

STRAWBERRY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
118 E. STRAWBERRY DRIVE, MILL VALLEY, CA 94941
May 15, 2017 MEETING NOTES

SUMMARY

I. Chairman, Joe Sherer, called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

Members present: Joe Sherer
Rebecca Lind
Julie Brown
Penna Omega

II. Agenda Items

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>PLANNER</u>
1. SRD Tennis Courts	Leanne Kreuzer/General Manager SRD	Jocelyn Drake/Project Planner
2. Application materials.		
3. Discussion of various guidelines within Strawberry.		

III. Comments to the Planning Staff

1. SRD Tennis Courts

1. It was originally thought there was enough information to determine whether the applicant could comply with agency standards. However it was later determined that the submitted drawings contained inaccurate information.

2. We need the existing poles heights for each of the tennis court lights.

3. Given the inadequate lighting, the project should be modified to bring it to minimum tennis court lighting standards.

4. It is up to the applicant to propose a revised design.

2. Application materials.

Request to the Planning Staff. Please post online (and send to SDRB) all materials for upcoming projects -- including all project narratives, reports and documents that can be scanned and uploaded for reviewing. We frequently do not have all of the information that the applicant has submitted.

3. Discussion of various guidelines within Strawberry.

Please indicate which codes/master plans/community plans (that have been adopted by the County) are applicable to each project up for review.

1. SRD Tennis Courts	Leanne Kreuzer/General Manager SRD	Jocelyn Drake/Project Planner
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

- A. Ron Zeiger presented plans for new LED lighting for the existing poles at SRD tennis courts. He proposed poles 25 feet tall (same as existing on upper courts) and 30 feet tall on lower courts, made of galvanized steel and fixtures with a black finish. Tennis lights are 600 watts and would be controlled by timed dial as

well as motion control. The proposed landscape and security lighting was removed from the plans presented.

- B. Seven (7) tennis players came to voice their support. There were no residents opposed to the light improvements. Adam Leong, tennis pro, shared concerns about motion-detected lights and wanted reassurance there would be alternate ways to turn the lights on, should there be a problem with the detectors.

Motion to APPROVE with the following conditions/recommendations as submitted by Julie Brown, seconded by Rebecca Lind.

Vote yes: Sherer, Lind, Brown, Omega
Vote no: none

- Applicant to eliminate the security/path lighting from proposal at this time until further clarification is made on location, height, wattage and fixtures. Security lighting & landscape designs were missing/incomplete.
- It was noted that the photometrics with the proposed lights did not seem adequate. For example, the brightness at the net was over 50 foot candles, while the center baselines show 12-13 foot candles. This will not only provide poor lighting, it is barely, if any, improvement over the existing lights. The applicant should work to improve the photometrics. A suggestion was to direct light toward the center of the courts using 5' pole arms instead of 4' (in both directions).
- SRDB recommends considering aluminum poles instead of steel to avoid future corrosion.
- Clarify the switching "on/off" manual override or consolidating motion sensors with a vacancy control.
- Maintain the 10pm cut off for tennis court lights.
- Tennis court lights should be dimmable (by SRD, not players).

It was later noticed that the presented drawings inaccurately showed the existing pole heights. Recommend withholding approval until accurate drawings are presented.

Motion to CONTINUE security lights and landscaping as submitted by Julie Brown, seconded by Rebecca Lind.

Vote yes: Sherer, Lind, Brown, Omega
Vote no: none

IV. The meeting adjourned at 10:18 p.m.