



TOWN OF TIBURON  
Tiburon Town Hall  
1505 Tiburon Boulevard  
Tiburon, CA 94920

Action and Approved Minutes - Regular Meeting  
Design Review Board  
November 18, 2010  
7:00 P.M.

## ACTION MINUTES #18

### TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

#### CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL *At 7:00 PM*

**Present:** Chair Tollini, Vice Chairman Kricensky, Boardmembers Chong, Emberson & Weller  
**Absent:** None  
**Ex-Officio:** Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. **680 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. 709044; Colleen Mahoney, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 1,072 square foot second story addition to add a larger master bedroom suite, two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, and a guest suite for the existing dwelling. Four new skylights would be installed. APN: 055-191-18  
**Withdrawn**

#### NEW BUSINESS

2. **191 BLACKFIELD DRIVE;** File No. 710119; Matthew and Jennifer Powell, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 940 square foot addition to the rear of the house to add a master bedroom suite family room and expand an existing dining room and kitchen. APN: 034-111-02 **Approved 5-0**
3. **118 LYFORD DRIVE;** File No. 21019; Sam Huang and Cindy Cao, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced side yard setback, excess lot coverage and excess building height. The applicants propose to demolish an existing single-family dwelling on the site and construct a new 4,515 square foot house. The house would extend to within 6 feet of the eastern side property line, which is less than the 15 foot side yard setback required in the RO-2 zone, necessitating a Variance for reduced side yard setback. As the maximum lot coverage in the RO-2 zone is fifteen percent (15.0%), a Variance is required in order to construct addition that would expand the lot coverage on the site to 16.9%. The house

would have a maximum height of 32 feet, 6 inches, which is taller than the maximum building height of 30 feet, necessitating a Variance for excess building height. APN: 058-272-07 **Approved 5-0**

MINUTES

4. Regular Meeting of November 4, 2010 **Approved 5-0**

ADJOURNMENT **At 7:35 PM**

**APPROVED MINUTES #18  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 18, 2010**

The meeting was opened at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Tollini.

**A. ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Tollini, Vice-Chair Kricensky, Boardmembers Chong, Emberson and Weller  
**Absent:** None  
**Ex-Officio:** Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Rusting

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None**

**C. STAFF BRIEFING**

Planning Manager Watrous announced that the application for 680 Hawthorne Drive had been withdrawn.

**D. OLD BUSINESS**

1. **680 HAWTHORNE DRIVE:** File No. 709044; Colleen Mahoney, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 1,072 square foot second story addition to add a larger master bedroom suite, two bedrooms, one bathroom, a laundry room, and a guest suite for the existing dwelling. Four new skylights would be installed. APN: 055-191-18 ***Application Withdrawn***

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

2. **191 BLACKFIELD DRIVE;** File No. 710119; Matthew and Jennifer Powell, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The applicants propose to construct a 940 square foot addition to the rear of the house to add a master bedroom suite family room and expand an existing dining room and kitchen. APN: 034-111-02

The applicant is submitting a request to construct additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 191 Blackfield Drive. The existing dwelling is a one-story structure. The proposal would expand the rear of the house to add a master bedroom suite family room and expand an existing dining room and kitchen. An existing chimney would be removed.

Matthew Powell, owner, said they would like to add an addition to the rear of their home. It is currently a single story home and will remain single story. They would like to add a master bedroom, bath, family room, and expand the existing dining room and kitchen.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Emberson said that she visited the site and this was a modest proposal that fits with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Chong stated that he visited the site and found the proposal to be similar to many others in the neighborhood that have added on to the rear of the properties.

Vice-Chair Kricensky, Boardmember Weller, and Chair Tollini agreed with the other Boardmembers.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Weller/Chong) that the request for 191 Blackfield Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.

3. **118 LYFORD DRIVE;** File No. 21019; Sam Huang and Cindy Cao, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced side yard setback, excess lot coverage and excess building height. The applicants propose to demolish an existing single-family dwelling on the site and construct a new 4,515 square foot house. The house would extend to within 6 feet of the eastern side property line, which is less than the 15 foot side yard setback required in the RO-2 zone, necessitating a Variance for reduced side yard setback. As the maximum lot coverage in the RO-2 zone is fifteen percent (15.0%), a Variance is required in order to construct addition that would expand the lot coverage on the site to 16.9%. The house would have a maximum height of 32 feet, 6 inches, which is taller than the maximum building height of 30 feet, necessitating a Variance for excess building height. APN: 058-272-07

The applicant is submitting a request to construct a new single-family dwelling, with variances for reduced front yard setback, excess lot coverage and excess building height, on property located at 118 Lyford Drive. The upper level of the proposed house would include a living room, family room, dining room, kitchen, guest bedroom and one bathroom. The lower level would include a master bedroom suite, three additional bedrooms, two more bathrooms, and a den and laundry room. A “basement” level would include a storage area and bathroom adjacent to a swimming pool and spa. A two-car garage would be situated adjacent to the upper level. Exterior decks would extend around the north, south and east sides of the house. The proposed house would have a total floor area of 4,040 square feet, which is less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, made some corrections on the Staff report. He said they would not be demolishing the building and would not exceed the current maximum height of 32.5 feet, and in some areas they would be lowering that height. He said that the project involves adding to the upper floor of the house, connecting the existing garage to the rest of the house, squaring off the existing living room on the upper floor, adding a master bedroom suite and child’s bedroom on the lower floor, and changing the roof to a combination of low pitch and high pitch roofs. He said that they would use stucco and stone instead of the existing board and batten siding, replace the aluminum windows, and install glass railings to replace the existing wood rails.

Mr. Sadrieh stated that they are requesting 1.9% additional coverage because the existing home is not directly accessible to the backyard. He said that the main public areas of the building, which occur on the upper level, were in need of a reasonably sized deck in order to enjoy views, and the creation of these decks would result in the additional coverage they are requesting. He stated that the hillside guidelines suggest they should step the building down the hillside, and that would also result in additional coverage. He stated that reducing the height of the roof would require flat ceilings throughout the house. He said that they would like to reinvigorate existing vegetation and add a few plants. He said that they would keep the existing buffer of trees and bushes that separates the property from uphill neighbors to insure privacy.

Planning Manager Watrous clarified that this was a substantial remodel and not a complete demolition. However, enough of the house would be removed that it was considered to be new construction for the design review process.

Chair Tollini asked if the Fire District required anything additional turnaround area. Mr. Sadrieh said that he reviewed the proposal with the Fire District and their main concern was providing windows in the continuous brush on the lower side of the building. Mr. Sadrieh stated that that was also one of the reasons they did not propose to heavily landscape that area.

The public hearing was opened.

Shirley Mydland asked about the exterior color of the house, and Mr. Sadrieh explained that it would be a brown tone.

John Kauffman said that he would be probably most impacted by the proposal because his home is directly above the site. He said that right now he looks down at what appears to be two swimming pools because of standing water on the flat roofs. He said that he was not concerned with anything on the other side of the house but he was mostly concerned about noise and did not want a deck full of people right below him. He asked about the location of the deck on the side of the house that would face his house.

Chair Tollini explained that most of the decks would face the open space or the city. Mr. Kauffman asked whether the deck near the chimney would wrap around to face his property.

Ms. Myland said that she lives above and to the west of the project. She said that the owners will have a lovely home and have been very open, and she was delighted to have new neighbors. She was concerned about the trees at the end of the property and requested some commitment that those trees would not be taken down because they provide a sound buffer.

Edna Griffith said that the neighborhood is very careful about trees because they provide privacy in the area. She had no objection to the deck, but she said that she would like some reassurance that the existing trees would remain in place and if a tree were to die in the future she would like a commitment that there would be some sort of screening so that privacy is maintained.

In response to questions of speakers, Mr. Sadrieh said that most of the roof would be slate and the other roof area would be flat and tar and gravel. He stated that there would be no standing water on the flat roof. He said that the owners would do anything needed to maintain the trees and keep them in good health because it was to everyone's benefit to keep screening in place.

Ms. Griffith said that she would like more trees to be planted if the addition requires them. Mr. Sadrieh said that they would add a few trees and are not removing any trees, but if more landscaping becomes necessary due to the construction, they would be glad to add them. Ms. Griffith asked if this was a commitment. Chair Tollini said that this type of discussion could be continued between neighbors.

Chair Tollini asked Mr. Sadrieh to address the public's questions about the deck. Mr. Sadrieh said that the decks face away from uphill neighbors and that if there were no landscaping or trees a portion of the deck would be seen by the uphill neighbors.

Vice-Chair Kricensky noted that the color and materials board listed concrete for the roof materials and not slate. Mr. Sadrieh noted that this was incorrect and that it should be identified as slate.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that this is a difficult site because the access corridor takes up a lot of the buildable area. He said that the lot has excessive setbacks on the sides and the corner toward the neighbors. He understood the need for the decks and said there seemed to be a fairly modest amount of addition to the building. He thought that the neighbors would be pleased with the roof and the architecture would look nicer than the existing building.

Boardmember Chong noted that the project would keep a large portion of the house and he agreed with the Staff analysis of the variance findings.

Boardmember Emberson thanked the neighbors and applicant for being peaceful and cooperative about this application. She agreed that the existing building would be significantly improved by the proposed additions. She said that the variances were necessary due to the difficult situation created by the flag lot.

Boardmember Weller agreed with the other Boardmembers and thought that the proposal was a reasonable and sensitive solution for this site. He felt that the Staff report properly addressed the required variance findings.

Chair Tollini stated that that he was enamored with the location near open space and views. He said that the existing house would be greatly improved by the design of the proposed project. He noted that the house would also be a lot nicer to look at from the open space. He complimented the architect for coming up with a design solution that works well for the neighbors. He agreed that this is a very difficult site and that the large decks were a necessity due to a lack of usable outdoor space. He stated that the existing house dimensions and the location of the site bordering open space help justify the requested variances.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Chong/Kricensky) that the request for 118 Lyford Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and approving the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.

#### **F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #18 OF THE 11/4/10 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Weller/Emberson) to approve the minutes of the November 4, 2010 meeting as written. Vote: 5-0.

#### **G. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.