

**MINUTES #14
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 1, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Kricensky, Vice Chair Emberson and Boardmembers Chong, Cousins and Tollini

Absent: None

Ex-Officio: Planning Manager Watrous, Associate Planner O'Malley and Minutes Clerk Rusting

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING

Planning Manager Watrous noted changes that had been made to the format of the agenda, stating that the Town had switched to a new software system to connect online agendas and staff reports to audio recordings in the future. As a result, there is now a standardized format listing only public hearings and action items.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Boardmember Chong recused himself from the following item.

1. **85 EAST VIEW AVENUE:** File Nos. DR2016091, VAR2016026, VAR2016027, VAR2016028, VAR2016029, VAR2016030 & FAE2016009; David and Tandy Ford, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced front and side yard setbacks, excess lot coverage and excess building height, and a Floor Area Exception. The applicant proposes to construct a new four-story, 1,908 square foot house, which would result in a floor area ratio of 97.1%, which is greater than the 35.0% maximum for a lot of this size. The front yard setback would be zero feet in lieu of the minimum 15 feet. The east side setback would be 3 feet and the west side yard setback would be 3 feet, 4 inches, in lieu of the minimum 8 feet. The lot coverage of the house would be 1,227 square feet (62.3%), which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone. The house would be 42 feet, 11 inches tall, in lieu of the maximum building height of 30 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 060-105-67.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new four-story single-family dwelling on property located at 85 East View Avenue. The subject property is currently vacant. The first (lowest) level of the house would include a bedroom, bathroom study

and storage area. The second level would include a master bedroom suite and laundry room. The third level would include a living room, kitchen, dining room and a half bathroom. The fourth (highest) level would include a two-car garage and an entry. A deck would extend off the second level, along with access to a patio area on the first level and a roof deck adjacent to the entry on the fourth level. All four levels would be connected by an interior stairway and an elevator. Skylights would be installed above the entry stairs on the fourth level and the first level study. A wire fence would extend along the west (left) side property line. An additional parking pad would be created to the left of the driveway.

The floor area of the proposed house would be 1,908 square feet (97.1%), which is greater than the 35.0% maximum floor area permitted for a lot of this size. A floor area exception is therefore requested. In addition, the following variances would be required for the proposed house:

- The proposed house would extend up to the front property line, which would be less than the 15 foot front yard setback required in the R-1 zone.
- The proposed house would extend to within 3 feet of the east (right) side property line, which would be less than the 8 foot side yard setback required in the R-1 zone.
- The proposed house would extend to within 3 feet, 4 inches of the west (right) side property line, which would be less than the 8 foot side yard setback required in the R-1 zone.
- The proposed house would cover 1,227 square feet (62.3%) of the site, which is greater than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone.
- The height of the proposed house would be 42 feet, 11 inches, which is greater than the 30 foot maximum building height in the R-1 zone.

David Ford, owner, gave an overview of the project history. He described the process by which surveys were made that resulted in a lot one-third smaller than they previously thought they had. He said that they therefore redesigned the house that would step up the hill, be built into the hill, and be much less intrusive.

David Thompson, architect, displayed images of the proposed project and materials to be used. He said that they had previously redesigned the project to address the Board's concerns, but after finding out about the lot line issues it took until June to be able to redesign the project. He said that since this is a substandard lot, it seemed reasonable to adjust the setback. He stated that the Town's records show a three foot setback on one side of 83 East View Avenue and a two foot setback on the other side, and he believed that this represented a precedent for what they proposed. He displayed photos of several properties along East View Avenue and stated that the houses are set back very similar to what they have designed. He said that the top floor would be level with the road, and the roof structure kept as minimal as possible, which would be consistent with other properties on the street. He said that the owner's preference for a contemporary design was appropriate. He stated that any time a new home is built on a vacant lot next to an existing

home, there will be impacts on the existing homes that are often considered to be “borrowed views.” He compared drawings of the old design and new design and noted that the current proposal would step the building up the hill and push it away from the neighboring property. He said that the house was moved further into the hill and up the hill and that it was not possible to move it any further up the hill because the lot became narrower. He displayed several examples of 3-4 story buildings in the neighborhood. He stated that construction projects on Corinthian Island are challenging, and hoped that the Board approved the project.

Vice-Chair Emberson asked if they studied the existing retaining wall built by the Town. Mr. Thompson said that they did and their project would reinforce that wall, but they were not relying on that wall to support the house.

Boardmember Tollini asked if the proposed exterior stairway was requested by the Fire Marshall, and Mr. Thompson confirmed that it was. He said that the site is much steeper on the other side and the stairs would follow the contour of the grade.

The public hearing was opened.

Emily Gannett said she that owns a very small house with beautiful views and the story poles indicate that the house would obstruct her view of Angel Island almost entirely. She hoped for a compromise so she may continue to have the view for which she purchased her home. She suggested pushing the house further into the hillside.

Ken Welter asked if the story poles represented the top of the railing or the top of the deck. The Boardmembers confirmed that the poles represented the top of the railing. Mr. Welter stated that the tallest story pole was in his view towards Mt. Tam and he requested a way for the house to be pushed back further into the hill.

Ulrik Binzer said that the suggestions at the last meeting were completely ignored. He said that the project would eliminate all of his views and suggested moving the home closer to the street. He displayed photographs of the view from his living room and kitchen showing the story poles and noted there would also be a window looking right into his home. He said that the house would have a huge impact on privacy, light, and views. He felt that the neighbors’ views could be preserved by pushing the house further into the hillside and by removing some of the living room and repositioning it near the retaining wall. He also thought that it would help to move the third floor slightly back and remove some deck space. He did not think that a fourth parking spot was necessary since most of the houses in the area have only two.

Teresa Ou stated that the applicants did not follow the feedback that was given. She believed that the impact on the neighbors could be easily mitigated if they followed that feedback. She felt that some of the commentary about the lot lines was a distraction from the main issue at hand, which is that the house does not follow the Hillside Design Guidelines.

Mr. Thompson stated that the notion that they ignored the previous direction and discussion was insulting because a lot of effort was put into the revision. He said that the views presented by neighbors were somewhat misleading and if the house was moved as suggested, that would

impact their own views because it would place the building in a “canyon.” He said that they already have a smaller view corridor than their neighbors. He stated that moving the garage closer would make the parking steeper than what is allowable and was therefore not possible. He stated that the front property line was not accurately located in Mr. Binzer’s diagrams, as the property line varies along that location. He said that removing the existing retaining wall and pushing back the house in that area would be a major undertaking and he did not believe they should be forced to do that. He reiterated that they paid a lot of attention to the comments, and the change in lot size made reaching all of the goals more difficult. He believed that the issues the neighbors were concerned about had improved since the original design.

Mr. Ford said a significant amount of time was spent figuring out the lot lines and then a good deal of time was spent figuring out how to build on this lot. He said that they tried to incorporate everything that was mentioned at the last meeting. He felt that the views to the side were borrowed views at best. He said that the previously proposed house would have blocked a lot more view than the current design. He said that their intention was to build a small house with a nice design and he did not think they can do any better.

Chair Kricensky asked for an explanation of what would be needed to move the house closer to the street. Mr. Ford said that they did not want to have to close East View Avenue for a substantial period of time to rebuild the wall, which would be necessary if they moved the house further up the hill.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins commended the applicant on the presentation and the design. He believed that they did much of what was requested at the last meeting, with a considerable reduction in size and pulling the house up the hill. He said that he was hesitant to move it further up the hill as it was as tight as it could get. He said that if the lot was still wider, then they could build a wider house and push things back, so it was difficult to see how it could be made smaller. He noted that the home at 83 East View Avenue is nonconforming and there was bound to be a big impact when something was built next to it. He thought that the changes made to the design addressed the Board’s comments and that this was a good compromise. He believed that the primary views from the home at 87 East View Avenue were of Mt. Tam and downtown and that the views across the property to Angel Island were borrowed. He liked the design of the house and support the project.

Boardmember Tollini said that this was a thoughtful design with a resilient applicant, adding that he was sympathetic to the applicant because of what happened with the lot lines. He noted that the house at 87 East View Avenue is oriented differently and that the primary living room window looks directly at Raccoon Strait and Angel Island. He did not think that it was reasonable for the house in the borrowed view to be 43 feet tall. He felt that possible changes to the third story could help preserve views from both 83 & 87 East View Avenue. He suggested moving the living room back 6 feet or more and removing the glazing on that side. He acknowledged that this is a tough site and a house would have a dramatic impact on neighbors no matter what, but he felt that if the third floor space could be shifted it would be a good balance. He felt that there were opportunities to redistribute the living room space on the third floor. He

also believed that the road would be blocked anyway during construction since it is a one-way road and it is difficult to access the lot.

Vice-Chair Emberson said she struggled with this application, as she liked the design but felt that there was some room to shift some of the space to preserve more of the views. She agreed that the road would be affected by the construction and thought that there was an opportunity to adjust the retaining wall and move the house back. She said that this would help the neighbors' views and said that she would like to see the living room on the third story pulled back.

Boardmember Tollini said that he did not believe views from the new house would be affected by moving it back. The Boardmembers reviewed the plans and questioned whether the living room could be made wider. Boardmember Tollini suggested that there was space to shift some of the portions of the house that block views.

Chair Kricensky said that this was a nicely designed house and would be rather modest and very similar to other houses in that area. He said that the further back the house is pushed, the further back the next house would have to be. He said that the side windows on 83 East View Avenue were designed knowing that a house would be built on this lot someday and that that house is built much further out. He said that he was more concerned about losing the slot view from 87 East View Avenue.

Boardmember Tollini agreed about the views from 87 East View Avenue. He stated that often with windows on the side of older homes a new house needs to work with what exists and strike a balance. He thought that there were some plausible changes to the design that would resolve the view issues and have less impact.

Planning Manager Watrous stated that the owner needed to grant a time extension to the Permit Streamlining Act deadlines to continue the application past October 6 and the applicant verbally agreed to the extension.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) to continue the application for 85 East View Avenue to the November 3, 2016 meeting. Vote: 4-0-1 (Chong recused).

Boardmember Chong returned to the meeting.

E. ACTION ITEMS

2. **173 STEWART DRIVE:** File No. DR2016036; Afie Royo, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story, 2,723 square foot house with a 510 square foot garage. Assessor's Parcel No. 055-101-21.

The applicant is requesting to construct a new two-story single-family dwelling. The existing single-family dwelling on the site shall be demolished.

This application was first reviewed at the May 19, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, several neighboring residents raised concerns about the accuracy of the story poles and the height of the house. The Design Review Board did not support the project design. The Board reiterated its concerns that were raised during the review of the previous application for this property, stating that having all of the living area on the upper floor without extending the lower floor was contrary to the Hillside Design Guidelines and that the eventual removal of the pine trees on the site would make the house very visible when viewed from below on Sierra Court. The Board encouraged the applicant to consider placing some of the floor area on the lower floor, which could require some excavation on the site. The application was continued to the July 7, 2016 meeting, and further continued until September 1, 2016 at the request of the applicant.

Since the May 19 meeting, the applicant has told Town staff that she met with several nearby residents who told her that they would not support a revised project design with more floor area on the lower level, but, with the exception of concerns over the glass patio railings, would not oppose the original building design. The applicant submitted revised plans that only marginally change the project design. The roof was slightly reconfigured to lower the ridge height above the southern portion of the house by 1 foot 2 inches to 2 feet, 4 inches. The dining room windows were reduced in size by 25%. The main floor kitchen would be 6 inches narrower and the lower floor laundry was pulled back 6 inches. The curved patio design was been squared off and the railings changed. Otherwise, the floor plans were identical to the previous design and the floor area and lot coverage of the house remained unchanged.

Joseph Farrell, architect, reviewed the project and described changes made to the design. He said that they removed a large projection off the north side of the house and modified the patio and added a solid railing to address neighbors' concerns. He stated that they reduced the height of the roof by reducing the plate height by 2 feet, 4 inches. He said that they considered excavating underneath the house after the last meeting, but found that it would require significant excavation and grading to be able to put the bedrooms downstairs, which would only have one window each and would be dark. He said that it would be expensive to do that excavation and grading. He said that this proposal met all of the development guidelines and he believed that it was fairly reasonable. He agreed that the house would not step back according to the Hillside Design Guidelines, but he noted that those are guidelines and not code. He said that the house would have quite a bit of articulation and the most prominent view of the building would be landscaped. He said that excavating underneath would result in a two-story building which would be more visible with no landscaping in that area.

Afie Royo, owner, said she purchased the property 2½ years ago and that this was the fourth time at design review. She said that they initially submitted plans with a new upper story, which would block the views of the adjacent neighbor and was rejected. She said that their next step was to propose a plan with 2,700 square feet of living space on the first level that projected onto Sierra Court, but the neighbors on Sierra Court objected and that project was not approved. She said that the third time was to reduce the living space and they were told to consider excavating underneath the house. She said that the house would have 2,200 square feet of living space. She said that contractors told her that excavation would cost in excess of \$300,000 and this was not feasible. She said that they therefore worked on adjusting the existing plan by reducing the height of the building and the height of the rooms. She said that this process had been

challenging and very costly. She stated that the house would not impact anyone's view or privacy. She felt that there was no other possible alternative and that they had done what they could to please everyone, but it seemed to be impossible.

The public hearing was opened.

Joan Foster said that she looked forward to this meeting in the hopes of a new design that addressed the directive of the Board but she saw that that did not happen. She stated that the pictures did not show the north side that faced the neighbors. She said that the house would look massive when viewed from the bottom of Sierra Court. She said that no thought was given to stepping down the hill. She said that she compared the old and new plans and noted that the old plans show a different ridge height measurement for the existing home than shown on the new plans. She requested that the project observe the Hillside Design Guidelines.

Laurie James said that she appreciated the redesigned roofline and thought that it visually made more sense. She thought that it was confusing that each plan has had varying building heights and said that it would be helpful to know if the new ridge would be higher or lower than the existing ridge. She said that the majority of the new space would come out toward and loom over Sierra Court. She said that the design did not address discussion at the last meeting to look at other possible options than having all of the living space on one floor. She said that they met with the applicant to talk about possibilities and their understanding was that a two-story structure was not a good idea, but that they were open to other possibilities on other parts of the property.

Mr. Farrell addressed the height discrepancy, stating that the previous drawings were completed by another company and were incorrect, but had been corrected after a survey. He said that the roof would go up slightly in one location, but they feel it would be quite a bit lower than previous applications and would be respectful of the neighborhood. He said that the roofs would be hipped in order to avoid tall gable ends and they removed a fair amount of building mass. He stated that the house would comply with the height limit and he believed that the design was a compromise and very reasonable.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Tollini stated that he had attended all three of the prior meetings for this property and the only thing that was changed on this application was that the 11 foot plate heights were reduced to 9 foot plates. He said that he felt the same way as he previously had and that it was not reasonable to expand on a single plane on a hillside lot. He said that he appreciated the economics of excavating, but still believed that the addition needed to go underneath in a hillside neighborhood. He said that the house would loom over Sierra Court and that he could not support the project.

Boardmember Cousins agreed with Boardmember Tollini and noted that the mudroom could be placed below grade and that there was a large crawl space beneath the house. He suggested that the windows could be installed in another location without removing the landscaping.

Vice-Chair Emberson noted the large amount of crawl space and suggested adding living space there. She said that she liked the hipped roofs but felt that there was room to add below the house, even for bedrooms. She said that she was also concerned about the ridge height.

Boardmember Chong said that the ridge height did not necessarily bother him. He said that a cantilevered design can look nice but he did not think it belonged on a home that is in neighbors' views. He said that with the pine trees removed, this was not the right design. He agreed that this is a challenging corner lot with a slope, but he could not support the design.

Chair Kricensky said that he understood wanting the master bedroom and the other bedrooms on the same level, but this proposal was too far removed from the Hillside Design Guidelines. He agreed with the other Boardmembers' comments.

Boardmember Cousins noted that the guidelines specifically say homes need to be excavated into the hillside.

ACTION: It was M/S (Cousins/Tollini) to direct staff to prepare a resolution of denial without prejudice for 173 Stewart Drive, to be adopted at the next meeting. Vote: 5-0.

3. **2225 VISTAZO EAST STREET:** File No. DR2016089; Shor Capital, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story 5,375 square foot house and a 720 square foot garage. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-091-55

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 2225 Vistazo East Street. The subject property is currently vacant. The upper floor of the house would include a living room, dining room, kitchen, family room and a master bedroom suite, along with a mud room, a small additional bathroom and a powder room. The lower floor would include three more bedrooms and bathrooms, along with a media room, laundry room, wine cellar and storage room. Decks would extend off both floors to the east and patios would be located at ground level on several sides of the building. A roof deck would cover much of the southern portion of the upper floor. A swimming pool would be situated off the upper floor.

The floor area of the proposed house would be 5,375 square feet, with 720 square feet of garage space, which is 679 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The proposed house would cover 5,655 square feet (13.5%) of the site, which is less than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone.

Scott Couture, architect, said that they resubmitted the project with substantial changes. He displayed a site plan showing building components that were removed. He said that they shortened the length of the home by 13 feet, removed 345 square feet of glazing, reduced the lot coverage by 345 square feet, and reduced the pool wall by 6 feet. He said that they also changed the landscape to include softer materials and removed the retaining walls near the pool. He presented a montage showing the view of the house from Vistazo East Street which he said would be most visible view of the house. He stated that a large portion of the home would be cut

into the hillside and displayed a drawing showing areas that would be below grade, including the garage and mudroom. He displayed views of the visual mass from all of the nearby vantage points. He stated that the proposed trees to be planted would grow to 15-20 feet and would help screen the home from Vistazo East Street. He said that they chose materials that are darker toned so that the house would blend in with the landscape. He displayed photos from other homes in the area with renderings of how the home would look from those locations. He stated that the lot is one acre and is larger than the surrounding lots, yet the house would conform to all of the zoning requirements and have little impact on privacy and views. He also noted that the project would include widening the street and adding a fire hydrant, which would serve many of the other homes in the area.

The public hearing was opened.

David Peterson said they have been through several meetings and as he still felt that the house would be architecturally dramatic and would not fit the character of the neighborhood. He said that the floor area would be much larger than other homes in the neighborhood. He said that the house would be very tall for a two-story building and the glazing would make the house very bright at night in what is otherwise a dark area. He said that he could see every story pole from his outside deck. He said that there appeared to be more glazing on the lower level of the east side than was previously proposed. He said that the core design of the house was very similar as present at prior meetings and he did not think that the proposed changes addressed the issue of fitting in with the neighborhood.

James Bernheisel said that the story poles were not plumb and the project did not look different to him. He thought that the house did not fit in with the neighborhood and was essentially the same as what was presented before. He stated that there are some artesian springs on the property and he believed it was important to be sure they are not building on them. He said that it was important still to understand what will happen with other vacant lots in the vicinity in the future. He said that he did not understand the landscape plan and needed clarification.

Bob Miller said that the photo present indicated that the house would have no visual impact on them, but he said that that was not the case. He said that they would see the entirety of the building from their living room and deck. He said that the house would be enormous and very high and portray a feeling of mass unlike anything else in the area. He said that this house would be twice as big as the size of the average home below it and its size and mass would be out of keeping with the Old Tiburon area. He also expressed concern that the amount of light and glazing would have a huge impact at night.

Van Swearingen stated that his primary views face the proposed house and he was concerned that the glazing would shift light pollution to the east toward their house. He said that the house design was extremely large to begin with and was still extremely large. He said that he created maps with information he collected from Google maps showing that the average home size on Vistazo East is 2,500 square feet, and if the Ridge Road houses are included the average size is 3,100 square feet. He stated that house would be over twice the size of the average house around it. He referred to the Tiburon General Plan and stated that the project did very little to address the fundamental concerns brought up at previous meetings.

Christine Miller said that the house would impact her primary living space and she presented a photograph of her kitchen, dining area and deck. She questioned why the house needed to be perched so high on the property. She said that she would be looking at light coming from the windows of the structure from all of her primary living areas. She stated that a home on Ridge Road that they can see brightly at night is only 1/6 of the size of the proposed project. She requested that the massiveness of the house be minimized and also expressed concern that the proposed trees would not create a green screen for a long time.

Eric Lindell said that he would like to retain the character of Old Tiburon and felt that the proposed house did not belong in that neighborhood.

Carol McKegney said that at the last meeting the Board said that the house would not adhere to the Hillside Design Guidelines, brought up issues of neighborhood fit, and requested reducing the linear design of the house. She felt that the applicants can do better to retain the character of Tiburon.

Mr. Couture acknowledged that the home would be large, but noted that this is one of the largest parcels in the area. He stated that all of the properties uphill of Vistazo East are zoned RO-2 and downhill all of the properties are zoned RO-1. He said that they did not add glazing to the east side, but took all of the windows out of the eastern side and added screening louvers in front of some windows that would screen all of the glass. He displayed a view from Mr. Bernheisel's patio and stated that there was no potential for trees to grow up into that view.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Tollini said that there is a traditional feel to much of Old Tiburon but also an eclectic mix of architecture. He had no issue with the design and believed it to be quite attractive. He stated that no one would be high enough to see as much glazing as shown on the plans and that moving the house downhill would make the windows more visible. He stated that the linear mass was reduced and the swimming pool wall has been brought down. He noted this is a one acre lot and there is a home of almost the same size two doors down on only a half-acre lot. He said that there are other homes in the area with a lot of glazing and modern architecture. He said that the reality is that there will be more large homes built on the other large lots in the area.

Vice-Chair Emberson agreed with Boardmember Tollini except she believed that the house would be more visible because it is in a bowl, which makes it harder for people to accept. She liked the idea of the louvers, the smaller pool and retaining walls and significantly reduced glazing. She thanked the applicant for removing a lot of the retaining walls. She believed that the house would be less visible than people think with articulation that was added. She acknowledged that there will be light, but said that that is one of the realities of living next to an undeveloped parcel of land for so long.

Planning Manager Watrous noted that staff is beginning to see an issue with eaves that have reflective materials or downlights. He suggested a condition of approval stating that lights should not be allowed in the eaves in the front and sides of the building.

Boardmember Chong agreed with the other Boardmembers and felt that the modern architecture was beautiful. He said that it is hard to distinguish where Old Tiburon stops and the Hillhaven neighborhood begins. He believed that a lot of this size can be developed with a house the size of the one proposed. He appreciated the changes made to the design and supported the project.

Boardmember Cousins agreed and stated that the size of the house was a function of the size of the lot. He said that the house would relate more to the homes above the site. He said that the changes addressed the previous concerns. He said that the wings of the house would be more articulated, the louver screens would make a big difference and the pool changes would help.

Chair Kricensky said that this would be a new home on a vacant lot and this is the type of house being built in Tiburon on large lots. He said that the issue with the previous design was not the size of the house but how it was presented. He thought that the architect did a good job with the changes as the glazing would be much less and the house would now step into the hill in accordance with the Hillside Design Guidelines. He liked the house and believed that it would eventually fit in and have less impact than people think. He also believed that other homes along Vistazo East Street would be remodeled and enlarged in the future.

ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) that the request for 2225 Vistazo East Street is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval and the additional condition of approval that soffit lights be allowed in the eaves on the front and sides of the house and that the eaves not use reflective materials. Vote: 5-0.

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #13 OF THE AUGUST 18, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Vice-Chair Emberson questioned the variance request described on page 2, and Planning Manager Watrous said that it is no longer required and they would correct that in the minutes.

Vice-Chair Emberson also pointed out the second paragraph on page 5 should be corrected to: "...when he sketched it out it ended up less..."

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) to approve the minutes of the August 18, 2016, meeting, as amended. Vote: 5-0.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m.