

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

SAUSALITO PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 29, 2008
Approved Minutes

Call to Order

Chair Keller called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 420 Litho Street, Sausalito.

Present: Chair Bill Keller, Vice Chair Stan Bair, Commissioner Joan Cox, Commissioner Stafford Keegin, Commissioner Eric Stout

Staff: Community Development Director Jeremy Graves, Assistant Planner Lilly Schinsing, Contract Planner Brian Stanke, City Attorney Mary Wagner

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Public Comments

Public Hearings

1. **DR/NC 08-013, Design Review Permit, Nonconformity Permit, Preston, 47 Miller Avenue.** Design Review Permit and Nonconformity Permit for a remodel that would add to the ground level of an existing residence, four dormers, an exterior staircase, and remove an existing desk.

Commissioner Keegin recused himself from the meeting since he resides within 500 feet of the project site.

The public hearing was opened. Contract Planner Brian Stanke presented the Staff Report.

Presentation was made by Barbara Chambers, the applicant.

Commission questions and comments to Ms. Chambers:

- Is the owner of the property in agreement with staff's conditioning of approval? *Ms. Chambers responded she is, although they would rather not have it. They were not aware of the 15-foot setback that now makes the shape of the porch awkward, but it is simple to comply with if necessary.*
- Staff has stated there would be a 3-foot reduction of the structure, yet the current structure already only has a 3-foot existing setback. *Ms. Chambers responded they propose to push it out 3-feet more in the rear setback, so it would stay where it is.*
- Is there no way to meet the parking requirement? *Ms. Chambers responded no. The site is sloping and there is no off-street parking. The best they can do*

1 *is to get one car off the street. The site is so sloped that a parking deck would*
2 *have to be built to meet the parking requirement, which would be unsightly.*

3
4 Commission questions and comments to staff:

- 5 • Right now the existing structure only has a 3-foot setback and it is required to
6 have a 15-foot setback. *Staff responded the existing house does not meet the*
7 *rear setback as it was built decades before the Zoning Ordinance was adopted.*
8 *The addition would add 3 feet heading eastward along the entire eastern face*
9 *of the property. The section that is within 15-feet of the northern property line*
10 *would not be added, but the existing footprint of the house as built would not*
11 *change.*
- 12 • The condition says the proposed addition would be pulled back 15-feet from
13 the property line. *Staff responded the language is confusing, but the part being*
14 *added would be pulled back 15-feet from the northern property line.*
- 15 • Is the Commission being asked to approve the existing structure as is, because
16 it was built before there was a Zoning Ordinance prohibiting it? *Staff responded*
17 *that is correct. The approval is for what is being added.*
- 18 • What exists in the space that is now going to be removed, part of the
19 basement? *Staff responded that is correct.*
- 20 • The proposed addition is not being pulled back 15 feet from the property line, it
21 is being pulled back 3 feet. *Staff responded it depends upon which property*
22 *line. From the northern property line it is being pulled back 15 feet, but from the*
23 *eastern wall of the existing building, rather than being pushed out 3 feet it stays*
24 *where it is for the first 12 feet of wall.*
- 25 • The findings the Commission is being asked to approve state that the proposed
26 project fits within the setbacks for the zoning district, but it will not meet the
27 required rear yard setback, however it will not change the existing property.
28 *Staff responded the existing house would not meet the 15-foot rear setback*
29 *and is a Legal Nonconforming use, and by eliminating the 3-foot additional*
30 *nonconformity it is keeping the status quo and not exacerbating the*
31 *nonconformity. The addition would meet the rear yard setback.*

32
33
34 The public comment period was opened. Being none, the public comment period was
35 closed.
36

37 Commission comments to staff:

- 38 • If the project is approved a construction schedule for the times of day should
39 be conditioned. That is critical with the amount of activity on Miller Avenue.
40 *Staff responded Condition 12 requires that a plan for construction, traffic*
41 *control, parking, and staging and a construction schedule shall be submitted for*
42 *review and approval by the City Engineer.*
- 43 • The language of Design Review Finding 7 and Heighted Design Review
44 Finding B should be altered to indicate that the nonconformance for the rear
45 setback is not being exacerbated, rather than indicating that the project fits
46 within all setbacks, in order to make it clear in the record that the Planning
47 Commission knows it is approving a Nonconforming project with respect to the
48 rear setback on the basis that the nonconformity is not being exacerbated.
49 *Staff responded the two findings would be revised to say, "The project has a*
50

1 *legal nonconformity with respect to the rear yard setback and that legal*
2 *nonconformity is not being exacerbated by the project as conditioned.”*
3

4 **Chair Keller moved and Vice Chair Bair seconded a motion to approve a Design**
5 **Review Permit and Nonconformity Permit for 47 Miller Avenue subject to the**
6 **amended findings. The motion passed 4-0.**
7

- 8 **2. DR 07-021, Design Review Permit, Latch, 43 Cloudview Road.** Design
9 Review Permit to demolish the existing single-family house and garage built in
10 1923 and construct a new 3,676 square foot single-family house and 426
11 square foot garage.
12

13 Commissioner Keegin returned to the meeting.
14

15 The public hearing was opened. Assistant Planner Schinsing presented the Staff
16 Report.
17

18 **Chair Keller indicated he had had ex-parte communication with the Gureviches of**
19 **41 Cloudview Road.**
20

21 **Commissioner Keegin indicated he had had ex-parte communication with the**
22 **Gureviches of 41 Cloudview Road on October 27, 2008.**
23

24 **Commissioner Cox indicated she had had ex-parte communication with the**
25 **Gureviches of 41 Cloudview Road on October 29, 2008.**
26

27 **Commissioner Stout indicated he had had ex-parte communication with the**
28 **Gureviches of 41 Cloudview Road.**
29

30 Presentation was made by Connie Latch, the owner, and Tom Taylor and Odessa
31 Schneider, the architects.
32

33 Commission questions and comments to Ms. Schneider and Mr. Taylor:
34

- 35 • What is the length of the overhang of the roof from the edge of the roof back to
36 the house? *Ms. Schneider responded in 41 Cloudview's view corridor it is down*
37 *to the minimum of 6 inches on the east side of the house, but on the rest of the*
38 *house it is 18 inches.*
- 39 • Is there any way to reduce the size of the house or move the structure any
40 further back to accommodate the view concerns of the neighbor at 41
41 Cloudview? *Mr. Taylor responded it is not possible to reduce the size of the*
42 *house and meet the desires of the owners. They already have reduced the size*
43 *of the garage to the bare minimum. The turnaround space in the courtyard is*
44 *tight. The room sizes have been pulled back to the minimum to make the*
45 *house function and still have the primary living spaces on the main level.*
- 46 • This house size is reduced from an earlier proposal. What was the original FAR
47 and lot coverage? *Ms. Schneider responded they did not reduce the square*
48 *footage, just molded it differently and tucked the building into the hill. The*
49 *house is still at the maximum FAR. Mr. Taylor responded they made the*
50

1 *master bedroom three steps down from the main level in order to reduce the*
2 *massiveness of the building.*

- 3 • The roofline shown on the plan appears greater than 6 inches, more like 2 feet,
4 on the northeast side of the house, which obstructs 41 Cloudview's view. *Ms.*
5 *Schneider responded they have pulled the roofline back to 6 inches on the*
6 *master bedroom on the top of the building. The other two eaves have not been*
7 *pulled back.*
- 8 • If one looks from 41 Cloudview there are three edges, the garage, the closet,
9 Lloyd's bathroom. Connie's bathroom is the edge one that is 6 inches, so
10 before that is it 18 inches? *Ms. Schneider responded yes.*
- 11 • The obstruction is even greater than what is represented by the story poles,
12 because the story poles don't take into account an 18-inch roof? *Mr. Taylor*
13 *responded yes, but the roofline is high enough that it does not block any of the*
14 *San Francisco view.*
- 15 • But what the roofline does do is it encloses the San Francisco view from 41
16 Cloudview, creating a ceiling for the residents to look through. The 18-inch
17 overhang should be moved back to open up the view bring it into conformity
18 with the other 6-inch roof overhangs. *Mr. Taylor responded he would consult*
19 *with the owner and take that suggestion into consideration.*
- 20 • Regarding the grading and the slope stability, did you do a geotechnical
21 survey? *Ms. Schneider responded yes.*
- 22 • One of the findings for Heightened Design Review is the structure cannot be
23 safely constructed without adversely impacting slope stability. This will not be
24 known until you comply with the engineer's requirement that you incorporate
25 into your plans the recommendations contained in the May 13, 2008 from
26 Hobach Lewin as well as conditions proposed by the City Engineer. What have
27 you done to address those issues? *Mr. Taylor responded those conditions*
28 *would be part of the construction drawing packages they would submit at a*
29 *later date, and they fully intend to satisfy all those conditions.*

30
31
32 The public comment period was opened.

33
34 Daniel Daniloff, 3 Cloudview Circle, indicated the following:

- 35 • He and his wife live east of the subject property and approve of the project.

36
37 Peter Van Meter, 4 Cloudview Circle, indicated the following:

- 38 • They live next door to the subject property.
- 39 • The proposed project will be a compatible addition to the neighborhood.
- 40 • They support the project because the existing trees and hedges screen the two
41 properties from each other. The applicants have indicated they will preserve
42 and maintain the greenery that separates their two homes and will install a
43 fence.

44
45
46 Bob Stafford, 49 Cloudview Circle, indicated the following:

- 47 • He and his wife support the project.
- 48 • The roof of the proposed home will significantly impact their view of San
49 Francisco, a fact that has been minimized in discussions.

- There are trees that block their view. The applicant's have indicated they will keep the trees trimmed to compensate for the structure.

Andre Roegiers, 45 Cloudview Circle, indicated the following:

- The project does not affect them, as the roofline of the proposed house is below them.

Alex Gurevich, 41 Cloudview Circle, indicated the following:

- He was shown the plans before they were submitted to the City. At that time he proposed a compromise whereby he would give up some of his obscure winter views and agree with the positioning of the proposed garage. In return he asked the applicants to not obstruct any of his primary view of San Francisco.
- Any project of this size will obstruct his view somewhat.
- The winter view should not be neglected, because he enjoys seeing the seasonal changes.
- The picture shown by the applicants is slightly different from his own photograph, which he has circulated.
- The applicants want to build their dream home on a very small lot, which is difficult, as well as position and plan the house to enable them to have a garden, master bedroom view, and the main living spaces on the same level, but it is at the cost of his own dream home.
- His home has a panoramic view that will be only partially reduced by the project, but he bought his home for the view. Any view reduction will be meaningful to him, but he would be happy with an adjustment of 2 feet on the eastern side.
- He was not aware of, and feels he was mislead regarding, the 18-inch roof overhang.

Commission question to Mr. Gurevich:

- What is the difference in the height between the building as it now exists and the proposed new building's roof? *Mr. Gurevich responded the roof of the proposed house is about the same level, but the proposed house has been pushed eastward, creating a significant view obstruction for him.*

Mrs. Latch's rebuttal to public comment:

- They met with Mr. Gurevich previously to discuss pushing back the corners and increasing his view. Mr. Gurevich requested they not build the new house any bigger than the current one, which is 1,300 square feet. That is where they stood last.

Commission questions to Mr. Taylor:

- Could you easily move the house back a few feet as Mr. Gurevich is requesting? *Mr. Taylor responded no, it could not easily be moved. The couple of degrees of view that they opened up is significant from where the project was located previously. They have squeezed everything as much as they reasonably can and have made a large improvement over where they were a year ago.*
- What would you have to do to get the house to where Mr. Gurevich would be happy based on what he said at this meeting? *Mr. Taylor responded if Mr.*

1 *Gurevich said he would be happy to get two more feet of view; they would try*
2 *to do that. But with the view that Mr. Gurevich has, he does not know if two*
3 *more feet of view on the extreme south corner of his view would make a*
4 *significant impact. They are willing to sit down with Mr. Gurevich and see if*
5 *anything can be done to move the corner of the proposed building.*

- 6 • *Would it be possible to have a diagonal instead of a corner on the proposed*
7 *building? The corner that is obstructing 41 Cloudview's view is a bathroom, but*
8 *you have two master bathrooms already. Mr. Taylor responded that bathroom*
9 *is important to the Latches. The plan shows that clearances are at a minimum*
10 *in order to keep everything the Latches really want in that corner of the house.*
11 *He is not sure angles would help, because they are not the most efficient way*
12 *to lay out a floor plan, so they could have to increase the square footage in*
13 *order to reduce the impact on the view.*
- 14 • *Would you achieve anything by lowering this bathroom/master bedroom wing*
15 *another couple of feet? Mr. Taylor responded he did not believe so, because*
16 *while it reduces the mass of the house, but it would pull the roofline down into*
17 *the Guraviches San Francisco view, whereas right now they look underneath*
18 *the roof overhang.*

19
20
21 The public comment period was closed.

22 Commission comments:

- 23 • This is a proposal for a maximum FAR, which triggers Heightened Design
24 Review with a reference to take particular care to protect primary views and
25 minimize the obstruction. This project cannot be supported because of the view
26 obstruction and the fact that this is a maximum buildout project.
- 27 • Given that Heightened Design Review requires particular care be taken to
28 protect primary views it is surprising that the roofline was not reduced as much
29 as possible, to the 6 inches, as it was on another side of the home, a way to
30 take particular care to protect primary views.
- 31 • Although 41 Cloudview has a panoramic view that is not being significantly
32 impacted the applicant has to demonstrate that they have taken particular care
33 to protect the primary view, and that primary view is being impacted. The
34 applicants revised their initial plans, but with no reduction in square footage.
35 Even a minor reduction could result in providing particular attention to the
36 primary view.
- 37 • The Commission would like to see a grading plan for this type of site and slope
38 to see where the drainage is going. The project would add more impervious
39 surface, therefore more water that will be developed from this site.
- 40 • In redesigning a 1929 site the new home needs to conform to the other
41 properties around the site that built their homes in accordance with the layout
42 of the 1929 site. Two to five feet of space makes a huge difference for the
43 surrounding homeowners, significant enough to come up with a better solution.
- 44 • In looking at the primary view of 41 Cloudview this constitutes a very small
45 obstruction. The ordinance definition of view says, "The term view does not
46 mean an unobstructed panorama of any or all of the above."
- 47 • This is the sort of situation that should be worked out between the neighbors,
48 and can be. The groundwork for a solution was set forth at this meeting with
49
50

1 Mr. Gurevich's comments that a small adjustment of 2 feet on the eastern side
2 would satisfy him.

- 3 • Should this project be revised and comes back to the Planning Commission,
4 Mr. Gurevich will he held to his statement that he is only looking for a couple of
5 feet in reduction.
- 6 • The applicant and architect have gone a long way to address the concerns of
7 the neighbor at 41 Cloudview, but this is Heightened Design Review. The
8 Commission would like the owner and architect to rethink the square footage
9 and see if it can be reduced anywhere in order to bring it under the Heightened
10 Design Review and/or address the concerns of 41 Cloudview with regard to
11 getting 2 feet more of view.
12

13 **Chair Keller moved and Commissioner Stout seconded a motion to continue the**
14 **public hearing for 43 Cloudview Road to the meeting of December 10, 2008. The**
15 **motion passed 5-0.**
16

- 17 **3. DR/EA 08-017, Design Review Permit, Encroachment Agreement, Gibbs,**
18 **42-44 Cazneau Avenue.** Design Review Permit and Encroachment Agreement
19 to demolish the main house built in 1956, construct a new single-family house
20 and garage, and remodel an existing Legal Nonconforming cottage. The new
21 main house would be 2,501 square feet and the existing cottage would be
22 reduced in size from 816 square feet to 594 square feet.
23
24

25 The public hearing was opened. Contract Planner Brian Stanke presented the Staff
26 Report.
27

28 **Chair Keller indicated he had had ex-parte communication with the Gaetanis of 76**
29 **Cazneau on October 28, 2008.**
30

31 **Commissioner Stout indicated he had had ex-parte communication with the**
32 **Gaetanis of 76 Cazneau.**
33

34 **Commissioner Cox indicated she had had ex-parte communication with the**
35 **Gaetanis of 76 Cazneau on the previous weekend.**
36

37 **Vice Chair Bair indicated he had had ex-parte communication with Barbara**
38 **Giesler of 41 Cazneau and toured her property.**
39

40 **Commissioner Keegin indicated he had had ex-parte communication with the**
41 **Gaetanis of 76 Cazneau on October 26, 2008.**
42

43 Commission questions to staff:

- 44 • Would the redesign of the cottage in the back reduce its size such that it would
45 be ineligible to be a second dwelling unit? *Staff responded the cottage would*
46 *still fall under the definition of a second unit after the removal of the addition.*
47 *There would have to be a considerable reduction in size of the cottage, to*
48 *below 150 square feet, for it to be considered too small to be a second unit.*
49
50

- 1 • Will altering the size of the cottage require qualification for additional parking
2 requirements because it is a second dwelling unit? *Staff responded no, that*
3 *would only be triggered if there was substantial demolition of that second unit.*
4

5 Presentation was made by David Berman, the architect and applicant.
6

7 Commission questions to Mr. Berman:
8

- 9 • Is the floor height of the main level in the proposed house one foot higher than
10 the existing residence? *Mr. Berman responded yes.*
11 • What are the ceiling heights in the main level? *Mr. Berman responded the*
12 *kitchen, living room, and dining room are ten feet. The master bedroom is nine*
13 *feet. The bathroom and closets are eight feet. The height is affected by the*
14 *need to cut into the hillside in order to have the rooms down below, the family*
15 *room at the back part of the house, and a terrace. They tried to find a*
16 *compromise between cutting and still bringing the house down to where it is*
17 *not blocking views, as well as coming up with a good design that can keep all*
18 *the trees.*
19 • On top of the ten feet ceiling height in the primary space is there also a pop-
20 out? *Mr. Berman responded yes. The reason for the clerestory pop-out is to*
21 *create privacy between the applicants and the neighbors on the high side. The*
22 *windows there have been minimized to create privacy and also bring in light.*
23 *For a house that is wide for a small lot and with all the trees, this can bring in a*
24 *good amount of light in a simple way.*
25 • What is the ceiling height in the clerestory pop-out? *Mr. Berman responded*
26 *that would be another three or four feet above the ten feet ceiling height.*
27 • The clerestory is five feet wide, but how long does it run? *Mr. Berman*
28 *responded it runs thirty feet.*
29

30 **Vice Chair Bair indicated he would be leaving the meeting in five minutes.**
31

32 The public comment period was opened.
33

34 Ginny and Tony Gaetani, 76 Cazneau Avenue, indicated the following:
35

- 36 • She and her husband live immediately above the subject property.
37 • They have seen the plans and story poles and are in favor of the basic design
38 and placement of the house.
39 • However they strongly object to the height of the roofline and clerestory that on
40 top of the main roof. Any lights in the main living area at night will reflect
41 outside the clerestory onto their house and impact their master bedroom, living
42 room, kitchen, downstairs bedroom, and their decks.
43 • They would like the Commission to continue the hearing and ask the applicant
44 to lower the house into the hillside and eliminate the clerestory, thus reducing
45 the bulk and mass that impacts their view of the harbor, bay, and Belvedere
46 from downstairs.
47

48 **Vice Chair Bair left the meeting.**
49

50 Barbara Geisler, 41 Cazneau, indicated the following:

- She lives across the street from the subject property.
- She wrote a letter to the Planning Commission addressing her concerns.
- She presented a video of the neighborhood to illustrate its character and why it is special. The video showed lots of trees, single-story homes, and picket fences.
- Scale is very important in this neighborhood. The small-scale homes will be dwarfed by larger structures such as the proposed house, which is too large for its lot and needs to be pulled down and in, leaving more room for the trees and so it will not dwarf its neighbor.

Neil Gibbs's rebuttal to public comment:

- The trees are what makes the lot and why they bought it, and they are being careful to preserve as much of the greenery as possible.
- They brought in an arborist before buying the property to ascertain the status of the trees. Several of the trees were already dead, and then several more contracted Sudden Oak Death and died. All the dead trees were deemed hazardous and they were forced to remove them at great expense.
- They plan to be extremely careful job of preserving the remaining trees with the help of the arborist. During construction each tree will be surrounded by fencing, fertilized, watered. The house will not have a standard foundation, but drilled piers with footings on top of the piers above grade, so the soil will not be cut. They plan to utilize as much of the cuts from the existing house and garage as possible.
- The clerestory window is very important for bringing light into the house and they have minimized its size as much as possible. There is a large overhang of the roof, which will conceal the windows from 76 Cazneau. Any light coming from the clerestory windows will be captured under the overhang and deflected straight down. They will also paint the roof flat black to minimize any reflection.
- The views being impacted at 76 Cazneau are from the yard and basement, which is why they pulled the clerestory back. They took great pains to keep the house low and not impact the Gaetani's primary upstairs living space.
- Regarding the mass and scale, they have pulled their house down into the soil so much that one bedroom just barely makes code for an egress window. The height of the house is only several feet higher than what currently exists there. The new garage in front takes the exact footprint of the current garage.

Commission questions to Mr. Berman:

- With respect to the concerns of the Gaetanis at 41 Cazneau, because this project falls under Heightened Design Review this project must be more heavily scrutinized with more emphasis than usual on the primary view.
- The Gaetanis primary concern is the light from the clerestory that faces them. Mr. Gibbs claims the roof's overhang will deflect that light, but that claim must be demonstrated.
- A solution would be to eliminate the windows on the west side of the pop-out and lower the pitch so the light would not reflect off the roof, also removing an impact to the Gaetani's view; or lower a portion of the property. What could you do to come up with a solution satisfactory to the Gaetanis? *Mr. Berman responded decrease the pitch slightly, taking a few inches off. The reason for*

1 *the pitch is the kitchen is lower than the living room; therefore there are*
2 *minimum windows on the living room side. The roof they are proposing is*
3 *black. They could also create a screen wall on the applicant's roof that stops*
4 *the light from bouncing up.*

- 5 • There are substantial windows across the north elevation and there are the
6 clerestory windows up above and on the street side. What would happen if no
7 clerestory windows were installed on the south elevation? *Mr. Berman*
8 *responded the project site is dark due to a huge tree canopy with little direct*
9 *sunlight, which is why the living room needs a higher ceiling, and the only way*
10 *to get high enough on that side of the house is to have some slope. A solution*
11 *would be to increase the overhang to conceal the clerestory from the*
12 *Gaetani's upper level windows. They could still see the clerestory from the*
13 *yard and their lower rooms, which is why they propose a screen wall on the*
14 *applicant's flat roof. From the lower level they will only see the screen.*
- 15 • What would happen if you eliminate the pitch on the clerestory altogether and
16 made it a flat roofed pop-out? *Mr. Berman responded that would be fine, and*
17 *then they would increase the overhang. With a flat roof they would have to go*
18 *farther out to block the view and the light. He is not sure a flat roof would solve*
19 *the problem though.*
- 20 • Is the reason for the pitch of the roof to provide an overhang to block the light
21 of the clerestory windows? *Mr. Berman responded yes, and to get it higher on*
22 *the living room side to get windows on that side as well. Another solution*
23 *would be to decrease the size of the clerestory windows.*
- 24 • Can you lower the house another foot? *Mr. Berman responded that is a lot of*
25 *grading, and then at a certain point the applicants will not have any sense of*
26 *view and space and light either.*
- 27 • Could you explore the possibility of windows on the south side of the building
28 and using screenings, or have windows lower down to get light into the living
29 space as opposed to using clerestories? *Mr. Berman responded he would*
30 *prefer to work with the clerestory due to the width of the house. He wants to*
31 *bring indirect light into the middle of the house. He would rather redefine the*
32 *clerestory, how it is shaped, what it does, and how it blocks the light.*
- 33 • The view from the patio that serves the house is a primary view and should not
34 be seen as a secondary view. The clerestory doesn't just impinge on the view,
35 but blocks the entire view of the harbor, the bay, and Belvedere from the lawn
36 and patio.

37
38
39 Tony Gaetani, 76 Cazneau Avenue, indicated the following:

- 40 • The clerestory not only blocks the view from the garden, it blocks the view from
41 the downstairs front where they intend to eventually building a master
42 bedroom. There are windows on that side that view the harbor, the bay, and
43 Belvedere, a view he has enjoyed for the past 25 years; all of this will be
44 blocked by the clerestory.

45
46
47 Neil Gibbs, 42-44 Cazneau Avenue, indicated the following:

- 48 • They carefully designed their house around the City's guidelines. They are now
49 being told a view from a yard is a primary view, but that was not their
50 understanding. *The Commission responded, "A primary view is a view from the*

1 *primary viewing areas of the dwelling, such as the living room, dining room,*
2 *kitchen, master bedroom, and deck or patio spaces serving such living areas.”*
3 *The Commission believes the patio space and the lawn space serve the living*
4 *areas.*

- 5 • The Commission refers to the lawn space, but he needs to know where that
6 space ends. The Gaetani’s have an extensive lawn area, a great deal of it with
7 views not impacted, but there are areas of the lawn where the view is
8 impacted. *The Commission responded that from the lawn/patio area at the*
9 *front of the house the view is completely blocked, and the Commission*
10 *believes that lawn/patio space serves the main house.*

11
12 Commission questions for staff:

- 13 • Staff stated that because the downstairs room is currently being used as a
14 storage room they considered that a secondary impact, but the homeowner
15 stated that eventually that space would be a master bedroom. How is the
16 Commission to consider that room? Is it based on current use? *Staff*
17 *responded yes.*
- 18 • So currently it would be considered a secondary view impact from that room?
19 *Staff responded yes.*

20
21
22 The public comment period was closed.

23
24 Commission comments:

- 25 • The concerns of the residents of 41 Cazneau are not unreasonable. Their
26 primary concern is the clerestory windows. They are also concerned about
27 their views of the bay. If the impact of the view from their lawn and patio area
28 could be minimized, that would go a long way.
- 29 • The Commission would like to see the architect come back with a few
30 alternatives with no clerestory windows on the south elevation and a flat roof. It
31 would be best to continue this application to a future date.
- 32 • This project is an example of people buying smaller lots and then maximizing
33 their development to build a house larger in scope and size than those in the
34 neighborhood.
- 35 • The scale of the proposed home is a concern, although the effort the architect
36 has made with the variety of building materials to minimize the appearance of
37 density and mass of the building is appreciated.
- 38 • If this project comes back to the Planning Commission, the Commission
39 requests staff to provide a chart showing the size of the neighboring residences
40 compared to their respective lots.
- 41 • The Commission has discretion in how they approach issues of density and
42 mass, depending on the effort made to fit within the neighborhood. A lot of the
43 massing of the house has to do with the fact that the owners are designing the
44 house around the trees to save them, and restore the carriage house. The
45 combination of those two factors triggers Heightened Design Review from a
46 building coverage standpoint, but the Commission needs to look at the
47 extenuating circumstances.

1 Chair Keller moved and Commissioner Keegin seconded a motion to continue the
2 public hearing for 42-44 Cazneau Avenue to the meeting of December 10, 2008.
3 The motion passed 4-0 (Bair – Absent).
4

5 **Old Business**

6 None.
7

8 **New Business**


9 None.
10

11 **Communications**

- 12 • Staff—The Planning Commission meeting on November 19th will be a joint
13 meeting with the Historic Landmarks Board.
14

15 **Adjournment**

16 The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 p.m.
17

18 
19 _____
20 Submitted by
21 Jeremy Graves, AICP
22 Community Development Director
23

24 
25 _____
26 Approved by
27 Bill Keller
28 Chair
29

30 I:\CDD\Plan Comm\Minutes\2008\10-29-08-Approved.doc
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50