

ACTION MINUTES #8

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, MAY 3, 2007
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

A. ROLL CALL: Present: Chair Doyle, Boardmembers Corcoran, Frymier, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Assistant Planner Phillips and Minutes Clerk Harper

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)

C. STAFF BRIEFING

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

1. 1893 Centro West Harb New Dwelling/Variance/Floor Area Exception
CONTINUED TO 5/17/07
2. 9 Burrell Court Hariri Additions/Variations **CONTINUED TO 7/19/07**
3. 16 Southridge East Ehsan Additions/Variations **APPROVED**
4. 180 Solano Street Halawa New Dwelling/Variance/Floor Area Exception **APPROVED**

E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

5. 16 Turtle Rock Court Block Addition **APPROVED**
6. 2309 Spanish Trail Stafford Addition/Variations **CONTINUED TO 6/7/07**
7. 673 Hawthorne Drive Young Addition/Variations **CONTINUED TO 6/7/07**
8. 2 Warren's Way Roberts Addition/Variations **CONTINUED TO 6/7/07**

F. MINUTES OF THE 4/19/07 D.R.B. MEETING - APPROVED AS AMENDED

G. ADJOURNMENT - 9:45 PM

**APPROVED MINUTES #8
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF MAY 3, 2007**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Doyle, Vice-Chair Frymier, Boardmembers Corcoran, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Assistant Planner Phillips and Minutes Clerk Harper

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the item for 1893 Centro West Street was continued to the May 17, 2007 meeting; 9 Burrell Court was continued to July 19, 2007; and 2 Warren's Way was continued to July 7, 2007 meeting . He formally introduced Lisa Harper, the Town's new Minutes Secretary.

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

- 1. 1893 CENTRO WEST HARB NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION (CONTINUED TO 5/17/07)**
- 2. 9 BURRELL COURT HARIRI ADDITIONS/VARIANCES (CONTINUED TO 7/19/07)**
- 3. 16 SOUTHRIDGE EAST EHSAN ADDITIONS/VARIANCES**

Boardmember Corcoran recused himself from this item.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling located at 16 Southridge East. The addition would include a lower level guest suite, expansion to the main level bedroom and entryway, a new upper level master suite, and improvements to the terrace on the lower and main level. Variances are requested for reduced side and rear yard setbacks and excess lot coverage.

This application was first reviewed at the April 5, 2007 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, the neighboring property owner adjacent to the subject home at 18 Southridge East raised concerns regarding potential view impacts that would be caused by the proposed addition above the main level. The Board reviewed the proposal, but continued the project as the Boardmembers believed that it would be possible to redesign the upper level addition to decrease the potential view impacts.

David Ehsan, Owner/Applicant, said he had previously presented the project to the Board on April 5, 2007 and the original proposal was continued to consider alternatives to minimize potential view impacts to their neighbors at 18 Southridge East. He said that since then, they have revised the project and reviewed the plans with Mr. Thompson, who now supports the project. He described plan modifications which would move the study directly over the garage and move the master bedroom back which opens up the views significantly. He said the current concept is more expensive for them to build, but in the spirit of compromise, they are willing to accept the reduced concept to keep their neighbors happy.

Boardmember Teiser confirmed with Mr. Ehsan that the area exiting to the terrace in the lower bedroom would be leveled and flat.

Boardmember Glassner referred to the land facing the Marotta's property and asked if there were still

outstanding issues regarding drainage and landscaping. Mr. Ehsan said it was still his intent to meet with their designer to improve the area and said the Marotta's main objection was subtle; they were unhappy about the way the deck looks and was situated. He agreed to change the deck to make it more aesthetically pleasing and more functional for them, said there is dense vegetation and they will build a tree fence all the way across the area, and Mr. Thompson would assist them in working with all neighbors to accomplish improvements.

Public Comments:

Andrew Thompson, next door neighbor, said he approves of the new design and very much appreciates what Dr. Ehsan has done in addressing their concerns. He visited the Marotta's house to view the impacts from their patio and hot tub area, felt the issue could be dealt with by adding fencing strategies that would create hedges which would eventually replace trees, and he agreed to help facilitate the matter.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner commended Dr. Ehsan and his family for working with the neighbors and working through multiple redesigns of the property.

Vice-Chair Frymier echoed Member Glassner's comments and supported approval. She especially liked preserving the views from the children's bedrooms and felt Dr. Ehsan had gone above and beyond in working with neighbors.

Boardmember Teiser commended the Ehsans and their architect for accommodating their neighbors. He said there was a discussion of putting screening, shrubbery or trees along the fence line, and wondered whether the landscaping should be added as a condition, as the applicant was amenable to the condition.

Chair Doyle agreed with all comments, liked the new design and supported the project with the added condition.

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) that the Board determines that the project is categorically exempt from the provisions of CEQA, and that the project be approved with the recommended conditions, with the additional condition of approval requiring that screening shrubbery or trees be planted along the rear property line, to be reviewed by staff. Vote: 4-0-1 (Corcoran recused).

Boardmember Corcoran returned to the meeting.

4. 180 SOLANO STREET HALAWA NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new single-family dwelling on property located at 180 Solano Street. A variance for excess lot coverage and a floor area exception are requested as part of this project. The application was first reviewed at the April 5, 2007 Design Review Board meeting. At that time, several neighboring property owners raised concerns about the project, including potential view impacts, effects on limited on-street parking on Solano Street, and possible visual and privacy impacts on the downhill neighbor at 172 Solano Street. Several neighbors also requested that mature trees on

the site be trimmed or removed to better evaluate the extent of the story poles for the proposed house.

The Design Review Board generally found the design of the proposed house to be acceptable, but recommended that the roofline be lowered. The Board also encouraged the applicant to trim some of the mature trees on the site to address the neighbors' concerns. The application was continued to the May 3 meeting to allow the applicant to address these issues. The applicant has now submitted revised plans for the project.

Patrick Lapelche, Architect, said at the last meeting there was a request to modify the design such that the roofline would be diminished in height anywhere from 12-18 inches. He said that they lowered the plate height by 6 inches and modified the roof pitch from a 5:12 to a 4:12 pitch. The result was that the ridgeline that goes over the family room, kitchen and dining room was reduced by 14 inches and the ridgeline over the living room and entry was reduced by 18 inches.

He said the owner was proposing to remove the very tall Pine tree on the property line and an Acacia tree, which was fairly invasive and choking the other trees. In addition, the applicant proposes to reduce the height of the existing trees so the uphill neighbor would be less affected. However, Mr. Lapelche stated that the owner would like to keep the remainder of the trees on the site rather than categorically removing all of them.

Boardmember Glassner questioned whether or not the owner would agree to a condition to have the trees topped no more than 15 to 20 feet, and Mr. Lapelche said it was the owner's intent to lower the trees in such a way that it does not hurt the tree to ensure it could still grow and said he was amenable to the added condition.

Boardmember Teiser said the Board had previously requested that the trees be trimmed prior to this hearing so neighbors could observe the changes or the roof height of the new construction and story poles and he questioned why this had not been done. Mr. Lapelche said he and the owner did not understand the request to be a directive but more a suggestion.

Public Comments:

Masa Murata said that he consented to the project revisions but felt the horizontal stretch of the roof still blocked his view. When he talked to the owner, he said the applicant had lowered the roof 18 inches and the lowered other side down 14 inches and suggested that an additional 4 inches be made to lower the southern ridgeline roof.

Boardmember Corcoran said he visited Mr. Murata's home before the last hearing. He confirmed with Mr. Murata that his water view from the living room would be impacted and asked if the additional 4 inches might serve as a compromise and resolution to the problem. Mr. Murata responded that the trees had also not been cut down. He said the east side had grown substantially and he asked the Board to consider denying the floor area exception to further address the horizontal stretch of the roof.

Milton Diaz said prior to this meeting he had not seen any plans for the project and he felt it was difficult to respond. He said that although he lives down the street, he can see the story poles from his house and there appears to be a massive roofline through the trees. He felt the project had a massive feel to it and asked that the trees be trimmed down for neighbors to truly assess what was being proposed.

Delores Davis, said her neighbor, Diane Lynch, who could not attend the meeting had spoken to her about the many parking issues on Solano Street. She described the parking situation along this street, stating that, construction trucks working on the neighborhood above them park on Solano all day long and she asked that the Town also address this issue if the project were approved. She said when she built her home three years ago, they had to adhere to significant redesign requests and conditions. She felt it was unfair for them to be asked to comment on the project when the story poles were not revised and the trees were not removed. In addition, the project includes lights which had been previously denied for her application, and she asked that the Board require downlighting.

Mr. Lapelche said both the ribbons and the story poles were lowered, they had previously addressed the parking issue at length at the previous meeting and he felt putting in parking on the uphill side would create problems and would affect views and accessibility. He noted there was currently a double-wide curb cut for the existing house which was being moved downhill, and it was the Public Works Department's decision as to how far they would carry the red curb down the street, which he also felt would leave only one less space on the street. He said he did feel strongly that the parking did work well, and agreed to change the lighting.

Boardmember Glassner asked if the owner would agree to excavate down an additional 4 inches. Mr. Lapelche felt it was something they could consider and agree to, he was concerned that if the project was continued to redesign the house, someone could attend next month's meeting and request further height reduction.

Boardmember Corcoran questioned how far back the architect would need to pull the wall back on the southern edge facing the Bay in order to create the equivalent of a 4 inch drop. Mr. Lapelche felt this would be a geometrical question and most likely would need to come back very far horizontally to achieve the 4 inch height reduction, adding that the view corridor has a very shallow pitch.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner felt the owner did a lot of work trying to achieve as much parity with neighbors as he possibly could and noted parking issues had been discussed at length. He said that the parking situation was as good as it was going to get, and noted that the owner has agreed to trim the trees back and lower the roofline 4 inches.

Boardmember Teiser felt the owner should have trimmed the trees back so that neighbors could view the project. He suggested a continuance and felt the issue regarding contractor parking was something the Town needed to address. He agreed with Mr. Murata's request, noting that the architect's agreement that the southern ridgeline of the roof be lowered.

Planning Manager Watrous said the Board has rarely, if ever, required trees to be removed or trimmed prior to approval of a project; it is more of an educated guesswork of what story poles look like through a tree and it must be very dense vegetation for the Board to do this. He also said the Town discourages removal of the trees, as this would require a separate tree permit approval prior to the Board's action.

Boardmember Corcoran felt the proposal by the architect to remove or trim trees sounded reasonable, as was

the garage location. He believed the root of the problem was the floor area and excess lot coverage; that if the owner at least stays within the amount that is allotted according to the zoning, then there would not be as much of a view encroachment. He noted the property was a corner lot and typically there was more of a setback on street frontages. He felt that the house would be very close to the street on the side which also represented some of the massing issues the neighbors were concerned about. He thought that if some of the floor area issues were addressed it would also help with some of the view issues.

Vice-Chair Frymier said she did not have a floor area or excess lot coverage argument last time, but her concern was that the Board had specifically encouraged the applicant to trim some of the trees on site to address neighbor's concerns and that the applicant had ignored that suggestion. She noted that the neighbors were concerned about the trees, and she said that the trees have grown substantially over the last two years. She said she would prefer a continuance, and felt that lowering the project 4 inches was a good idea, but was annoyed by the fact that neighbors could not see what was proposed.

Boardmember Doyle said he did not have that many issues at the last meeting and said if the architect could lower the house or reduce the roof height it would get him over his biggest hurdle. He said that the neighbors' main concern at the last meeting was that the roof was too high. However, he did not think it was reasonable to ask someone to start cutting down trees and then determine what a house would look like. He said that he would rather look at trees than having them decimated and then be asked to start lowering the roofline. He noted that the architect already lowered the roof 18 inches in one spot and 14 inches in another spot and now was being asked to reduce it another 4 inches. He felt there would be significant grading costs and the owner was already being asked to do a lot. He also confirmed the amount of area for the variance for lot coverage and the floor area exception were relatively small, particularly when spread over the entire lot. He noted that when much of the floor area is buried or hidden, the Board typically feels it does not contribute to the bulk of the house. He felt the owner had done a lot, and that cutting 2-3 trees after the project was approved and then also trimming trees would be helpful. He said that he could support the project simply with the 4 inch additional height reduction.

Boardmember Corcoran said he would support the project as is without the 4 inch drop if it was within the floor area ratio and lot coverage, but agreed that the owner had continually reduced the height and this request could continue to go on and on.

Boardmember Glassner agreed that continuing the project to trim trees could result in continual requests for change by neighbors. He felt the owners have made significant changes, have addressed what has been asked and felt if continued, the project would simply continue on and on.

Boardmember Teiser supported Boardmember Glassner's comments, felt the Board liked the design and said the Board approves lot coverage and setback variances when homes are kept low without building up. However, he was still bothered that the owners did not work well with neighbors and the neighbors were asking that the trees simply be trimmed down and recommended the item be continued. Vice-Chair Frymier agreed.

Boardmember Teiser questioned the amount of trimming needed, and Planning Manager Watrous said the Board could indicate a volume percentage, but typically staff would not recommend a condition of approval where trees are simply to be trimmed in conformance with the View Ordinance. He felt another other issue

was determining how much trimming would be needed to be able to see the story poles. He noted that although it was important for neighbors to see the story poles, the most important thing was that the Board feels that it has enough information to make its decision.

Vice-Chair Frymier said that she wanted to approve the project but felt the trees still needed to be trimmed, as there was no accurate picture of what neighbors will see.

Chair Doyle said the Board could consider a motion of continuance for some trees to be trimmed, but felt the neighbors could then return and say they do not like the resulting view of the house.

In response to a question from Boardmember Glassner, Planning Manager Watrous suggested the Board consider one of three different motions: 1) to continue the application with direction that the application trim the trees no more than 1/3 to see the story poles more clearly; 2) to continue the application and request a tree permit be obtained to either remove some of the trees and/or trim them further; or 3) to approve the project with the conditions that the Pine and Acacia trees be removed and the trimming be performed as recommended by the applicant, and a 4 inch height reduction.

Boardmember Teiser said he had visited the neighbors' homes and had enough information to make a decision on the project. He felt that the roof height was satisfactory with the additional condition to lower the roofline and addition of 4 inches.

ACTION: It was M/S (Glassner/Teiser) 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 following additional conditions of approval: that the Pine and Acacia tree be removed; that other trees on the site be trimmed a minimum of 30%; the roof of the southern ridgeline further be lowered or that excavation take place to lower the southern ridgeline 4 inches. Vote: 3-2 (Frymier and Corcoran voted no).

Boardmember Glassner said he wanted to go on record as saying he encouraged applicants to listen clearly to what neighbors request to avoid this process in the future.

E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

5. 16 TURTLE ROCK COURT BLOCK ADDITION/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

Boardmember Glassner recused himself from this item.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling located at 16 Turtle Rock Court. The addition would include a new game room where a deck currently exists and a new deck adjacent to the proposed game room. The addition would also include six skylights.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, clarified that the applicant was not requesting a floor area exception or variance on the project, which includes a new game room where the deck currently exists and a new deck adjacent to the proposed game room. He said that the addition would present very little visible mass, and the colors and

materials would match the existing home.

Vice-Chair Frymier said when she met with the Mr. Sadrieh on Tuesday, it was indicated that the story poles were incorrect. Mr. Sadrieh said the story poles correctly represent the plans and after having seen the location of them, the owner was considering making the deck a little shorter, but this decision had not yet been made.

Boardmember Corcoran voiced concern about the excessiveness of 6 skylights on the roof for a 900 square foot addition; although he acknowledged there were no homes behind the property, he noted the Board has tried to limit the number of skylights in the past. Mr. Sadrieh said the reason for the skylights was to capture more of the sky and the hillside. Planning Manager Watrous added that there will never be any homes uphill because the area was designated as open space and noted that a standard condition of approval recently added to the Municipal Code requires skylights to be tinted.

There was no public comment.

Boardmember Teiser supported the design. Boardmember Corcoran agreed the light from the skylights would not affect people. Vice-Chair Frymier supported the request, given the size of the house and its surrounding area. Chair Doyle stated that the skylights essentially take the place of clerestory windows.

ACTION: It was M/S (Frymier/Corcoran) to determine that the project is exempt from the provisions of CEQA and approve the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report. Vote: 4-0-1 (Glassner recused).

Boardmember Glassner returned to the meeting.

6. 2309 SPANISH TRAIL STAFFORD ADDITION/VARIANCES

Vice-Chair Frymier recused herself from this item.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 2309 Spanish Trail. A new living room, master bedroom suite and study would be added to the upper floor of the house. The lower floor of the addition would include a two-car garage and storage area. An existing detached garage on the site would be demolished. Variances are requested for excess lot coverage and reduced front and side yard setbacks.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, said the only place the addition could be located was uphill of the existing home, as all lower area additions would impact views. He said that the owner has met with uphill neighbors at 2331 Spanish Trail who welcome the addition as well as the removal of trees which will enhance their views. He said the owner wishes to clad the entire home in shingles and change window patterns at a later date when financially feasible; however, he agreed that it was also possible for the same architectural style to be maintained. He said that the variances are needed because the lot gets narrower in the uphill portion.

Mr. Sadrieh stated that a few days ago they were also informed that the open exterior space under the upper level addition would count as floor area. As a result of this new development, it appears no decision would be able to be made tonight, but requested feedback from the Board tonight on the proposal.

Planning Manager Watrous said the issue of the additional floor area came to staff's attention several days ago, noting that this is a result of the recent change to the Town's floor area definition. He noted the area was approximately 300 square feet and the proposal is currently 9 square feet under the floor area ratio. He said that no notice was given regarding the floor area exception and staff proposes the application be continued to allow for noticing requirements, although the Board could discuss the project's general design.

Public Comments:

Lowell McKegey said his mother owns the property to the west of the proposal and he wanted to go on record to ensure that landscaping remains intact along the west property line, as their home was located toward the southwest corner. He pointed out a tree grove along the property line and said that he did not want trees removed in order to maintain the visual barrier.

Mr. Sadrieh said the owner would agree to provide a temporary fence outside the building envelope to protect the trees.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner suggested landscape drawings be provided, as well as modified elevations to show the exterior design of the home and addition.

Boardmember Teiser said that it would be odd to have shingles for the addition and stucco for the existing house. He recommended better architectural integration of the new and old house, possibly tying the slope of the existing roof to that of the addition. He also wanted the entire house to be shingled and not postpone the shingling to the existing structure.

Ron Stafford, owner, felt the design would obviously need to be changed if the variance for the floor area was not approved. He described the existing architectural style of the house and said it was originally designed by an architect who designed ski cabins. He said he met with neighbors and distributed an alternate version of the addition to the Board, and felt that tying in the roofline with the cantilevered deck would assist in its unification.

Chair Doyle suggested the roofline and design be better integrated. Boardmember Glassner agreed and recommended more detail for the trim elements. Boardmember Corcoran said he liked the alternate design originally presented to the neighbors, but felt he would be less inclined to support a project that had a floor area issue as well as inconsistent exterior materials. Boardmember Teiser agreed, echoed Boardmember Corcoran's comments and asked for integration of the roofline.

| |
|--|
| <p>ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Glassner) to continue the application to the June 7, 2007 meeting. Vote: 4-0-1 (Frymier recused).</p> |
|--|

Vice-Chair Frymier returned to the meeting.

7. 673 HAWTHORNE DRIVE YOUNG ADDITION/VARIANCES

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling located at 673 Hawthorne Drive. The addition would include a new lower level bedroom and family room and a new den, entry foyer and deck on the existing upper level. Also included in the proposal is a spa within the rear yard setback. Variances are requested for reduced rear yard setback and excess lot coverage.

David Holscher, architect, said he has been working with the owners on their need for a larger home. He said that the request would exceed the lot coverage due to the fact that most of the addition was located on the bottom floor. He described efforts to break up the mass by using different materials and efforts to work with the topography of the site.

Jane Young, owner, said she and her husband put a lot of thought and deliberation into the project and knew from the start they could not build up without difficulty. She said 90% of the project would be located underneath the home. She said that they have tried to meet with the Eklunds, but noted that they and Mr. Holscher were only able to discuss the project over the telephone.

Boardmember Glassner questioned whether Ms. Young felt the house seemed bulky or massive from a square footage standpoint. Mr. Holscher noted the addition was still under the allowable floor area ratio. Ms. Young felt that visually the house looked very nice from the street and from all sides in that it extends out only 5 feet from the garage. Mr. Holscher said their attempt was to hide the density of the home, described what would be seen from the street and from the private courtyard in the back of the house.

Boardmember Corcoran confirmed that the proposed new deck would match the height of the existing deck, and that the hot tub would be added and would be located 5 feet from the property line and fence.

Public comments:

David Eklund said the back of their property abuts the back of the Young's property, and presented prepared comments and photographs which were distributed to the Board. He said that the photos showed the view from the great room where he spends much of his time, as well as story poles protruding into his water view. He also showed photos taken from the upper level of his house. He noted there were currently three rooflines of the Young's house and he believed this was the result of an expansion approved 5-6 years ago. He said that they would have a birds-eye view of the enormous roof and deck. He said that the deck would be larger than his daughter's condominium in San Francisco, and urged the Board to deny the proposal as submitted. He felt it was too high, too large for the lot and neighborhood, requires a setback variance, and would have major impacts on their views and privacy.

Boardmember Corcoran asked if Mr. Eklund was concerned about the spa. Mr. Eklund said he was concerned about its location right along the fence line and felt there could be possible damage to the fence, along with noise, and privacy issues.

Kathleen Bailey, said she and her husband live next door to the Young's, and questioned the size and location of the spa and deck. She said their home was physically close to the proposal and asked that outdoor lighting be minimized. She said one neighbor had also suggested that the lower addition could be converted into an in-

law unit in the future, and she asked that this not be allowed.

Mr. Holscher said this was the first time he had seen the Mr. Eklund's photos. He said that he did not understand some of their perspectives and agreed to provide perspective drawings at the next meeting. Upon request by Boardmember Teiser, Mr. Holscher also agreed to install tape between the story poles to better illustrate the actual roof lines. Mr. Holscher said the spa would sit on top of the deck and could be relocated into the hillside, but could not be placed on the roof of the addition due to water loading requirements. He agreed more screening was needed between the two neighbors to address privacy issues and agreed to return with a landscape plan.

He said that a trellis could be installed around the spa to address the privacy issue.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Teiser stated that he visited Mr. Eklund's home and felt that the study is a main room for that house. He felt going up was not so much the problem as going out, adding that the den would block views from another den. He objected to the spa being so close to the property line.

Boardmember Corcoran agreed the spa should be moved back from the property line. He sympathized with the view loss, but noted that the Hillside Guidelines give less actively used areas of the dwelling less priority. He said that the Eklunds' house was clearly designed with primary living areas on the top and less active areas below. He felt there would only be one impacted room, and that the addition of trees may help the view impact. He said that every single home in the neighborhood looked massive to the one above it due to the neighborhood being sloped.

Boardmember Glassner echoed some of Boardmember Teiser's concerns regarding the project's massing. He agreed that tape between the story poles and perspective drawings would be helpful. He encouraged more interaction with the neighbors and felt that additional trees and landscaping would help break up the visual mass. He was not sure that the view blockage was that great and agreed that the spa needed to be more private.

Boardmember Teiser cited the staff report statement that noted that "the Design Review Board has often discouraged projects that would gain views for a secondary portion of a home, such as a bedroom or study, at the expense of views from less actively used areas of other neighboring homes" and felt Mr. Eklund's study was an actively used room. Boardmember Glassner agreed a secondary view might come from another room, but felt judgment and experience should also be exercised.

Vice-Chair Frymier said she visited the site but not the Eklunds' home. She noted that the architect had said that he will address the issues raised by Ms. Bailey and suggested all parties meet to resolve outstanding issues.

Chair Doyle acknowledged the project's use of different materials and felt it provided good texture and helped to break up the mass. He felt that perspective drawings would help and encouraged further dialogue between the neighbors, adding that the architect did good work around town and was considerate to other people's needs.

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Frymier) to continue the application to the June 7, 2007 meeting. Vote: 5-0.

**8. 2 WARREN'S WAY ROBERTS ADDITIONS/VARIANCES
(CONTINUED TO 6/7/07)**

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #7 OF THE 4/19/07 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Boardmember Teiser had the following corrections to the minutes of 4/19/07:

Page 6, paragraph 4, 3rd sentence; change the word "one" to "on".

Page 6, paragraph 5, 4th sentence, add; "Boardmember Teiser asked the applicant to reduce the floor area of the addition and move it further back from the street, which would provide articulation from the front."

Page 7, paragraph 2, 3rd sentence; "He also offered to cut down a Monterey Ash tree on Caltrans right-of-way to restore the neighbors' views."

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Corcoran) to approve the minutes of 4/19/07 as amended. Vote: 5-0.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.