



**MINUTES #17  
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF OCTOBER 7, 2004**

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

**A. ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Beales, Boardmembers Bird, Figour, O'Donnell and Teiser

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Assistant Planner Krasnove and Minutes Clerk Flanagan

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No one spoke during this time.

Boardmember O'Donnell reported that he was contacted by the attorney of the suit regarding the home at 4 Cazadero Lane, and that he signed a declaration reaffirming what he stated at those meetings. Boardmember Figour stated that he also signed a declaration reaffirming what he stated at those meetings.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the Town is not party to the lawsuit.

**C. STAFF BRIEFING**

Planning Manager Watrous stated Item 8, 561 Silverado Drive, was continued to the November 13, 2004 meeting. He stated that the Town Council had heard the appeal regarding the denial of the project at 100 Lyford Drive, and had granted the appeal. He also noted that the Council discussed a zoning amendment that would require areas that add mass and bulk to a house to be calculated as floor area.

**D. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. 955 OWLSWOOD LANE MANGUS, RESOLUTION RESCINDING APPROVAL**

On June 17, 2004, the Design Review Board reviewed an application for the construction of a new single-family with a variance for reduced side yard setback, on the property located at 955 Owlswood Lane. At that meeting, the Board reviewed the project and considered public testimony. There were several concerns voiced by the Board regarding the potential for an unpermitted secondary dwelling unit on the site and the awkward design of the building, as well as the height of the proposed retaining walls. The

consensus of the Board was that the project should be modified with a more integrated design, where direct access to the bedroom over the garage is shown and the height of the retaining walls is reduced. The project was continued to the August 4 meeting. Applicant requested it be continued to the September 16, 2004 meeting where applicant presented revised plans that eliminated the need for the previously-requested variance, but included a request for floor area exception. The Design Review Board considered the application at that meeting and voted to approve the application. After that meeting, Staff was alerted by a nearby property owner that he did not receive notification that the item was being heard again by the Board. Although it is Town policy to not mail courtesy notices for hearings continued to a specific date, it is clear that the item was not on the agenda for the August 15 meeting to which it was originally continued, and that it should have been re-noticed prior to the September 16 meeting. As a result of this Staff error, the Design Review Board should not have taken action on the application at the last meeting. Staff recommended that this previous action be rescinded, and has prepared a resolution to rescind this approval.

There was no public comment.

**M/S, Beales/ Figour (passed 5-0) to adopt the resolution rescinding the action.**

**E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

**2. 955 OWLSWOOD LANE MANGUS, NEW DWELLING/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION**

On June 17, 2004, the Design Review Board reviewed an application for the construction of a new single-family on the property located at 955 Owlswood Lane. The applicant has revised the project in an attempt to address the issues raised by the Board. The plans have been modified to enclose the entire second story area. As a result, a variance is no longer required for reduced side yard setback, but a floor area exception is now requested.

Dave Wegner, representing the Mangus family, discussed the project and noted that the latest work was done to remove the awkwardness of the design and prevent the potential of a second unit.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the applicant had taken due concern of the Board's recommendation, accommodated all the recommendations, and eliminated the need for a variance, and that the request for the floor area exception was reasonable.

**M/S, Bird/Figour (passed 5-0) to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report.**

### **3. 79 ROUND HILL ROAD OZNOWICZ, NEW DWELLING**

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 79 Round Hill Road. The subject property is currently vacant. This application was first reviewed at the September 16, 2004 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, the applicant presented revised plans that would slightly reduce the height of the proposed house. The neighboring property owner at 75 Round Hill Road raised concerns over the potential view blockage that would be caused by the location of the proposed house. The owner of the neighboring property at 85 Round Hill Road indicated support for the proposed house location and the plan revisions, but raised concerns about the potential view impacts that could occur if the house location were moved uphill to address the view concerns about 75 Round Hill Road. The Design Review Board considered the testimony of the neighbors and determined that the views across the subject property from the home at 75 Round Hill Road were borrowed views across undeveloped land. It was the consensus of the Board that it would be unreasonable to force both the proposed home and any future home to the intervening lot at 77 Round Hill Road to sacrifice a large portion of each lot to protect such a borrowed view. The Board also expressed concerns regarding the submission of the revised plans at such a late date, without adequate time for the Board and the neighbors to review the plans and modified story poles for the project. The application was then continued to the October 7 meeting to allow the applicant to formally submit the revised plans and modify the story poles for the project. The revised plans for the project do not significantly alter the floor plans of the previously-submitted house. Several rooms have been pulled back slightly, and the overall width of the house has been reduced by several feet. The deck off the upper floor living room has also been reduced in size. As a result, the floor area of the house has been reduced from 3,956 square feet to 3,733 square feet. The proposed lot coverage has also decreased from 3,218 square feet (15.0%) to 3,023 square feet (14.1%)

Carl Weissensee, applicant, discussed the changes made since the last meeting. He reduced the area of the master bedroom and moved it back by reducing the entire length of the house and one foot off two sides of the house. He said that the deck had been reduced in size and that the roofline had been lowered and modified. He said that the floor area had been reduced by 220 square feet and the length of the house by two feet.

Charles Sofnas stated that he had been told by the Tiburon Fire Chief to clear the brush more than 30 feet from his house, and submitted a copy of a newspaper article about a fire near his house. He denied Mr. Doyle's claim that his view had improved since the eucalyptus trees were removed. Mr. Sofnas presented a copy of a real estate ad marketing his house in 2000 that included the language, "with water views." He stated that his slot view is as important as Mr. Doyle's panoramic view, and distributed a photograph taken from the Doyles' house that showed the story poles. He said that the applicant had stated that the house could be moved uphill to minimize Mr. Sofnas' view but the applicant has chosen not to do so. He discussed the language within the Town's approval of the lot line adjustment covering the subject lot stating that there were expectations that his view blockage would be minimized. He disputed the concept that

his view was a borrowed view. He proposed that the house be moved slightly up the hill to protect his view.

Debra Despues stated that she had discussed the project with the applicant, and he stated that the project would not impact her water view, excluding the two-foot chimney. She said that she did not object to the project as long as the house is built according to the submitted plans. She noted that moving the house uphill could affect her water views.

Mr. Weissensee stated that moving the house uphill per Mr. Sofnas' suggestion probably would not impact Ms. Despues' view.

Frank Doyle stated that he will have three houses sitting in his view, including homes on two other vacant lots. He said that the lot lines were modified to meet the request of Mr. Sofnas, and that the location of the subject house made sense given the resulting shape of the lot. He said that he had witnessed Mr. Sofnas cutting branches from trees that were not on his property two years ago to claim the view. Mr. Doyle said that he had designed his house for the existing view and does not want this house to be pushed into his view. He said that a person cannot claim a view two lots away from his house.

Brian Forehan stated that it sounded like Mr. Sofnas was being generous in agreeing to have only one-half his view. He said that moving the home up the hill sounded like an appropriate solution to save the view.

Mr. Sofnas stated that Mr. Doyle has an objective of protecting his view and never seeing the houses. He again stated that he had received direction from the fire department to clear additional brush near his house that was more than 30 feet away. Chair Beales stated that the fire department only requires clearing brush within 30 feet, and does not require someone to clear brush on another person's property. Mr. Sofnas asked the Board to enforce the language within the lot line adjustment to protect his view.

Mr. Weissensee stated that the video shows Mr. Sofnas cutting Mr. Weissensee's trees, and that the cut brush was shoved under trees that were not in Mr. Sofnas' view, which increased the fire hazard on the site. He said that the trees are 150 feet away from Mr. Sofnas' house. He said that he had never received any request to cut the brush, and had checked with the fire department, which had no record of any such request. He said that Mr. Doyle will see three homes and a driveway in front of his house, and will not be unaffected.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the design did not seem to take Mr. Sofnas' view into consideration as recommended by the lot line adjustment. Mr. Weissensee responded that historical consideration had been given to the views in the future development of 77 Round Hill Road, and included a view under the trees that was still respected. He felt that Mr. Sofnas' view is stolen, not borrowed. He said that the current design would leave Mr. Sofnas with the same view he was satisfied with in 1982, during the review of a previous application for this property.

Boardmember Figour asked if it is possible to pull the house up the hill and utilize the play area as the driveway space, with the play area and yard space going to the bottom of the lot. Mr. Weissensee responded that the current design is appropriate because it creates some push and pull in the entire plan. He said that moving the house uphill would make it more visible for the entire town. He said that the house was already dug in with a low profile. By going up the hill, he could not dig in and the house would get taller.

Chair Beales asked if a one-story design would be considered and added that lot coverage variances are sometimes approved when alternatives are unacceptable. Mr. Weissensee responded that in 1982 this house location was perfectly satisfactory to Mr. Sofnas. He said that by cutting the trees, Mr. Sofnas eliminated the barrier between 77 and 79 Round Hill Road, which could not be seen in 1982 when the trees were whole.

Boardmember Figour asked if a good faith effort could be made to give something to Mr. Sofnas. Mr. Weissensee responded that he did make a good faith effort by pulling back the house location for 77 Round Hill Road.

Boardmember Figour stated this is a difficult issue. He said that the Board must rely on the language included in the lot line adjustment. He said that protecting the view from 75 Round Hill Road would tear the heart out of the site, which would not allow an appropriate structure on the lot. He felt that there had been enough thought put into minimizing the view impact from the Sofnas' and Doyles' houses. He said that the house could be pulled uphill a little bit, which would not open the view tremendously for Mr. Sofnas,. He said that the Board should solve this issue at this level.

Boardmember Teiser stated he concurs with Chair Beales. He said that he would like to hear discussion about allowing exceptions and variances to accommodate the situation.

Boardmember Bird noted that there are many conflicting points of view on this issue. She still felt that no matter how Mr. Sofnas' view got there, it is a view across another lot. She said that the applicant had done a lot to modify the design and was building in the widest part of the lot, which was appropriate. She supported the project as designed.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that Mr. Sofnas should not be penalized or rewarded for cutting the trees and creating a view. He acknowledged that the Doyles have made concessions with this and the future houses. He felt that the trees are a non-issue. He said that the Board has to deal with how structures fit on the land and compliance with the Hillside Guidelines. He said that the proposed house location fits within the building envelope. He stated that Mr. Sofnas has a borrowed view, and that pushing the house up the hill would severely impact the Doyles' view. He said that the project should stay as proposed.

Chair Beales stated that Mr. Sofnas clearly has a borrowed view. He noted that the Hillside Guidelines are written to protect downhill views, and this is a lateral view across another property. He said that Mr. Sofnas cannot tell someone not to build there. He noted that the lot line adjustment stated that this project should "reasonably minimize

view blockage,” and that that phrase can be interpreted differently. He said that the applicant has modified the edge of the house to open up the view a little bit for Mr. Sofnas. He said that moving the house up the hill would create view problems for the Doyles. He said that he supports the project as is.

**M/S, O’Donnell/Bird (passed 4-1, Teiser dissented), to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report.**

**F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**

**4. LYFORD DRIVE/TIBURON BOULEVARD TOWN OF TIBURON, TREE PERMIT**

On August 25, 2004 an application for a tree permit was filed for the removal of two Italian Stone pine trees on the Lyford Drive public street right-of-way adjacent to Reed Elementary School. Staff mailed the notice of this application as required by the Tiburon Tree Ordinance. Due to the number of objections received, the application has been referred to the Design Review Board for review.

Chris Carter, Superintendent of the Reed Union School District (RUSD) discussed the project. She stated that the project was originally designed to keep the pine trees, but a MMWD water line caused the roots to be cut and the roots of the trees have buckled the street. She said that she would not ask that the trees be removed unless there was the potential of a disaster occurring. She said that the two trees would be replaced and distributed a draft plan for replacement trees.

Planning Manager Watrous noted the school has worked very cooperatively with the Town on this project. He said that the Town had hired Moritz Arboricultural Consulting to conduct a second review of the trees, and the report echoed the concerns of the first arborist report. He said that the report recommended appropriate replacement tree species, and added that the Design Review Board has the authority to approve replacement trees as part of this permit.

Ray Moritz, Moritz Arboricultural Consulting, answered questions from the Board about causes of death for pine trees. He said that the trees have been damaged by many sources, and that the hazard level is high, particularly given the location of the trees at the school. He said that although the root system is somewhat regenerative, his concern is anchoring the trees. He said that the stone pine trees around the corner have some bad branch attachments that could be addressed through pruning, but do not present the same hazard as the subject trees.

Boardmember Bird noted that utilities may be undergrounded in this area, which could create another concern for these trees. Boardmember Teiser added that the branches that hang over Lyford Drive also are a concern, irrespective of the damage to the roots.

Brian Lantier, representing the Marinero Homeowners Association, stated even though many asked that the trees not be cut, Mr. Moritz's report indicates that that would be postponing the inevitable. He acknowledged that the trees have been damaged, and he said that those who damaged roots may not have obtained the necessary permits. He said that the Town can require more pleasing replacement trees. He asked that this item be continued to determine why permits were not obtained. He suggested that myoporum or mature trees be used as replacements.

Harriet Smith said that a year ago Ms. Carter stated that the project design would be changed if the trees would be damaged. She asked if the two arborists actually witnessed the damage to the tree roots. She said that the death of the trees would be a great loss of beauty to the community.

Gail Geiger stated that it is a given that the trees must be removed. She said that the neighbors would like to know if the replacement trees would be a barrier for the all-night lighting in and around the school, which is very invasive. She said that low bushes would not help the immediate neighbors.

Norma Tortoritis stated that there had been no care taken by the contractor to save the roots and trees. She asked why the contractor was not properly supervised. She said that the school district should be responsible for saving the trees or replacing them with very good trees.

Jane Jacobs stated that it is evident that the trees will have to be removed and thought should be given to the usefulness of trees as sound barriers from Lyford Drive and Tiburon Boulevard. She asked if anything could be done to brace the trees and observe them to ensure that the trees are not a safety hazard.

Boardmember Figour asked if she saw a big difference in sound and noise when the trees were cut down along Tiburon Boulevard. Ms. Jacobs responded that she had noticed a big difference.

George Landau stated that it pained him to hear that the tree roots are affecting the traffic signals because the signals create safety. He said that he knows from personal experience that there is no RUSD cabal of any kind, and he had no knowledge that Ms. Carter had meant to deceive the public. He thought that it would be helpful if the community had more information on the replacement trees so the public could comment and ensure that mistakes are not repeated.

Danica Weber stated this situation sends a bad message, and if the trees have to be cut down, something should be done to ensure this does not happen again.

Boardmember Teiser stated it appears that even if the trees had not been damaged, there would still be a problem with the branches going over the street and the damage to the traffic signals. He said that trying to save the trees would not solve these problems. He stated that residents pay school taxes and thereby would have to pay for any remedial

actions. He felt that there was some culpability with the contractors and he expected that the school district would try to get relief if the contractors did not follow correct procedures during construction. He said that there should be a public hearing after the permit is granted to remove trees, to more thoroughly review a replacement planting plan.

Boardmember Bird stated that there is a lot of angst among the people who love the trees and felt it did not have to happen this way and that the school did not handle the project as promised. She said that the trees create a hazardous situation in a highly trafficked area. She said that this is not really a battle over whether to take the trees down. She said that the trees need to be replaced in a very specific manner.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the Design Review Board can specify types and sizes of replacement trees and can require any size and any amount.

Boardmember O'Donnell said that this was a sad event, and that nobody wanted to see the trees go, but there is no choice but to take down the trees. He said that he would approve the permit, then the community should have the chance to review replacement trees at a hearing, and the school should take input from everyone and plant accordingly.

Boardmember Figour stated there should be a comprehensive landscaping scheme, and he would like to see an overall plan for trees on the site. He felt that the RUSD appears to be bent on cutting down trees. He acknowledged the safety issue, but felt that the school district was playing the "kids' being hurt" card.

Chair Beales noted the Town has limited ability to oversee what is done by the school. He said that it was obvious that the trees must be removed. He said that he would like to hear about what size trees could be planted in this area.

Mr. Moritz responded a school site needs child-proof, drought-resistant trees with fibrous roots systems that do not impact infrastructure. He said that larger box trees could be installed because there is good access all around the planting area, and that 48-inch box trees would be quite feasible. As an example, he said that pittosporum would start at a twelve-foot height. He suggested that no more than three 48-inch box trees be planted in this area.

Boardmember Teiser stated that it was inappropriate for the Board to pick the tree species. He suggested that the school district be asked to return with a replacement plan, based upon the arborist's choices, and that a public hearing be held to take comments on the plan.

**M/S, Teiser/Bird (passed 5-0) to approve the tree permit, with a condition of approval requiring the school district to return with a more detailed replacement plan to include species and sizes, to be reviewed by the Design Review Board.**

## **5. 18 PLACE MOULIN ALM, DECKS**

The applicant is requesting design review approval for the construction of two private deck areas and associated landscaping improvements on property located at 18 Place Moulin. The property is developed with a single-family dwelling. This application was initially submitted for Staff-level design review and originally included a request to construct a retaining wall to create a level lawn area and to add a deck to the rear of the house. Concerns were raised by several adjacent property owners regarding the proposed project. As a result, the application was referred to the Design Review Board for review.

Cliff Alm, owner, discussed the project and changes that had been made since the application was first submitted.

Boardmember Figour asked about the height from the deck to the top of the wall. Mr. Alm responded that it would be seven feet from the surface of the deck to the top of the wall for the upper deck, and between 9 and 11 feet for the lower deck. He said that the only views of the wall from the house at 16 Place Moulin would be from a small side-facing window. He said that increasing the setback from the decks to the side property line to three or four feet would be acceptable.

Boardmember O'Donnell asked what would happen if the neighbors put trees on their side of the wall to protect that view. Mr. Alm responded that he has views to the east that could be affected. He said that one tree currently affects this view, and he said that it was essential that the tree be trimmed. He said that trees that were not properly situated would affect his view.

Boardmember O'Donnell noted that one tree could be located to create privacy for both parties. Mr. Alm responded that one bush or tree by the small window would not obstruct his view and would screen the neighbor's view, but that trees below the neighboring house would block his view.

Chair Beales noted the new decks will not create a privacy issue because of the height of the wall. Planning Manager Watrous noted that although the level of the deck would be below the level of the wall, the view from the upper window is from above and down, which could make portions of the deck visible, but from further away.

David Moyne stated that when he purchased the property he was not aware of the entitlements which Mr. Alm now claims. He asked that additional story poles be installed that would reflect the horizontal plane on the furthest point of the decks as well as poles that would indicate a person standing on the decks. He said that he would like to know what trees would be removed, and was concerned that the decks would kill the undergrowth in this area, leaving the slope more susceptible to slides. Regarding the setback from the wall, he said that he may have to maintain the wall, and would need enough room for scaffolding to be set up safely.

Mr. Alm stated that not all of the trees in the area of the decks would be removed, and that no permit is required to remove these trees. He reiterated that Mr. Moyne can plant a tree to provide privacy. He said that his neighbor cannot place scaffolding on his property, and that he will maintain his side of the wall. He said that when the Moynes purchased the property, Ms. Alms told them of his intention to build the decks.

Boardmember Bird stated that there is a long history to this project, and that the intent to develop this has always been there. She stated that the applicant has done a lot to alter the plans to address the neighbors' privacy. She said that she was happy to see the walls changed to decks. She said that she visited the Moynes' house, and only one window of their house looks toward that side. She said that the project had been pushed back. She noted that the trees on this site had been planted by the Alms for their own benefit, and that it was the responsibility for the neighbors to provide for their own privacy. She said that she was satisfied that a person standing on the deck would not be seen by the neighbors. She recommended moving the deck back three to four feet from the side property line

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that he visited both sites, and that the privacy impacts were not that significant. He said that he would support a short continuance to allow the neighbors to make more calculations on the decks, but not for more story poles.

Boardmember Teiser stated that there has been adequate reworking of the plan. He said that he visited both sites and he is satisfied that this is a reasonable solution. He said that hopefully most of the trees would be kept, but acknowledged that the applicants were not obligated to keep the trees. He said that the neighbors can plant privacy vegetation themselves. He said that he could approve the project with a three- to four-foot setback from the property line.

Boardmember Figour stated that he visited both sites, and estimated that 80 to 90 percent of the time, there will be no one on the decks. He said that we live in the suburbs where houses are close together and sometimes you see your neighbors. He said that privacy is a two-way street. He felt that the impact of the decks would not warrant stopping use of this portion of the property. He recommended a minimum seven foot distance between the top of the decks and the top of the adjacent walls, and a four-foot setback from the property line.

Chair Beales stated that the pulled back location and the elevation difference between the deck and the top of the wall suggests that there would be no privacy impacts. He said that a portion of the deck would be seen, but seeing a house from one's home is not a problem. He saw no need for a continuance.

**M/S, Figour/Bird (passed 5-0), to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report; with the additional condition of approval that the finished floor of decks have a minimum of seven feet to the top of the wall and the decks to be set four feet from the property line wall.**

## 6. 34 NOCHE VISTA LANE FERGUSON, ADDITION/VARIANCE

The applicant is requesting design review approval to construct an addition and make exterior alterations to an existing single-family dwelling located at 34 Noche Vista Lane. The property is essentially land locked and is accessed via a private roadway easement. The site slopes down from the entrance to the site (north side) to the south side of the property. The existing residence is a three-level structure with the garage and primary living areas on the upper level, secondary living areas and master suite on the middle level, and additional bedrooms on the lower level. A site plan and architectural review application for an addition of 693 square feet with a variance for a reduced rear yard setback (21 feet in lieu of the required 25 feet) was approved on April 1, 2004 for the subject property. The permit granted approval for a new garage to extend four feet into the rear yard at the northwest corner; therefore a variance is requested for reduced rear yard setback.

Michael Heckmann, architect, discussed the project.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember Bird stated this is a reasonable addition. She said that much of the house is below grade and is very hidden. She said that this is nicely done, and she supported the project.

**M/S, O'Donnell/Teiser (passed 5-0) to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report.**

## 7. 145 PORTO MARINO SHAW, ADDITION/VARIANCE

Boardmember Figour recused himself from this item.

The applicant is requesting design review approval to construct additions to an existing single-family dwelling located at 145 Porto Marino. A new master suite and two new bedrooms would be added on the main level to the rear of the existing house. The entryway would be renovated and extended toward the rear of the residence on the main level and the existing kitchen would be extended toward the rear of the residence on the upper level. The applicant submitted a previous design review application for a master bedroom and bathroom addition that was approved on June 21, 2001. The applicant never constructed the previously-approved addition and has now submitted a new design for the additions to the existing residence. A variance is requested for reduced rear yard setback.

David Holscher, architect, discussed the project.

Don Joseph stated that there was a major slide on this site in 1998 that went into the area of the proposed extension, and wanted to be sure that the geotechnical issues are

addressed for this addition. He hoped that there would be plantings to screen the home from his property.

Mr. Holscher noted that a structural engineer had been hired to evaluate the project.

Boardmember Teiser stated that engineering issues are not under the purview of the Board. He said that the design is appropriate, and he was glad that the applicant is aware of the geotechnical issues.

Boardmember O'Donnell stated that this is a lovely design and will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. He said that he was sure that privacy planting can be done to respond to Mr. Joseph's concern.

Boardmember Bird stated that this was a nice addition and a great project. She said that she was glad that the geotechnical issues would be addressed.

**M/S, O'Donnell/Bird (passed 4-0-1, Figour recused) to determine that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report.**

Boardmember Figour returned to the meeting.

**8. 561 SILVERADO DRIVE MCCULLOUGH, MINOR ALTERATION:  
CONTINUED TO 11/4/04**

**F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #16 OF THE 09/16/04 DESIGN REVIEW  
BOARD MEETING**

Changes include:

Page 2, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph, to read, "...exterior, and could support..."

Page 6, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line, delete "while."

Page 6, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph, 1<sup>st</sup> line to state, "...Anderson, in approving the lot line adjustment, to encourage..."

Page 7, change "slop" to "slope."

**M/S, Teiser/Bird (passed 5-0) to approve the minutes as amended.**

**G. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.