

**MINUTES #7
TIBURON DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MEETING OF MAY 5, 2016**

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

A. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Boardmember Chong

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

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

C. STAFF BRIEFING - None

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. **2225 VISTAZO EAST STREET:** File No. DR2015145; Shor Capital, LLC, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new single-family dwelling. The applicant proposes to construct a new 5,730 square foot house. 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. This application was first reviewed at the February 18, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, several property owners in the vicinity raised concerns about the overall size and visual mass of the proposed house, compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, and the proposed widening of the private roadway of Vistazo East Street.

The Design Review Board shared the concerns about the overall size of the house, concluding that a variance for excess lot coverage was not warranted for a house of this size on such a large lot. The Board also raised objections to a proposed rooftop deck, the amount of glazing on the front of the house and the overall roof height. The Board determined that the proposed street widening was a requirement of the Fire District and would not be a substantial change to the neighborhood. The Board directed the applicant to revise the house design to address these issues and continued the application to the March 17, 2016 meeting.

The applicant subsequently submitted revised plans for the project. The floor area of the proposed house was reduced by 100 square feet to 5,730 square feet and the garage reduced in size by 144 square feet to 716 square feet. The lot coverage of proposed house was reduced by 535 square feet to cover 6,260 square feet (15.0%) of the site, which was 1 square foot less than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone and eliminated the need for the lot

coverage variance. The rooftop deck and putting green were removed. The overall roof height was lowered by one foot. The swimming pool was shortened in depth. The overall floor plans, house layout and windows on the building elevations were not substantially changed.

At the March 17, 2016 meeting, several neighboring residents again raised concerns about the overall size of the proposed house and its compatibility with the Old Tiburon neighborhood. The consensus of the Board was that not enough had been done to substantially change the design of the house. The Boardmembers felt that 1) the house still had too much glazing; 2) the structure was too tall for a two-story home with a flat roof; 3) the retaining walls were too large; 4) the pool elevation exacerbated the wall issues; and 5) the house did not fit with the surrounding neighborhood, particularly the Old Tiburon neighborhood below the house. The application was continued to the April 21, 2016 meeting. The applicant requested a continuance to the May 5, 2016 meeting after determining that the revised story poles were not correctly installed.

The applicant has now submitted further revised plans for the project, which included the following changes:

- The lot coverage was reduced by 162 square feet to 6,098 square feet (14.5% of the site) and patio, walkway and pool areas were reduced by 350 square feet.
- The lower floor ceiling height was reduced to 10 feet, which reduced the overall roof height by one foot.
- The pool was shortened in both directions and the walls in front were reduced to a maximum height of 8 feet and made a darker color.
- Glazing was removed from most of the master bathroom on the upper level northeast elevation.
- The solar panels and the uphill deer fence were moved downhill closer to the house.

The floor area of the house was not changed. The applicant submitted a table comparing the floor area of the proposed house and the ratios of floor area to lot size to other properties above and below the site.

Scott Couture, architect, reviewed issues raised by neighbors at the previous meeting. He described changes made to the tree species, solar panel locations and fencing. He displayed a photograph of the view from 480 Ridge Road and stated that the story poles were completely out of view. He described changes to the pool design and lighting. He stated that the proposed floor area would be less than other neighboring houses in the area as a percentage of lot area. He said that they tried to directly contact all neighbors in the vicinity, and have addressed the issues of the neighbors that responded.

Mr. Couture addressed the issues brought up by the Board at the last meeting, and stated that they removed the glass out of the eastern wall of the master bedroom, dropped the roof, and reduced the visible height of the building. He requested the Board take into account the zoning of the property in their decision, as the houses downhill are smaller and zoned R-1, while the houses uphill are larger and zoned RO-2. He said that larger lots are usually allowed a larger home with more open area around it. He said that the proposed house would be located in the

middle of the site, far away from other properties, above any houses that can see it, and cut into the hillside so that one-third of the home would be below existing grade. He acknowledged that this would be a large home but much of it would be below grade and very well screened. He said that the design was very stepped back and the materials would blend into the hillside. He displayed photographs showing that not much of the home would be visible from the street, and noted that the percentage of floor area to lot size for the house would be one of the lowest in the neighborhood. He displayed photographs of several homes in the vicinity with large amounts of glass, modern designs, and large size. He acknowledged that the house would be close to its floor area ratio, but reiterated that much of the home would be below grade, it would step up the hill, and there would be a good deal of screening and landscaping.

The public hearing was opened.

James Bernheisel said he thinks it is important to look at the big picture. He said that this is an open lot and whatever happens with this property will affect the other lots that will be developed. He said that he was told 18 years ago that this was a “dead lot.”

Carol McKegney said she is part-owner of the vacant lot that adjoins this property. She believed that the retaining walls were still large, the pool elevation is an issue, and she felt that the house did not fit in with the Old Tiburon neighborhood below the site. She was concerned about a house that would set a precedent.

David Peterson said that it was clear at the last meeting that the glazing, height, amount of decking, and high walls around the pool were concerns of the Board. He thought that minimal work was done to address these points and he noted that this was the third time the project was reviewed by the Board.

Chris Miller said that many of the photos taken on Vistazo East Street did not address her main concerns. She said that there is a character to this area and they would be looking up at a corner from the homes below. She characterized the appearance as looking at the side of a freight train and said that the house would be spread out across the expanse of the site. She thought that the percentages were meaningless and was concerned about the precedent this would set in the area.

Mr. Couture pointed out that this is a private lot and is not open space. He said that although his client is from out of town that does not mean that he has fewer rights. He said that many of the neighboring lots are underdeveloped, but that did not mean that they have less of a right to develop their property.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said that he had no objection to the size of the house, but this particular design was more massive than it needed to be and did not adhere to the Hillside Design Guidelines. He said that the design was dug back in some places, but the section drawings show that the house would be 75 feet from front to back, with large areas well above the existing grade. He said that there were things that could be done to mitigate the height and all of the

previous suggestions and comments had been ignored. He said that the house would loom over the neighborhood and that he could not support it unless those comments were addressed.

Boardmember Emberson agreed with Boardmember Cousins' comments. She said that the Board gave clear direction at the last meeting. She said that this house would be one of the largest homes in the area. She did not feel that the issues raised by the Board were addressed. She said that there were ways to mitigate the mass of the house and she did not believe that the house would look like it was presented in the photo simulations from most vantage points. She noted that the overall height was only lowered by one foot. She said that it was important to look at how the house would integrate into the whole neighborhood. She said that the Board wanted to see meaningful changes to the design. She said that she liked the design, but not at this location.

Vice Chair Kricensky complemented the architect on the presentation, but said that there were some things that the Board takes into account that were not addressed. He said that the design cannot be defended based on other neighborhoods or by comparative numbers and ratios, as numbers can be presented in different ways. He said that he was not opposed to the floor area, but how it was presented. He said that the upper floor would be 120 feet long, and with the pool and 60%-70% floor to ceiling glass there would be a huge impact. He said that other homes have windows broken into smaller units and this would be like be a beacon stretching across the hillside. He said that this lot is in a transition area between the lower houses and the upper houses, and he would like to see the design of the house reflect that. He noted that the newer house on Vistazo East Street has a smaller lineal impact when viewed from the street.

Chair Tollini stated the other Boardmembers' comments were consistent with his own thoughts. He said that the Board's focus is mostly about neighborhood fit and the applicant has a different idea about that. He said that this is not a contiguous neighborhood and this lot is large like those above on Ridge Road, but the lot is on Vistazo East Street. He said that these neighborhoods feel very different and this house would not fit with the neighborhood the way it needs to. He felt that the large, monolithic glazing would not fit as well in the neighborhood. He said that the apparent size of the nearby home on Vistazo East Street was mitigated by having other materials and less glazing, so it fits better with the neighborhood. He said that he had no issue with the floor area and views, but rather the issues were the apparent size of the house and its fit with the neighborhood. He acknowledged that this site will be visible, but felt that placing so much floor area on one flat plane creates issues and that the lateral size of the project and its large amount of glazing did not fit in with the neighborhood.

Planning Manager Watrous stated that the Board should consider either a continuance or directing staff to prepare a resolution of denial and suggested asking the applicant which option they preferred. The applicant indicated that they preferred that the Board make a decision on this design.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Tollini/Emberson) to direct staff to prepare a resolution to deny the application for 2225 Vistazo East Street. Vote: 4-0.</p>
--

2. **17 ACELA DRIVE:** File Nos. DR2016002/VAR2016015; Miraj and Nisha Shah, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of additions to an existing

single-family dwelling, with a Variance for excess lot coverage. The applicant proposes to add 1,966 square feet of additions to the existing main floor and a new lower floor of an existing one-story house. The project would result in a 4,504 square foot dwelling, with 4,684 square feet (17.8%) of lot coverage, which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. Assessor's Parcel No. 058-231-16.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of additions to an existing one-story single-family dwelling on property located at 17 Acela Drive. This application was first reviewed at the March 3, 2016 Design Review Board meeting. At that meeting, several neighboring residents raised concerns about potential view impacts that would be caused by the proposed second story addition. The Board acknowledged the neighbor's concerns, raised doubts about the feasibility of a second story addition at this location and expressed concerns about the size of the proposed roof deck. The application was continued to the April 7, 2016 to allow the applicants to revise the project design. The applicants subsequently requested a further continuance to the May 5, 2016 meeting.

The applicants have now submitted revised plans for the project. The upper floor addition has been eliminated and replaced with additions on the existing main floor and a new lower floor. The new lower floor would include three bedrooms and two bathrooms. The additions on the main floor would expand the living room, dining room and one bedroom and bathroom. A new deck would extend above the proposed lower floor addition. The roofline of the existing house would be modified, but would retain its flat roof and would not increase in height.

The floor area of the would be increased by 1,966 square feet to 4,504 square feet, which is 46 square feet smaller than the previously proposed addition and 127 square feet less than the floor area ratio for a lot of this size. The revised project would increase the lot coverage of the house to 4,684 square feet (17.8%) of the site, which is greater than the 15.0% maximum lot coverage permitted in the RO-2 zone. A variance for excess lot coverage is now requested.

Nisha Shah, owner, said that they took the Board's feedback seriously and revamped the project completely so that it would sit below street level. She said that they worked directly with the neighbors to upgrade the home without affecting anyone's views.

Lindsay Massey, architect, also stated that they completely redesigned the project by expanding the house to the back and down, rather than up. She said that the existing house smaller than the neighboring houses and that the redesign would be in character with the rest of the neighborhood. She said that they contacted the neighbors and received good feedback from them as well as from the Planning Division. She noted that there is already existing screening in front of the house and the area in back was the prime location to expand the house without interrupting views from other homes. She said that they intend to cut into the existing hillside for the lower addition, which would extend only a few feet beyond the existing structure.

There were no public comments.

Boardmember Emberson said that it was easy to support the variance because they addressed the Board's directions to go downhill. She liked the design and said that she could make the findings for the variance.

Vice Chair Kricensky agreed and said that the applicants listened to the Board and came back with a good solution. He noted that the house would have a lot of glass, but would be in keeping with the neighborhood and set so low to have no impact on the neighbors. He commended the applicant and architect for their response and agreed with staff regarding the variance findings.

Boardmember Cousins agreed with the other Boardmembers and supported the application.

Chair Tollini complemented the architect and said that the design really works well with the vernacular of the existing house. He liked the design and felt that it would have no impact on neighbors. He noted the Boardmembers agree with staff's conclusions regarding the variance.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Kricensky) that the request for 17 Acela Drive is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and to approve the request, subject to the attached conditions of approval. Vote: 4-0.

E. NEW BUSINESS

3. **2350 PARADISE DRIVE:** File No. DR2016030; Peter and Tracy Dempsey, Owners; Site Plan and Architectural Review to legalize as-built construction of a fence and construction of a new fence for an existing single-family dwelling. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-191-03.

The applicant is requesting design review approval to legalize as-built construction of a fence and construction of a new fence for an existing single-family dwelling on property located at 2350 Paradise Drive. The as-built metal fence is situated on the rear south property line near an existing parking pad on Linda Vista Avenue. The proposed metal fence would be located on the west side property line in between the subject site and 2340 Paradise Drive and in the front north property towards Paradise Drive in front of the existing home. The as-built fence and proposed fence would have a maximum of six feet (6').

This application was first submitted for staff-level design review. During the review of this application, multiple adjacent neighboring property owners raised objections to the design of the as-built fence and proposed fence. As a result, this application has been referred to the Design Review Board.

Peter Dempsey, owner, said they are present tonight due to concerns about their fence. He showed several photographs of fences in the area and noted that they are all six feet or higher. He said that their fence was entirely within the property boundaries and its location was approved by the Fire District. He said that the fence along the west side of the property is decaying and is a combination of chicken wire, rotted pickets, and ivy. He said that the fence would less impact on neighbors' views than a higher one. He said that this project was completed more than a year ago and after the permit was issued, they resubmitted a new drawing showing a revised layout and

fence height to keep deer from entering the property. He said that the building inspector visited the site twice to inspect the post holes and there was never a discussion of layout or fence height. He said that their contractor made a mistake by not making a final inspection of the fence location. He believed that this issue was prompted as a result of a remodeling project they intend to undertake and was retaliation from neighbors. He said that the fence is consistent with others in the neighborhood, the height conforms to the zoning ordinance, and it is completely within their property lines.

Tracy Dempsey, owner, said that Architectural Digest called their fence design the perfect fence because it does not block anyone's views. She said that their survey matched those done previously. She said that they went to great lengths to be sure the fence did not impact the neighbor's view.

Chair Tollini asked if the landscaping planted along the fence was designed to grow and become part of the screening. Ms. Dempsey said that they would never allow the landscaping to grow more than three feet high, and the purpose was to keep deer and neighborhood dogs out.

Boardmember Emberson said that the fence appears to go past the property line on the survey. Mr. Dempsey said that that was not the fence indicated on the survey. Planning Manager Watrous noted that the survey clearly showed that the fence is actually constructed beyond the property line and into the adjacent right-of-way and described the various lines on the survey indicating the property line, fence and edge of roadway pavement. Chair Tollini asked if the private roadway was affected, and Planning Manager Watrous said that it does not belong to the Town and that the fence can only be constructed on the Dempseys' private property without approval from all of the neighbors that own the private road. Mr. Dempsey stated that the fence was approved for construction. Planning Manager Watrous stated that the approved drawings were for a fence constructed on the property line. Ms. Dempsey pointed out that the line of the fence was consistent with all of the neighbors' fences. Planning Manager Watrous stated that fences which are not on the property line are very common in Old Tiburon, but that that did not give authority to build beyond the property line.

The public hearing was opened.

Julia Shumelda said that a six foot tall fence would be visible from the living room, dining room, and kitchen. She agreed that the current four foot tall fence is dilapidated, but it does not block views. She asked that the fence height be kept at four feet. She stated that she confirmed with the Building Division that the proposed fence needed to be located completely on the neighboring property.

Mr. Dempsey apologized for the information he gave regarding the drawings. Ms. Dempsey said that they would not build a fence in front of anyone's window.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said that surveys are difficult in Old Tiburon but the fence should be constructed entirely within the property lines. He thought that the fence design was sensible and

would not obscure any views. He agreed that it can be seen by the neighboring property, but that was not a reason to deny the fence and it did not reduce the view or the light.

Boardmember Emberson agreed the fence needed to be moved out of the right-of-way. She noted there portions of the fence appeared to be taller than 6 feet and needed to be lowered. She suggested making the fence a little lower to be able to work it out with the neighbor, but said that a 6 foot fence was legal.

Vice Chair Kricensky noted there was nothing in the staff report about needing to move the fence. Associate Planner O'Malley said that that was an oversight and that is why they are proposing to add the condition of approval about moving the fence to the property line.

Vice Chair Kricensky agreed with Boardmember Cousins that this was a reasonable fence. He said that the fence could appear more open or might look like a green fence after vegetation grows, but that the black color of the fence would recede once the landscaping grows. He stated that there were a number of different types of fences in the area. He said that the fence should be a maximum of six feet in height. He also noted that only about 12 inches of fence would be visible.

Chair Tollini noted the fence protrudes into the grassy area along Linda Vista Avenue more than other fences. He said that the Board would never approve a fence in the right-of-way without a compelling reason. He felt bad for the homeowner, but said that the fence needed to be moved out of the right-of-way. He noted that there are other black metal fences in the area, but the others have ivy or other plants growing on them that help the fences blend in. He noted that the neighbor's open view is of the applicant's back yard. He said that the Town generally allows people to erect six foot fences as long as they do not cause problems, and in this case the fence design allows light and views through and the neighbor can plant ivy on her side of the fence.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Tollini) that the request for 2350 Paradise Drive is approved, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional condition of approval that all portions of the fence within the Linda Vista Avenue right-of-way shall be relocated to the rear property line. Vote: 4-0.</p>

- 4. 1694-1696 TIBURON BOULEVARD:** File Nos. DR2016011/VAR2016011; ACV Argo Tiburon LP, Owner; Site Plan and Architectural Review for construction of a new three-story mixed use commercial and residential building, with a Variance for excess flagpole height. The first floor of the proposed building would contain 2,450 square feet of commercial space and the upper two floors would contain two residential condominium units. A proposed 40 foot tall flagpole would be taller than the maximum flagpole height of 24 feet. Assessor's Parcel No. 059-101-12.

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval for the construction of a new three-story mixed use commercial and residential building on property located at 1694-1696 Tiburon Boulevard. The subject property is currently developed with a one-story commercial building occupied by two restaurants (New Morning Café and the Grass Shack).

The existing building has 2,776 square feet of floor area. The first floor of the proposed building would contain 2,450 square feet of floor area. The first floor would either be an entirely new restaurant or alternately designed with 1,679 square feet of restaurant space and 771 square feet allocated for separate retail commercial space. The restaurant would have 38 to 68 interior seats (depending on the restaurant/retail mix) and seating for 30 patrons outside the building along Tiburon Boulevard and Juanita Lane.

The second floor would be divided into two condominium dwelling units. Unit 1 would contain two bedrooms and two bathrooms and 1,196 square feet of floor area and be contained entirely on the second floor. Unit 2 would contain two bedrooms and two bathrooms and 1,105 square feet of floor area on the second floor and an additional bedroom and bathroom with 504 square feet of space on a partial third floor. Both units would have small balconies on the second floor, while Unit 2 would include a larger deck on the third floor. Two (2) one-car garage spaces for the residential units would be located to the rear of the first floor. An elevator would connect all three floors of the building. The building would have a maximum height of 38 feet, which is the maximum height for buildings in the NC zone with Tiburon Boulevard frontage.

A 40 foot tall flagpole is proposed to be installed in front of the building. As the maximum height for a flagpole in Tiburon is 24 feet, a variance is requested for excess flagpole height.

S.G. Ellison, developer for ACV Argo, said there have been several planning and zoning hearings on this proposal. He said that they were extremely pleased with the design of the building, which would have an elegant maritime feel with an understated contemporary design that would fit right in with downtown Tiburon. He said that the building would be consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines, which state that buildings should be on scale with those on Main Street, close to the sidewalk, and encourage outside gathering. He said that they believe that the flagpole was an important element of the design and they therefore asked for a variance for this element.

Marty Zwick, architect, said the Downtown Design Guidelines were very helpful and they tried to design a building that would fit in as best as possible. He said that they worked hard to maintain the existing pedestrian scale, including seating along the outside of Tiburon Boulevard. He said that they included wide openings and the fenestration would be aligned between the upper and lower floors. He said that they tried to minimize the mechanical room for the elevator and squeezed it as much as they could.

Boardmember Cousins asked about the form of the guardrail. Mr. Zwick said the “sweeping out” form of the guardrail was the correct form. Planning Manager Watrous asked about the third floor plan guardrail and whether it would go all the way to the front and from one end to the other. Mr. Zwick said that the guardrail was a design element and they advocated it. Mr. Ellison said that there would be a second railing inside to keep people from falling, and he noted that the outside railing was a design element.

Vice Chair Kricensky asked about the mechanical room and Mr. Zwick said that they were able to reduce the width and a few inches in height. Vice Chair Kricensky asked if the ten foot height

was necessary. Mr. Zwick said that the height was the minimum necessary for the equipment they hope to install.

There were no public comments.

Vice Chair Kricensky noted that the Planning Commission and Town Council had done most of the work for this project, but the Board was asked to address a few items. He said that the mass of the third story mechanical room would be masked mostly by the second story when viewed from the street. He felt that the design of the deck railing would act as a cornice for the building.

Boardmember Cousins felt that the curve of the rail would add to the design and would look strange if it stopped earlier than the edge of the roof. He said that the rail is transparent and would not affect the overall height of the building. Chair Tollini stated that it was part of the overall maritime look of the building.

Vice Chair Kricensky said that the flagpole might be an issue for residents because of the sound it might make with flags flapping in the wind.

Boardmember Emberson said that the third story railing would make the building look bigger and taller than it is. She said that she cannot support the flagpole. She did not like the large windows on the lower floor and suggested that it would look like a garage. She noted that it is often too cold in the area to actually open up the windows.

Chair Tollini said that much of the building design was in response to the Downtown Design Guidelines, which encourage large windows and spaces that open up. He noted that this was one of the few projects on Tiburon Boulevard to be built from the ground up. He said that he had no problem with the window design.

Boardmember Cousins said that he was torn regarding the handrails, as they would make the building appear taller, but it would be a repeating feature and look like the prow of a ship. He said that the railings would not block light or views. He stated that the 40 foot tall flagpole was inappropriate for this building, but he would like to see a different feature other than the flagpole.

Chair Tollini noted that the third floor mechanical room was reduced in height from previous plans and he felt that it was pretty small and brought back from Tiburon Boulevard. He believed that the railing would look odd if it only surrounded the roof deck and was more attractive from an aesthetic standpoint as proposed and would not add to the visual mass. He thought that the flagpole would add some interest to the design, but that was not sufficient to make the findings for the variance.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Kricensky/Cousins) that the request for 1694-1696 Tiburon Boulevard is approved, subject to the attached conditions of approval, and the additional condition of approval that the flagpole and accompanying variance request are not approved as part of the application. Vote: 3-1 (Emberson opposed).</p>
--

5. **1550 TIBURON BOULEVARD:** File No. SIGN2016002; Belvedere Land Company, Owner; Sign permit for a Sign Program for signage for tenants of a shopping center (Boardwalk Shopping Center). The sign program would allow 6 freestanding signs, multi-tenant, wayfinding and directory signs, and signs for individual tenants. Assessor's Parcel Nos. 060-082-57 and 060-082-58.

The applicant requests consideration of a sign program for the Boardwalk Shopping Center, located at 1550 Tiburon Boulevard. The Boardwalk Shopping Center is a multi-tenant commercial center that straddles the corporate boundary line separating the Town of Tiburon and the City of Belvedere. The existing center has three entrances into the parking lot; one off of Tiburon Boulevard and the two off of Beach Road.

The sign program for the shopping center is intended to modernize the signage for the center and individual tenants. The applicant has indicated that the program is necessary since there has been no change to the signage at the center for more than 50 years, and that the program would provide a themed unity between the tenants within the center and provide effective communication and traffic safety to the visitors of the center. The majority of the existing signs would be removed, except for seven (7) existing wall signs which would remain.

The proposed sign program would allow the following signs for the shopping center:

Parking Lot:

- Two (2) four-sided wooden monument signs identifying the center and listing the individual tenants. The main sign faces would be 16 feet tall and 8 feet, 8 inches wide, for a total area of 138.7 square feet. The sides of the signs would identify the center and be 2 feet 8 inches wide for an additional 42.7 square feet of sign area. The monument signs would be 23 feet tall and would have a 28 inch tall copper weathervane on top. The signs would be illuminated by 3 lights at the top of each main sign face, a single light at the top of the side faces and in-ground spotlights shining upwards.
- Three (3) one-sided freestanding parking information signs. Each sign would be 3 feet tall and 6 feet wide and have a maximum height of 5 feet, 6 inches. No lighting is proposed for these signs.

Courtyard:

- One (1) three-sided wooden under marquee sign identifying the central courtyard area of the center. The sign would be 2 feet, 3 inches tall, 12 feet, 8 inches wide in the front and have 8 foot wide sides, for a total of area of 64.5 square feet. Four lights would be mounted above the front face, with three lights above the side faces.
- One (1) three-sided courtyard wayfinding sign with individual sign panels for each of 5 tenants. Each sign would be 2 feet wide and 7¼ inches tall (1.2 square feet). The total sign area for the 3 sign faces for 5 tenants would be 18 square feet. No lighting is proposed for these signs.
- One (1) wall-mounted directory sign with a shopping center map and tenant names and suite numbers. The sign would be 8 feet, 1¼ inches wide and 4 feet, 5 inches tall and

have a total sign area of 34.2 square feet. The sign would be illuminated by two gooseneck lamps).

- Miscellaneous signage on the courtyard ceiling joist with selected verses from mid-20th century poems (i.e. Emily Dickenson). Three joists are within Tiburon and the rest are in Belvedere. The signs would be 4 inches tall and 3 to 4 feet wide.

Individual Tenants:

- One (1) double-faced overhead mounted hanging sign for each of 7 tenants located in the shopping center. Each sign would be 2 feet wide and 1 foot, 6 inches tall, with two faces, for a total area of 3 square feet per sign. No lighting is proposed for these signs.
- One (1) or two (2) wall signs above the windows for each tenant. The area of the existing signs for each tenant would be grandfathered into the sign program as follows:
 - Tiburon Spa: 20 square feet
 - The Ark: 36 square feet
 - Diana's of Tiburon (2 signs): 72 square feet
 - Tiburon Mail Service: 30 square feet
 - Pacific Union Real Estate: 24.5 square feet
 - Holscher Architecture: 22.5 square feet

R & S Auto Repair:

- One (1) double-faced freestanding wooden sign. Each side of the sign would be 5 feet, 2 inches tall and 3 feet, 6 inches wide, for a total sign area of 18 square feet. The sign would be 11 feet tall, with no illumination.

Todd Barbee, designer, said the Boardwalk Shopping Center has been updated, but the signage needs to be modernized. He said that the proposed sign program would increase public safety, conform better to the sign ordinance, and preserve the original design of the building. He described the freestanding signs that would replace the existing signs and better identify the center entries. He said that the proposed signs would be almost identical in size to the existing signs except that for being positioned vertically as opposed to the existing horizontal signs. He described the signage for the Courtyard area, including a three-sided way-finding sign to help patrons find stores inside the courtyard area, which would replace existing signs and also remove the need for the hodgepodge of A-frame signs that merchants place in the area. He stated that each merchant would be allowed both wall signs and blade signs to allow pedestrians to better navigate the center and provide continuity and visibility from Tiburon Boulevard. He said that they also propose to remove the service station awning, signage, and architecture and install a new freestanding sign. He said that they would install "no parking" signage at northern, western, and southern areas of the parking lot and remove all A-frame signage and the parking kiosk. He described a new directory sign and signage on the joists leading to Corner Books.

Jim Allen, one of the owners of the Boardwalk Center, said that he showed the sign plan to many of the tenants and gotten feedback. He read highlights from letters from the merchants in support

of the signage. He also stated that Rustic Bakery almost did not come to the center because of the poor signage.

The public hearing was opened.

Glen Isaacson said Corner Books asked him to appear and state that the Library Foundation fully supports the efforts to make the Courtyard more identifiable.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Cousins said the Town has been doing a lot to rejuvenate the downtown area, and the arrival of Rustic Bakery will have a big impact. He stated that signage is very important for retailers and he welcomed this proposal. He stated that the freestanding signs would be big and he believed that the vertical design would compete with trees. He noted that the signs would be three feet taller than allowed by the sign ordinance. He felt that it was important to have the lettering big enough to be able to be visible and he thought that the lettering on the sides of the freestanding signs would be useful, but he questioned whether ten extra lights were necessary. He said that it would be nice to see under the freestanding signs. He liked the courtyard sign and the hanging signs and said that he had no problem with tenants keeping their existing signs. He welcomed the removal of the old service station architecture and signage. He said he did not like exclamation points on the customer parking signs, but noted that he may not be able to comment on the sign content.

Vice Chair Kricensky said the no parking signs seemed rather large. He liked the service station sign. He noted that the wall signs were previously approved, but thought that those signs should only include the name of the business and not include phone numbers and email addresses. He was unsure whether the signs would be visible from Tiburon Boulevard, but would be visible from the parking lot. He thought the blade signs were acceptable and typical of a small town and that emphasizing the Courtyard was important. He said that the freestanding signs felt out of scale and too tall. He said that for a pedestrian, the sign does not start until it is a foot overhead, and the signs would loom overhead. He suggested keeping the signs lower and keeping the landscaping more decorative and low.

Boardmember Emberson said that the no parking signs appeared rude and suggested that the size of the sign did not matter to people who would park there anyway. She loved the overall design of the sign plan and believed that this would be a great addition to the Boardwalk Center, but felt that no one can read every sign while driving down Tiburon Boulevard. She stated that the freestanding signs were too tall, but she liked the weather vane on top. She said that the Courtyard sign was large and she suggested it could be a little smaller and not so looming. She liked the directional sign. She noted that there would be too many lights. She suggested that it might look too busy to have both the wall signs and the blade signs. She liked the service station sign and the directory sign.

Chair Tollini said that he largely agreed with Boardmember Emberson's comments. He understood why the shopkeepers and property manager want more signage, but stated that the sign ordinance is intended to restrain that. He agreed that the existing signage is ineffective and

camouflaged. He said that the freestanding signs would be too tall and out of scale. He said that he would like to avoid putting the name of every store in the center on the sign, but recognized that desire. He said that it did not feel right to be able to walk under the signs. He appreciated that the wall signs were previously approved, but he did not want to add to those signs and believed that the signs needed to be revisited. He said that the great-looking signs are for Rustic Bakery and Wells Fargo and he encouraged the wall sign program to follow that format along with the blade signs. He said that the no parking signs should just have less text and smaller fonts with no exclamation points. He noted that almost all the signs would be lighted, including signs for businesses that are not open at night, so the lighting should be reduced. He said that the wall signs have not stood the test of time and he felt that there should not be additions to large signs.

Boardmember Emberson noted that since the sign program is being proposed, the wall signs can be changed as well. Chair Tollini and Vice Chair Kricensky agreed. Boardmember Cousins stated that every store needs to be able to have its own sign and identity. All of the boardmembers agreed that the information on the wall signs could be better conformed, and that the entire sign program needed to be revisited.

ACTION: It was M/S (Emberson/Kricensky) to continue the application for 1550 Tiburon Boulevard to the June 2, 2016 meeting. Vote: 4-0.
--

F. APPROVAL OF MINUTES #6 OF THE APRIL 21, 2016 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Boardmember Emberson requested the following changes:

Page 5, second paragraph, last sentence: The sentence should read: “He said they had a survey done to be sure they were within the setback.”

Page 5, second paragraph, second sentence: The sentence should read: “...Mr. Sabetian said the intent was to not overstep the setback but to get close to it.”

Page 5, sixth paragraph, fourth sentence: The sentence should read: “He considered the architecture of the house to be overbuilt...”

ACTION: It was M/S (Cousins/Emberson) to approve the minutes of the April 21, meeting, as amended. Vote: 4-0.

G. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.