



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

525 San Anselmo Avenue, San Anselmo, California 94960
 Tel. (415)-258-4616/FAX 454-4683/email: planning@townofsananselmo.net

Received
 MAY 14 2014
 Town of San Anselmo

GENERAL PLANNING APPLICATION FORM

Job Site Address: 130 CRESCENT RD.	Assessor Parcel No.: 007-221-32	Zone: R-1 450 HSA
Property Owner(s) Name: DREB & ALYSSA HARPER	Phone Numbers: Home: Cell: 415.385.1189 Work: Cell: 415.264.4600	Fax Number: Cell Phone: E-Mail: AKWELDE@GMAIL.COM
Mailing Address: 407 MANZANITA AVE.	City: CORTE MADERA	State/Zip: CA 94925
Applicant(s) Name (contact person): DAVE JOCHUM	Phone Numbers: Home: 415.453.5895 Work: 415.454.0674	Fax Number: Cell Phone: 415.939.5775 E-Mail: DAVE@JOCHUMARCHITECTS.COM
Mailing Address: JOCHUM ARCHITECTS 114 VAN TASSEL CT.	City: SAN ANSELMO	State/Zip: CA 94960-1033

TYPE OF APPLICATION/FEE	ACCOUNT	FEE	COSTS
Planning Commission: Annexation, General Plan Amend, Rezoning, Design Review*, Use Permit, Variance*, Subdivision, Parcel Split, Lot Line Adjustment* Illuminated Sign Review, FAR Exception, Grading Permit	01.00.48057	\$ 1,200 ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾ 600	
Environmental Review/Negative Declarations/ Environmental Impact Reports	01.00.48057 01.00.20312	\$ 1,920 ⁽³⁾⁽⁴⁾ Consultant cost plus 20%	
Administrative Design Review (commercial)	01.00.48057	\$ 360	
Administrative Design Review (residential)	01.00.48057	\$ 600	600
Ministerial Residential Second Unit	01.00.48057	\$ 720 ⁽⁵⁾	
Administrative Variance	01.00.48057	\$ 720	
Administrative Minor Exception	01.00.48057	\$ 238	
Administrative Sign Review (conforming)	01.00.48057	\$ 119	
Administrative Lot Line Adjustment	01.00.48057	\$ 1,200	
Administrative Lot Merger	01.00.48057	\$ 238	
Administrative Temporary Outdoor Display	01.00.48057	\$ 100	
Certificate of Compliance	01.00.48057	\$ 1,200	
Peer Review	01.00.20327	Consultant cost plus 20%	
Plan Storage	01.00.20313	\$ 2 per/sheet 17	34
General Plan Maintenance Fee	01.00.48012	10% of application fee	60
Planning Technology Fee	01.0048058	5% of application fee	30
Planning Training Fee	01.0048059	5% of application fee	30
Appeal (to Planning Commission or Town Council)	01.00.48057	\$ 504	
Additional Planning Deposit and Research Fee	01.00.20312	\$ 119/hour	
TOTAL APPLICATION FEE			\$ 754

Notes: See Planning Division Acknowledgement of Application Fees

Variance
 5/14/14
 \$ 720.00
 \$ 754.00

1) The project adds shed dormers to the side of a 15:12 roof and raises a portion of the roof ridge 40". As neighboring houses are separated by considerable distances, this project will have zero affect on light and air access. Additional explanations below further support this statement.

2) The proposed second floor windows facing the street on the west side of the house are a completely common, normal, and reasonable characteristic of any two story house, of which most houses in the neighborhood are. The nearest house facing this elevation is across the street on significantly higher ground than that of our house. We will have no windows to the north and one visible dormer facing east that is as far away from the property line as physically possible. Nobody's privacy will be compromised in even a minute way.

3) The small 40" rise in one ridge line will have a de minimis effect on the "bulk" of the house. In the two story portion of the house, the lower floor ceiling is 8' high, while the wall plates at the second floor are set at 7'. This results in a structure only 25'-7" tall where 30' is allowed. It is very important to us to retain as much of the existing structure as possible and maintain the existing building style and scale. As previously stated, the property is significantly lower in elevation than the houses across Crescent to the west. The dormers will be on the side of the steep roof and their profile will not extend above the ridge line. This house was built 100 years ago and is one of the oldest in the neighborhood. We are making only superficial changes to the exterior of the house with the exception of the very modest shed dormers, and they are completely in character with the style and time period of the original house. Completed, it will continue to be a relatively modest house in the neighborhood. Many houses are larger--some much larger, including the neighbor to the north. The visible portion of the house (the basement is fully underground) will only be 2,519 s.f. When complete, this residence will be viewed as humble, contextual, and fitting perfectly with its neighbors. In addition, it will advance the quality and value of the area in a very significant way.

4) Rather than tear the old house down and locate an entirely new house elsewhere on the property (which would have cost less), we chose to save the 100-year old structure, re-build it to a higher quality level than it was originally, and add the square footage necessary to house a modern family completely within the walls of the existing structure and below grade. As the house has existed in this exact position for 100 years, there is no possibility of any adverse effects on health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood or be materially detrimental to the public welfare, etc. On the contrary, this project will greatly enhance the neighborhood with very tangible benefits to the neighbors closest to the property.

Grading Permit Findings

130 Crescent Road

i. The health, welfare, and safety of the public will not be adversely affected.

This house was built over 100 years ago at a time when construction methods were far inferior to those employed today. The concrete foundation was basically built on top of the soil rather than excavated to bedrock. Since the existing foundation was insufficient by current standards and literally crumbling, a new foundation was necessary. A significant amount of grading was necessary to accomplish this—the same that is required for a new house.

Additionally, this property was saddled with the remains of a drainage swale that originally ran through the entire block surrounded by Crescent Road. Over the years, it had been abandoned both upstream and downstream of the subject property, leaving a useless hole in the front yard. This needed to be properly filled to act as a bio-retention area to disperse both surface and subsurface water. Some of the soil in this area was determined by the soils engineer to be incapable of proper compaction and we were required to remove it.

It was important to the owners that the original style, scale, and structure of the house be maintained. Therefore, to provide the living space necessary for a growing family, they elected to expand the house below and not outward. The basement excavation accounts for the bulk of the grading on the site.

When completed, this house will not look substantially different than the one built 100 years ago, though it will be constructed to a much higher quality level. Other than the construction of a state-of-the-art bio-retention area in the old front yard swale area, the ground plane will not be altered. The health, welfare, and safety of the public and surrounding neighbors will be greatly enhanced rather than adversely affected.

ii. Adjacent properties are adequately protected by project investigation and design from geologic hazards as a result of the work.

The grading work is being done by professional contractors following the design of the soils, civil, and structural engineers. The engineers routinely visit the construction site to monitor the work and look for unforeseen conditions.

iii. Adjacent properties are adequately protected by project design from drainage and erosion problems as a result of the work.

During construction, erosion control sediment stops protect neighboring properties from migrating water and soil. Pumps are used when necessary to eliminate standing water. When complete, the site will do a much better job of gathering and dispersing water and eliminating any chance of erosion than it did previously. In addition to the proper grading and the extensive bio-retention system, there will be emergency sump pumps and a natural gas powered emergency power system

on-site to handle the possible 1,000-year flood. (That is not a misprint—the system is designed to handle even the most catastrophic flood event.)

iv. The amount of excavation, grading, or fill proposed is not more than is required to allow the property owner reasonably beneficial use of his or her property.

All excavation, grading, and fill have been design and monitored by the soils, civil, and structural engineers to minimize such work. When completed, the site will look unaltered from its original configuration with the exception of filling the front yard swale to form a level yard.

v. The visual and scenic enjoyment of the area by others will not be unreasonably adversely affected by the project.

As previously stated, with the exception of filling the swale to form a level front yard, the site will be unaltered from its original grading. There will be no possible negative effects to anyone's visual or scenic enjoyment.

vi. Natural landscaping will not be removed by the project more than necessary and that any removed vegetation will be replanted in a timely manner.

The property suffered from decades of neglect. The few plants (primarily rhododendrons and roses) that had been purposely planted many years ago were in very bad shape and many were dead. The two oak trees on the west side of the property that have not been pruned or otherwise properly cared for, will be. The rest of the foliage on site consisted of volunteer scrub plants and wild privet, which were removed allowing for the construction of the bio-retention system. The yard will be beautifully landscaped as part of this project in a manner the site has never seen.

vii. The time of year during which construction will take place is such that work will not result in excessive siltation from storm runoff nor prolonged exposure of unstable excavated slopes.

The site is essentially flat, and as such there is no possibility of excavated slopes, unstable or otherwise. Extensive erosion control measures, approved by the Department of Public Works, are in use.

viii. The proposed excavation, grading, or fill does not violate the Town's General Plan or Zoning Codes.

The excavation, grading, and fill have been designed by professional soils, civil, and structural engineers to exceed the Town's guidelines, and have been approved by the Town's Public Works Department.

vi. Sufficient erosion control measures will be employed to offset any impact by the proposed excavation, grading, or fill.

Our erosion control measures were approved by the Department of Public Works and have been employed since permits were issued in November, 2013. They have performed perfectly.



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Planning Division, 525 San Anselmo Avenue, San Anselmo, California 94960
Tel. (415)-258-4616/FAX 454-4683/email: planning@ci.san-anselmo.ca.us

VARIANCE SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Complete the information below:

Setback Variance:

_____ foot front yard variance to construct a _____ within _____ feet of the front property line.

9'-11" foot rear yard variance to construct a modifications to (E) roof @ attic within 10'-1" feet of the rear property line.

_____ foot side yard variance to construct a _____ within _____ feet of the side property line.

_____ foot side yard variance to construct a _____ within _____ feet of the side property line.

Other Variance Requests:

Fence height: _____

Building Height: _____

Lot Coverage: _____

Floor Area Ratio (FAR): _____

Parking number and/or size: _____

For All Variance Applications (does not include Sign Variance):

1. List below special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, to show why the variance should be granted, and why the granting of the variance will not be a granting of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and zone (you may attach a statement).

-See Page 2.

2. List below your reasons why the variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood or be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood (you may attach a statement).

-See Page 2.

1. This house was built over 100 years ago, and as one of the oldest houses, its history is significant and important to the neighborhood. Like most houses of similar vintage, it does not strictly meet today's zoning standards, though it meets all but this one. The proposed minor modification to the roof is de minimis and necessary to accommodate a modern family by providing ceiling clearance in a small portion of the existing attic. It was important to the owners to maintain the existing structure, architectural style, and physical relationship to its context. So rather than tear the house down and build a completely new structure elsewhere on the site that would accommodate their needs—and all zoning standards—they elected to renovate the historic house in place and do so without adding visible floor area which would have altered its scale, form, and site coverage. It was more expensive to go this route, but it was worth it to the Harpers. This cannot be considered a special privilege because the only reason it is necessary is because the Harpers want to save the most important aspects of this historic property. This proposal does nothing to exacerbate the non-conforming setback as surrounding houses are separated by considerable distance and elevation change. This house sits approximately 12' (about 1 1/2 stories) lower than the neighbors to the west and is separated by a minimum of 90'. The house to the north is more than 30' away.

2. This proposal will simply make a very minor modification to the existing attic roof. It will not modify the footprint of the building nor significantly change the outline of the house. It cannot possibly affect the health or safety of people in the area, be detrimental to the public welfare, nor harm neighboring property. It is an architectural treatment that will be inconsequential to anyone other than the owners.



950 NORTHGATE DRIVE, SUITE 200
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA 94903
WEB www.sorensenlaw.com

LAW OFFICES OF
NEIL SORENSEN

TELEPHONE 415 499-8600
FACSIMILE 415 491-9515
EMAIL neil@sorensenlaw.com

June 12, 2014

Chair, Matthew Brasler and
Members of the Planning Commission
Town of San Anselmo
525 San Anselmo Avenue
San Anselmo, CA 94960

**Re: Variance Design Review and Grading Permit
130 Crescent Road, San Anselmo**

Dear Chair Brasler and Members of the Planning Commission:

This office represents Greg and Alyssa Harper, the owners of the property at 130 Crescent Road, San Anselmo. The purpose of this letter is to request that the Planning Commission approve the design review, grading permit and variance applications for the renovation and remodel of the Harpers' home. The project should be approved because it is consistent with the Town's General Plan, and complies with the requirements for "flatland design review." Additionally, the project qualifies for a minor setback variance due to the special circumstances relating to the property.

I. Background.

The home at 130 Crescent Road was built over 100 years ago. As such, at the time of its purchase by Mr. and Mrs. Harper, it was in dire need of renovation or alternatively, destruction. The Harpers purchased the property with the admirable intent of preserving its historic character. To do so, a complete renovation and remodel was necessary, including the installation of a concrete foundation and the correction of drainage problems created by a drainage swale crossing through the front yard. In order to save the home, yet provide the new owners with some additional space, they elected to expand the existing basement and convert existing space in the attic into living area, rather than building outward. This also helped insure that the house would not look substantially different than it did when built 100 years ago.

In order to correct the drainage problem in the front yard and to excavate for an expanded basement, slightly over 100 yards of grading and excavation is necessary. However, it is important to stress that only 60 yards of "off haul" was generated by the project. The grading work was completed quite sometime ago with a permit issued by the Town. When the Town issued the building permit for the renovations to the house, they approved all grading shown on the plan. After 99% of the grading was complete, the

Planning Department decided that a separate, after the fact, grading permit was required. The applicants submitted the application, paid the fee, and a permit was issued. However, days later the permit was rescinded after the Planning Department decided that design review was required.

A rear setback variance to allow a 10' 1" setback where 20 feet is required is being sought to alter the existing non-conforming attic in the roof. No other variances are necessary.

II. All Findings for Grant of a Variance Can be Established.

As shown in the attached suggested Variance Findings, all findings required by Municipal Code Section 10-3.1405 can be made. The special circumstances applicable to the property include the fact that it is the only lot in the neighborhood with a street passing along two sides of the lot (essentially a corner lot). Additionally, the lot is one of the smaller lots in the neighborhood with six adjacent lots being larger.

<u>Address</u>	<u>Lot Size</u>
130 Crescent Road	10,249 sq. ft.
125 Crescent Road	11,200 sq. ft.
131 Crescent Road	16,560 sq. ft.
137 Crescent Road	15,000 sq. ft.
156 Crescent Road	11,266 sq. ft.
158 Crescent Road	12,403 sq. ft.
166 Crescent Road	12,042 sq. ft.

Additionally, the pre-existing or historic swale located in the front yard creates a special circumstance which restricts the building envelope and forces the home toward the rear of the lot. Although the swale has been filled, it acts as a bio-swale and should not have structures built on it for two reasons. First, it is not a good idea to build on fill. Second, the operation of a bio-swale would be severely restricted if a structure were built over it.

III. All Findings for Grant of a Flatland Design Review Can be Made.

As shown in the findings submitted by the architect, the project will not unreasonably impair access to light and air to structures on neighboring properties. Although there is a proposal to add some additional height to the structure, it will have absolutely no affect on access to light or air. The nearest house facing this elevation is to the west across the street and 90' away. Additionally, the house at 130 Crescent Road is 12 feet lower (about 1 ½ stories). The house to the north is more than 30' away and will be unaffected.

June 12, 2014

Page 3 of 3

There will be no impact on privacy to neighboring properties. The windows in the proposed second floor face the street (westside of the house). The nearest house facing these windows is across the street, over 90' away, and on higher ground.

Finally, there will be no impact on the surrounding neighborhood due to the bulk, mass or design of the expanded attic. The proposed structure is only 25' 7" tall where 30' is allowed. Additionally, the property is significantly lower than the houses across the street to the west.

IV. All Findings for Grant of a Grading Permit Can be Made.

The project architect has submitted a two-page analysis of the grading permit findings required under San Anselmo Municipal Code Section 9-18.08. This analysis shows that all required findings can be made.

V. The Project is Consistent with General Plan Policies Encouraging the Preservation of Historic Structures.

The renovation in place of the house (rather than destruction) is consistent with a number of goals and policies of the San Anselmo General Plan. These include Policy 2.2 on page 5, which requires new development to preserve the cultural characteristics of development sites, and Policy 6.2 on page 7, which seeks to "protect historic buildings." Finally, the project is consistent with Objective 11, page 10, which seeks to preserve existing character and scale.

VI. Conclusion.

The requested minor second story intrusion into the rear yard setback is justified by the special circumstances applicable to this property (size, location of drainage swale) and necessary to allow the preservation of this historic home in place. The expansion of the attic area meets all design review criteria and will not block the neighbor's access to light and air.

It is respectfully requested that the Planning Commission approve the variance, design review and grading permit applications for this thoughtfully designed renovation of the Harpers' home.

Sincerely,



NEIL SORENSEN

NS/mjs

Enclosures

cc: Greg and Alyssa Harper
Dave Jochum

VARIANCE FINDINGS
130 Crescent Road

1. List below special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, to show why the variance should be granted, and why the granting of the variance will not be a granting of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the zone.

The special circumstances applicable to this property to justify the granting of a setback variance include the size, shape and topography of the parcel, the location of the parcel on a corner, and the location and configuration of the house on the lot. The lot at 130 Crescent Road is smaller than the three lots across the street at 125, 131 and 137 Crescent and smaller than the three lots to the north of the property at 156, 158 and 166 Crescent. Additionally, the lot is flanked by Crescent Road on two sides. It is one of the only corner lots in the neighborhood, which also restricts development. The lot is further constrained by the existing topography. There is a swale (proposed to be filled) running through the property from Crescent Road in a northerly direction. Because of the swale, the house was built further back from Crescent Road and closer to the rear property line (the property line from which the setback variance is requested). While the swale is proposed to be filled, it will be developed with a bio-swale and no development should be placed there.

Moreover, this house was built over 100 years ago and as one of the oldest houses, its history is significant and important to the neighborhood. Like most houses of similar vintage, it does not strictly meet today's zoning standards; though it meets all requirements except for the minor intrusion into the rear setback. The proposed minor modification to the roof is de minimis and necessary to accommodate a modern family by providing ceiling clearance in a small portion of the existing attic.

It was important to the owners to maintain the existing structure, architectural style, and physical relationship to its context. So rather than tear the house down and build a completely new structure elsewhere on the site that would accommodate their needs – and all zoning standards – they elected to renovate the historic house and do so without adding visible floor area which would have altered its scale, form, and site coverage. It was more expensive to go this route, but it was worth it to the Harpers. This cannot be considered a special privilege because the only reason it is necessary is because the Harpers want to save the most important aspects of this historic property. This proposal does nothing to exacerbate the non-conforming setback as surrounding houses are separated by considerable distance and elevation change. This house sits approximately 12' (about 1 ½ stories) lower than the neighbors to the west and is separated by some 90'. The house to the north is more than 30' away.

The existing structure has a serious roof design flaw in the area of non-compliance. The unbalanced double gable is not only an awkward architectural detail that begs to be resolved, but it also necessitates an extremely large (30") roof cricket that is nearly impossible to successfully waterproof. The existing roof simply must be altered to remedy this problem. Leaving it as-is is not a reasonable or acceptable option. The proposed roof modification successfully solves both these serious problems while providing usable living space in a very modest solution.

2. List below the reasons why the variance will not materially affect adversely the health or safety of persons residing or working in the neighborhood or being materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood.

This proposal will simply make a very minor modification to the existing attic roof. It will not modify the footprint of the building nor significantly change the outline of the house. It cannot possibly affect the health or safety of people in the area, be detrimental to the public welfare, or harm neighboring property. It is an architectural treatment that will be inconsequential to anyone other than the owners.