## STRAWBERRY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

# 118 E. STRAWBERRY DRIVE, MILL VALLEY, CA 94941 January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020 MEETING NOTES

Co-Chairman, Joe Sherer, called the meeting to order at 7:38 p.m.

Members present: Joe Sherer

Julie Brown Rebecca Lied Matt Williams Penna Omega

### 1. Open for public comments

- I. Strawberry resident Cathy Nourafshan asked about the view restriction issues she is having and HOA regulations in her area. Inquired about who to speak with to resolve the issue.
- II. Resident David Crouzet spoke about the lack of sidewalks in Strawberry to safely walk to bus stops, school, shopping center, etc. J. Brown suggests contacting Safe Routes To School as an option as well as posting on Nextdoor to continue the conversation with the public.
- 2. JB Motions to accept 11/4/19 meeting notes without changes. PO seconds the motion. Vote: JS yes, JB yes, MW yes, PO yes, RL abstains. Motion carries.
- 3. Thomas Drive/N. Knoll

Story poles are needed and digital plans were not posted on county site for neighbor review. Applicant agreed to come back after both are complete.

Motion to continue the project until Jan 20<sup>th</sup>.

Vote: JS yes, JB yes, MW yes, PO yes, RL yes. Motion carries.

4. 240 Tiburon Blvd. Presbytery of the Redwoods

Applicant presented plans for paint selections.

Dunn & Edwards "Vintage Ephemera" – main (670), "Sepia Tone" – trim (638), "Wooden Peg" – accent color (6215)

Board appreciated the pallet and felt it was a nice upgrade from the existing colors.

JB motion to approve plan A3.2 D with paint colors as specified above. MW seconds.

Vote: JS yes, JB yes, MW yes, PO yes, RL recused. Motion carries.

(continued on next page)

5. 105 Tiburon Blvd. Chevron canopy (revised)

Applicant was not in attendance to present. Plans submitted were reviewed for completeness.

#### SRDB COMMENTS

Julie Brown: Landscape plans are deficient and do not show what was agreed upon in earlier review. It was agreed (and not on current plans) that area near propane tank will have screening of minimum 8' trees, and that screening will be maintained. Julie also suggests that placement of fuel tanks be configured during redesign to comply with setbacks.

Rebecca Lind: Happy with slope of roof design compared to flat line as last presented and doesn't mind the idea of canopy as over-hang. Does mind it being used for logos and signage in a residential neighborhood, with houses right across the street. Concerned size of canopy is larger than actual structure and canopy already goes beyond setback as it is now.

Matt Williams: Plans need to conform to the front set-back of 25' and sign allowance (no more than two signs) as per code.

Penna Omega: Code allows for 2 signs, which applicant already has. Size of canopy proposed is too large compared to existing structure and lot size.

Joe Sherer: Liked the roof revision and did not have a problem with it extending into the front setback. JS was also OK with signage, however did not want it lit (even indirectly) on the east facing N. Knoll Road side.

Julie, Rebecca and Matt do not see justification for exception to the 25-foot front setback. The applicant previously mentioned some state law about covering the pumps that may be required, even if the project does not meet our local setbacks. The suggestion was made to rearrange the pumps to meet any state requirements, if necessary.

The variance is unsupported because it is an intensification of the front setback beyond the existing non-conforming encroachment. The extension of a non-conforming use where the expansion itself increases the non-conformity.

We support the design of the roofline as it is shown as opposed to flat roofline, but do not support the signage/logos on the West, South or East facing canopy as presented. Maximum signage allowed (code 22.28.40 E &F) is already present and new fuel tanks will have additional & significant logo visibility.

Complete landscape plans to show 8' minimum height of landscaping buffer at North East corner to hide propane tank as agreed from earlier review.

Matt Williams motions to DENY the project as presented. Rebecca Lind seconds. Vote: JS no, JB yes, MW yes, PO yes, RL yes. Motion carries.

#### 6. Discuss proposed 2020 – 22 Biennial Report

JB Motions to CONTINUE discussion of item #5 Biennial Report until our next meeting. MW seconds motion. Vote: JS yes, JB yes, MW yes, PO yes, RL yes. Motion carries.

The meeting adjourned at 9:39pm