

Strawberry Design Review Board
Draft Minutes

August 6, 2018

Strawberry Recreation Center Meeting Room First floor

The meeting was called to order at 7:38 PM by chair Joe Sherer

Board members Present

Joe Sherer, Chair

Rebecca Lind

Penna Omega

Board Members Absent

Julia Brown

Matt Williams

Open Time

There were no comments from the public

Minutes from previous meeting

Minutes could not be approved due to lack of a quorum.

Item 1

212 Richardson Drive Addition

Project architect Geoff Butler explained the circumstances leading to the discovery that the second floor addition was built by error 11 inches into the front setback at the southeast corner and 1 foot and 2 3/4 inches into the front setback at the north east corner. He stated that County requirement is to have side and rear setback verified by a surveyor. The rear was conforming but the front second story was not.

The floor of the existing structure is already legal non-conforming. The contractor failed to have the surveyor confirm the location of the steel post in the front. The project conforms to the floor area ratio, coverage and rear setback standards. Mr. Butler presented photographs documenting that many homes in the neighborhood are built into the front yard setback.

M/S Lind/Omega to recommend approval of a retroactive variance to allow completion of the project as submitted and constructed based on the following findings.

1. A variance is not a grant of special privilege because other properties on the street have the similar encroachment into the front setback.

2. There is no significant visual impact on the adjacent property owners and
3. No public safety issue is associated with the project.

Vote: Joe Sherer: yes, Rebecca Lind: yes, Penna Omega: yes

Item 2.

102 Neider Lane Revised Decks

The Board discussed the revised proposal with the property owner and designer. The board previously requested topo and additional information about resolution of the stair area at the side setback. There was lengthy discussion about revisions to the proposal focusing on the six foot retaining wall which is the design element requiring the variance. The chair summarized the Board's concerns.

1. The Board asked to see sections through the site and requested further information about the proposed finished grade of the yard area.
2. There was discussion of the possibility of terracing the rear yard to allow grade changes in the backyard that conform to code.
3. There are four walls proposed. The existing retaining wall in the side setback on the east side would be retained and a new two-foot wall constructed in front of it forming a planting area. In addition there would be one six feet, one four feet and one two feet tall. The additional height and mass of the handrail proposed on top of the six-foot wall was discussed, Board members agree that the combination of the wall and handrail from the down slope was a concern.
4. The applicant discussed the desire to protect the tree and provide additional landscaping.
5. Board members asked whether information about drainage was corrected.
6. John Batdorf and Susan Loop neighbor to the west commented on reduction of the upper deck.
7. There was discussion of the artificial turf proposed for the yard area.
8. Susan stated that the project should conform to the homeowners association requirements.

Board comment

Rebecca Lind stated that she doesn't support a six-foot wall because it is possible to design the yard in a way that is conforming.

Joe Sherer agreed and stating that a four-foot wall solution is possible with a different design.

Penna Omega stated that she is still not clear on the overall plan. She likes the change in the privacy wall.

All members generally support the upper deck as redesigned.

M/S Lind/Omega to approve the drawings as submitted for the upper deck with the condition that the lower wall be reduced from six feet to four feet at an elevation not to exceed 48 inches. The Board supports a conforming project rather than variances or exceptions through design review.

Vote: Joe Sherer: yes, Rebecca Lind: yes, Penna Omega: yes

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30PM