbors' views. She said that this addition would dramatically impact significant portions of their home and would loom over their home. She added that if the house was extending out to the northwest it would significantly impact their home.

Bruce Portner, project manager, said that he owns a real estate company in Tiburon and is familiar with the neighborhoods and changes taking place. He said that Ms. Jacks' property had room to expand downhill, but this property was built on bedrock and does not have the room to expand in the same way. He said that the existing house has 7.5 foot ceilings and a total height of 10 feet. He said that there may be some adjustments that could be made to help the neighbors.

Ms. Massey said they are fully prepared to make alterations to address concerns about the roof deck. She said that they want to work with the community and make this a respectful home, but they would like some assurance that a second story addition can be built.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said that the lots are situated in a radial pattern around the cul-de-sac, with oblique views over adjacent sites. He said that the views from 16 Acela Drive toward this site are not primary views. He said that the applicant's house is already close to the setback lines and could not go down much without having to demolish the whole building. He said that the proposed second story was very high and would add 17 feet to the existing building. He suggested that there must be some way of reducing that height and its impact. He added that the roof deck location was also problematic.

Boardmember Chong said that he had a hard time supporting a second story. He said that he visited the homes at 14 & 16 Acela Drive and believed that other options have not been explored. He noted that there is some building pad to the southeast and also possibly the northwest. He felt that a decent amount of floor area could be gained without going up to a second story.

Boardmember Emberson said that she has the same concerns. She said that it was unusual to have a 27 foot tall house on a flat building pad. She said that there seemed to be other options besides adding a second story box on top of the house. She thought that the neighbors had valid concerns and added that the façade looked massive.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he understood that the first floor of the existing house is very low, but the house seemed out of balance and top heavy with the second story. He said that much of the extra volume was for bedrooms and closets and he was unsure whether a second story was feasible. He said that the deck over the garage would not work and would be very predominant over the master bedroom at 16 Acela Drive. He said that any such deck should face the views and be less impactful. He noted that other homes in the area had developed downhill. He could not tell if the second story could be modified to preserve neighbors' views and he saw no reason for the 27 foot height.

Chair Tollini agreed with the other Boardmembers and felt that the project design fundamentally did not work. He believed that a second story was unlikely to work and said that there should be a fair expectation that the addition should not affect the neighbors so much. He suggested that the houses are spread apart enough that a less impactful project could be designed. He said that the roof deck and building height were impactful and that the project was inconsistent with the Hillside Design Guidelines. He stated that it is possible to go down into bedrock as many other homes have done in Tiburon.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) to continue to continue the application for 17 Acela Drive to the April 7, 2016 meeting. Vote: 4-0 (Emberson recused).</p>
--

4. **180 GILMARTIN DRIVE:** File No. VAR2016002/DR2015155; Christopher and Suki Grounds, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicant proposes to add 314 square foot master bedroom suite addition and new 271 square foot single-car garage addition to an existing single-family dwelling. The lot coverage of the house would be 3,297 square feet (16.2%), which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-1 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 039-171-04.

**CONTINUED TO MARCH 17, 2016**

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #2 OF THE FEBRUARY 18, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

Boardmember Cousins requested the following change:

Page 4, fourth paragraph, third sentence: Change "...move the garage underground..." to "...move the garage above the house..."

Vice-Chair Kricensky requested the following changes;

Page 4, fourth paragraph: Remove last sentence since it is repeated.

Page 4, fourth paragraph: Add to the last sentence, "...that was concerned with the amount and height of glazing."

Chair Tollini requested changing 1) at the top of page 5 to: "1) No variances should be allowed as a starting point for size reduction".

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2016 meeting, as amended. Vote: 5-0.

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.