

Strawberry Design Review Board  
118 E. Strawberry Dr. Mill Valley, CA 94941  
Strawberry Recreation Center  
February 3, 2020

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 by Joe Sherer, Chair

Members Present:

Joe Sherer  
Rebecca Lind  
Matt Williams

1. Open time for public comments

There were no public comments.

2. Approval of minutes from previous meetings

The Board discussed the January 20, 2020 minutes but could not approve them because only two Board members in attendance were present at the last meeting.

3. New single family residence at the corner of Thomas Dr. and N. Knoll

Applicant Tony Richards and Linda Johnson, 16 Birds Nest Court, representing Laura Lindskog, were present. Mr. Richards stated that he made all the Board's requested changes from the January 20th meeting. The Board discussed the revised proposal and made the following additional comments.

A. Light fixtures:

9 inch fixtures are provided. The Board has the concern that the proposed fixture will be too visible from the street. Board members like the craftsman character of the fixture but want to see a solution with more down light.

B. Landscape screening:

At the last meeting the Board asked for screening between the house and the neighboring residences on the downslope. In response, 8 sycamore, 8 wax myrtle (which will grow to 30 feet) and "Ray Hartman" variety of cyanosis (which grows to 12 feet) are proposed. The consensus was that this solution addresses the prior concern. Slide mitigation on a portion of the site was also discussed. The proposal is to remove the existing soil, provide benching, install drainage and replace the soil. The consensus was that these changes address the Board's concern.

C. Aesthetic considerations:

Concern was raised about the stucco and wall height in the original plan. The proposal is to provide stone to the base covering the concrete retaining wall extending under the garage. The material will be faux stone made out of concrete and textured with color variation grey. Joe suggested using real stone because the faux stone product leaches. Stone will also extend approximately 5 feet along the driveway and approximately 3 feet at the base of the entry stairs. The garage and entry stair are still stucco as originally proposed.

The shingles are changed to Hardie shakes, stained in cedar finish. Dimensions 7 inch staggered is preferred as shown on sheet A7, A5 L1 and L2.

Note to country engineering: The plan set page c11 is to be corrected specifically Profile b- b, c-c, a-an. On Sheet c-12 all sections are to be corrected. Sheet c-13 needs to be checked.

D. Concern about changes in site drainage:

A bioswale is proposed on the uphill side of the driveway. The existing ditch on the neighboring parcel will be improved with a bio swale and a catch basin to take the flow under the driveway.

E. Plan Section e1 through the hammer head:

The Board has concern about the height of the wall, the stability of the slope and the amount of earth moved so close to the property line. The reconstructed slope is proposed to be terraced to hide the wall. Landscaping will be installed in pressure treated planter boxes below the fire truck turn around. Additional or higher landscaping is recommended for both screening and stabilization on the engineered slope at the base of the wall. Check detail 7 on c.22.0. which may be show in conflicting information.

F. the Board has concern about work occurring beyond the property line and not within the project site. Applicant advised the Board that the site has existing legal egress across adjacent property as well as drainage easements. Documentation was not provided.

G. Lighting:

The Board has concern about lighting and requests a more recessed bulb with an indirect shielded light source.

M/S Williams/Sherer to approval the project subject to resolution of the concerns addressed as noted above: lighting and the drainage on the driveway, the hammerhead, and the irregularities in the plan set that are called out by sheet.

Board appreciates the changes made in response to the Boards concerns at the last meeting.

Vote: JS yes; RL yes; MW yes. Motion passes.

#### 4. 2020-2022 Biennial Report

The "Accomplishments" section of the report was noted. 20 meetings are proposed to review and comments on projects in the community.

M/S Williams/Sherer to approve the attached 2020-22 Boards and Commissions Annual Report

Vote: JS yes; RL yes; MW yes. Motion passes.

The meeting was adjourned at 9 PM.

Notes provided by Rebecca Lind

*Please note that this report should reflect accomplishments, goals, initiatives, etc. for the entire two year budget cycle (July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022). The next time this report will be updated will be for the 2022-2024 budget cycle (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2024).*

*Please fill out all sections. Click on the gray boxes where prompted to enter text. Any sections that are not applicable can be notated as “N/A”.*

**I. Commission Name/Title**

Strawberry Design Review Board

**II. Commission Purpose/Mandate**

The Strawberry Design Review Board (SDRB) shall serve as an advisory and resource body and liaison to the Board of Supervisors, the Community Development Agency, the Planning Commission, and the community. The SDRB shall review and provide comments on discretionary land use and zoning applications, and community plan amendments within the Strawberry Planning Area that are referred to the SDRB by the Community Development Agency.

**III. Accomplishments for 2018-20 budget cycle (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2020)**

1. Held approximately 20 public meetings to review and respond to applicants for projects in the Strawberry area. Forwarded comments and suggestions to Planning staff.
2. Heard comments from community members and passed resolution regarding the large Seminary property in Strawberry.
3. Held public meeting to discuss Community Education about Affordable Housing and State Housing Initiatives

**IV. Goals and Key Initiatives for 2020-22 budget cycle (July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2022)**

*List the Board/Commission’s most important goals (up to 5). These goals should be statements that reflect your highest priorities, which may or may not change over time.*

*Below each goal, list 1-5 key initiatives (activities) that the Board/Commission will be working on that will help make progress toward that particular goal. Typically, initiatives are discrete activities that can be achieved over the course of one or two years.*

**Goal #1:** Review and respond to applicants with proposed projects in the Strawberry area and forward comments and suggestions to Planning staff.

**2020-22 Key Initiatives for Goal #1**

1. Provide staff at meetings
2. Provide at a minimum a summary of how the proposal does or does not meet minimum requirements.
3. Provide support staff for notices.
4. Provide support for minutes for large community meetings (more than 25 people)
5. Consider adding a fee to submittal requirements where community design review board review is required by code to provide the necessary funding for initiatives 1-4.
6. Planning staff to notify SDRB if its recommendations are not followed.

Post the Notice of Decision on the Alto Strawberry DRB website for all projects.

**Goal #2:** Update the Strawberry Community Plan (SCP) because it is decades out of date. The SDRB needs an updated SCP to more clearly enumerate its role in the community.

### 2020-22 Key Initiatives for Goal #2

1. The updated SCP should address two major categories of issues either together or separately:

A. Ongoing changes to the housing stock and community character. The current SCP does not address the kinds of development issues that come before the Board as typical applications for infill development and remodels. This includes height, bulk and scale, views, vegetation, fencing, second story additions in neighborhoods with a single family context, lighting, pedestrian and bicycle routes, safe routes to school, entry features or gateways to the community, and the interface between commercial and residential areas.

An updated SCP is needed for the Board to fulfill its mandated responsibilities for normal design review of projects in the community which are required to come before the Board as part of the development process. The current plan focuses on new development capacities of (already completed) major parcels but gives no guidance to the kind of remodeling and reconstruction projects that are on the Boards normal agenda items.

- B. Policy for redevelopment of the Seminary site. The present plan only addresses this property as Study Area 3 in the context of a specialized institutional land use: the Baptist Theological Seminary.

An updated SCP is needed before the next Seminary redevelopment proposal is processed. A scope of work recommended by the Board could become a project submission requirement for the next development proposal under CEQA review due to the very outdated sections of the existing plan. This approach could allow an independent consultant selected by the County and paid by the developer to prepare draft plan amendments in response to the DRB generated (with community input) work program.

**Goal #3:** SDRB requests county to provide budget for anticipated large-attendance SDRB meetings.

### 2020-22 Key Initiatives for Goal #3

Previous meetings had approximately 300 attendees.  
County should provide insurance payments to Strawberry Rec District for our meetings.  
County should provide recording (video and/or stenography) for large meetings.

**Goal #4:** Click here to enter text.

#### 2020-22 Key Initiatives for Goal #4

Click here to enter text.

**Goal #5:** Click here to enter text.

#### 2020-22 Key Initiatives for Goal #5

Click here to enter text.

## V. Key Challenges and Issues

*Please list any challenges in achieving your 2020-22 budget cycle goals.*

We understand that County funding is needed to accomplish our key goal of 1) increasing Board effectiveness and 2) updating the Strawberry Community Plan (SCP). Two financial mechanisms are recommended:

1. An additional fee for design review to be collected for projects that are required by code to go through the design review process. The proceeds from this fee could be used to support County services to the Boards.
2. Identify an additional fee for private development occurring on large acreage in areas where the community plan is more than 20 years out of date or where significant CEQA issues exist between.

## VI. Additional Board/Commission Comments

Updating our SCP is critical not only because the current SCP is decades out of date, but because one of the largest and most impactful projects in the County needs immediate direction. The former Baptist Seminary site is over 100 acres and now has an expired Master Plan and a severely outdated Community Plan.

Strawberry needs to craft its future using a positive community-directed method, and not attempt to squeeze in an ad hoc solution for this tremendously important project, as well as determine appropriate community-directed solutions to all other development standards in Strawberry on which the current SCP is silent.

**VII. Department Comments**

*If applicable, please provide any comments from the County department that this board/commission works with.*

Click here to enter text.