

Strawberry Design Review Board  
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941  
Strawberry Recreation Center  
July 2, 2018

**SUMMARY**

The meeting was called to order at 7:36 by Joe Sherer, Chair

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Joe Sherer, Chair (JS)  
Penna Omega (PO)  
Matt Williams (MW)

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Julie Brown (JB)  
Rebecca Lind (RL)

**OPEN TIME / PUBLIC COMMENTS**

A. No items.

**MINUTES**

The minutes from the 06.04.18 meeting were discussed. The minutes were approved without modification unanimously. M/S: MW /PO Vote: JS: yes, PO: yes, MW: yes

**AGENDA ITEMS**

The applicants for Richardson and the sign permit were not present.

1. 102 Neider Lane: Deck replacement and deck additions (revision 1).

Applicants (APP) Nick Drakulich (Owner) discussed their revisions to the project, and new story poles. The car parking deck is removed, the lower deck has been replaced by an on grade artificial lawn.

JS opened the floor to public comments from neighbors:

a. Tim Bartow, attorney and son of Kay Brown, owner of 116 Reed, (directly below subject property) appreciated the changes made to the project which are improvements. He could not tell from the string line where the top of the lawn would be.

b. Larry Wolf of 114 Reed still has concerns that the upper deck looks directly down onto his deck. There was discussion as to how long it will take the 8-9ft tall bushes to grow to the projected 20-25ft height.

I. After discussion, Larry said he wanted to withdraw his concern.

c. John Batdorf of 106 Neider Lane (adjacent to west) appreciated the changes made. The main concern was to privacy and noise, which is why APP proposes an 8ft wall at the upper deck facing his property. MW voiced concern for the height of that wall on an elevated deck. APP and John Batdorf said they would look at what height was appropriate.

d. P.J. Cosgrove of 118 Reed had concerns about the drainage ditch outflow. Board discussed that arrows seem to be pointing the incorrect direction – ditch flows to the west, not to the east towards 118.

I. P.J. appreciated that the parking deck was eliminated.

II. He has issues with the drawings not reflecting what is going on with the stairs.

Board discussion:

Primary discussion focused on concerns that what is drawn does not reflect what the APP tells us is happening.

1. The retaining wall jog at the existing 16in oak tree seem too small at 3ft. X 3ft. It seems the drilling of the wall supports will disturb the roots and damage and/or kill the tree they are trying to save.

2. Topo lines at rear lawn show sloped ground, not a flat lawn.
3. Wood retaining wall shows max. 72" high, but detail it references only is for a 4ft max height wall.
4. There is no detail of the guard on top of the wall. APP states it will be a vertical wood fence (solid). MW concerned that will be in effect an almost 10ft high solid wall facing the lower neighbors and suggests the guard have some gaps to allow light and not appear so solid.
  - a) Neighbor below at 116 Reed not necessarily concerned about guard, if he can understand where it is via better string/tape line.
  - b) JS requests that top of wall and bottom of wall be noted.
5. APP states that there isn't much removal of grade at the existing house foundation to make flat lawn area. MW & JS point out that the way it is drawn (& that is unclear), it appears that about 6ft of dirt is being removed from wall, exposing the piers and requiring some sort of retaining wall. JS expressed concern that there might not be enough of the pier embedment to remain stable. It would help if there was a section to clearly show where existing grade was relative to proposed.
6. Board appreciates the applicants revision to the project, we think it is much more supportable provided we better understand what is being proposed.

After discussions of the drawings, a MOTION TO CONTINUE 102 Neider Lane deck replacement with the following conditions and recommendations so that there is another review before the SDRB:

- Provide adequate and accurate elevations of ALL stairs and retaining wall including the full height of the retaining wall (not cut off) and the guard. Include missing lower stair to lawn and existing side stairs in elevations.
- Provide a partial building section to better describe rear yard and relation to existing house floor level and piers and show guardrail at retaining wall
- Provide a detail for the 6ft. high retaining wall (what are it's effects on sizing and depth of drilling) and guardrail on top.
- Provide accurate existing and proposed topographical lines as well as top of wall and bottom of wall elevation notations on plans.
- Study the jog in the retaining wall to try to maintain and respect the tree.
- Provide photos of lower level context if necessary or applicable.
- Specify materials and present to Board at follow up meeting.

The Motion to Continue was approved unanimously. M/S: MW/PO Vote: JS: yes, PO: yes, MW: yes

The meeting was adjourned at 9:26

Notes prepared by Matt Williams 07.08.18