

**MINUTES #19
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF DECEMBER 1, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Kricensky, Vice Chair Emberson, 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 stated that the item for 23 Mercury Avenue was continued to the January 19, 2017 meeting and that the item for 484 Washington Court item was also continued to the January 19, 2017 meeting, not the December 15, 2016 meeting.

D. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Boardmember Chong recused himself from the following item.

1. **77 EAST VIEW AVENUE:** File Nos. DR2016104, VAR2016033, VAR2016034, VAR2016035 & FAE2016011; Clinton Yee, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling, with Variances for reduced front setback and excess building height, and a Floor Area Exception. The applicant proposes to construct 1,361 square feet of additions to an existing three-story house, which would result in a floor area ratio of 55.8%, which is greater than the 35.0% maximum for a lot of this size. The front setback would be 2 feet, 6 inches in lieu of the minimum 15 feet. The house would be 37 feet tall, in lieu of the maximum building height of 30 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 060-105-92.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing three-story single-family dwelling on property located at 77 East View Avenue. The application was first reviewed at the October 20, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, neighboring residents at 75 & 81 East View Avenue raised concerns about view and privacy impacts from the proposed additions and the overall mass of the project. The Design Review Board shared these concerns, stating that the house was too large and too wide, and would have privacy impacts on the home at 81 East View Avenue. The Board continued the application to the December 1, 2016 meeting.

The applicant has submitted revised plans for the project. The width of the house would be narrowed by 1 foot, 10 inches and would now comply with both side setbacks. The roof over the proposed garage has been changed to a flat design. The upper level deck off the living room has been shortened by 2 feet, 6 inches, and the railing has been changed from a solid wood design to a glass railing. Additional screening landscaping has been proposed around the house, although this vegetation has not been reviewed by the Tiburon Fire Protection District for compliance with their vegetation management standards.

Minor changes have been made to all three floors of the house. A total of 95 square feet has been removed from the upper level, 77 square feet from the middle level and 35 square feet from the lower level. The total floor area of the house has been reduced 242 square feet to a new proposed total of 2,942 square feet (55.8%), which is greater than the 35.0% maximum floor area permitted for a lot of this size. A floor area exception is therefore still requested. The lot coverage of the site would increase by 804 square feet to 1,536 square feet (29.1%), which is less than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone.

Variations would still be required for reduced front setback and excess building height, as the proposed front setback and building height have not changed. The additions would now comply with the side setbacks and a variance is no longer required for reduced side setback.

Michael Heckmann, architect, detailed the revisions that were made based on comments from the neighbors and the DRB at the last meeting. He said that they revised the story poles and met with neighbors and after that meeting they adjusted the story poles a second time. He stated that he met with the Welters' attorney to review the final changes, and a list of those changes was provided to the DRB. Mr. Heckmann stated that the north garage wall was moved one foot to the south and the entire garage was shifted three feet toward the street. He said that the garage roof was changed and would now be a flat roof to open up as much as possible to the Welter property. He said that they reduced the width of the deck to only three feet so that it would not be useable for seating. He said that the main southeast dining deck was widened one foot to compensate for the loss of the living room deck size. He said that in order to create a terraced profile as recommended by the Hillside Design Guidelines, they shifted the middle bedroom toward the street, and the lower level closet and bedroom were set back. He said that their structural engineer reviewed the project and as a result they decided to offset the main stairs at the middle level, which reduced the height and eliminated the 18 foot wall and terraced the stairways. He said that the master bedroom below was also shifted toward the east to accommodate this new stairway. He stated that the south walls no longer require a setback variance and have been shifted away from the property line. He said that they indicated new landscaping on the plan showing vegetation on all three sides of the building.

Mr. Heckmann stated that the Welters bought a house with panoramic views and the view across this property is only a small part of that view. He stated the portion of their view across the property is "borrowed" and can be expected to change due to development of the property. He said that their views that would be affected are not from primary living areas and the views of those rooms are not as critical. He stated that the Welter house is three stories tall all the way to the street and view would only be affected from one room. He felt that the Welters should take some responsibility for protecting their privacy, and suggested that that can be done with window

coverings. He stated that the Welter home is located six feet into the side setback and there is no evidence of an approved variance for this encroachment. He felt that they should acknowledge that the nonconforming building location is something they purchased with the house, and that that the current project should not suffer because of it. He stated that his client should be able to enjoy the same rights as other houses in the area. He stated that the Welter house has a floor area ratio of 66%. He stated that the survey is accurate and has been reviewed by the assessor recorder's office and he believed that anything to the contrary that was brought up by the Welters or their attorney had no basis. He stated that they modified the project extensively based on the Board's comments and those of the neighbors, and hoped that the Board will approve the project.

Vice Chair Emberson asked Mr. Heckmann if he had a certified copy of the survey that is on file with the County. Mr. Heckmann handed her a copy of the survey with the certification stamp and said it was recorded with the County on November 7, 2016.

Chair Kricensky asked for clarification of story poles for the living room and deck. Mr. Heckmann discussed the poles and noted that the story pole for the deck railing was set at the height of a privacy wall that is no longer part of the design.

Boardmember Tollini asked if the plan reflected the measurements in the certified survey. Mr. Heckmann said that they created a perfect reproduction of the boundaries from that survey in the plans.

The public hearing was opened.

Chris Skelton, attorney for the Welters, said that they have engaged a surveyor to survey their property and expect this to be ready in January. He requested a continuance to the January 19, 2017 meeting to reconcile this difference. He stated that the applicant had agreed to have the story poles certified by a surveyor, but that did not happen. He said that the story poles did not line up and they felt that they did not have the information to make an informed decision.

Andrina Welter said they live next door to the property and requested that the Board deny this application. She stated that the materials were inconsistent, that the applicant did not listen to the Board or the neighbors and the changes made to the plans were very small. She said that the home appeared to be larger and taller in certain areas according to the story poles. She felt that the house would be too big for the lot with no new articulation on the eastern elevation. She said that the building would be too close to their home and would create a light well effect. She said that there were no adjustments to the width of the house or to step it down the hillside, and the decks were made only two feet smaller. She displayed photos of the views of the story poles from their home, and noted that the poles were inaccurate and had risen. She believed that the floor area calculation was inaccurate and she displayed the numbers they calculated which were different from the numbers presented in the plans. She displayed photos showing the impact of the garage. She felt that the design had not changed enough and would still be extremely impactful.

David Sparks said he lives on the other side of the proposed project. He felt that the project was really about equity. He stated that his home has many levels in order to adhere to the Hillside Design Guidelines and they asked for the same consideration with the current project. He believed

that if they proposed a similar structure as the proposed project it would be met with the same resistance. He said that they could accept the project if it adhered to the same principles as other homes in the neighborhood have done.

Mr. Heckmann said that it was obvious that the neighbors' interest was only in delaying the project. He said that this is a larger property and should be allowed to be developed in an appropriate fashion. He felt that the encroachment of the Welter house into the setback should not limit what they are allowed to build on their property. He felt that the project should not be delayed for six weeks because the neighbors did not engage a surveyor until just now. He believed that the Board had everything needed to approve the project tonight.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Tollini said that although he could see both sides, his remarks from the prior meeting still stand. He did not believe that the proposed project was close to being acceptable. He said that the changes were insubstantial, although the flat roof on the garage was helpful. He said that the house would create a light well situation for the adjacent neighbor. He said that the deck immediately outside the bedroom window was still too close because a neighboring master suite has an expectation of privacy and the glass railing might exacerbate that. He acknowledged that the Welter home is a similar version of this property with nonconforming issues, which creates a valid constraint and is part of what makes this a challenging site. He thought that the project was still too impactful and not enough was done to the width of the home. He said that the east elevation was too massive compared to other homes on the hillside.

Vice Chair Emberson said that her views were similar to those of Boardmember Tollini that not enough was done to reduce the size of the house. She said that the fact that the Welters' house did not comply with the Hillside Design Guidelines did not mean that this house did not have to as well. She said that she wanted to see more articulation, more stepping, and more done to break up the mass of the home. She said that she was not as concerned about the glass railings, but was concerned about the survey. She said that she would like to see the story poles certified because the poles were difficult to reconcile with the plans. She said that the house would look huge when viewed from below and would be very impactful and should be scaled back. She said that there enough issues with the boundaries that she would like to see the Welters' survey before making a decision. She also recommended scaling the house back instead of building it completely to the setbacks. She said that the house was not nearly close enough to being approvable.

Boardmember Tollini commented that the deck and glass railing would affect the perceived privacy of the neighbor's master suite, if not their actual privacy.

Boardmember Cousins said that the existing house is very iconic and typical of Corinthian Island and he was disappointed to see it go, but it was more disappointing that what was being proposed would be so bland and large. He said that the project felt like more house than would be expected on a tight site. He said that he would like more articulation to the design to make it much more interesting and break up the mass of the building. He said that the house would be 50 feet wide and all of the bathrooms and the closet would have a window to the outside. He said that the house would be very close to the home at 81 East View Avenue and that the large lot allowed flexibility

dealing with homes on neighboring lots. He believed that there should perhaps be 16 feet between the buildings, not 10 feet. Boardmember Tollini agreed with that comment.

Chair Kricensky stated that the survey did not answer the question about whether the boundary line is in the right location in relation to the house. He said that there were discrepancies in the story poles and that the survey did not site the structure correctly on the lot. He agreed with the comments of Boardmember Tollini and Vice Chair Emberson and stated that since the lot is the largest in the neighborhood the house did not need to maximize its floor area. He said that it would be a start to step the house down the hillside, but he felt that more needed to be done to comply with the Hillside Design Guidelines.

Boardmember Tollini contrasted the house design with the structure recently approved for 85 East View Avenue where the lower floors were excavated much further into the hillside. He said that he did not have an issue with the floor area ratio or lot coverage numbers, but felt that the percentages should decrease as the lot size increases. He suggested that the house appears larger because it would not be excavated enough into the hillside and could be made less impactful with more excavation. Vice Chair Emberson agreed.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to continue the application for 77 East View Avenue to the January 19, 2017 meeting. Vote: 4-0-1 (Chong recused).</p>

Boardmember Chong returned to the meeting.

2. **484 WASHINGTON COURT:** File Nos. DR2016128/VAR2016041; Karla Rivera and Ernie Cervantes, Owners; Site Plan and Architecture Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess fence height. The floor area of the proposed house would be 2,269 square feet, and its lot coverage would be 2,480 square feet (28.3%). A portion of a new fence would be 8 feet tall, which is greater than the maximum fence height of 6 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 034-251-28. **CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 15, 2016**

E. ACTION ITEMS

3. **150 AVENIDA MIRAFLORES:** File Nos. TREE2016001/TREE2016017; Edwin and Nancy Clock, Owners/Applicants/Appellants; Firuze Hariri, Applicant; Consider Adoption of Resolutions Denying Appeal of Planning staff approval of Tree Permit to permit the removal of one (1) Italian Stone Pine Tree and one (1) Cajeput tree, and appeal of Planning staff denial of Tree Permit to permit the after-the-fact planting of one (1) Italian Stone Pine Tree, one (1) Cajeput Tree, one (1) Cotoneaster Tree and one (1) Privet Tree; Assessor's Parcel Number: 039-111-09.

Following a public hearing and discussion at its November 3, 2016 regular meeting, the Design Review Board directed to staff to prepare draft resolutions denying appeals of an approved tree permit (File No. TREE2016001) to permit the removal of one (1) Italian Stone Pine tree and one (1) Cajeput tree on Town of Tiburon right-of-way adjacent to property located at 150 Avenida Miraflores and a denied tree permit (File No. TREE2016017) to permit the after-the-fact planting

of one (1) Italian Stone Pine tree, one (1) Cajeput tree, one (1) Cotoneaster tree and one (1) Privet tree on the same property. The resolutions were to be considered for adoption at the next regular meeting.

Edwin Clock asked for clarification that the word “removal” in the draft resolution would also encompass transplantation of the trees. He said that they would like the right to transplant the trees if possible to a location that is not visible from the street. He reiterated his previous comment that section 15-16 of Title 4 of the Tiburon Municipal Code gives exclusive jurisdiction to the Department of Public Works and excludes the Planning Division from decision making.

Nancy Clock reiterated that at the last hearing they offered a compromise to cut down the Italian Stone Pine tree, but she felt that they should not be responsible for paying for its removal.

Planning Watrous noted that “removal” includes the ability to transplant a tree and staff recommended that the wording of the resolution be unchanged. He stated that the trees could not be relocated to another location in the Town right-of-way.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to adopt draft resolution for tree permit TREE2016001 denying the appeal for 150 Avenida Miraflores. Vote: 5-0.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Cousins) to adopt draft resolution for tree permit TREE2016017 denying the appeal for 150 Avenida Miraflores. Vote: 5-0.

4. **23 MERCURY AVENUE:** File No. DR2016075; Jeff Greenberg, Owner; Site Plan and Architecture Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The floor area of the proposed house would be 3,110 square feet, and its lot coverage would be 2,716 square feet (18.2%). Assessor’s Parcel No. 034-252-03. [DW] **CONTINUED TO JANUARY 19, 2017**

5. **200 ROUND HILL ROAD:** File No. DR2016129; Phil and Jen Bennett, Owners; Site Plan and Architecture Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The project would add 723 square feet to the existing house, resulting in a total floor area of 3,504 square feet and lot coverage of 2,954 square feet (14.9%). Assessor’s Parcel No. 058-252-01.

The applicant is requesting to construct additions to an existing single-family dwelling, on property located at 200 Round Hill Road. The property is currently developed with a 3,317 square foot single-family dwelling. The proposal consists of adding 723 square feet to the lower level of the existing dwelling, which would include a guest room, bathroom, storage, playroom and office. In addition, two existing guest rooms would be converted into a 536 square foot two-car garage.

Other proposed improvements would include modified windows and doors on all sides of the existing home, six new skylights on the roof, an expanded upper level deck with new metal guardrail and an exterior staircase connected to a new patio and lawn area. The majority of the existing landscaping would remain throughout the property with a few existing trees removed

from the property. The existing driveway would be expanded and resurfaced to accommodate additional off-street parking.

The proposal would result in a gross floor area of 3,504 square feet, which is below the maximum permitted gross floor area for the property (3,976 square feet). The proposal would result in lot coverage of 2,954 square feet (14.9%), which is below the 15.0% maximum permitted lot coverage in the RO-2 zone.

Todd Davis, architect, said that they intend to convert guest rooms back to a two-car garage and add two new guest rooms to the addition. He said that they would replace all of the windows and update the materials.

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Emberson stated that she supports infill projects. She said that it was nice to see the garage brought back. She said that the whole house would look better and this would be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

All of the other Boardmembers agreed with Vice Chair Emberson. Boardmember Tollini stated that restoration of garage space was a benefit and the expansion was totally modest and would have no impact on the neighborhood.

Chair Kricensky agreed and said that this was a smart and practical design.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Chong/Emberson) that the request for 200 Round Hill Road is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 5-0.</p>

- 6. 9 MERCURY AVENUE:** File No. DR2016132; Todd and Gena Davis, Owners; Site Plan and Architecture Review for construction of additions to an existing single-family dwelling. The project would add 1,043 square feet to the existing house, resulting in a total floor area of 2,804 square feet and lot coverage of 2,479 square feet (29.9%). Assessor's Parcel No. 034-252-10.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing two-story single-family dwelling on property located at 23 Mercury Avenue. The house was originally a one-story structure. A two-story addition with a small upstairs 147 square foot studio was approved in 1988.

The first floor of the house would be expanded to the front and rear. New den, kitchen and laundry room would extend to the rear of the house, while a new two-car garage would be constructed in front. A new master bedroom suite would be constructed on the second floor, centered above the first floor. Several existing skylights would be replaced and new skylights added, with a total of seven (7) skylights installed. New fireplaces and chimneys would be constructed at the front and rear of the house.

The floor area of the house would be increased by 1,043 square feet to a total of 2,804 square feet, which is 25 square feet less than the maximum floor area permitted for a lot of this size. The lot coverage would be increased by 864.5 square feet to a total of 2,479 square feet (29.9%), which is 4 square feet less than the 30.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the R-1 zone.

James Wright, architect, said that they designed a low energy building that would salvage as much of the existing building as possible. He said that they canvassed the neighborhood before beginning to find examples of good architecture and he displayed photographs of other homes in the area with second story additions. He said that they proposed a second story addition that would tuck the addition behind the existing line of the building so that the proposed mass would be eclipsed by the existing structure. He said that they centrally located the addition and calculated the summer and winter sun angles so no shading would be created by the addition. He described the second story master bedroom and noted that it would be set back from the street and they chose high windows to preserve privacy. He displayed the landscape screening that would be placed between the properties. He said that they removed the chimney from the design and instead propose a gas fireplace. He said that if the roof was lowered it would create a collision below the existing ridge. He said that they never imagined there would be any issues with the proposed design since they would be below the maximum height limit. He said that they propose to replace old fencing with new fencing that is attractive on both sides to preserve privacy.

Todd Davis, owner and landscape architect, said that he spoke to several neighbors and found out what the neighbors do not want in the neighborhood. He said that this design was created to be as friendly as possible with neighbors, including a “good neighbor” fence that looks nice from both sides. He reviewed the planned trees, including crepe myrtles and dogwoods and some redwood trees in the front. He said that they pulled the master suite addition as far away as possible from the street and put it in the rear. He said that privacy is as much of a concern for them as for the neighbors. He said that they modeled the house after the home at 31 Mercury Avenue. He said that they placed the windows in the addition as high as possible and made them small to allow natural light into the room. He said that planting strategic trees would preserve privacy and focus the view toward the wooded area behind the house.

The public hearing was opened.

Dilys Bart said they spend a lot of time in their yard and feel intimidated by the proposed addition. She said that they were concerned about the loss of southern light in their home and backyard and shadows from the vegetation proposed as a privacy screen. She stated that the current house has a small loft and is not a regular second story, but the proposed second story would be an entirely new second floor. She said that they are also concerned about loss of privacy in their home and backyard as the plans show four windows pointed toward their home that would see directly into their master bedroom, children’s bedrooms, and dining room. She added that a rear-facing balcony would overlook their yard. She asked the Board to advise the applicant to put all the floor area on the first floor, stating that there is plenty of space on the lot for a one-story house. She said that she understood that the Town workshop concluded that second stories should be discouraged in the interior area of the neighborhood, but she believed that second stories should also be discouraged on the perimeter. She said that homeowners on the

perimeter should be granted the same rights as those in the interior, because neighbors impacted by a two-story design should have the same principles of privacy and impacts protected.

Holly Hudson supported Ms. Bart's comments. She stated that a 2,000 square foot home is large in this neighborhood and she characterized a 3,000 square foot home as a "mega home." She asked the Board to respect the spirit of the development of this neighborhood. She stated that some recent requests for second stories have been denied in the neighborhood based on neighbors' comments. She said that they are open to remodels but want to be sure everyone has reasonable privacy and the spirit of the neighborhood continues.

John McLeod said that he agrees with upgrading properties and noted that short term residents and developers have done some very nice projects. He said that he has a problem, however, when a project impacts neighbors' privacy and light.

Bill Melbostadt said the neighborhood enjoys views of Ring Mountain and open space. He opposed any second story structure in Belveron and believes it sets a bad precedent. He stated that this neighborhood needs to be protected to prevent large homes being built and suggested that other areas of Tiburon can accommodate them.

Andy Wisner said that he does not have a problem with second stories, but felt that there is precedent to not allow them in the neighborhood. He did not think that the existing partial second story should be allowed to be expanded. He believed that every issue that applies in the interior of the neighborhood should also apply on the perimeter as a matter of consistency. He said that he would like to see a better process in place for informing people of the expectations for building and said that the current process is unfair to both new and existing owners.

Mr. Wright said that he was very surprised by the opposition of the neighbors. He felt that the project design was very sensitive and followed the guidelines of the Town in every way. He said that this would establish a good precedent because the addition would cause no imposition to the neighbors in terms of massing, light, and bulk. He said that the home would be 2,800 square feet and was not larger than the other 2,800 square foot house in the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Emberson asked for clarification of the plate heights. Mr. Wright said that there would be a 10 foot plate height on the first level and an 8 foot plate height on the second level with a vaulted ceiling.

Boardmember Chong asked what other designs were considered in the early stages of the design process. Mr. Wright said they could not expand on the first level because of the lot coverage limits. Boardmember Tollini state that many variances have been granted for excess lot coverage in this neighborhood to avoid a second story.

Mr. Davis displayed a photograph of the house at 31 Mercury Avenue and stated that they were asking for the same rights and privileges for their second story. He said that the addition could not be recessed further back and it would be hidden behind the existing roofline. He said that the addition would not impact sunlight and the house was designed with the neighbors in mind.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Chong said that he liked the design, but it would be better suited in another neighborhood with more generous lots. He said that the project was too much for him and that he would like to see the project kept to one story. He said that there was space in the back yard to expand at one level and he would like to see that explored.

Boardmember Cousins summarized previous Town Council discussions regarding Belveron and stated that it is difficult for second story addition in this neighborhood. He said that the project complies with the codes, but he believed that Belveron residents do not want two-story homes. He felt that this was a good design, but the biggest issues were privacy. He said that it was a very vertical design and that the gable roofs and higher ridgelines cause problems. He said that the high windows create a perceived privacy issue.

Vice Chair Emberson agreed with the other Boardmembers. She loved the design of the house but said that there was nothing as tall in the neighborhood. She agreed that the perception of privacy was the issue. She said that the design seemed sensitive to the neighbors, but the 25 foot height was taller than other two-story homes in the area. She said that the house needed to be lower and more compact, but she said that she would be happiest with a one-story design.

Boardmember Tollini agreed and noted that the Zoning Ordinance states that homes should be consistent with the pattern of development in the neighborhood. He said that this project would be grossly out of scale with its surroundings. He felt that the existing second story could be modestly expanded, but making it higher than the existing roofline would not fit in with the neighborhood. He said that the project was not close to fitting the pattern of development in the area.

Chair Kricensky said that he appreciated the effort that the architect and owner put into the project. He stated that the second story was very big for just a master bedroom and would loom above the site because the extra height would make the mass greater and cover 75% of the house with an upper floor. He acknowledged that the design complies with the codes and that second stories are allowed in the neighborhood, but it has to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. He said that there are three two-story houses in the area, the site is on the perimeter, and this could be seen as an interpretation of the development pattern of the neighborhood. He said that the house felt big compared to other homes and would not feel as big if it was more discreet and not so massive. He stated that the other two-story houses in the area have lower plate heights for the upper floor than the lower floor. He said that the house felt really big for the neighborhood. He believed that the height of the building and the quantity of the second story felt out of proportion. He said that the side windows were not an issue and that the balcony was modest and would not be used for entertainment.

Boardmember Tollini said that he did not have a categorical objection to second stories, but he felt that what was proposed was grossly out of proportion. Vice Chair Emberson agreed. Boardmember Chong stated that the most legitimate argument for not having one story is to preserve more backyard space, but he thought that one-story expansions were the best option for the neighborhood.

Boardmember Cousins stated that second stories should have lower plate heights in order to prevent them from becoming too large, but he felt that the small second story designs in the area do not look as nice architecturally. He said that the one story additions in the neighborhood are much more beautiful.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) to continue the application for 9 Mercury Avenue to the January 19, 2017 meeting. Vote: 5-0.

7. **MINUTES:** Consider adoption of minutes of meeting of November 3, 2016

Boardmember Cousins requested correcting “tile” to “title” on page 6, paragraph 6.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Chong) to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2016, meeting, as amended. Vote: 4-0-1 (Tollini abstained).

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.