

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING of the ROSS ADVISORY
DESIGN REVIEW GROUP
TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2011
Ross Town Hall

1. Commencement.

Jim Kemp, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. Jim Kemp, Mark Fritts, Peter Nelson, Dean Popplewell and Mark Kruttschnitt were present. Elise Semonian, senior planner, was also present.

2. Selection of chair for one-year term.

Jim Kemp nominated Mark Fritts to serve as chair for a one-year term. Peter Nelson seconded the nomination and Mr. Fritts was unanimously elected to serve the chair of the ADR Group.

3. Approval of Minutes for January 2011.

No minutes were approved.

4. Open Time for Public Expression.

No one wished to comment during the open time.

5. 19 Woodside Way, Addition and Remodel, No. 1816, Todd and Julie Boes, 19 Woodside Way, A.P. 73-252-03, R-1:B-6 (Single Family Residence, 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size), Medium Density (6-10 units per acre).

Addition and significant remodel to the residence that would require an application for design review and a setback variance. The project includes reconstruction of the attached garage and a new second story addition. Total floor area of 4,524 square feet is proposed. A variance is requested in order to maintain the existing encroachment into the northwest side yard for a new entry patio and covered entry porch (15 feet required, approximately 8 feet existing and proposed).

Lot area	23,516 sq. ft.	
Existing Floor Area	12.6%	
Proposed Floor Area	19.2%	(20% permitted)
Existing Lot Coverage	18.0%	
Proposed Lot Coverage	18.4%	(20% permitted)

The existing residence is nonconforming in setbacks.

Applicants Todd and Julie Boes were present with project architect Wendy Posard and project landscape designer Janell Hobart, Denler Hobart Gardens. Ms. Posard described the project and materials and the changes made since the last ADR meeting. She presented a slope calculation based on MarinMap topographic information that demonstrated the average slope of the site was under 30% and indicated a topographic survey will be obtained for the site. In response to the ADR and neighbor concerns, the project architect reduced the height of the stair tower and also the clerestory over the entry, eliminating a row of windows. Ms. Posard met with

March 1, 2011 Minutes

neighbors Charlie and Marji Evans, 17 Woodside, since the last meeting and viewed the story poles from their site. Ms. Posard indicated that the Evans' were not in favor of any two-story addition in the proposed location. Ms. Hobart described the new landscaping proposed to screen the addition from neighbor views, including six new 12' tall *pittosporum eugenioides* to supplement the existing hedge.

The owner of 2 Spring Road was present.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilcox, 21 Woodside, had questions regarding the access between the proposed wall and garage. They indicated that they were in favor of the design and that the applicants were willing to cooperate with them on potential tree removal and landscaping between the sites.

Peter Chase, 15 Woodside Way, stated that he would see more of the project than any other neighbor will and he felt it would be a positive addition to the community and an improvement.

David Calderon, 20 Woodside Way, was present on behalf of his brother-in-law, Charlie Evans, who is opposed to the project but was unable to attend the meeting.

The ADR Group discussed the proposed landscaping, including the desire to screen the residence while maintaining light for both properties. Mrs. Boes indicated creeping fig would be planted to grow on the stair tower.

The ADR Group (Fritts, Kemp, Nelson, Kruttschnitt and Popplewell) generally supported the design and had the following recommendations:

- Applicants should review the revised plans and landscaping with the neighbor.
 - The applicant should reduce the fenestration in the stair tower and clerestory by as much as 50%.
 - The retaining wall design and drainage should be engineered.
 - Consider a modification to the roof slope on the addition to reduce the ridgeline as much as possible.
 - A finish and color board should be submitted for ADR or Council review.
 - The applicant should provide a site section.
 - Additional details on the landscaping and the initial height of the proposed plantings should be provided.
6. 33 Spring Road, New House, No. 1819, Geoffrey Franklin, A.P. Nos 73-281-11 and 74-161-25, R-1:B-5A (Single Family Residence, 5 Acre Minimum Lot Size), Very Low Density (.1-1 Units/Acre)
- Review and discussion of a project that would require applications for a demolition permit, design review, hillside lot application, tree removal permit, and variances. The project proposes demolition of the existing 7,337 square foot structure and construction of a new residence, attached garage and detached second unit within the required hillside lot side yard areas (45 feet required, 25 feet proposed). A total of 7,037 square feet of development is proposed. The project also includes redevelopment of the landscape with a new pool, hardscape and decks.

March 1, 2011 Minutes

Effective Lot Area	111,346 square feet	
Existing Floor Area Ratio	6.6%	
Proposed Floor Area Ratio permitted)		6.3%* (15%)
Existing Lot Coverage	5.4%	
Proposed Lot Coverage	5.3%	(15% permitted)

*The slope of the lot is 64.4%. The Hillside Lot Ordinance limits the maximum floor area to 3,031 square feet.

The existing residence is nonconforming in setbacks.

Jim Kemp recused himself from considering the item to avoid the appearance of conflict since he has a current work relationship with the applicant's project manager.

Geoff Franklin, applicant, indicated that he purchased the site with the intent of building a new residence to replace the existing structure. He was present with members of his project team: architect Takashi Yanai, AIA, Ehrlich Architects and Brendan Canning, designer, Ehrlich Architects, and David Whiteside, project manager. They described the project, including the materials, and construction management. They indicated that the house would be pulled further away from the Martens than the existing structure. After story poles were installed, in response to Mr. Eben's concerns about losing a view, the architect modified the design to lower the project by 4 feet in height. The modified height was reflected by tape on the story poles. Mr. Franklin indicated existing vegetation could be modified to increase the Ebens' views.

Mr. Eben, 9 Quail Ridge, was concerned that the project would block views of the water as well as the sunrise and moonrise from his site. He suggested that the applicant daylight trees on other sites and apply for view restoration from the Kent Woodlands Property Owners Association in order to increase other views so that the second floor mass would not be necessary. He questioned where vents and chimneys would be located. He was concerned with nighttime light from windows. He did not want the landscape plan to include a hedge or fence that could impair his views. Mrs. Eben also expressed concerns with loss of privacy due to the proposed design. Mr. Eben presented pictures of his view at different times of the day.

Mr. Martens described the problems they experienced during the construction of 37 Spring Road, including construction vehicles turning around on their driveway. They indicated there is no room for parking. He considered if the design would fit in to the countryside. He indicated the calm colors were reasonable and the plan was "smart."

The ADR Group asked staff about the rule on views and staff read the provision of the Hillside Lot Ordinance on views.

Peter Nelson questioned if the house would relate to the hillside and if pulling the second floor mass back would be more appropriate. The ADR considered if additional grading would further lower the house and if that could make the project more satisfactory to the neighbor even if more off haul was involved. ADR group members did not believe the project would infringe on

March 1, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Eben's views and believed the applicant's gesture of lowering the height by 4 feet was a good compromise. Some members noted that Mr. Eben's trees block his own view and that views could be increased by modification of other landscape at the sites.

The applicant and the project architect explained that further cut was not possible because they sought to protect the redwood trees. They indicated that lowering the building any further would also bury or sink the house into the surrounding landscape and block views, which was not desirable. The pool wall may be cantilevered or the height may be exposed.

The ADR Group (Fritts, Nelson, Kruttschnitt and Popplewell) supported the design as proposed.

7. Adjournment.

Chair Mark Fritts adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.