

**Strawberry Design Review Board**  
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941  
**September 15, 2014**

**SUMMARY**

**I. The meeting was called to order at 7:34pm.**

Members present:

Joe Sherer  
Negissa Araghi  
Jeff Wong

**II. Agenda Items:**

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Planner</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1. Fridman Design Review	Shawn Yoder/Yuri Fridman	Heidi Scobe	Continuation

**III. Administration and Other Business**

None

**IV. Comments to Planner**

The following materials were requested by the Board,

- Survey describing existing property lines, existing building, proposed and existing retaining walls, stairs, and site amenities, topography, vegetation and relevant dimensions. Work should be done from a licensed surveyor.
- Accurate and complete architectural, civil, structural and plumbing drawings (plans, elevations, sections and details) to scale that describe new design including required setbacks.
- Material board showing wall, railing & light fixtures.
- Plant list with pictures.
- Line-by-line document itemizing which Marin County Planning Code requirements are met. Code references/section numbers should be described.

**V. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.**

**Design Review Recommendation: Agenda Item 1 – Fridman Design Review**

Shawn Yoder, an unlicensed laborer on behalf of owner, and Yuri Fridman, owner, described the project,

- The existing house is on a hillside. Applicant has begun to build three terraces in the backyard to provide flat areas owner uses. This involved extensive cut and fill along the hillside and with several new retaining walls made out of split-face interlocking CMUs. Metal railing would be used as guardrails. Stairs would be built along side of terrace walls. In time, landscaping vines will cover the CMU walls over time.
- Applicant noted that roughly half of work was done without a permit. The Community Development Agency issued a stop work notice.
- Approximately 8 pine trees were cut.
- Existing wall design encroaches on code required setbacks.
- Geotechnical engineering report from Robert Settgast is the only engineering document presented.
- Hand-drawn site plan and section are conceptual in nature lacking details and key dimensions.

### **Comments from the Public:**

Matthew Sessions, adjacent property owner/neighbor at 74 Bay Vista Drive, noted that,

- No notification of work was given to neighbors
- Construction noise was an impact to his property
- Applicants accidentally damaged and destroyed Mr. Session's hot tub and on a separate occasion, damaged an existing railing on Mr. Session's property
- Mr. Sessions notes that the scale of the wall is intrusive and too high.
- Mr. Sessions also notes that when heavy rain occurs, erosion is a problem as mud debris spills onto street.
- There is no barrier or fence between the two properties
- The construction goes on holidays and weekends. However whenever he complains about the noise the applicant stops the work.

### **Comments from Board Members:**

Jeff Wong comments,

- JW expressed disappointment that work was done without a permit, input from neighbors and with improperly prepared construction document. He also noted that not using a licensed construction professional could lead to safety concerns for the applicant and the surrounding residents. Applicant noted that he didn't know a permit was needed.
- JW noted that to remedy this situation, comments would be steered towards the idea that construction had not occurred yet.
- JW noted that the drawings didn't have sufficient detail to show cut and fill amount/area and height of new wall. In addition, a material board (showing wall and railing material and light fixtures) and plant list pictures were not presented by applicant.
- JW noted that wall was too massive and large for property.
- JW noted that wall encroaching within the setbacks was not appropriate.

Joe Sherer comments,

- JS noted that 30' wall was not an appropriate design and building within the setback was not appropriate.
- JS noted that vines (which were to grow on terrace walls) are not drawn on plans.

- JS asked about irrigation. Applicant responds that drip irrigation will be provided.
- JS noted that a stamped survey was not provided.

Negissa Araghi comments,

- NA noted she was in agreement with fellow board members.
- NA noted that the construction documents weren't complete and the drawings were not clear. Misinformation seemed present. The topography and the numbers indicated on the plans did not match the sections.
- From a design standpoint, NA recommended artificial grass on terrace flat areas.
- NA was surprised at the lack of stamped set of drawings.

**Motion:**

Joe Sherer moved for a continuance of the application pending SDRB members review of the following requested materials,

- Survey describing existing property lines, existing building, proposed and existing retaining walls, stairs, and site amenities, topography, vegetation and relevant dimensions. Work should be done from a licensed surveyor.
- Accurate and complete architectural, civil, structural and plumbing drawings (plans, elevations, sections and details) to scale that describe new design including required setbacks.
- Material board showing wall, railing & light fixtures.
- Plant list with pictures.
- Line-by-line document itemizing which Marin County Planning Code requirements are met. Code references/section numbers should be described.

Jeff Wong seconded the motion.

In favor = all board members present

Joe Sherer: Yes

Negissa Araghi: Yes

Jeff Wong: Yes

**End of Minutes**