



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

Action and Approved Minutes - Regular Meeting
Design Review Board
August 5, 2010
7:00 P.M.

ACTION MINUTES #12

TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

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

Present: Chairman Chong, Vice Chairman Tollini, Boardmembers Emberson, Kricensky & Weller

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner Tyler and Minutes Clerk Rusting

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Tollini elected Chair; Kricensky elected Vice-Chair

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **215 BLACKFIELD DRIVE:** File No. 51003; Congregation Kol Shofar, Owner; Sign Permit to install an illuminated directional sign on top of an existing monument sign. The 1.3 square foot wooden sign with the word "enter" and a directional arrow would be placed on top of an existing 18.75 square foot monument sign indicating the presence of the Congregation Kol Shofar synagogue on the property. A ground-mounted light fixture would face upward to illuminate the face of the proposed sign. ***Approved 5-0***

NEW BUSINESS

2. **11 RACCOON LANE:** File No. 21006; Desmond King and Georgeann Economy, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception. The applicants propose to construct a 63 square foot addition that would create a new bathroom, closet and storage area on the lower floor of the house. The additions would extend to the front property line, in lieu of the minimum 15 foot front yard setback for this property. The proposed floor area is 2,832 square feet, which would exceed the floor area ratio of 2,081 square feet for this property by 751 square feet. ***Approved 4-0***

3. **55 MT. TIBURON ROAD:** File No. 710062; Zach and Annette Faidi, Owners; Walter and Betsy Menzel, Appellants; Appeal of Planning Staff's decision to approve a Site Plan and Architectural Review application for construction of a six foot high (6') deer fence. On June 17, 2010 the Planning Division approved an application for construction of a small retaining wall, a six foot high (6') perimeter deer fence and a vehicle entry gate. The adjacent neighbor has now appealed this decision to the Design Review Board.
Appeal denied 5-0

4. **139 LELAND WAY:** File No. 21014; Jeffrey and Kate Ratto, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling with a variance for excess lot coverage. The applicants propose to add onto an existing residence but demolish more than 50% of the existing floor area. A great room and master bedroom suite would be added to the front and existing bedrooms and a garage would be extended toward the front. The roofline would be raised to a maximum height of 17 feet, 6 inches. The additions would increase the lot coverage on the site to 43.6%, in lieu of the maximum 30.0% lot coverage for this property. **Approved 5-0**

MINUTES

5. Regular Meeting of July 15, 2010 **Approved 5-0**

ADJOURNMENT **At 8:55 PM**

**APPROVED MINUTES #12
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF AUGUST 5, 2010**

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

A. ROLL CALL

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

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING - None

D. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Kricensky) to elect Michael Tollini as Chair of the Design Review Board.
Vote: 5-0.

ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Chong) to elect John Kricensky as Vice-Chair of the Design Review Board. **Vote:** 5-0.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **215 BLACKFIELD DRIVE:** File No. 51003; Congregation Kol Shofar, Owner; Sign Permit to install an illuminated directional sign on top of an existing monument sign. The 1.3 square foot wooden sign with the word “enter” and a directional arrow would be placed on top of an existing 18.75 square foot monument sign indicating the presence of the Congregation Kol Shofar synagogue on the property. A ground-mounted light fixture would face upward to illuminate the face of the proposed sign.

The applicant desires to an illuminated directional sign on top of an existing monument sign on property located at 215 Blackfield Drive. The 1.3 square foot wooden sign with the word “enter” and a directional arrow would be placed on top of an existing 18.75 square foot monument sign indicating the presence of the Congregation Kol Shofar synagogue on the property. A ground-mounted light fixture would face upward to illuminate the face of the proposed sign.

Dragana Monson, architect, said that they are seeking approval for adding lighting and a directional element to an existing sign. She said that they will keep the existing sign as is and add the directional element pointing to the entrance of the parking lot. She said that a light fixture on a programmable timer will also be added.

There were no public comments.

Vice-Chair Kricensky asked if the blue color in the photo is close to the blue color that would be used, and Ms. Monson answered that it will be the same. Vice-Chair Kricensky asked if the word “Enter” would be engraved or painted on the sign. Ms. Monson said that it would be engraved and outlined.

Boardmember Weller asked if there was anything that would prevent the new portion from being such a bright blue color. Ms. Monson said they could make the color less bright and more similar to the existing blue color on the sign.

Boardmember Emberson asked for the wattage of the light that would be used to illuminate the sign. Ms. Monson answered it will not produce any glare or excessive light and only be enough to illuminate the sign. Boardmember Weller noted the plans specify the wattage at 600 lumens, and Boardmember Emberson suggested the neighbors may be concerned about the lighting and expressed concern that it not be excessively bright. Planning Manager Watrous said the illumination ends up being too bright, staff will work with Kol Shofar to change the wattage.

Vice-Chair Kricensky asked if the applicant considered using a more similar typeface for the word “Enter.” Ms. Monson said that they did not want to mix it with the rest of the sign, as its intent was to simply point people toward the parking lot. Planning Manager Watrous said the parking lot has been altered from two-way to one-way, and the purpose of the sign is to be sure people understand which way to drive.

Boardmember Chong said that he visited the site and although he was unsure how much light 600 lumens would be, but he felt that the sign would not be brightly illuminated and he could support the application.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that he visited the site and it was his understanding that the requirement to light the sign was not under the purview of the DRB. He felt that the “Enter” portion of the sign looked like an afterthought. He suggested that the grayish brown to blue colors that currently exist on the sign might be more pleasing than the very bright blue which was proposed.

Boardmember Weller stated that he drives by this sign every day and he noted that this area is almost entirely made up of single-family homes. He said that the current sign is not a problem because it fits in with the area, but the proposed sign addition would look more commercial, which is inconsistent with the Action and Approved Minutes #12

neighborhood. He opposed the sign as designed and liked to see something designed more consistent with the current appearance of the sign.

Boardmember Emberson felt that the proposed sign did not quite fit, but that it should be relatively simple to redesign the sign to make it more architecturally pleasing. She stated that she visited the site and that the proposed sign felt tacked on and should be better integrated with the existing sign.

Chair Tollini that he visited the site and suggested an additional condition of approval requiring that the color be more consistent with the existing sign and possibly adding another horizontal member. He agreed that this was a primarily residential neighborhood and that the existing sign is well integrated and blends with the landscaping. He acknowledged that a goal for a directional sign is to stand out so people know which way to go, but in six months people will know which way to go. He would like to see the addition become incorporated into the existing sign and asked to change the color of "Enter" to be more muted.

ACTION: It was M/S (Weller/Kricensky) that the request for 215 Blackfield Drive is approved, subject to the attached conditions of approval and the additional condition of approval that the color of the directional sign match the coloring of the existing sign and be better integrated into the existing sign, subject to the approval of Planning Staff. Vote: 5-0.

F. NEW BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

2. **11 RACCOON LANE:** File No. 21006; Desmond King and Georgeann Economy, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception. The applicants propose to construct a 63 square foot addition that would create a new bathroom, closet and storage area on the lower floor of the house. The additions would extend to the front property line, in lieu of the minimum 15 foot front yard setback for this property. The proposed floor area is 2,832 square feet, which would exceed the floor area ratio of 2,081 square feet for this property by 751 square feet.

Chair Tollini recused himself from this item.

The applicant is requesting to construct an addition with a variance for reduced front yard setback and a floor area exception on property located at 11 Raccoon Lane. Currently the property is improved with a single-family dwelling. The proposal would slightly expand the lower level of the home by incorporating a larger bathroom for the master bedroom, as well as a walk-in closet and storage area.

The proposed structure would result in a lot coverage of 2,295.2 square feet (38.6%) which exceeds the maximum permitted lot coverage in the R-2 zoning district (35.0%). The existing lot coverage of the structure is 2,246.5 square feet (37.7%). The proposed addition would increase the lot coverage by 48.7 square feet. The proposed structure would result in a gross floor area of 2,831.9 square feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted gross floor area for a parcel of this size (2,081.3 sq. ft.). Therefore, a floor area exception has been requested.

The home currently encroaches five feet (5') into the required fifteen foot (15') front yard setback. The proposed expansion at the lower level of the home would continue the same five foot (5') encroachment, for a continued reduced front yard setback of ten feet (10'). As the minimum required setback in the R-2 zone is fifteen feet (15'), a variance for reduced front yard setback has been requested.

John Swain, architect, reported that virtually all of the neighbors on Raccoon Lane have been contacted and are in favor of the project. He described the topography of the lot and stated that part of the goal was to integrate the architecture of the house and to reduce the height of the wall. He said that this would improve the curb appeal of the house and allow a redo of the floor plan of the bathroom. He noted that a great deal of the space to be expanded is already counted as floor area because it is covered by a roof and existing deck, and a very small area is coming into the setback, but would still be well back from the street.

Desmond King, owner, said that the plan was to make their home more welcoming from the street, to make it blend in with the neighborhood, and to make it seem like a single-family dwelling. He further described the project design and felt that the variance was warranted. He said that the proposed plan would improve the aesthetics of the street and neighborhood.

The public hearing was opened.

Mike Tollini voiced support for the project, said that the proposal would be a great use of space and the terrace in front would be a nice addition.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Weller said that this was a very modest proposal and the only issue is whether the Board could make the findings necessary for the granting of the variance. He noted that Staff had suggested 3 of the 4 findings could be satisfied, except for practical difficulty or necessary hardship, and he could appreciate the importance of including a bathtub in the new bathroom as part of a retirement plan for the residents. He said there is no way to include that type of facility in the current layout, which would be a practical difficulty for the applicant.

Boardmember Emberson agreed and said that this would be a lovely addition to the neighborhood. She said that it would be a practical difficulty to deprive the owners of storage space enjoyed by other homeowners in the vicinity.

Boardmember Chong thought that this was a good design and an excellent way to utilize space that would not add any bulk to the project. He said that this represented the most logical design to accommodate a full size master bathroom and therefore meets the finding for practical difficulty.

Vice-Chair Kricensky noted that there is a lot of full height crawl space that is not being used. He said that the house currently does not have a sense of entry, and this would create a nice entry from the street level. He noted the distance of the house from the street and supported the project.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Weller/Emberson) that the request for 11 Raccoon Lane is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approved the request subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.</p>

Chair Tollini returned to the meeting.

3. **55 MT. TIBURON ROAD:** File No. 710062; Zach and Annette Faidi, Owners; Walter and Betsy Menzel, Appellants; Appeal of Planning Staff's decision to approve a Site Plan and Architectural Review application for construction of a six foot high (6') deer fence. On June 17, 2010 the Planning Division approved an application for construction of a small retaining wall, a six foot high (6') perimeter deer fence and a vehicle entry gate. The adjacent neighbor has now appealed this decision to the Design Review Board.

On June 17, 2010 the Planning Division approved a Site Plan and Architectural Review application for construction of a small retaining wall, a six foot high (6') perimeter deer fence and a vehicle entry gate, on property located at 55 Mount Tiburon Road. The adjacent neighbor located at 45 Mount Tiburon Road has now appealed this decision to the Design Review Board. The applicant submitted a request for construction of a six foot high (6') perimeter deer fence, a vehicle entry gate and a small section of retaining wall. Currently the property is improved with a single-family dwelling.

The proposed deer fencing would be six feet in height (6') and would be a non-climbable wire mesh fencing material in between metal stakes, all of which would be painted a flat black. The fencing would be similar to what is installed around the property located at 80 Mount Tiburon Road. An approximately fifty-six foot (56') section of wood retaining wall would be installed in combination with the proposed

deer fencing on the west side of the property. The vehicle entry gate would connect with the proposed perimeter deer fencing at the driveway, and would incorporate stone columns with a solid redwood gate.

Planning Manager Watrous reviewed the procedure for an appeals hearing.

Walter Menzel, appellant, thanked the Board for their service to the Town of Tiburon. He commented that the applicants are good neighbors and he hoped to continue that relationship. He said that he did not object to the concept of building of the fence around the property. However, he strenuously objected to the placement of one portion of the fence that would impede his view of San Francisco. He said that that view was the reason he originally purchased the house.

Mr. Menzel presented four exhibits which he described as various iterations of a fence plan for the subject property, which included references to the “neighboring view corridor,” referring to the view from his property. He said that he had had numerous discussions with the applicant in which his neighbor agreed that he would not block his views. However, on May 10, 2010, a fourth plan (Exhibit 4) was presented that put the entire fence on the property line. He said that he only heard about this plan through the Planning Division’s courtesy notice. He stated that he objected to the design and the application was modified. He said that he met further with the neighbor to resolve the fence issue and he again asked to have the fence moved so it would not block his view. He said that he was also concerned with plans to landscape the fence, which could further block the view. He said that he requested the fence be moved upslope by three feet and he heard no response. He said that moving the fence further upslope should preserve his view and he believed that this was a small and reasonable request that would minimally impact the property, whereas the impact on his own property would be huge if the fence was not moved. He assured the applicants that he was not trying to gain property rights but only to preserve his view, and he stated that he would be glad to sign any legal documents to that effect.

Barry Kahn, attorney for the appellants, said that the details presented by this appeal are very small but very important. He acknowledged that the applicant has a lawful right to request a six foot deer fence, but he stated that this is not an unfettered right and is subject to review and approval. He said that the appellant has a right to protect his property rights, and the DRB’s job is to enforce the zoning ordinance. He stated that this fencing issue has been brewing for three years, and that the applicant has presented three plans that were acceptable and preserved the appellant’s views, but with no notice or rationale, the applicant submitted a fourth plan that deleted that protection and moved the fence back without consulting the appellant. Mr. Kahn stated that the appellants were not in any way trying to impair the applicants’ safety, views, security, privacy, or use and enjoyment of property. He stated that this appeal was only about the location of the fence and the potential effect of intruding on the views.

Mr. Kahn addressed some items in the Staff report. He quoted sections from the Zoning Ordinance that state that “uses and structures [should] enhance their sites and are compatible with the highest standards of improvement in the surrounding neighborhood.” He asked the Board to apply the highest standards as required by the Town. He noted further that the Zoning Ordinance requires that review of the location of improvements on the site must take into account view consideration. He said that there was no hardship or impairment of property rights to the applicant to move the fence three feet as requested. He said that they were trying to avoid a further appeal and reach a resolution to this situation and he thought that the DRB should preserve the status quo as long as it did not infringe on the applicant, and he believed that moving the fence three feet did not infringe on the applicant’s rights. He did not think that the Staff report adequately analyzed protecting the appellant’s views from the fence or vegetation.

Zach Faidi, applicant, said that he likes the Menzels and they have never had any issues in the past. He said that all he wants to do is have a simple deer fence, of which there are many in the neighborhood. He said that he would rather have a wrought iron fence, but he selected this fence design because it would be the least visible. He said that he never wanted to block anyone’s views, and he repeatedly told his architects to be sensitive to neighbors’ views. He said that what he has requested would not be in the Menzel’s view. He stated that he asked his architect to meet with the appellant and they agreed on a plan, but within a few weeks he was contacted by the appellant’s attorney who said that they wanted another portion of the fence to be pushed up 17 feet. He said that he was asked for a deed restriction for protection of view corridors forever. He said that he was entitled to put a fence on the property line and be sensitive

to their views. He said that he contacted Mr. Menzel and explained he does not want to block the view but he cannot protect him from seeing the fence. He stated that the appellant asked him to push the fence upslope three feet, and he said he was struggling with the decision. He stated that if the fence was moved back three feet, some tree limbs would need to be trimmed, and this would reduce his privacy. He reiterated that he would like the opportunity to ask for a wrought iron fence instead of the one currently proposed.

Chair Tollini asked about proposed vegetation inside and outside the fence. Mr. Faidi said that he would ultimately like to create a barrier to prevent people from seeing inside their home, but he had not yet determined where it would be located. He reiterated that he does not intend to ever block Mr. Menzel's view. He said that he was not certain of the angle of the photos taken by Mr. Menzel.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Menzel stated again that he did not object to the fence itself, but rather to its location. He said that understood that the fence would be visible, but he felt that if it was not moved three feet it would be right in his view. He said that there is no guarantee whatsoever that vegetation will not grow into the view. He stated that the photos he submitted were taken from his living room. He assured Mr. Faidi that he had no desire to own the land on the other side of the fence and would be glad to sign something to that effect.

Mr. Kahn said that vegetation is a very broad term and he proposed the possibility of asking to move the fence three feet and clarify the vegetation or lack of vegetation along the fence. He said that it would be premature to approve the application without some clarification of the vegetation.

Planning Manager Watrous stated that there was no proposed landscaping as part of this application. He said that any landscaping that grows into the view is addressed by the Town's View Ordinance. He asked Mr. Menzel if he would have any problem changing the material of the fence to wrought iron, and Mr. Menzel said that he would have a problem with that.

Mr. Faidi stated that the fence would not be in Mr. Menzel's view of San Francisco and would be a few feet in from his view corridor. He said that there is nothing preventing him from planting in that area today, but he had no desire to plant anything to block any of their major views.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Weller said that he visited the site and tried to get a sense of the view and the fence. He said that this project was not about the view because none of the renderings show that the view of the city would be affected by the proposed location of the fence. He said that moving the fence three feet back would give the appellant more of a view of the hillside, but Mr. Faidi's right to build a fence on his property that does not impair views is something the Board should respect. He said that the fence would be visible but would not obstruct any views. He said that he could not support the appeal.

Boardmember Emberson said that it appeared that things have gotten out of hand between the two property owners. She said that she visited the site and the Menzels' home and she agreed that the fence would not block the view. However, when she entered the Menzel's house, she said that she saw the potential for vegetation growing into the view.

Planning Manager Watrous clarified that this application has no landscaping included and therefore that is not part of the discussion and appeal. Boardmember Weller noted that normal plantings would not come before the Board. Planning Manger Watrous said the only planting that would require Town review is the planting of an undesirable tree. He reiterated that any view obstruction issues regarding vegetation are left to the View Ordinance. He said that landscaping that is part of an application can be included in discussion, but this application does not include landscaping. Boardmember Weller stated that they cannot consider hypothetical landscaping as part of the Board's decision.

Chair Tollini asked if the Board was setting itself up for a future vegetation problem since the placement of the fence is right at the edge of the view. Planning Manager Watrous said that it was still speculative as

to whether there would be landscaping along the fence or not and that requirements to prevent future landscaping are difficult for the Town to enforce.

Boardmember Emberson said that she would like to see a solution that would allow both parties to get something. She said that she was still concerned about future landscaping blocking views.

Boardmember Chong said that he visited the site and the Menzels' living room. He said that it was unfortunate that the fence would be close to the main view, but there is an expectation Tiburon that one will see certain structures. He thought that the fence had been pushed back far enough that the main view would be preserved. He stated that there was ample documentation of the property without vegetation, and the View Ordinance could be used to take care of any landscaping that grows up into the views. He said that he leaned toward denying the appeal.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that the fence itself would affect views of the applicant's property and not the view of the City and water. He noted that landscaping around the fence could make the fence disappear even more and that black colored fences such as this tend to disappear into the trees behind it. He stated that landscaping could interfere with the appellant's views whether the fence is moved back or not. He said that the view ordinance could come into play, but the Board is charged with discussing the fence and not vegetation in this case. He stated that the corner post of the fence could make a difference if moved back, but he could not find a basis to require moving it back.

Chair Tollini agreed that the fence itself would be nearly invisible and would only block a view of the applicant's vegetation. He stated that the appellant has a great view, but one that is extremely vulnerable. He noted that the trees across the street have been regularly trimmed and this is a view that has been preserved throughout the years because Mr. Menzel has had strong positive relations with neighbors. He noted that it has probably required substantial effort and cost to maintain that view. He thought that it would be sheer indulgence to ask the applicant to move the fence. He noted that landscaping could interfere with the view any time, regardless of whether or not the fence was there. He said that the fence material as proposed would be as invisible and innocuous as possible.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Kricensky/Weller) to direct Staff to return with a resolution to deny the appeal for 55 Mt. Tiburon Road at the next Board meeting. Vote: 5-0.</p>
--

- 4. 139 LELAND WAY:** File No. 21014; Jeffrey and Kate Ratto, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling with a variance for excess lot coverage. The applicants propose to add onto an existing residence but demolish more than 50% of the existing floor area. A great room and master bedroom suite would be added to the front and existing bedrooms and a garage would be extended toward the front. The roofline would be raised to a maximum height of 17 feet, 6 inches. The additions would increase the lot coverage on the site to 43.6%, in lieu of the maximum 30.0% lot coverage for this property.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 139 Leland Way. As more than 50% of the floor area of the existing house would be demolished as part of this project, the application has been deemed to be construction of a new single-family dwelling. The project would extend additions to the front and rear of the existing house. The existing one-car garage would be pushed forward and bay windows would be added to the two bedrooms at the front of the house. A larger addition would be attached to the rear of the house, including a new great room, master bedroom suite and study, along with an expanded kitchen. The roofline of the house would be reconfigured to provide a taller peak to the ridgeline. Two new skylights and a solar tube skylight would be installed in the roof.

The proposed additions would increase the floor area of the house by 1,484 square feet to 2,502 square feet, which is less than the floor area ratio for this site. The proposed addition would increase the previously approved lot coverage of the site by 1,990 square feet to a total of 3,272 square feet (43.6%), which would be greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1-BA zone. Therefore a variance is requested for excess lot coverage.

Jeff Ratto, owner, said that they are proposing a single-story home of 2,502 square feet and that he was available for questions.

Boardmember Weller asked why the roofline was elevated. Mr. Ratto said that it was designed to allow roof trusses; it would be a simple structure where the truss is run from the front to the back of the house. He said that the trusses would meet at the center of the home, and the roof peak would be about ten feet long in the center of the home.

Boardmember Weller noted that there was no cross section view and he questioned what was happening structurally from the inside. Mr. Ratto said that there was no structural reason for the roof to provide interior space, but the roof structure was a result of the hiping from all sides. Boardmember Weller questioned what was above the raised portion, and Mr. Ratto said that this was where the furnace would go, and possibly some storage space. He said that they were not trying to create any living space in that area.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that there are a number of ways to roof the house, but this was the simplest roof design for the house. He said that he was concerned with the front elevation until he realized how the roof would slope back. Mr. Ratto said that this design would take some of the massing away from the street.

There were no public comments.

Vice-Chair Kricensky said that running the hips of the roof in both directions and shortening the ridge line really mitigate the impact of the roof. He appreciated the effort of the applicant to keep the design to a single floor and he agreed with Staff's findings for the variance.

Boardmember Chong said that the roof jumped out at him also, but the black composition shingles would make it blend in. He said that this seemed like a good way to do a modest addition.

Boardmember Emberson said that this was a great plan and fits with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Weller said that now that he understands the roof, he agreed with the other Boardmembers and commended the applicant for keeping the home to one story so it is consistent with the neighborhood.

Chair Tollini agreed and noted that the floor area would not be excessive and this was the best design for an addition.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Weller) that the request for 139 Leland Way is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.</p>

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #11 OF THE 7/15/10 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Weller/Chong) to approve the minutes of the July 15, 2010 meeting as written. Vote: 5-0.</p>
--

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.