

**Strawberry Design Review Board**  
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941  
Strawberry Recreation Center Gymnasium  
**April 4, 2014**

## SUMMARY

### I. The meeting was called to order at 7:48pm

Members present were:

Julie Brown

Joe Sherer

Isis Spinola-Schwartz, Chair

### II. Open Time:

Time for the public to speak on items not on the agenda was offered, and no one had any issues.

### III. Administration:

1. Approval of Minutes March 7, 2016: Joe Sherer moved to approve the minutes as written. Julie Brown seconded the motion.

#### Vote:

Brown – yes

Sherer – yes

Spinola-Schwartz – yes

Copy of minutes will be sent to county Planning Dept and to SDRB.

2. Minutes from the March 14, 2016 meeting were continued since a quorum for approval was not present.

### IV. Agenda Items:

#### 1. Shaw Design Review – 57 Shell Road

**Applicant** – Ann Bool

**Planner** – Tammy Taylor

**Recommendation:** Applicant was not present, so item was continued.

#### 2. Shine Design Review – 26 Shell Road

**Applicant:** SKS Architects

**Planner:** Tammy Taylor

**Recommendation:** Approve architecture, applicant to return with comprehensive landscape plan.

#### 3. Peek Development Design Review – 7 Starboard Court

**Applicant:** Peter Mark

**Planner:** Joycelyn Drake

**Recommendation:** Approve design with conditions, presuming no variances are required.

## AGENDA ITEMS

1. **Shaw Design Review** – continued.

2. **Shine Design Review** – 26 Shell Road

**Applicant:** SKS Architects

**Planner:** Tammy Taylor

Stewart Summers, architect, presented the project saying the owners wanted more space. The design stepped back up the hill keeping the two-story portion well back from the street. He indicated that the project met all setbacks, height limits, floor area ratio coverage guidelines, and needed no variances. He indicated the proposed siding was a white Hardie board, or similar. The rear yard was proposed to be covered with wood chips and gravel and no turf was proposed anywhere on the site.

The item was opened for public comments. No public comments were made.

The item was brought back to the board for deliberation.

Member Sherer said that he liked the house design and appreciated that it did not need any variances. He was concerned about privacy on the west side and suggested landscape screening. He also questioned the white color and felt it would be better if it were toned down.

Member Brown also liked the house design, suggested adding screening, and told the owners to “brush out” for colors when making the final selection. She felt the color might be too white.

Chair Spinola-Schwartz also like the house design. She felt additional screening was needed, and the white color was unacceptable. She said the landscape plan was inadequate and needed additional screening.

Spinola-Schwartz moved, and Brown seconded:

**Motion:** Approve architecture as submitted; continue the project for materials board showing shingles, siding, stone, with paint color toned down, plus comprehensive landscape plan showing mulch vs. gravel areas, all ground coverings, irrigation plan, and screening.

**Vote:**

Julie Brown - yes

Joe Sherer - yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz, Chair – yes

### 3. Peek Development Design Review – 7 Starboard Court

**Applicant:** Peter Mark

**Planner:** Joycelyn Drake

Peter Mark, owner, presented the project saying that no variances are required, all the development is to the rear, and the project is five feet under the height limit at its tallest spot. He presented an aerial photograph of the neighborhood, a complete sample board, floor plans, elevations and landscape plan.

Item was opened for public comments and the following neighbors spoke:

Betty Toole, 8 Starboard, was concerned about preserving her San Francisco view and particularly concerned about the trees on the east side of 7 Starboard. When she originally moved in to her home she had a clear SF view but now the trees have grown obstructing her view. It was determined by the owner and neighbors present that the trees in question were on the neighbor property.

Ana Chorus, 5 Starboard was concerned about the windows facing her property. She noted that there were only one or two now and many more were proposed. She was also concerned that the pop out cantilevered feature on the east side was too close to her property and would diminish her privacy.

Susan Cole, 9 Starboard, had questions about the colors, and was satisfied after hearing from the owner.

The item was brought back to the board for deliberation.

Member Brown was concerned about the development in the setbacks, particularly at the front. The owner noted that technically this did not need a variance since the existing non-conforming structure was already partially in the setback and he was just filling in the area that was already in the setback. She also proposed removing windows on the east wall.

Chair Spinola-Schwartz appreciated the complete landscape plan, and was concerned about the development along the eastern side and would like to see a reduction in the windows. She felt the white paint color was not appropriate.

Member Sherer appreciated the complete application with a sample board. He wanted to ensure that no variances were required as there were areas of new development in the setbacks, and he could not make the findings for a variance. He noted that the development in the front would be mitigated by the large, nice, Ipe fence blocking the entry. He was concerned about the eastern cantilever area, but felt if the windows could be limited in number and sill heights kept up as drawn, it would greatly improve his property and not materially impact the neighbors. In particular, it was shown that from the aerial photograph it did not appear to block the neighbor's view of San Francisco from 8 Starboard.

There was discussion with the neighbors and owner, and the owner agreed to eliminate five proposed windows along the east side, and to tone down the white paint color.

Spinola-Schwartz moved, and Brown seconded:

**Motion:** Approve architecture with the following conditions:

1. County planner to confirm that no variances are required, including for development of front area near the street and eastern cantilever area.
2. Eliminate five of the seven windows along the east elevation, preserving only the windows above the tub and toilet (so it will be difficult to look right down to neighbor property).
3. Cantilever at east side is approved, only if it does not block the view of neighbor at 8 Starboard, who was requested to send an email confirming the story poles do not block her view.
4. “White chocolate” color to be toned down.

**Vote:**

Julie Brown - yes

Joe Sherer - yes

Isis Spinola-Schwartz, Chair – yes

**Meeting adjourned at 10:30pm.**

Minutes provided by Joe Sherer.

Strawberry Design Review Board meets 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays at 7:30pm at the Strawberry Recreation Center. Agenda is available several days before meeting at:

<http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/boards-commissions-and-public-hearings/drb/strawberry-drb>

If there are no agenda items scheduled, meeting will be cancelled.