

**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MARCH 6, 2007**

**ROLL**

**APPROVED**

Board Members Present: Chairman Kent, Crew, Dickens, Vice Chair  
Huntsberry

Planning Commission Liaison: Lang

Board Members Absent: Alternative Machnowski

Community Development: Raffi Boloyan, Senior Planner  
Jessica Leviste, Contract Planner  
Caron Parker, Associate Planner  
Steve Stafford, Assistant Planner

**AGENDA**

**A. Staff Communications**

- 1) Past City Council, Planning Commission and Design Review Board Action on Design Review Matters

**B. Board Communications**

**C. Minutes**

- 2) February 6<sup>th</sup> 2007

**D. Old Business**

- 3) ED06-054 **Environmental and Design Review Permit to allow new construction of a new 3,280.5-square-foot two-story single-family residence on a vacant hillside property.**  
355 Prospect Drive (Leviste)

**E. New Business**

- 4) ED07-008 **Environmental and Design Review Permit and Sign Program for a revised signage and repainting of the service station building and canopy for proposed Valero Service Station.**  
831 Francisco Blvd. (Parker)
- 5) PA06-003 **Conceptual Design Review of a new, three-unit, residential condominium project. The project would renovate an existing**

**craftsman-style single-family residence at the front of the site and construct a new, three-story, structure containing two additional units in the rear portion of the site.**

411 Mission Ave. (Stafford)

**A. Staff Communications**

- 1) Past City Council, Planning Commission and Design Review Board Action on Design Review Matters

Boloyan provided the Board with a set of the revised Loch Lomond plans that will be reviewed on the 20<sup>th</sup> of March as well as a brief cover letter prepared by Contract Planner Paul Jensen. A full staff report will be provided the Friday before the meeting. The plans also include the last set of the site plan before it was modified. The next Board meeting will be the 20<sup>th</sup> of March with Loch Lomond along with one small sign item.

Boloyan announced that the City Clerk would be putting out the advertisement in regard to the vacancy position on the Board. Dickens asked staff if Alternate Machnowski could become a permanent member of the Board. Boloyan responded that Council has the ability to appoint Alternate Machnowski or appoint another individual, so Council will interview the panel of those interested in applying for that position, then make a decision.

**B. Board Communications**

Crew asked staff to investigate the Days Inn signage approval because they have a sign totally out of context. She believed there is a sign program that was approved many years ago. Boloyan agreed to investigate.

**C. Minutes**

- 2) February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007

Crew provided staff with a few corrections. Chairman Kent asked for a motion.

**Crew moved and Huntsberry seconded, to approve the February 6<sup>th</sup> minutes as amended. Motion carried with the following vote:**

**AYES: MEMBERS: Crew, Huntsberry, Chair Kent**  
**NOES: MEMBERS: None**  
**ABSENT: MEMBERS: None**  
**ABSTAIN: MEMBERS: Dickens**

**D. Old Business**

- 3) ED06-054 **Environmental and Design Review Permit to allow new construction of a new 3,280.5-square-foot two-story single-family residence on a vacant hillside property.**

### 355 Prospect Drive (Leviste)

Crew believed this project is not complete. As discussed at the last meeting, the Board has the ability to not review a project if found not complete. Chairman Kent believed that is a possibility. Dickens indicated it is very disrespectful for the applicant to provide the DRB with data to review the night of the meeting. He noticed that there is a new site plan with grading. Leviste responded in the affirmative, but it is not clearly specifying the location of cut and fill and it is up to the Board to determine if there is sufficient information to review tonight.

Boloyan added that staff strongly encouraged the applicant to complete the modifications to present to DRB and the applicant did not provide all the information requested by the Board from the last meeting, but the applicant requested to come back before the Board and present this information. It is the Board's prerogative to continue with the same recommendations or allow the applicant to make a presentation.

Dickens agreed to give the applicant the benefit of the doubt, but felt the Board will continue the application because sufficient information is not provided to act tonight and he would support a continuance.

Huntsberry pointed out that various items of concern by the Board at the last meeting were not addressed. He added that some information is provided about the third garage and roof over the entranceway, so the Board should at least go through the items. Chairman Kent concurred.

Jessica Leviste, Contract Planner, summarized the staff report and requested that the Board provide final recommendations to the applicant regarding the proposed architectural design, on-site parking, and landscaping. In addition, staff welcomes the Board's guidance on any additional design details that would further improve the project.

Leviste noted the arborist report was submitted by the applicant prior to the first DRB meeting and had now been included as Exhibit F for the Board's review. Grading, drainage, drip irrigation and planting plans were requested by the Board. The Board also requested the applicant to consider adding the fourth on-site parking space, which has been addressed with the re-submittal. The applicant strengthened the building entry with a porch and has agreed to darken the primary color of the structure. The driveway steepness was revised to reflect a 15% maximum slope, which the Public Works Department reviewed and approved. Façade articulation, additional architecture and design details were additional concerns of the Board.

John Lundy, architect, indicated that there is no grading outside the cut for the building because the Hillside Guidelines do not allow disturbance of the existing plantings. There is no landscape plan because the existing Hillside Guidelines do not allow changing the existing plantings. The arborist report indicated that if there is any change to the grading around the plantings it might kill the trees. Listing each plant is not practical and since they cannot modify or do not intend to change the plantings, a planting plan is a waste of

time and ridiculous in his view. There is a great deal of conflict with regard to the Planning Department submittal guidelines, the grading plan, the drip irrigation system and planting plan, all of which cannot be done because they cannot grade, change the plantings or provide irrigation because it would kill the plants as indicated in the arborist report. The grading plan submitted one year ago shows the line of the cut and the outline of the foundation is the only cut on the property, except for the driveway. That plan has been modified to add that extra parking space, but there is no grading on the site. The original plans that were submitted one year ago were rejected by the Planning Department because they were over the square-footage. There inclusion of the garage plan in that estimation of square-footage was wrong. They have since revised and the code states that the garage did not count in the square-footage, so the actual square-footage of the house is about 2,800 square feet, not 3,200 square feet. He had several problems with planning staff reviewing this project. The house fits on the site. They have saved all major trees and only two small oaks must be removed to locate the house in the middle of the site. He then provided photographs showing how overshadowed the site is currently from the existing trees and did not believe the requirement to plant two trees for every tree removed seemed appropriate for this site. There is a complete drainage plan provided and explained that all drainage is directed to the existing v-ditch at the bottom of the hill. The conflict between the Planning Department and the Hillside Guidelines must be resolved by the Zoning Administrator. This is a native site and the trees have existed for well over 50 years and they intend to preserve them. He wanted to remove the acacia tree because it is a hazard and the arborist recommended removal because it is leaning, but he did not want to pay a penalty of planting three more oak trees on the site when the site is already overburdened with trees. This house is the best looking house in the whole neighborhood. He believed the house proposed is the correct house for this site. This is a very tough site and they saved every tree, except for the trees where the house is located. This house must be built fairly economically because the foundation will be very expensive. He felt the house proposed is economical, efficient and fits the site. He believed what is proposed is the best design for the site. Stepping the building back is not practical because they will either kill more trees or be in the setback. He then noted his frustration. They added the porch, which was a good idea and nice feature at the ground level. He did not believe it makes sense to add extra roofs over the garage, which he explained by using the rendering. He further noted that if the acacia tree is removed, the existing oak tree in the setback would have a chance to recover.

Huntsberry asked the architect if consideration was given to bringing the driveway over at the same grade. Architect Lundy responded that it is too steep. The parking space slopes out, but possibly bringing it up some could work. Huntsberry believed it would be a good design to continue the stone on the retaining wall. Architect Lundy considered that approach, but they must have structural retaining walls and real stone is a great expense.

Chairman Kent opened the public hearing on this item, and seeing no one wishing to speak, he closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion and action.

Huntsberry stated that the house is a shallow house, not a deep house and they are adding levels benched in the hillside, which fit into the hillside the best it can. He believed the bay window in the front provided great articulation. He had concerns with the open carport, which has been enclosed and now fits the house. The sense of entry with the porch has helped. Also, the extra parking spaces has been provided, but that level of cut should be softened with a smaller wall railing, and not have such a gash in the hillside in front of the wall. He felt it is imperative that the stone continue along the face of the structural concrete walls in order not to appear added on. The east elevation gives the impression that it is a flat part of the roof, but it is a bend in the house and that is the long level ridge that breaks into two wings, so essentially the house has a gable along the length of the house and it is broken in the middle. The plans may not be as clear as desired, but there are notations in regard to grading. He agreed if possible to cut straight down as suggested by the architect in order to not disturb the landscaping behind and right of the house. He could support the project, but desired the front of the house to be addressed.

Crew felt the house is nicely designed. In regard to the landscaping, she hoped Chairman Kent will carefully review it. She agreed the retaining walls should have some sort of surfacing and agreed that a shingle roof is more appropriate than a mission style roof. Adding a roof over that third garage is a good idea. The railing between the lower and upper parking spaces has not been defined and must come back to the Board to make sure it works. There is a lot of paving in front of the house and desired that to be mitigated with some kind of paver rather than just asphalt. She disagreed with the architect on the landscaping because a certain amount is allowed to be disturbed. The current landscaping is not very attractive. She is not sure other trees are needed, but would leave that to Chairman Kent's discretion. She is disappointed and believed the plans are hard to read. In terms of the design of the house itself, she desired the roof to be extended over the garages and the design of the railing must be addressed.

Dickens agreed the drawings are hard to read. He then asked the architect if the driveway would be asphalt or concrete. Architect Lundy responded that the driveway is intended to be concrete.

Dickens noted that several of the Board's comments have not been addressed. This is a terribly, heavily shaded site and recommended a skylight or clerestory glass at the last meeting and there has been no response to that recommendation. He agreed there are conflicts with the Hillside Design Guidelines and typical planning submittal but there is latitude and the Board always aires on the side of excellence. The retaining wall is very conspicuous and suggested 8-inch concrete block faced with rock or built out of heavily formed concrete or add an element to keep concrete from setting. He did not want to view a regular conventional concrete wall or a wood wall of some type. He requested that last minute submittals not occur in the future. He felt the design is adequate for the neighborhood. The house is too flat and wished more light was provided into the house. He added that valley oaks are not appropriate because there is not enough sun. The site is too shady and desired an alternative to that tree because there is not enough light for valley oaks to survive.

Chairman Kent agreed that another roof over the third garage makes a lot of sense. He understands the architect's frustration, but plantings are allowed on the hillside. He believed trees behind the house would make sense to provide species variation. Valley oaks get very large and would do fine, but probably too large of a tree for that site. Some planting must occur and believed native plantings must occur between the house and street. In regard to drip irrigation, a trench that is one inch deep will not disturb the trees. There is no information in the drip irrigation plan that demonstrates drip irrigation in regard to valves or pressure reducers. It would be nice to demonstrate some expertise in drip irrigation. In the front of the house, the amount of hardscape is a concern. He recommended eliminating the fourth parking space and tandem park in front of one of those garages. Making the walls more interesting is needed. He recommended a natural paver if the fourth parking space is provided to have some interest.

Huntsberry noted that the fourth space was driven by extending foundation out from the building and it seems that the retaining wall for that fourth space could be moved over a couple of feet to provide a planter between the sloped paving and driveway to create a softer area with a shrub or bushes.

Chairman Kent believed more thought should be given to the walls. Also, on Sheet 2 in regard to a drain line running to the daylight, which can be run very nicely or awful, so that is another detail that might be helpful. He noted that an arborist should be present in regard to the drip line. The cuts should be real clean and the less in the drip line the better. He further stated that the applicant should avoid any fill around the roots, and if necessary, he recommending creating tree wells.

Boloyan summarized the Board's comments:

- Architecture of building was well designed and appropriate;
- Concern regarding the completeness and adequacy of the plans. However, the Board found that much of the information was provided.
- The third garage space should have a roof added over it to maintain consistency;
- A condition should be included that requires the arborist to be on site during construction near any trees.
- Revised color board needs to return to DRB for follow-up review
- Board does not find that the design of the hardscape and site improvements along the front of the property are appropriate and the following recommendations are made:
  - Consider adding a planter between the fourth parking space and the rest of the driveway (at the location of the proposed railing) to break up the large expanse of driveway
  - Real stone material should be continued up retaining walls on both sides of driveway;
  - Details on the railing need to be presented and reviewed;
  - Consider alternative hardscape treatments and/or scoring to the parking area to break up the visual impact of the large expanse of concrete.

- The final details of the front area needs to return to the Board for a follow-up review.

Crew asked to see the color board depicting the darker color. Leviste responded that the applicant did not provide a color board but the colors would be darker. Crew desired a revised color board rather than a color rendering.

Chairman Kent believed it would be acceptable to bring the landscaping and some of the details before the Board on the Consent Calendar prior to Building Permit issuance. Crew disagreed with that suggestion.

Chairman Kent asked for a motion.

**Dickens moved and Huntsberry seconded, to approve the house, but the Board wanted to see the landscaping, including the hardscape, particularly the driveway; retaining walls; scoring; materials; textures; and colors of the building to come back to the Board. Motion carried with the following vote:**

**AYES: MEMBERS: Crew, Dickens Huntsberry and Chair Kent**  
**NOES: MEMBERS: None**  
**ABSENT: MEMBERS: None**  
**ABSTAIN: MEMBERS: None**

**E. New Business**

- 4) ED07-008 **Environmental and Design Review Permit and Sign Program for a revised signage and repainting of the service station building and canopy for proposed Valero Service Station.**  
 831 Francisco Blvd. (Parker)

Caron Parker, Associate Planner, summarized the staff report and requested the Board's comments and recommendations to the Planning Commission on the following:

- The overall color and scale of the project's proposed signage for the Marin Express Lube/Castrol GTX signs.
- The design of the proposed Express Lube sign over the garage bays.
- The state of the existing landscaping on the project site.
- Any additional design details that would further improve the project.

Huntsberry asked staff the wattage of the lamps in the canopy. Parker deferred to the applicant. Huntsberry asked staff if there are any restrictions on the pylon sign along Francisco. Parker responded that there is no additional signage proposed below the pricing signs and they are not allowed as a condition of approval.

Mardeen Gordon, applicant, stated she made every effort to comply with all the requests made by staff to reduce the amount of signage and is trying to improve the appearance of the site. They are aware that the image of the station is very dependant on signage and colors of all signage. They have reduced the area of the signs and eliminated signs that

were not approved. The corner sign was a major issue from the beginning, so they removed that sign and moved it up the street making it a monument. They simplified the look of the sign as well. They want to continue to advertise Marin Express Lube since it is an operational portion of the business and must be identified as such. They complied with the requirements of the Sign Program, which is that the background colors be consistent with the nationwide branding of Valero. They reduced the sign over the bays considerably, which was too large for its purpose and reduced it down almost a quarter of the existing sign. It will be mounted flush with the fascia and complies with the requirements of a roof sign. They will be attaching side panels to hide the back and bracing of that sign. In dealing with the landscaping, the property owners are very aware of the value of landscaping for a gas station. The owners enjoy landscaping and wanted to improve the appearance of the station as much as possible. The owners are willing to comply with conditions of approval to improve the site. In regard to the canopy lighting, it is old and it is probably not possible to install recessed lighting in that canopy. However, the photometric survey indicated that the light levels are within the light levels approved for other stations within the last five years. If there is a problem with glare or light levels being too high, shielding could be installed to reduce visibility. The photometric survey indicated that light levels approach zero at the property line, so glare is not an issue at this site, but they understand that is a desire of the Commission to reduce lighting at gas stations. They desired a safe level of lighting at the gas station for safety.

Huntsberry clarified that the main canopy will have sheet metal flashing, so it will be smooth. Ms. Gordon responded in the affirmative. Huntsberry was under the impression that recessed lighting would be used. He submitted that it is no trouble to add nine recessed lights in the canopy.

Crew clarified that the Castro GTX colors are the cooperate colors. Mr. Gordon responded in the affirmative.

Peter Jizwari, owner, explained that the signs on Francisco will not have the complete auto repair service sign hanging from it. Also, smog signs are required by the State to be visible for the public and if desired he could present a permit in that regard. He further noted that there is only trim on the roof and the proposal does not include any work to the roof. Ms. Gordon recommended placing that sign on the base or on the building, which would be the simplest approach.

Huntsberry asked the owner if they sell diesel fuel or propone, and if so, where will the advertisement be located. Mr. Jizwari responded that they do not sell diesel, but they do sell propane and the only advertisement is in the newspaper.

Huntsberry asked if the fascia is being painted on Sheet 6 of 7. Ms. Gordon responded in the affirmative.

Dickens expressed concern for a side view of the sign on Vivian Way. Ms. Gordon submitted photographs to the Board for a better understanding that show the signs more

into scale. She added that they will deal with the return bringing them back to meet the roof, so the bracing and back of sign will not be visible.

Chairman Kent opened the public hearing on this item, and seeing no one wishing to speak, he closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion and action.

Crew felt the signage is acceptable. She is glad to see the smaller sign on Vivian looks much better than the initial proposal. She expressed concern for the existing landscaping and wanted to see a complete landscaping plan. The current landscaping is in poor repair. She thinks it must be addressed. She wanted to see a new landscaping plan that reflects what is present. She desired new landscaping. On lighting, she wanted that to come back to the Board. She preferred recessed lighting, if possible, with the lowest lighting levels possible. She further requested to see the smog signs and their location.

Dickens agreed the signage is a great improvement. He wished the building roof could be enhanced. Also, there are surface mounted cans with 100% side cutoffs that could be used, but more lighting must be provided. Biggest concern is landscaping and wanted to see a fresh plan and explore a more urban solution. Maybe a combination of cobbles and understory level shrubbery might be appropriate along with a few trees. He further believed the owner is headed in a good direction.

Huntsberry is very adamant about recessed lighting on canopies and believed recessed lights could be installed. His favorite is the Standard Station on Grand that has 1-foot by 2-foot recessed lights at the off ramp of Irwin and Second Street that has been well received. He appreciated the signs on Francisco and Vivian being redone. In regard to the fascia sign on Marin Express Lube on Sheet 6, it appears tacked on and suggested moving the sign up in order to integrate it more into the roof structure. Also, landscaping must improve. He wanted to know how the smog signs will be integrated into the building frontage or on the monument sign itself.

Chairman Kent agreed signage is fine. He expressed concern for the lighting and the goal is recessed. Also, none of the landscaping is worth saving. Plant selection is key for this site. He did not agree with cobbles. Taking the sign off the corner of Francisco and Vivian way creates a tree opportunity. He further desired high quality landscaping for this site.

Boloyan summarized the Board's comments:

- Board applauded changes in renovations, signage and enhancements to the property.
- Signage as shown is acceptable. However, two modifications need to be made:
  - The mansard sign along Vivian Way frontage needs to be integrated into the wall better and recommend centering and potentially moving it up to make; and
  - Account for and show all extra signs that will be located on the property (*smog check certifications, etc*) and strive to incorporate these ancillary

signs into the overall sign package and place them on building walls rather than tack them onto the monument signs.

- Complete overhaul of site landscaping is needed.
- A complete landscape and irrigation plan needs to be prepared and return to the Board for review.
- Canopy lighting should be recessed and return with more information on wattage and explore lowering the wattage from 350 watts to 250 watts.

Chairman Kent asked for a motion.

**Crew moved and Dickens seconded, to continue this project in order to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the Board's comments. Motion carried with the following vote:**

**AYES: MEMBERS: Crew, Dickens Huntsberry and Chair Kent**  
**NOES: MEMBERS: None**  
**ABSENT: MEMBERS: None**  
**ABSTAIN: MEMBERS: None**

- 5) PA06-003 **Conceptual Design Review of a new, three-unit, residential condominium project. The project would renovate an existing craftsman-style single-family residence at the front of the site and construct a new, three-story, structure containing two additional units in the rear portion of the site.**  
 411 Mission Ave. (Stafford)

Steve Stafford, Assistant Planner, summarized the staff report and requested that the Board identify relevant issues, prioritize concerns and develop a consensus as to the appropriateness of the conceptual design and its compliance with design review criteria and guidelines. Staff also requests that the Board's recommendations with respect to plans and materials that the Board would like to see when the propose project returns for formal review. (i.e., landscape, lighting photometric plans, photomontage, contextual streetscape renders, etc.) Following the Board's comments, the applicant will submit their formal design review permit application.

Stafford noted that there is a correction on the exhibit. Staff identified incorrectly the home on the vicinity map. Correctly the arrow should be pointing to the subject site, which is one parcel immediately to the east of the one that has been noted with the red arrow.

Huntsberry asked staff the required drive aisle width that goes with 90 degree parking. Stafford responded that a 10-foot wide parking driveway width for the units in the back in regard to access is proposed. Dickens indicated that 24 feet of backup space is needed. Boloyan added that the parking configuration shown which is a one-way in to a 90-degree space is not one shown in the City's Zoning Ordinance. This plan was reviewed by the Traffic Engineer and found acceptable, but the Traffic Engineer required that the

parking spaces be widened to 11.5 feet in width rather than the standard 9 feet to address the reduction in the backup space. With that change, the Traffic Engineer found it an acceptable parking configuration.

Huntsberry assumed a new fence would be provided along the property line. Stafford believed that an existing fence would be refinished, as proposed, but deferred to the architect. It appears from the parcel survey that the fencing is located off the property line slightly and is actually located on the adjacent parcel. Also, the current standard in parking is two covered spaces for a single-family. Boloyan added that for multifamily units there are various parking standards, but with two-bedroom units it is two spaces per unit with one of those two spaces being covered. So, a brand new project would be required to provide six total spaces with three of those as covered. They proposed to provide the two covered spaces for the two new units, but requesting to continue forward with substandard parking for the existing unit out front.

Dickens asked staff if these will be rented or for-sale units. Stafford believed they would be for-sale. Boloyan noted that the City does not have a guest requirement for projects less than five units. The guest-parking requirement kicks in at five units or more under the current code.

Huntsberry asked staff why the existing driveway cut was not used. Stafford noted that the location of the existing parking space was in conflict with access to the rear. There is no real landscaping in the front yard and crushed gravel was put down to be used as an uncovered non-dedicated parking space. The application currently is looking to creating a dedicated parking space at that location at this point.

Huntsberry discussed the two spaces between the single-family residence and new building, which are shown as 9-foot 8 inches and asked staff what happen to the 11-foot 6-inches. Boloyan responded that planning staff has concerns with the number of parking spaces and the maneuverability on-site, but City's Traffic Engineer reviewed and approved as shown.

Leila Bijan, project designer, explained this is a family development project and they are very conscious about community and worked very closely with Montecito Area Residents Association (MARA). They had several meetings with MARA and walked through the area and incorporated many comments and suggestions into the design of the project they feel addressed MARA's concerns. They have gained support from MARA and a letter of support was attached to the staff report as an exhibit for the Board's consideration. There is a blend of architectural styles in the neighborhood and MARA helped identify these architectural styles predominate in the neighborhood and the project architecture attempted to replicate those design elements. They kept the existing residence at the front of the property. They propose two new residences in the back of the property about 100 feet back from the street front that echoes the character of the front building's roof pitch as well as that of other neighboring buildings. In order to improve the project, they propose to remove a nonconforming addition, which will create light and view for the east neighbor and also create a 15-foot setback between both existing buildings. They are

providing five on-site parking spaces. Pedestrian and vehicular access is separated and they are providing as much landscaping as possible. They propose decorative pavers where hardscape is proposed. They desired permeable pavers for drainage purposes. They wanted to maintain the character of the neighborhood and feel their building is consistent with the adjacent three-story multifamily structure. They tried to break up the mass on the eastern and western elevation with dormers and bay-window like elements. To address privacy, the more private areas with fewer windows face the building to the east. They echoed architectural elements found predominate in the neighborhood such as gable roof, double-hung windows, dormers, bay windows, and porch insets. They propose natural wood siding and stucco at the base. She then provided the Board with photographs of buildings in the neighborhood. The colors proposed are earthtones. She further believed it is a great project for the neighborhood and hoped the Board supports the project.

Huntsberry asked if consideration was given to mimic the roofline of the building in the front with a Dutch gable to reduce the massing of that rear building element. Ms. Bijan believed it did not help the look of the site elevation, but if requested they would do so.

Chairman Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

Bob Gerstenkorn, 407 Mission apartment owner, felt this proposed project would negatively impact both light and ventilation to all seven of the bedroom windows in his building. Several tenants expressed concern that the desirability of their apartments will be negatively impacted by this structure as currently shown. The existing single-story structure at 411 Mission already significantly encroaches into the front setback. The proposed structure, in his opinion, overwhelms the existing structure to the front as well as the structure to the west and his building to the east due to lot coverage, height and mass. The proposal between the existing structure and proposed new structure appears that every single square-foot of lot that can be covered is covered as well as significantly encroaching into the front setback. The near maximum allowable height and mass of the proposed new structure seems to overpower the neighborhood, the existing structure to the front of the site and both buildings to the east and west. He suggested a structure at the rear more similar in style, scale and mass to the front structure would fit more appropriately in the neighborhood, which would less dominate the buildings around it. Also, he believed these are three-bedroom four bath units, which would change the parking requirement. Another issue is the driveway width and fence. According to the plans submitted it would appear on the plan that the existing fence is between a few inches to a foot on his property at 407 Mission. The fence currently, as the driveway proceeds to the rear of the property, loses elevation by comparison to the elevation on his property. The fence is also in less than good condition because the roof structure of the encroaching addition touches this portion of the fence and likely would be damaged during this addition's removal. He did not believe there is 10 feet between the existing structure and fence, which must be resolved. He then provided photographs to the Board in order to better visualize that the proposed structure would be 12 or 15 feet taller than his adjacent structure.

Jackie Schmidt, representing MARA, believed this proposal is better than the first

iteration, so they are very happy that the roofline now echoes rooflines in the neighborhood that is early 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings. They believed this project would not impact the historic area of the neighborhood. They are happy that the 100-year old small home is being maintained. Any enhancement of landscaping will be great and street trees as staff recommended would be wonderful. She pointed out that this is the second project MARA has supported in front of the DRB. They are concerned about the drainage and the more permeable pavers would be appropriate for this site. The City of San Rafael has Design Guidelines and within those are special design suggestions for areas near buildings on the Historic Architectural Survey and neither are on the website, so those should be available on the City's website for the public to view.

There being no further public testimony on this item, Chairman Kent closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion.

Dickens sees this as three-bedroom units and felt parking is inadequate. He is positive that access is not adequate. He felt the architecture is so/so and could be better. He is quite concerned that the building is too massive, but photographs throughout the neighborhood show other three-story buildings. When parking is solved, the buildings will be smaller. Also, colors are acceptable, but not great.

Huntsberry asked staff what is the parking requirement for a three-bedroom unit. Stafford responded that there is no difference. Huntsberry asked staff what is the parking requirement for a five-bedroom. Stafford responded that there is no difference, which from a practical standpoint did not make sense.

Huntsberry applauded the applicant for maintaining the cottage residences in the front. He believed this is a great opportunity to remove the gravel parking space in front and add landscaping. Parking for that front building must move to the back. Also, internally, the floor plans work nicely, but there is too much building on too little of a site. They have a great opportunity with this lower level to recess the extreme edges of the lower floors at least three or four feet without disrupting to any great extent the design of the building. The second and third floor could cantilever over the first floor providing much wider drive aisle and better maneuvering space to get into these parking spaces. They might have to lose the entire first floor of that first unit or a combination of that unit and half of the rear unit and have a minimal room on the first level with stairs to the second and third levels to provide the amount of required parking. He suggested mimicking the front building roofline by introducing a Dutch gable to greatly minimize the bulk of the rear building that is overpowering currently. He suggested that the eaves drop down to the eave line of the adjacent area as another area to offset building mass and provide more articulation in the east elevation. He is concerned about lighting on the outside of the building that would affect the walkways, driveways and next-door neighbors. He suggested if there is a problem with the fence next door to come back with a solution and verify the width of the front building with a surveyor. His main problem is that the driveway is too narrow to make a maneuver into the parking space. At the extreme rear end of the drive aisle, there is another parking spaces waiting to happen. He believed more parking is needed. Also, the applicant should widen the drive aisle, reduce the mass

of the building and comply with the parking regulations, which would be six total spaces with no parking in front in order to provide landscaping in that area.

Crew expressed concern for the views of the neighbors, which is a major issue and must be addressed that goes back to the mass and height of the building. She suggested that if the door is moved to the lower room then landscaping or a barbeque area could be provided where Huntsberry suggested another parking space could be created. She desired landscaping to hide the gas meter. The parking problem must be solved. She expressed concern for the trash, which must be addressed. Also, floor-to-floor height must be reviewed. The main problem is the relationship between the building in back and the apartment building to the east. More information on permeable paving must be provided. The fence must be addressed as well. She did not believe there is enough maneuverability in and out of these spaces. It would be a good idea to verify the 10 feet between the existing house and fence. She further believed street trees are a great idea.

Chairman Kent agreed parking in front is not a good idea and should be minimized. The site is near maximum lot coverage and the FAR on this site must be off the scale. There is a lot of issue in regard to trash and storage, so functionality issues must be addressed. There is a lot of landscaping opportunities on this site not being explored. The driveway is a prominent features and where permeable hardscape should be considered. This is a great site for infill, but surprised to see three stories. They are large units so there must be some opportunity for reduction.

Huntsberry believed if there are three spaces under the building and they reduced the ground floor structure of the first half of the new building as an access element, three spaces between the new building and building in front could provide uncovered spaces and three covered spaces could be provided underneath, square-footage would be lost in the first unit, but that might be a good solution.

Ms. Bijan asked staff if they are allowed to provide five spaces instead of six if they grandfathered the original condition in regard to the residence in front. Boloyan responded that the Board is not the deciding body and it will be up to the Planning Commission. Staff noted that parking is an issue and should be explored, but the Planning Commission would be the ultimately hearing body.

Ms. Bijan clarified that there is not 10 feet between the existing house and property line as noted in the survey. The Traffic Engineer indicated that since it is an existing condition they could maintain that portion and as soon as they pass the existing house they provide the minimum 10-foot setback for the driveway. Also, the existing building to the east is a second story building and if they reduced the size of their building they would continue to block views. Crew asked that orientation of the windows and decks be addressed in regard to privacy. Ms. Bijan noted that only a bathroom, a kitchen, one bedroom and a stair window face the east property. All master bedroom windows are facing west. Crew requested a contextual plan to better understand.

Huntsberry believed the side windows in the stairway are more than adequate.

Boloyan announced that this was a conceptual application and there are no recommendations or consensus items from the Board. These comments will be transmitted to the applicant.

**ADJOURNMENT**

BY ORDER OF THE CHAIRMAN, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary