

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Doyle, Boardmembers Corcoran, Glassner and Teiser

Absent: Vice-Chair Frymier

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Dan Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler, Assistant Planner Phillips and Minutes Clerk Harper

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted that the item for 544 Silverado Drive was continued to the September 20, 2007 meeting. He also noted that Kol Shofar synagogue has submitted their application for expansion and staff will most likely schedule a special DRB meeting for the item due to the high attendance at previous Town meetings.

D. OLD BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

1. 9 BURRELL COURT HARIRI, ADDITIONS/VARIANCE/FLOOR AREA EXCEPTION

On April 5 and August 2, 2007, the Design Review Board reviewed an application for the expansion and additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with variances for reduced front yard setback and excess lot coverage. During the meetings, several of the adjacent neighbors on Burrell Court and Reed Ranch Road objected to the proposal, which included adding a partial second story to the home. Concerns raised included that the subject property already had a view to the south, and the addition of a second story would not only enhance the view, but result in a looming structure over Reed Ranch Road, block views for neighbors around Burrell Court, and create a home that would look out of character with the neighborhood. The application was continued in both instances, with direction that the applicant work more closely with neighbors to come to a better solution to expand the residence. At the August 2 meeting, it was the consensus of the Design Review Board that the house design appeared to have been relatively unchanged and needed to be further modified to lower the roofline, possibly by excavating below the house. The application was continued to the September 6 meeting. Revised plans have again been submitted for the project.

Michael Heckmann, architect, described the revised plans for the project, including the reduction in the overall roof height of the second story addition by one foot, and modifications to the roof design from a gabled roofline to a hipped roof with a flat portion at the center. He noted changes made to the proposed landscape plan which would increase the size of screening trees to be planted from 24 inch box specimens to 36 inch box trees. He said they abandoned the idea of

shifting additional square footage under the house due to noise impacts from Reed Ranch Road and the lack of light available to such excavated space. He felt that the neighbors' major issues had been addressed. He summarized conversations with Mr. Truman and Mr. Beaumont, and believed the neighbors now supported the application. Mr. Heckmann presented photographs of other homes in the vicinity and compared the proposed design with other similar dwellings. He stated that Mr. Beaumont requested to make the master bath window obscure glass; and install the two Oleander trees with an 18 foot height, with the understanding that if the applicant could fulfill these two requests, Mr. Beaumont would approve of the request.

Boardmember Corcoran noted that Mr. Beaumont's letter of September 3 did not talk at all about the window, but did describe a number of outstanding issues involving blockage of views and two-story design. Mr. Heckmann responded that he spoke with Mr. Beaumont on September 4 and confirmed comments made by him.

Boardmember Glassner questioned how changing the roofline and trees addressed massing and bulk issues. Mr. Heckmann replied that he felt that the design was within the context of the existing neighborhood and that the changes proposed provided an appropriate solution.

Boardmember Glassner referred to the Board's previous recommendation to excavate and lower the house and reduce massing, adding that he felt the issues identified in Mr. Beaumont's letter of September 3 were significant. Mr. Heckmann reiterated his discussion with Mr. Beaumont. Mr. Heckmann stated that excavation was not warranted as it would result in living space which would be dark and would be impacted by noise from Reed Ranch Road. He felt that the scale achieved by the addition was appropriate, good-looking and worked well for the neighborhood.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Christopher Wand noted that 9 neighbors who had previously objected to the application had not offered any written approval of the revised plans. He felt that it was optimistic that Mr. Beaumont would approve of the second floor. He said Mr. Truman could not attend the meeting, and read Mr. Truman's comments into the record requesting changes to the height. He disagreed with the applicant's negative characterization of excavated space, and suggested large picture windows, skylights, and sun tubes could be used to bring light into such space. He asked whether approval of the design would run with the property if the house was sold and asked the Board to approve a home that conforms to the Hillside Guidelines.

Boardmember Teiser noted the Hillside Guidelines protect primary views and confirmed that Mr. Wand's primary views were more toward Mt. Tamalpais, away from the subject property.

In response to a question from Boardmember Corcoran, Mr. Wand stated that his views across the subject home were of a hill above Trestle Glen and then Mt. Tiburon in the distance.

Mr. Heckmann showed a photograph of the view from Mr. Wand's front deck and said that his main views are from another part of the house. Mr. Heckmann reiterated Mr. Beaumont's agreement to the proposal, given compliance with his two outstanding requests, but noted that they would most likely need to identify a tree that would be 18 feet tall when planted.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Teiser stated that he understood the concerns raised by the Board regarding this project. He found it incongruous that Mr. Beaumont and Mr. Block submitted correspondence but were unable to attend meetings and confirm their concerns. He said that he visited Mr. Wand's house, whose primary views were to the west and away from the subject home. He noted that Mr. Beaumont's has a two-story home, yet objects to a second story addition, and that his views are from the upper story master bedroom and bathroom and are not primary views. He stated that his biggest concern was the impact on Mr. Truman and from Reed Ranch Road, and that Mr. Truman appears to now be satisfied. He agreed that the house was in a prominent location at the end of the cul-de-sac location but he was perplexed as to how to decide on the application.

Boardmember Glassner felt there were some view issues from Burrell Court, but that the main issue was that the second story still appeared to be massive when viewed from Reed Ranch Road. He stated that the design appears to be relatively unchanged and he preferred something be done with excavation or spreading out floor area on the property, possibly with a lot coverage or setback variance. He was concerned that relatively little progress had been made on the project.

Boardmember Teiser agreed that bringing the house forward toward Burrell Court could help and that the Board might consider granting a lot coverage variance to do so.

Boardmember Corcoran asked whether the landscaping approved 6 months ago had been installed at the front stucco wall area. Mr Heckmann replied that nothing had yet been planted.

Boardmember Corcoran stated that this was the same discussion that has been held regarding this application since April. He stated Design Review Board must be consistent with the design of the homes in the neighborhood. He cited Goal 1, Principle 1 of the Hillside Guidelines, which states that buildings should be cut into the hillside to reduce visual bulk. He agreed that many properties in the area have expanded in the last couple of years, and that some have expanded below. He agreed that light can be an issue, but if one wants light, one should not necessarily buy a hillside home. He felt the neighbors and the applicant needed to work together, but little progress had been made. He noted that the previous approval for a stucco wall at the front of the house called for shrubs to be planted, and he felt that planting the shrubs would have been a good gesture to the neighbors.

Boardmember Glassner stated that the solution to this project is not to plant taller trees, but to make the second story smaller.

Chair Doyle said he had no problems with the design originally and still did not, except that the house is at the end of the view corridor on this cul-de-sac. He stated that the applicant was instructed to work with neighbors on identifying other approaches but this was not done, and although some things were changed, the suggestions of the Board were mainly ignored. He said that he would like to see solutions that spread area out on the lot in a different way, possibly with

just the master bedroom upstairs. He noted that the other two-story houses in the area do not have the same effect as this design and he requested other options be pursued.

Planning Manager Watrous recommended that if the Board was interested in continuing the item, it should confirm with the applicant whether or not they are willing to make such changes.

Chair Doyle asked if the applicant was willing to look at other options or would rather have Board deny the application. Mr. Heckmann requested the Board vote on the project tonight and said they have looked at other solutions.

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Glassner) to direct staff to prepare a Resolution denying the application to be brought back at the next meeting for approval. Vote: 3-0-1 (Teiser abstained).

2. 23 OLD LANDING ROAD HARLE, NEW DWELLING

The application to construct a new single-family residence at 23 Old Landing Road was first reviewed at the July 19, 2007 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting concerns were raised by several neighbors along Old Landing Road about the visual prominence of proposed house design, particularly when viewed from the roadway below the site. The neighbors felt that the two-story design and size of the house would be inconsistent with the rural character of the Old Landing Road neighborhood. The Design Review Board shared some of these concerns, and recommended that the upper floor be reduced in size to decrease the visual mass of the house. The application was continued to the September 6, 2007 meeting to give the applicants time to address these concerns. Revised plans have now been submitted.

Jonathon Harle, owner, said plans for the house design had been revised and two meetings had been held with neighbors. He said that the master bedroom was moved from the second floor to the first floor of the house, with a guest room now to be situated to the rear of the second floor. The sides of the second floor have been moved in from those of the first floor and the ridgeline of the house has been lowered 2 feet, 9 inches. They also redesigned all pitches to be hip roof sections, used a stucco bottom to soften the exterior of the house and board and batten wood siding was kept for the second floor of the house. He showed photographs of 15 other two-story houses on Old Landing Road, stating that 5 of the homes were 4,000 square feet or larger. He stated that he believed they had addressed the design concerns, adding that the house did not require variances and complied with all zoning requirements.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Susan Bolle said her house was south of the Harle's residence and that she was representing 25 neighbors who signed the letter presented at the last meeting. She said that some of the neighbors had met with Mr. Harle and his architect to express their concerns. She reiterated her concerns regarding the rural and secluded character of the Old Landing Road neighborhood and felt that the height and mass of the second story and the overall size and square footage of the house were not compatible with the neighborhood. She noted that the applicant had returned with a plan which reduced the second story height but increased the floor area and lot coverage,

and she felt that it was still a big house. She said that the neighbors were disappointed with the landscape plan which would not preserve the privacy and seclusion from the street. She stated that there are 25-30 foot eucalyptus trees on the southern border on her property which had not been pruned for two years which screen the house for now, but that the Harles' are relying on fruit trees which are close to dying to provide screening from the roadway. She suggested that more shrubbery be planted along the front property line and recommended that the applicant be asked to plant Privet trees along the southern border which would help provide additional screening.

Boardmember Corcoran asked if Ms. Bolle was requesting screening between the fence and eucalyptus trees. Ms. Boley replied that additional screening vegetation would be helpful, and also asked that the square footage of the home be limited.

Mr. Harle referred to a photograph showing the eucalyptus trees on Ms. Bolle's property, stating that only a small portion of the existing or proposed house would be visible from her property. He also said the landscape plan includes a 42 inch wall and a 5-6 foot tall hedge. He said that they followed all of the Hillside Guidelines and had set the house back 80 feet from the street.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Teiser supported the project, stating that the design was very attractive and a more balanced looking house that would be a significant improvement to the existing situation. He felt the issue of the floor area was something the Board was facing across all older neighborhoods, where people do not want increased floor area until it is time to sell their own property, and then the sales price is used to justify a larger house. He noted that the Board has been sympathetic to changes over time as long as homes do not obscure views or create too much mass. He said that the landscaping plan was sensitive and noted that the neighbor could plant additional landscaping to complement the eucalyptus trees along her property line. He said that the applicant had made efforts to work with the neighbors and had made changes that were sensitive to their concerns.

Boardmember Glassner said neighborhoods change but they also can get run down over time. He stated that the current home and its landscaping had become an eyesore. He felt that the landscaping plan would be an improvement. He felt that the applicant took the Board's comments to heart and that the design and roofline changes were considerate. He stated that the house would be consistent in scale with other homes recently completed in the neighborhood.

Boardmember Corcoran stated that the Old Landing Road neighborhood was beautiful and unlike many in town because of its country-like, rural feel. He noted the existence of many newer and older homes and a mixture of smaller and larger homes. He felt the redesign addressed the Board's and neighbor's concerns. He noted that the lot has an open feel, and the house looks closer to the street than it actually is. He liked the rock walls, shrubs and landscaping which would make the house private enough. He stated that if the eucalyptus trees were not there, a privacy concern might arise, but he felt it was not necessary to require the applicant to plant another line of trees along the southern property line. He complimented the applicant for working with the neighbors.

Chair Doyle said that because the home was on a rise, the plantings hide part of the house. He said that many of the other houses in the neighborhood were as big or bigger and others that looked much bigger. He thanked the applicant for revising the project, and stated that there was a great distance between the house and the adjacent home, with the second floor moved back even further to enhance privacy. He felt the landscape plan was well done and suggested that tree planting can be worked out in the future with the neighbors. He noted that the project was under the floor area ratio and within the Town's guidelines.

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report. Vote: 4-0.

3. 19 PLACE MOULIN ALM/VALENTINO, ADDITIONS/APPEAL

The Design Review Board reviewed the appeal at the August 16, 2007 meeting. At that time, the architect for the applicant presented revised plans that had been discussed with the appellant that included modifications to the driveway, terrace and fence designs. The appellant indicated preliminary acceptance of the revisions, but requested more information about the revised plans. It was the consensus of the Design Review Board that the revised plans needed to be presented in more detail, and that the location of some of the improvements (including fencing, driveway locations and possible retaining walls) needed to be marked on the site. The appeal was continued to the September 6 meeting to give the applicant time to submit the revised plans and mark the improvements on the property.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, described the revised plans, indicating that there would be proper planting area for 39 pittosporum adjacent to the trail easement area. He described the relationship of the shrubs to the fence location marked by stakes in the field. He stated that he walked the pathway with Boardmember Corcoran to review heights and setbacks, and noted that the top of the bank was about 6 feet higher than the path itself and that the path has a current clear width of between 3.5 to 5 feet. He recommended the installation of a short wooden fence adjacent to the portion of Tiburon Ridge Trail which borders the property, the design of which would mimic the appearance of the wooden fence on the opposite side of the trail. He said that wooden wall would have a maximum height of only 36 inches and would be exempt from design review. However, an encroachment permit would be required for construction of the proposed wall to be reviewed by the Public Works Department. He noted that the slope shows signs of erosion and suggested that the wall would provide stability at the base of the slope with jute netting and groundcover to the screening plants to stabilize the hillside above. He said that the pittosporum would be planted along the areas where there is space for shrubs, with potato vines planted in the areas where there is not enough space. He felt Mr. Alm's idea to provide for more vertical plantings was a good one, which he felt they could achieve.

Chair Doyle questioned drainage on the top of the wood wall. Mr. Sadrieh proposed installing gravel in the back of the wooden wall which would allow the water to drain through the gravel and wall.

Boardmember Corcoran confirmed there would be irrigation installed for the landscaped area.

Boardmember Teiser asked if an engineer had looked at the retaining wall and the stability of the slope. Planning Manager Watrous said the height of the proposed small wood wall does not require Design Review, but the Town would require an encroachment permit which would be reviewed by the Public Works Department. Mr. Sadrieh said the small wall would not have a retaining role since they are not undermining the slope, and as there will be no additional load, the wall would act more as a catchment wall and a way to prevent future erosion. He noted there were one or two locations where cutting into the bank might be necessary, but they could also achieve this by lowering the height of the wall.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Abraham Valentino, owner, said he had the opportunity to meet with the neighbor to the south, and that the plan meets with their approval.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Corcoran thanked Mr. Sadrieh for the detail of the plans. He said that he researched the history of the Tiburon Ridge Trail and learned that the Town had passed a \$1.25 million bond measure in 1972 for the purpose of acquiring land for open space and recreation purposes which went toward building the trail. He felt that the compromise proposed was positive, noting that only a fraction of the easement is being used for the trail. He said that he would support the project with the revised plans, a 4 foot minimum trail width and the wooden wall improvements. He said that pitosporum species could be reviewed at staff level and agreed that the three foot high retaining wall would be sufficient, noting that a wider trail would need a taller wall.

Boardmembers Glassner, Teiser and Chair Doyle agreed, thanking Mr. Sadrieh for doing a great job with the plans and elevations.

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Teiser) to request staff return with a resolution partially granting the appeal to reflect the revised plans with added conditions for a minimum width of 4 feet between the existing fences, and that the wood fence along the trail be a maximum of 36 inches in height. Vote: 4-0.

E. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

4. 1910 STRAITS VIEW DRIVE KAVITSKY, GUEST HOUSE/SPA

The applicant submitted a request to construct a detached guest house and a spa on a property currently improved with a single-family home, detached garage and swimming pool. The proposed guest house would be a two-story structure and would include a bedroom and bathroom, wet bar, a large work-out room at the upper level. The lower level would include a

wine storage room, mechanical room, home theater, bathroom, sauna, and a smaller work-out room.

Jim Rottmeyer, applicant, said that the guest house was originally placed further down on the property to provide more buffering, but the Fire Department had issues with the distance, so they brought it back up. He stated that a letter was sent to the surrounding neighbors and response was received from Pamela Peterson who had concerns regarding landscaping, roof material and skylight pollution. He said that in addressing those concerns, the owner has chosen Olive trees to minimize the impacts of stucco siding. He noted that the roof material would be earth-colored gravel, and the skylights use diffusing gel which would significantly prevent light pollution.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Pamela Peterson distributed pictures of views of the site from her house. She noted that neighbors on both sides were in the process of building, and she was sure that the applicants would address landscaping. She said that the proposal would not impact her water views, but she hoped to minimize views of the roof. She was also concerned about light coming up from pathway, garden pool, spa, outdoor and inside lights.

Boardmember Teiser noted that the landscaping plan shows tree planting to address lighting concerns.

Richard Dwyer said his main concern with the project was having a second structure so close and how it would aesthetically impact his house. He said his living room, master bedroom and den all face the guest house location. He said he was pleased with the low profile of the structure into the hill, but added that he would look right at it.

Mr. Rottmeyer acknowledged similar neighbor concerns and agreed to work with them on landscaping in order to minimize impacts from windows.

Chair Doyle confirmed that the planting of Olive trees would address window or privacy views.

Associate Planner Tyler referred to a condition of approval recommended by the Fire District, which requires cutting and clearing all combustible vegetation within 100 feet of the structure, which must be done annually when the natural grasses dry out in early summer.

Chair Doyle confirmed that the equipment for the spa would be located under the stairway leading to it.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Glassner stated that consideration had been given to neighbors. He felt that the roof materials were vague and was unclear about lighting. He recommended that a timer be placed on the outdoor lighting as a condition of approval.

Boardmember Corcoran felt the home was beautiful but voiced concerns regarding the topography and the closeness of Mr. Dwyer's home. He noted that the closeness of the homes was a natural consequence of the site. He questioned the need for 3 skylights for an 880 square foot guest house and preferred that the number of skylights be reduced, but otherwise felt the project was reasonable.

Boardmember Teiser supported the project with the condition that a timer be installed on the outdoor lighting features and that the issue with the skylights could be addressed by the new gel skylight treatment.

Boardmember Corcoran said that he did not feel a timer device was necessary.

Chair Doyle stated that this was a reasonable building size. He noted that the structure would have large windows and doors, and he therefore did not understand the need for the skylights, but since the skylights were out of view, they would be acceptable. He suggested planting more Olive trees to help with views from Mr. Dwyer's home, and he felt that Ms. Peterson's concerns had been addressed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Corcoran) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report, with the additional condition of approval requiring that a timer for outdoor lighting be installed, that the skylights be of a diffusing gel type, additional landscaping be provided on the uphill neighbor side to be reviewed by staff, and that the roof be non-reflective. Vote: 4-0.

5. 43 UPPER NORTH TERRACE SOOFER, ADDITION/VARIANCE

The applicant requests approval for the expansion of a previously approved family room addition to an existing single-family dwelling. A family room addition to the rear of the existing breakfast nook on the main level of the house was approved by the Design Review Board on June 7, 2007. The applicants are now proposing to extend the addition to the rear an additional three feet. As with the previous application, a variance is again requested for reduced side yard setback.

Mohamad Sadrieh, architect, summarized the project.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Teiser felt that the project was a minimal change from the previous approval. Boardmember Corcoran said he could make the findings for the reduced side yard setback variance because it is a smaller lot, other lots with similar characteristics and have been granted variances, and the project would not be detrimental or substantially injure the neighboring properties.

ACTION: It was M/S (Glassner/Corcoran) that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report. Vote: 4-0.

6. 35 ROLLING HILLS ROAD MIRAVALLE/HIGGINS, SPA/VARIANCE

The applicant requested approval for the construction and legalization of a partially built large spa and a series of walls at 35 Rolling Hills Road. The spa was originally approved as a staff-level Design Review application within the rear yard setback. A building permit was subsequently issued, but the hired contractor proceeded to build the spa in a different location than what was approved. The applicant has now applied to legalize the unpermitted location of the spa within the required side yard setback, necessitating a variance for reduced side yard setback.

Mark Miravalle, owner, said they had originally delayed the project because of the magnitude of installing concrete, piers and retaining walls and the condition of the soil. He stated that the neighbors had no opposition to the request.

Chair Doyle confirmed that the spa equipment would be located in a room underneath the deck adjacent to and in front of the spa.

Boardmember Teiser said he visited the home, but was confused because the drawings never showed the original location of the spa and he was not sure he could support the request.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Corcoran said in light of all neighbor correspondence, it seems the applicants have done due diligence. He said that the property most affected was next door at 45 Rolling Hills, and that neighbor supports the request. Boardmember Corcoran felt it was a reasonable accommodation and he could support the project.

Chair Doyle said he was initially more concerned with the noise due to the spa equipment being so close to property, but the neighbors do not oppose it.

ACTION: It was M/S (Corcoran/Glassner) that that the project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the application subject to the conditions of approval as set forth in the Staff report. Vote: 3-0-1 (Teiser abstained).

7. 78 RED HILL CIRCLE LANYADOO, DECKS/VARIANCES

An application has been made to construct deck additions to the existing single-family dwelling at 78 Red Hill Circle. The proposed deck expansions would be situated within the required side yard setbacks up to the property lines. In order to expand a non-conforming condition, variances are required for reduced side yard setbacks.

Joe Lanyadoo, owner, said the house has major dry rot problems. He said that he removed the deck on the main floor of the living room and is requesting extension of it in an angular way so as not to block views of the neighbors. He said the neighbor's deck on the right side was 6-7 feet out, another neighbor had enclosed their deck, and he felt any objections to the request could be addressed by adding a tree or other type of landscaping.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

David Kell requested the Board deny the request to extend the main floor deck, as he said they would lose their visual privacy. He stated that no one before has ever been able to see into their house and they cannot see into anyone else's. He noted that all 23 homes in this development have privacy walls on each side built for the purpose of privacy and no one has ever been able to install such a deck. He described the differences in the decks on other homes. He said the applicant never brought the request to the neighbors. He also felt noise levels would increase and cited existing noise problems with the applicant without the deck extension. He also questioned the accuracy of the applicant's drawings.

Ken Miller said 6 years ago he was faced with something relatively similar when he wanted to extend his decks outward and, to avoid encroaching into the privacy of neighbors, he received approval from his neighbors to extend his deck 3-4 feet at an angle. He felt the critical variable was not extending the patio across, but out into someone else's view.

Ned Stephens said that all neighbors have been very considerate without exception, and he felt the main concern was noise. He said the interior walls were designed for privacy and noted that some people have built lower areas for ground floor access and extended out, but not on the bedroom and living room floors. He felt the encroachment proposed with the variance would pose a problem and was a serious situation with all neighbors.

Keith Nordstrom said the applicant's proposal would have zero impact on his line of sight. He noted that many people had expanded their decks, and felt the second page of the plans depicted a better visual account of the request. He said his next door neighbor was loud but people knowingly purchased units which are close to one another because of their views to San Francisco Bay.

The applicant acknowledged privacy was the neighbors' issue, stating that many neighbors could look into decks as well as living spaces and suggested landscaping to mitigate the problem.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Teiser stated that the plans submitted were very confusing, as he could not tell what was being proposed. He requested that the applicant provide better plans with dimensions, and describing how the deck relates to the privacy walls. He also requested a lighting plan be submitted and urged the applicant to work better with his neighbors. He suggested the matter be continued.

Boardmember Glassner agreed, stating that better plans and elevations were needed, including what the project would look like from the neighbors and below. He suggested the applicant provide a landscaping plan to reflect screening and that he should work with the neighbors.

Boardmember Corcoran agreed, and felt it was unfortunate the project had no CC&R's to control such issues. He acknowledged that many neighbors had made various improvements to their units, creating privacy issues. He agreed with the need for the applicant to resolve issues with neighbors and requested a better set of drawings.

Chair Doyle acknowledged that these were difficult homes with noise and privacy issues. He asked the applicant to work with neighbors, stating that the plans need to clearly indicate to the neighbors what is being proposed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Glassner/Corcoran) to continue the item to the October 4, 2007 meeting. Vote: 4-0.

**8. 544 SILVERADO DRIVE CAMERON, ADDITIONS/VARIANCE -
CONTINUED TO 9/20/07**

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #14 OF THE 8/16/07 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S (Teiser/Glassner) to approve the Minutes of the 8/16/07 Design Review Board Meeting as written. Vote: 4-0.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.