

Strawberry Design Review Board
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941

Minutes August 26, 2014

I. The Chairperson, Negissa Araghi, called the meeting to order at 7:34pm.

Members present:

Negissa Araghi (NA)
Barbara Rowe (BR)
Joe Sherer (JS)
Isis Spinola-Schwartz (IS) [arrived late]
Jeff Wong (JW)

II. Agenda Items:

Subject	Applicant	Planner	Recommendation
1. Litman residence Project Address: 426 East Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley	Brad Hubbell, KCS, Inc.	Lorene Jackson	Approve
2. Williams residence Project Address: 125 Chapel Drive, Mill Valley	Polsky Perlstein	Scott Greely	Approve
3. PB Teen signage Project Address: Strawberry Village Shopping Center	Cory Lilledahl	Heidi Scoble	Approve

III. Administration and Other Business

July 28, 2014 minutes were approved.

IV. Comments to Planner

V. The meeting adjourned at 8:51 pm.

Agenda Item 1 – Litman residence

Presenter: Brad Hubble (architect)

The presenter offered drawings and told us that the new materials would match the existing materials on the exterior. The pool and spa would be removed to accommodate the new added building. The extended roof height would be identical to the existing roof as it was expanded toward the neighbor at 418 Strawberry Drive. He indicated that the neighbor at 418 Strawberry supported the application.

The site has a 30% allowable FAR and 26% FAR proposed.
Existing size is 3,296sf for the house plus 583sf garage and shed.
Proposed is 3,773sf house plus 1,139sf garage and shed.
Proposed total building area is 4,372sf (after 540sf garage exemption) and 4,999sf is allowable.

The remodel proposes only one window facing the neighbor at 418 East Strawberry where there were three windows existing. All proposed landscape lighting is down lighting. The large eucalyptus trees have already been removed. The existing lawn is proposed to be removed and replaced with drought tolerant ground cover.

Presentation concluded, and the floor was open to the public for comment.

There were no public comments.

The item was brought back to the board for discussion.

JS said it was a thoughtful design, not too large, and didn't seem to imping on the neighbors views.

IS said it was a good project and would appreciate it if the drought tolerant plants proposed would look NICE from the street since they were quite visible.

JW, BR and NA agreed and supported the project.

JS made a motion to approve the application as submitted. JW seconded the motion.

Negissa Araghi: Yes

Barbara Rowe: Yes

Joe Sherer: Yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz: Yes

Jeff Wong: Yes

Motion carried: 5-0

Agenda Item 2 – Williams residence

Presenter: Jared Polsky (architect)

The presenter offered drawings and told us that the addition was going to be built over the existing deck to improve the flow and view enjoyment for the residents. It would also block some of the wind so the remaining deck would be more usable. The new materials would match the existing materials on the exterior. The new addition would have a flat roof so as not to block the important views of San Francisco from the upper floor master bedroom.

The site has a 30% allowable FAR and 26% FAR proposed.
Existing size is 4,675sf for the house plus 768sf garage.
Proposed is 5,064sf house plus 768sf garage.
Proposed total building area is 5,292sf (after 540sf garage exemption).

Presentation concluded, and the floor was open to the public for comment.

There were no public comments.

The item was brought back to the board for discussion.

JS said since the adjoining parcel on the right (from the street) was vacant and large there was no real neighbor impact. Maintaining the existing colors and keeping the addition over the existing deck should not be a problem for anyone, and a very large improvement for the owners. Since there are already so many different forms on the building, he didn't oppose a new flat roof.

IS said she didn't oppose the flat roof. She said the addition would have a low impact since it was designed over the existing deck. She liked the new stairway down to the existing yard since it would encourage more use the area.

BR said she thought the stairs were a good safety issue. She was sympathetic to the wind issue and agreed the new addition would help with that.

JW said he didn't like the flat roof, but didn't see any other option.

NA said she liked the improved floor plan to make the house more usable.

IS made a motion to approve the application as submitted. BR seconded the motion.

Negissa Araghi: Yes

Barbara Rowe: Yes

Joe Sherer: Yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz: Yes

Jeff Wong: Yes

Motion carried: 5-0

Agenda Item 3 – PB Teen sign

Cory Lilledahl made a presentation for Pottery Barn showing several drawings and photographs of the proposed new storefront and blade signs. He also brought in a working lighted sign to show the board.

He noted the proposed storefront sign was only 1' 4" tall and 1' 2 ½" wide in total with the letters being only 5 ¾" tall ("PB") and 3 7/8" tall ("teen") which is far below the allowable signage size.

He said the back of the approximately 11 foot wide sign area would be painted to match the existing beam color (dark brown) so it would blend in. The sign itself would be side illuminated, and he brought in an example of a similarly lighted sign. He noted the proposed sign would be smaller than the example he brought in.

The sign would have a white background with black letters made of steel. He noted the dark brown color matching the existing beam for the remaining sign area was not one of the approved five colors for sign backgrounds. He said the landlord was aware of the discrepancy and was in favor of the sign as proposed with the non-standard color. He noted that many of the other signs at the shopping center did not meet the guidelines. He pointed out that since this would match the existing wooden beam and the actual sign was only about 1.5 square feet total, it made sense.

Presentation concluded, and the floor was open to the public for comment.

There were no public comments.

The item was brought back to the board for discussion.

BR said the sign looks fine to her.

IS said she had no objections and the sign would blend in.

NA said the sign was very small and could barely be seen from the freeway. She had no objections.

JS said he was concerned about the illumination of the sign and certainly didn't want it to look like the recently constructed West Elm sign. He noted an excellent example was the new back-lit Nordstrom sign that created a nice halo effect that could be seen along the freeway at the Village Shopping Center. He noted how offensive the raw neon white light was on the West Elm sign and thought that sign was not what was approved, but it was before his time as a Design Review member. Since this sign was much smaller and the lighting was only coming from the side, it could be acceptable.

IS made a motion to approve the application as submitted. JW seconded the motion.

Negissa Araghi: Yes

Barbara Rowe: Yes

Joe Sherer: Yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz: Yes

Jeff Wong: Yes

Motion carried: 5-0

End of Minutes