

Strawberry Design Review Board
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941
November 11, 2016 Meeting Notes

SUMMARY

I. Chairman, Isis Spinola-Schwartz, called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Members present: Isis Spinola-Schwartz
Joe Sherer
Penna Omega
Rebecca Lind
Julie Brown

II. Public Comment

None. No community members present.

III. Agenda Items

1.	SUBJECT	APPLICANT	PLANNER
	29 Knoll Road, MV	Hamilton Trust	Tammy Taylor

IV. Comments to the Planning Staff:

1. After procedural discussion regarding preparation of minutes, noting that the Board was struggling to prepare minutes while absorbing the content of presenters and public, it was suggested that we need outside help (non-Board member) to prepare the minutes. Request is hereby made that county provide funds or other solution for meeting minute taking.

2. Motion made and seconded to CONTINUE the 29 N. Knoll project with the following feedback provided to the applicant:
 - a. smaller units / less FAR
 - b. more community space
 - c. remove (as much as possible, if not entirely) parking in Right of Way
 - d. provide a more detailed landscape master plan
 - e. bring color / materials board
 - f. middle unit is "too white"

V. Discussion

Architect Eric Layton presented the project. He said the story poles went up about two weeks ago and he had met with the neighbors and at least one had provided a letter of support that we should have received. (None of the Board members received it.)

After meeting with the western neighbor Eric agreed to add additional screening between the properties (on the neighbor's side of the fence) and a large tree on his side of the fence. Additional screening was also agreed to be supplied along the southern property fence to screen out the CitiBank building for both properties.

In response to previous comments, he provided the following changes:

- a. expanded the two public areas near the street
- b. pulled the buildings back to allow more separation from the street

He noted the impervious surface will be over 1,000 square feet less than existing. The fences between the properties will be about five feet tall. He intends to retain the two large cedar trees at the rear of the property and the oaks at the rear.

Comments from the Board members:

Rebecca:

- Size is too big for multi-family. Multi-family FAR is 30% and this is over that.
- Wants to see common space as is more typical in multi-family projects.
- Wants to see parking removed from out of the Right of Way

Julie:

- Agree with Rebecca
- No problem with detached single family homes
- Wants to see community space
- Wants a balance of high density with community space – not just density
- Don't like tree in Right of Way
- Wants more relief along the front
- They are baby "McMansions"
- Asked about providing sidewalk along the front – Client responded that he wanted to put in a sidewalk but the county did not want a sidewalk.

Penna:

- The project feels "greedy"
- Too dense
- Want to see each unit smaller
- No community space – wants to see community space

Isis:

- No parking in Right of Way
- For detached housing FAR should be 30% (not 38% as proposed)
- Good job with civil engineer
- More detail on landscaping plan – see Mill Valley guidelines for example
- Want to see pervious vs. impervious calculation
- Show irrigation plan

Joe:

- Really like the overall concept and plan, especially that you are able to follow the Strawberry Community Plan to achieve single-family type units.
- This is the type of development that should be encouraged and not penalized (i.e., supported with greater FAR).
- Have no problem with size or density since these are less dense than the neighboring multi family units, particularly since these will appear as small single-family homes.
- Don't mind lack of "community space" as that is for a different project, and feel community space at the street will not be used (although nice for street appeal).
- Project could be improved by pulling the units back from the street.
- Would like to see 3-4 street spaces available to the public.
- Recommend larger screening at rear, although this is for the benefit of the project only.
- Although the project sponsor wants to keep the two large pines at the rear, I have no problem if he wanted to remove them to allow pulling his buildings back farther onto the lot.
- Middle unit appears too white on rendering; please make darker shade.

Motion by Rebecca, seconded by Julie:

CONTINUE the project with the following suggestions:

- a. smaller units / less FAR
- b. more community space
- c. remove (as much as possible, if not entirely) parking in Right of Way
- d. provide a more detailed landscape master plan
- e. bring color / materials board
- f. middle unit is "too white"

Votes:

Rebecca Lind: yes

Julie Brown: yes

Penna Omega: yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz: yes

Joe Sherer: yes

Motion by Rebecca, seconded by Penna

Approve the minutes for the September 12, 2016 meeting as drafted.

Votes:

Rebecca Lind: yes

Julie Brown: yes

Penna Omega: yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz: yes

Joe Sherer: yes

Meeting adjourned at 10:07PM.