

ACTION MINUTES #20

**TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2007
1505 TIBURON BOULEVARD**

- A. ROLL CALL: Present:** Chair Doyle, Boardmembers Corcoran, Frymier, Glassner and Teiser
Absent: None
Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous and Minutes Clerk Harper
- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA)**
- C. STAFF BRIEFING**
- D. MINUTES OF THE 11/1/07 D.R.B. MEETING – APPROVED AS AMENDED**
- E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
1. 85 East View Avenue Hoppe New Dwelling/Variances/Floor Area Exception
CONTINUED TO 1/17/08
- F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD**
2. 215 Blackfield Drive Kol Shofar Additions/Renovations **APPROVED**
- G. ADJOURNMENT – 9:35 P.M.**

**MINUTES #20
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 15, 2007**

The meeting was opened at 7:02 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 and Minutes Secretary Harper

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous gave the following reports:

- The application for 85 East View Avenue has been continued to the January 17, 2008 meeting;
- The Town Council held an appeal hearing for 9 Burrell Court and they found the second-story design to be acceptable at the location, but felt the particular design of the addition needed some work. Therefore, they remanded the project back to the Design Review Board with specific direction;
- The appeal for 78 Red Hill Circle has been scheduled for the January 16, 2008 Town Council meeting;
- An appeal was received for 275 Diviso and has been scheduled for the February 6, 2008 Town Council meeting;
- Staff is still planning to hold the December 20, 2007 Board meeting dependent upon the Board's schedule and items for review;
- The January 3, 2008 Board meeting will be canceled.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #19 OF THE 11/1/07 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Boardmember Teiser requested the following amendments:

Page 5, 6th paragraph, "Boardmember Teiser said he was not so much opposed to the square footage of the house as much as its articulated design and poor fit in the neighborhood."

Page 7, paragraph 8, "Boardmember Teiser said he also wanted to ensure that construction complied with the building plans and wondered...."

Page 8, last paragraph, "Boardmember Teiser said he visited two neighbors on Hilary Drive and he felt the owner and architect worked well with the neighbors."

Boardmember Glassner requested the following amendments:

Page 12, 4th paragraph; "Boardmember Glassner felt it was a good project, but that lowering the roof height and moving the trellis would be positive changes. He stated that slate roofs add a lot of weight to a house and may require significant structural changes, adding that there have been technical and litigation issues with concrete roofs in the past. He was unsure whether it would be possible to reposition the house, and felt that the big issue was the height and elevation of the house.

Chair Doyle requested the following amendments:

Page 12, 4th line; "Chair Doyle said he felt the height issue was of concern to all the neighbors.

Boardmember Corcoran requested the following amendments:

Page 5, 1st full paragraph, 1st line; "Boardmember Corcoran felt Ms. Patton's home would have the most view impact. However, the lot is vacant and in order to address any view impacts the house would need to be moved too far back on the lot."

Page 10, 2nd paragraph; "Boardmember Glassner ~~Corcoran~~ asked when the CC&R's were adopted, and it was noted they were adopted in 1981 and have not been updated in the last 5

years.”

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) to approve the Minutes of the November 1, 2007 Design Review Board meeting, as amended. Vote: 5-0.

E. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

- 1. 85 EAST VIEW AVENUE HOPPE, NEW DWELLING/VARIANCE/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION - CONTINUED TO 1/17/08**

F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

- 2. 215 BLACKFIELD DRIVE CONGREGATION KOL SHOFAR, ADDITIONS/RENOVATIONS**

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions and renovations to an existing religious facility and day school (Congregation Kol Shofar). The project site currently contains the Congregation Kol Shofar synagogue building (originally constructed as a public middle school building), other facilities used by the Congregation, and buildings and outdoor space leased to Ring Mountain Day School, a private, secular pre-school that operates on the site. The project would involve construction of a new 8,420 square foot multi-purpose room addition; construction of a new 3,920 square foot classroom building; renovation of interior spaces of existing buildings, including installation of new skylights; reconfiguration and expansion of existing parking areas to provide a total of 156 parking spaces; improvement of pedestrian access around the site; and provision of improved on-site landscaping.

Planning Manager Watrous presented a brief summary of the staff report, noting that the hearing on this application needs to focus on the Design Review issues and compliance with the requirements of the conditional use permit approved for this project. He stated that the Design Review Board does not have the authority to consider other, non-design issues that are covered by the use permit.

Suzie Coliver, Herman & Coliver Architecture, presented a series of slides that illustrated the proposed project. She described the history of the buildings on the site and the location of the proposed multi-purpose building and classroom addition in relation to the existing buildings on the site. She stated that the multi-purpose building would be situated 140 feet back from Via Los Altos, 280 feet from the corner of Blackfield Drive and Via Los Altos and 175 feet from Reedland Woods Way. She described how 156 parking spaces would be placed on the site by re-striping the existing parking lot and construction of a new parking lot at the location of an existing unpaved lot. She stated that all access to the parking lots would come off Via Los Altos and the only point of egress would be onto Reedland Woods Way. She stated that a traffic monitor would be onsite to prevent a circulation bottleneck between the new and existing parking lots. She stated that the exterior walls of the proposed multi-purpose building would be a reflection of and in context with the original building and its pods. She addressed the concern that the walls of the multi-purpose building would be overly massive, stating that what looks like a solid block of wall is actually three splays which would be substantially broken up by divider panels where light is brought into the rooms. She said that each of the walls would be more or less the width of a conventional home, which would help break up the visual mass. She described the landscaping around the multi-purpose building, including a continuous hedge of 15 foot tall bamboo running

along the perimeter of the slope and trees below the building. She presented the actual materials sample board and said the multi-purpose building would be constructed of either split-face block or stucco. She said that they had originally intended to use a split face block material which would be reflective of the way buildings are built in Jerusalem, but may now prefer to use a less costly plaster finish.

Boardmember Teiser asked which materials were being requested at this time. Ms. Coliver said that given the plaster is less costly and may be more Mediterranean in feel, which may suit many in the community, most likely they would favor the plaster.

Ms. Coliver said there has been concern that the NANA wall on the east façade of the multi-purpose building would allow noise to escape. She said the building would have 3 people doors and it is the intention that these doors would be used on a regular basis and the NANA wall would be opened only for the high holidays for additional capacity for the room.

Ms. Coliver noted how the multi-purpose building had been pulled back the top of the slope. She stated that the existing building is 29 feet, 10 inches tall, the multi-purpose building would be 23 feet tall and the classroom building would be 20 feet tall. She presented an overview of the proposed landscape plan, stating that 23 existing trees would be removed and they would plant 88 new trees. She stated that the existing parking area landscaping would be changed very little, but new landscaping would be added to mitigate the intrusion of headlights into neighboring buildings. She described new hedges and a new fence adjacent to the new parking lot and plans for replanting along Via Los Altos. She also noted that an 11 space bicycle rack would be installed.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Kurt Kaull, representing the Tiburon Neighborhood Coalition, stated that there is pending litigation on the lawfulness of the project and its approvals and that the Coalition's legal position is that the Design Review Board does not have the jurisdiction to rule on the project at this time. He said their position needed to be on the record so there is no doubt that by commenting on this application that they are by chance acquiescing anything relating to the project. He stated that the neighbors continue to have concerns about noise, mainly at night; safety relating to traffic, parking and auto circulation; light impacts at night; and the aesthetics of the project. He asked that the Board be mindful of the larger concepts and specifics of the project. He noted that the three classrooms would be located directly below his house, and he voiced concerns regarding nighttime noise and light from this building.

Boardmember Corcoran asked if Mr. Kaull was referring to light from the new pre-school building. Mr. Kaull replied that he was unsure about the potential usage of the building in the evenings, noting that any light or noise could travel up the hill.

Boardmember Teiser noted that a playground where the new classroom building is supposed to be constructed would be moved away from Mr. Kaull's house. Mr. Kaull stated that he did not object to noise from the children, but was more concerned with usage of the building in the evenings and what sort of activities would go on in the rooms. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the Board has no discretion on the use of the building and that the use permit does not include anything about classrooms being used in the evening.

Boardmember Corcoran confirmed with staff that the 5 trees to be planted next to the classroom building would be in Mr. Kaull's line of sight.

In response to a question from Vice-Chair Frymier, Mr. Kaull stated that the TNC included representatives from 55 homes who have contributed toward litigation.

Jerry Thayer stated that the project would result in a considerable increase in traffic and that parking would likely overflow into the Bel Aire neighborhood. He felt that 156 parking spaces would be inadequate to handle the parking for major events. He was concerned with the noise generated by the parking lot late at night. He echoed Mr. Kaull's objections to the plan, adding that they expect to prevail in the lawsuit.

Boardmember Glassner asked Mr. Thayer to define what he meant by "late at night." Mr. Thayer said most of the residents go to bed at about 9:00 p.m. He stated that many residents cannot park in front of their homes due to functions of the school, and he was concerned with noise from people walking to their cars, talking, and starting up their cars, although this was mostly during the high holidays. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the number of events and amount of parking is governed by the CUP and was not part of the review of this application. Mr. Thayer said that the design of the parking lot is important to discourage overflow parking for events that affect the surrounding neighborhood.

Chair Doyle asked if similar requirements on parking and activities were imposed when St. Hilary expanded. Planning Manager Watrous stated that the use permit for St. Hilary required periodic review of the conditions of approval, and Kol Shofar's use permit requires similar reviews. Chair Doyle confirmed with Mr. Watrous that the Board was focusing on design related issues and that how parking would be handled is covered by the use permit.

Tim Metz said he wrote in a letter about his concerns with the NANA wall for the multi-purpose building. He said that one of the reasons they oppose the project is that the multi-purpose building is designed to accommodate the entire congregation inside their facilities during the high holidays. He said that during the Planning Commission meetings, the neighbors encouraged use of a temporary outdoor tent instead of a larger building to accommodate everyone. He was concerned that the NANA wall would open up the multi-purpose room and result in noise problems. He said that he did not see the figures for square footage and room dimensions in the application materials and he thought that the building seems to be larger than allowed. He said that if the NANA wall is opened all the way, it would encourage much larger gatherings than the Town intended.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the plans from the original use permit application and those approved by the Town Council both showed an openable wall for the multi-purpose building. Boardmember Corcoran noted that condition of approval 4.B.2 of the CUP states that "doors and windows shall remain in a closed position during functions of 100 or more persons."

Mr. Metz said that he still does not see the need for the openable walls which would cause very loud noise during a Kiddush lunch. He felt that the mosaic on the stairway leading to the entrance of the building was too colorful and would look bright from the street and be out of character. He also was unsure how quiet the fountain would be. He felt that the annex building was an eyesore and requested that something be done about its visual character. He stated that a trash enclosure was supposed to be inside the catering garage, but he

noted that the plans showed an enclosure outside in the parking lot.

Nicky Kennedy said her daughter attends the Ring Mountain Preschool and she questioned where the playground was going to be moved, as it was her understanding that the preschool must have playground facilities in order to meet licensing requirements.

James Winter disagreed that the Town should move forward on this application while litigation is pending. He asked that lights in any stairways be down-lit or shielded. He said any open air mechanical space would create a lot of noise. He said that the size of the multi-purpose building has increased from what the Town initially approved and he wanted to ensure that any skylights have blackout shades. He was concerned with the appearance of a lit sign at the entrance to the property and how it would look in a residential neighborhood.

Frank Lindsay said his biggest concerns are the aesthetics of the wall of the multi-purpose building and potential noise. He characterized the walls as something out of Homeland Security and out of line with the rest of the building and other pods. He said that these walls would be much taller than those of the other pods and he felt that the bamboo would not grow tall enough to screen the walls.

James Dignan said that the neighborhood is very beautiful and people take pride in it and he felt that Kol Shofar has done a poor job of maintaining their property. He said that much of the mitigation hinges upon good stewardship of the site and he had real doubts that they will keep up the property. He said that there has been little information on how long it will take to construct the buildings, and he was concerned with noise and other impacts on his home.

Boardmember Corcoran confirmed that there would be a three-year landscaping bond, as well as subsequent review of landscaping.

Karen Nygren spoke in opposition to the project and agreed with the comments made in the letter from the TNC attorney. She noted that the applicant's presentation had addressed some of the issues raised in her letter. She wanted to know which final exterior products would be installed, adding that the application should not allow a choice of materials. She said that plaster can use various colors to break up the elevations of the façade and make it look not so flat. She agreed with Mr. Metz about the NANA wall, recommending that the side of the multi-purpose building should be just doors and windows. She said that ingress from Via Los Altos was not demanded by the neighborhood, but instead was a safety issue. She said that the parking lot design would create a choke point and cause people to park on the street. She felt that professional analysis was needed to ensure that the parking lot circulation works correctly. She stated that the zoning code requires landscaping within the existing parking lot as well. She said that there should be trees in the parking lot which would help with the sound and greenhouse effects.

Brad Tardy said it is irresponsible for the Town to look at the project when prior approvals have not been put to rest. He said that he was not sure he could give an opinion of the project because there are unresolved issues regarding the building materials. He felt that the design would be inconsistent with the existing structure and the small town character of Tiburon. He said that the wood and limestone materials would be soft and warm, but he felt that the design should resemble the homes around it and not have an institutional look with glass and steel. He characterized the south wall as ugly and looking like a prison wall and felt it would be a huge heat sink. He said that the tent structure would be very large and be up for long periods of time. He

questioned the colors and material for the tent and its lighting. He felt that the NANA wall would not contain noise and he voiced concern about the lights from vehicles in the parking lot.

Ms. Coliver stated that the trash enclosure currently exists in the parking lot, but they would work out a method for either an auxiliary trash unit in the garage or not put out any trash until the following morning. She said that all proposed lighting would use low level bollards and downlights, with no uplights or floodlights.

Boardmember Glassner said while he understands that bollards will be used, he asked if the architectural flood lights were planned and that the flood lights that currently exist be shielded. Dragana Monson, Herman and Coliver Architecture, said that there are three existing pole lights on the site that would be shortened down to 10 feet and reoriented away from the street. Boardmember Glassner asked if Kol Shofar would consider eliminating the flood lights altogether. Ms. Monson said an attempt was made to address this by reorienting the lights toward the building. Ms. Coliver said they would be willing to consider this and work with their lighting professional, but she was not sure whether sufficient light would exist for cars to move safely through the parking lot. She said that they have no inherent interest in annoying anyone in the neighborhood with lighting that is more bright than necessary for the safety of drivers and pedestrians.

The Board discussed the possibility of including a condition of approval to work with staff on lighting issues. Planning Manager Watrous said this could be done, but would need to be more specific.

Ms. Coliver noted that all of the curbs surrounding the synagogue are to be painted red, so overflow parking in the vicinity would not be an option. Boardmember Glassner asked what accommodations would be made for overflow parking for the high holidays and other large events. Planning Manager Watrous stated that the mechanics of how overflow parking would be handled, including use of shuttles and parking monitors, were part of the use permit and was not within the purview of the Board.

Chair Doyle asked Ms. Coliver to address the design of the NANA doors. Ms. Coliver said the walls were put in to open up the entire wall of the multi-purpose room on the high holidays so that people sitting outside would have an unimpeded view of the pulpit and share the experience of the people inside for one combined service. In response to a question from Boardmember Teiser, she said that there is a speaker system indoors which would be heard outside for the high holidays. Planning Manager Watrous read the condition of approval of the use permit which requires that the doors and windows of the multi-purpose room remain in the closed position during functions of 100 or more persons and during amplified indoor events, such as life cycle events, except for high holy day services when the doors and windows can be left open only during the services.

Ms. Coliver described the tent outside the multi-purpose building, stating that it would be a ceiling structure intended to provide shade and not to be used in inclement weather or at night, adding that the high holidays fall during the hottest time of the year. In response to a question from Boardmember Corcoran, she said that a 5 foot hedge would be planted on the edge of the area near the tent. She noted, however, that vegetation does not substantially diminish sound, but does limit light intrusion.

Boardmember Glassner asked if more permanent solutions to blocking sound had been considered. Ms. Coliver said that they intend to see how the proposed system would work and then see if another solution is

needed. She said that there are a few openings in the walls of the multi-purpose building to avoid night light escaping into the neighborhood. She said that practically all the proposed windows would be internal to the site and could not be seen from anywhere in the neighborhood. She said that the concrete block materials have a lot of texture and lines, including score lines, which would break down the scale of the walls. She stated that plaster can be used decoratively, and that they do not want a plain wall, but rather something subdivided to break up the scale. She said that they would prefer a two-color scheme that would be dignified and quiet. She stated that the height of the multi-purpose building was set in part by the internal height of the multi-purpose room itself which is 14 feet from floor to ceiling. She said that the structure above would be 5 feet tall and at the end of the room the height would go up to 23 feet which was approved as a condition of the use permit. She said that the windows at the edge of the building would allow them to bring natural light in without spreading light at night. She noted that the use permit requires that blackout shades be installed on all skylights.

In response to questions about the building materials, Ms. Coliver said that green concepts have been incorporated throughout the entire project. However, she said that installing cedar siding on the multi-purpose building would be a waste, as the story poles indicate that the building can hardly be seen, particularly after landscaping is installed. In response to a question from Boardmember Corcoran, she likened the 23 foot height of the multi-purpose building to the height of a two-story house.

There was discussion by the Board about the possibility of approving the application without determining the exterior materials for the project. Planning Manager Watrous stated that the Board could ask for a separate review of the specifics of the exterior material at a later date, at the next meeting, or prior to submittal of building permits.

April Phillips, landscape architect, stated that specimen Olive trees would be planted that would be about 25 feet tall and about 15 feet wide. She said that the Timber Bamboo that would be used would grow to about 30 feet and could be purchased at a 20-25 foot height, with root barriers installed next to the shoots. She said that deciduous trees would be planted next to the courtyard adjacent to the multi-purpose building which would grow to 25 to 30 feet in height, including Western Redbud trees. She stated that the bamboo would be maintained so it does not rise over the height of the windows and also so as not to interfere with the solar panels. She stated that the infrastructure in the existing parking lot currently does not support trees. She said that they are looking to do sustainable drainage, with water going into permeable surfaces, but noted that the turning radii in the parking lot were already fairly tight.

Boardmember Teiser suggested that some landscaping be installed in the parking lot to break up the massive area of asphalt. Ms. Coliver said the main parking lot was actually invisible from any nearby homes. She said that any landscaping would not be appreciated and they cannot afford to lose any parking spaces.

Ms. Coliver stated that mosaic on the staircase is just an illustration of an existing stairway in San Francisco, and they just want this pathway to have some visual delight. Ms. Phillips stated that the mosaic might just be installed on the horizontal surfaces of the walkway. In response to a question from Boardmember Corcoran, Ms. Phillips stated that the upper parking lot would not utilize turf block, but they intend to drain the parking lot into bioremediation areas. She indicated the location of the two separate playgrounds, which would be located at least 20 feet from the edge of the tree canopy.

Boardmember Corcoran asked if the town can make sure that the five trees located near the new classroom building would be lined up with Mr. Kaull's house. Planning Manager Watrous stated that the language in the use permit requires these trees to be placed at that particular end, but the Board can require that Staff would determine the appropriate location of the trees during the building plan check process.

Vice-Chair Frymier asked for a description of the use of the annex building whether there were plans to improve the exterior of the building. Ms. Coliver said the annex is not part of the project scope and nothing is proposed to be done to the building. She said the annex serves maintenance staff, storage and workshop needs and it is used as a play area for the preschool during rainy weather. She said that something could be done in the future to improve the appearance of the building. Vice-Chair Frymier suggested that the building's appearance be cleaned up by possibly painting it to match the other buildings or landscaping around the outside. Chair Doyle noted that the building provides a noise barrier to the Kaulls' home.

Boardmember Teiser asked why the particular colors were chosen for the school as he felt the green color in particular did not blend with the rest of the area. Ms. Coliver said that the green color would play very well off the terra cotta color, but added that they are not married to that particular shade of green.

Mr. Kaull asked if there was an opportunity for rebuttal, and Planning Manager Watrous said the normal procedure of the Design Review Board is to allow the applicant to have the final word in front of the Board.

In response to a question from Boardmember Teiser, Ms. Coliver stated that the blackout shades are required by the use permit and would be operated by maintenance or facility staff.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Teiser said he was very concerned with the height of the multi-purpose building. He asked that it be lowered, as he felt it appears massive in height compared to the rest of the building, although he was not sure that the height could be reduced. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the use permit states that a 23 foot tall multi-purpose building could be built, meaning that the intent of the Town Council was likely to be that the 23 foot height of the building was acceptable.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the issue of how trash is handled after events needed to be addressed and he felt there should be a condition for lighting in the parking lot. He recommended that the mosaic be allowed only on the flat surfaces of the stairs. He felt that the green color of the school should be more muted. He recommended a condition of approval requiring the appearance of the annex building to be improved through painting and/or landscaping to coordinate with the rest of the project. He also recommended that the placement of trees for screening and all landscaping be approved by staff. He said that he could support the project with those conditions.

Boardmember Glassner agreed that the landscaping plan could be reviewed and approved by staff. He said that he would prefer planting evergreen trees instead of deciduous trees near the courtyard so the area would be screened year round. He stated that the parking lot screening issues have been addressed by the use permit. He asked if the Board could require the applicant to install sound-reducing tiles within the multi-purpose building. Planning Manager Watrous said the certified environmental impact report for this project dealt extensively with potential noise impacts and mitigation measures and conditions of approval were adopted

related to noise. Therefore, he felt it was inappropriate for the Board to address noise issues in this manner

Boardmember Glassner said that he would like to require some form of sound-deadening near the trash enclosure. He recommended that the applicant work with staff to eliminate floodlights. He agreed that the green color of the classroom building should be muted. He suggested Kol Shofar work with staff on painting the annex building the same color as the rest of the project. He felt that the roofline of the multi-purpose building seemed high, but was allowed by the use permit. He stated that the landscaping would help screen the building, although he would like to have the materials be less stark.

Boardmember Corcoran said that the process for Kol Shofar has taken many years, and the project will be a vast improvement. He suggested approving the plaster finish at this time but requiring the applicant to return at a later date with the exact plaster design. He noted that the skylights were installed partly for fire and that the tinting and blackout shades would eliminate any light pollution. He liked the windows at the edge of the building which would avoid having a wall of windows facing the streets. He disagreed with the contention that the structure would not be visible because he walked the surrounding streets and the story poles could be seen fairly well. He noted, however, that the use permit allows the multi-purpose building to be 23 feet tall and he thought that Kol Shofar had done a good job of mitigating the wall with bamboo and other landscaping. He agreed that Board should retain the authority to review the project lighting. He noted that the use permit requires the NANA doors to be designed to minimize noise. He liked the green design aspects of the project. He felt the stairs would not be visible from the street and the mosaic tile would not be a big issue. He thought that the colors of the school were fine, noting that many schools have bright colors.

Vice-Chair Frymier echoed many of Boardmember Teiser's comments and supported the project. She stated that it is difficult to review such project from a design standpoint and the Board needs to be cautious. She said that she visited Kol Shofar four times and went by many of the other nonresidential buildings in town, many of which have been improved within the last 10 years. She said that all of these other buildings are very different looking, and their diversity adds to the uniqueness of the community. She verified that all signage would be approved at a later time. She said that she was uncomfortable with the brightness of the plaster colors.

Chair Doyle stated that building additions would be far away from surrounding homes and the visual impact would be less than he thought it would. He noted that the elevation drawings are deceiving and do not show shading, angles and trees. He said that the existing school buildings are like a small village and the additions will fit in. He said that the height of the roof would help hide the solar panels. He said that he was surprised that none of the neighbors who live directly across the street from the multi-purpose building were present. He felt that the location of the new buildings reflected a common sense design. He understood concerns about noise and traffic, but stated that the Town will take care of any enforcement issues. He said that he liked the rough stone materials but would like to have bigger blocks. He did not think the noise would be excessive given the requirements of the use permit. He felt the landscaping was well thought out for the project, and his only concern was moving the playground to the side of the building because it might create more noise in the bowl of the site. He said that he lives behind Reed School and there is not that much noise. He said that he was unsure about approving the project without seeing the plaster design, and said that plaster surfaces can be scored to improve their appearance. He preferred the green color in the submitted drawings to the color on the materials board. He said that other issues are addressed by the use permit. He felt that this project would affect the surrounding neighborhood less than the Reed and Del Mar School projects affected their respective

neighborhoods.

Boardmember Corcoran noted that the applicant submitted a letter that day stating that the exterior walls would be moved 10 inches closer to the building and he confirmed with Planning Manager Watrous that this could be added to the conditions of approval.

Boardmember Teiser said that some neighbors want the additions to look like a house, but this is a synagogue with a different purpose and an appropriate architectural design.

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) to approve the application subject to the conditions of approval, with additional conditions that 1) the exterior walls of the multi-purpose building be finished with plaster or equivalent materials; 2) that the color palette for the multi-purpose building and classroom addition be reviewed and approved by the Design Review Board prior to issuance of a building permit for the construction of these additions; 3) that Planning Division staff review the proposed lighting plan and attempt to remove or reduce the number of floodlight fixtures in the parking lot; 4) that space be provided within the enclosed loading area for collection of trash; 5) that the Mosaics on the main stairs leading up to the entrance be installed only on horizontal surfaces; 6) that the appearance of the annex building be improved by painting and/or landscaping to compliment the remainder of the project; 7) that Planning Division staff review the specific placement of screening trees adjacent to the classroom addition in relation to the residence at 38 Via Los Altos; 8) that exterior walls of the multi-purpose building be moved 10 inches closer to the main domed existing building; 9) that a bicycle rack accommodating 11 bicycles be installed at the bottom of the main exterior curved entry stairs, adjacent to the lower parking lot; and 10) that the fence to the east of the new upper parking lot shall be increased in height to 4 feet instead of 3 feet. Vote: 5-0.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.