

Strawberry Design Review Board
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941
Strawberry Recreation Center
July 20, 2020

S U M M A R Y M I N U T E S

The meeting was called to order at 7:36PM by Joe Sherer, Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT (via video conference)

Joe Sherer, Chair (JS)	Penna Omega (PO)	
Julie Brown (JB)	Matt Williams (MW)	Rebecca Lind (RL)

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

OPEN TIME / PUBLIC COMMENTS

A. NONE

MINUTES REVIEW

The board reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting held on Jan. 20, 2020, prepared by JB.

M/S: JB/MW to approve minutes as drafted. Vote: 3-0 (JS yes; JB yes; MW yes) Motion carries.

The board also reviewed the minutes from the Feb. 3, 2020, minutes, prepared by RL, as amended by JS.

M/S: MW/RL to approve minutes as drafted. Vote: 3-0 (JS yes; JB yes; MW yes) Motion carries.

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM #1	APPLICANT	PLANNER
2 Harbor Point Drive -sign	Signcraft	Michelle Levenson

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Brad Westbrook (BW), of Signcraft, presented the proposed main monument sign for the corner of E. Strawberry Dr. and Weatherly Dr. to replace the existing one for Harbor Point. The proposed 29.3 square foot (SF) sign replaces the existing 27.5 SF sign board. It is an painted aluminum with a wood grain giclée accent and a circular Harbor Point logo protruding from the top. The main box of the sign is 48”H x 84”W x 18”D, with the logo reaching 57-3/8”H. There are no lights.

BOARD CLARIFICATIONS & DISCUSSION:

JS: The existing (E) sign is 68”W x with varying heights: 72” & 66”, which roughly equals +/-32SF. The sign regulations say Harbor Point is entitled to 6SF total.

RL: The code also requires the base to be a min. of 40% of the sign width.

MW: This is 100%, so we’re OK.

JB: Why is this sign not consistent with the wooden sign across E. Strawberry Dr. and elsewhere?
(shows photo)

MW: Why is this sign inconsistent with the Club & Lighthouse sign and the Harbor Point 450 sign at Strawberry Lane across the street from each other along E. Strawberry Dr? (showing photos of the two large stone clad signs, which are aluminum on wood and raised lettering on wood, respectively)

RL: The logo seems too big, and I don't like it protruding from the top - it should be removed.

PO: The blue logo isn't consistent with anything else. It's also visually too light and not very distinctive, there is little contrast. I don't like it.

JB: The logo is a bit strange – it's not the same logo as on the wooden signs, which are dark background with the bridge and say "Harbor Point" above it.

JS: The logo should be removed.

JB: If the logo is removed, then the wood part may be too far down and might appear to have what MW called a "heavy forehead".

General discussion that the wood part should be moved higher on the monument.

MW: I'm still distracted by it not being consistent with the other prominent road signs.

BW then talked about how the raised letter sign at Strawberry Ln. will be replaced to be consistent and showed us the mockup. It has a similar logo to the wooden signs and then the lettering to the right.

This prompted discussion of there seems to be a program to replace all the signage and in light of that, we should be seeing this as a whole, not piecemeal.

JB: There is a master signage program, obviously. Why not present your sign program, a full master signage package, for our review?

MW: Putting them all together will show them they should be consistent with one another. Doing them together will sort out the outliers.

JB: I think that is appropriate. We'd be abdicating our responsibility to future Board members if we don't give them some guidelines for approval, some record that this is what it should be like, especially since we all seem to be OK with Harbor Point exceeding it's allowed signage.

ACTION:

It was M/S by JB/RL to RECOMMEND A CONTINUANCE for resubmittal with the FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS to be conveyed to Staff:

1. Resubmit the sign to be consistent with a Master Sign Program for Harbor Point with consistent logos, colors, backgrounds, and lettering.
2. Elimination of the protruding logo at the top of the sign, making only the 48"H x 84"L x 18"D sign is acceptable.
3. Study the height of the wood section on the monument, moving it up from its current position.

Vote: 5 – 0 (JB yes; RL yes; JS yes; PO yes; MW yes)

600 Redwood Highway – McDonald’s Sign Review

David Ford

Kathleen Kilgariff

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

David Ford (DF), of Yesco, presented the proposed illuminated sign package which is additive to the complete remodel of the McDonald’s, which did not come before the Board. The applicant isn’t aware of or able to speak to all the other work beyond what is in his submittal.

BOARD CLARIFICATIONS & DISCUSSION

RL: We are not fond of illuminated signage along the freeway. Is there other lighting on the site?

MW: What is happening with the existing large illuminated sign? Does it remain?

DF did not know. This submittal was only for his scope of work, there is no supplemental reference architectural plans, nor any indication on this submittal if/what is to remain or go on the site. Since there was an Interagency Referral sent to us and we don’t think we have enough information to even understand the submittal, the Board decided to respond to the Referral:

ACTION:

It was M/S by RL/PO to RECOMMEND A CONTINUANCE for resubmittal with the FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION & SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATIONS to be conveyed to Staff:

From the Interagency Referral:

In your response to this referral, please provide the following information:

1. Indicate whether the application materials contain enough information for you to determine whether the applicant can readily comply with your agency’s standards.

SDRB: There is not enough information to determine what extent of illumination is proposed. There are no reference architectural plans nor any indication if the (E) large McDonald’s sign is to remain or be removed.

2. If the application does not contain enough information for you to determine whether the project can readily comply with your agency’s standards, please list the information that you will need to make this determination.

SDRB: We need the reference architectural and landscaping plans and/or other information to understand:

- A. If the (E) large illuminated sign is to remain.
- B. What other exterior illumination on the building and in the landscaping is proposed? Is outdoor seating proposed? Will it be illuminated? There is a wetland behind this site that needs to be considered and shouldn’t be negatively impacted.
- C. Is the existing screen wall along the frontage to remain? If not, then we believe we need to understand the amount of illumination (lighting & menu boards) visible on the interior relative to the amount of glazing proposed as well as the screening proposed.
- D. What improvements to the sidewalk are proposed?
- E. What is happening with the storage structure in the rear? Is there illumination there?

- F. What level of illumination of the menu boards is proposed at the drive through? Is there lighting at the new canopies at the cashier and pick up?
- G. Additionally, recently the car lineup has extended onto the street frontage, which seems like a safety concern – what improvements are proposed? *(added for clarification by MW after meeting).*
- H. What were the prior Conditions of Approval related to this site? Is the accessory building compliant?

3. If the application contains sufficient information for your review, please indicate whether the project is feasible as proposed or needs substantial modifications to comply with your agency's standards.

SDRB: There is not sufficient information to review. Not understanding the full extent of illumination is problematic.

4. If the project needs to be substantially modified to comply with your agency's standards, please describe the scope of those modifications. In your response, please indicate whether you would like to impose requirements on the project.

SDRB: A. We support the removal of the (E) large McDonald's sign. If it is to remain, we cannot support ANY illuminated signage on the building. The (E) sign exceeds the allowable area.

B. Logos should be removed from the illuminated directional signage.

We will forward your comments to the applicants/owners so they are aware of your agency's requirements.

Vote: 5 – 0 (JB yes; RL yes; JS yes; PO yes; MW yes)

ITEM #3

PLANNER

Marin County Objective Design & Development Standards (ODDS)

N/A

General discussion of the ODDS centered on the ineffectiveness of the Survey Monkey list and its presentation of photos and generalizations. It didn't seem to deal with good design, massing, or neighborhood cohesion. JB and MW were concerned that this approach could lead to cookie-cutter or watered-down designs. Worse, it could lead to bad imitations of what is held up as "good" design.

JS talked with a Planner who thought that these ODDS would only apply to one site in Strawberry. However, in discussion, we were unsure if any renovation or improvement could then implement the ODDS. Better understanding of the potential future impact to Strawberry would be appreciated.

RL walked the Board through some of the Design Guidelines on the City of Oakland website, specifically the Commercial Corridor Design Guidelines, or the Broadway Valdez District Specific Plan Appendix C. The Board liked the idea of "do this, not that" format in general.

ADJURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05PM.

Notes prepared by Matt Williams: 08.05.20