

Strawberry Design Review Board
118 E. Strawberry Drive, Mill Valley, CA 94941
Strawberry Recreation Center
November 4 2019

SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 7:37 by Joe Sherer, Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Rebecca Lind (RL)

OPEN TIME / PUBLIC COMMENTS

A. NONE

MINUTES

The board reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting held on July 1, 2019, prepared by JB.

At the previous meeting, the applicant for 240 Tiburon Blvd. had forgotten the documents for the proposed paint schemes, so those present then asked that they be discussed at our next meeting on July 15. However, no meeting was held on that date. The minutes also state that the Applicant “must update the County with exterior paint colors upon approval”. There was a motion to approve minutes unchanged.

M/S: MW/PO Vote: JS: abs, PO: yes, JB: yes, MW: yes

Motion carries 3-0 (JS abstained).

BOARD COMMENTS: JS stipulated that the Board still wants to see the proposed paint scheme, and therefore will contact the Applicant to come at a future scheduled and noticed meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS

ITEM #1	APPLICANT	PLANNER
1 Belvedere Place Master Sign Program	Rob Anderson	Kilgariff/Project Planner

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Gabby Blackburn (GB), of Field Paoli Architects, presented the proposed master sign program for the building at 1 Belvedere Place. The existing directional signage at street level are included in this proposal, and there is new proposed location of reversed aluminum channel (halo lit). The logo is allowed to be 40% larger.

BOARD CLARIFICATIONS & DISCUSSION:

JB: The signage can be logo or lettering? That is correct per GB

JS: But could there be a logo AND lettering? Per GB, that is not the intention, they have written the signage can be “either/or”, not “and”.

JB: Is there a reason why there is a choice between “white and brushed aluminum” for the signage? Per GB, a tenant wants a white sign.

MW: What are the heights of the capital letters in the original “Belvedere Place” sign? Per GB, the “B” and the “P” are 30” high, therefore the maximum height proposed for the 2 new building wall signs is 30”.

PO: What constitutes a logo vs lettering? “WeWork” is actually lettering, is that technically a logo? Per GB, they also have a logo and that should be interpreted as what we intended.

JB: There should be a distinction for logos to be symbols, not lettering. We should make that clear.

JS: Is there a tenant #2 that wants a sign? I.E., does Redwood Trust want a sign? Per GB, that is unknown at this time.

JB: This type of graphic, the big “R” for Redwood Trust, would be a logo, not lettering. GB confirmed.

JS: The code has a nighttime brightness (22.28.30) limit on illumination of a difference between off and on shall not be greater than 0.3 foot candles.

JB: The signage program should cite code so that it directs tenants to County Code rather than just

PO: Is there a restriction on the times the lit signs can be on, can it be on 24 hours? Per GB, that is not addressed. PO believes there should be some time restrictions and JB agrees.

JB: Is there a maximum sign square footage that they cannot exceed?

MW: The application is saying that approval is required because the project entails a proposed sign that does not comply with sign standards outlined in Section 22.28.040 of the Marin County Code as outlined in Section 22.60.020.A.1 of the Code.

JB: Discussion about 24 SF is all that is allowed.

JS: And it should be over the doorway? So there is that.

MW: Tenant Sign 2 is actually over a garage, so that seems per code.

PO: What if there is a 3rd tenant? Is this going to turn into a shopping center? Per GB, this master program only allows two primary tenant signs. Any more would require a new application for a new signage program.

JS: No more than 2 total signs.

JB: The language is unclear about sign area. I believe you are saying the “allowable sign mounting area” not the allowable sign area. I don’t know how they qualify for more than 24 square feet (SF). We need clarity on that.

MW: In multi-family, only 6 SF and maximum 10 ft. above grade is allowed. This property application says that it is zoned that way, RMP-12.1 (Residential, Multiple Planned, 12.1 units/acre), so why would we go beyond that? Why are we applying commercial use standards? The last meeting about the “WeWork” sign, I believe members of the public had raised the issue that only the Belvedere Place signage was allowed: no others. So, I don’t want to go beyond what was approved at that time. I

believe we asked for Planning to get back to us on the original conditions of approval for the buildings. That is what we need to go by and we don't have that information.

JS: It was originally proposed with just the one sign.

PO: Because they were going to reject the building at that time.

JB: Because they are up on the hill, above the shopping center.

MW: And that is another point, where on the 101 corridor, are there lit signs on the hillside? I can't think of any. Not in Corte Madera, not in Sausalito. I can think only of Autodesk which has building signage on it, by the Civic Center, but it is down in the flats there, not on the hillside. The medical buildings above that are not lit as far as I can remember.

JS: Nordstrom is probably the highest, but it is in the commercial zone by the freeway.

MW: And that's my issue, I'm not willing to set a precedent of lighting up the hillsides. No branding the hillsides.

JS: So you're against a lit sign.

MW: I'm not for anything beyond what is allowed. Unless they can prove to me that there was no condition of approval on the signage, I'm not willing to go beyond the code. Remember, there were comments from the public about the WeWork sign that there was not to be signage beyond what is there now. We need to know that from Planning. I don't think you can talk me out of it.

JB: He's not willing to give a variance.

MW: Why haven't they applied for a variance.

At this point, Michelle Levinson (ML) of Marin County Planning, who was in the audience for Item #2, interjected and explained general County regulations about signage. One of the reasons it comes before boards is because it is lit, the size, and the number.

JB: We don't have a size proposed, because what is shown is actually a signage mounting area, not the area of the sign itself. GB clarified that the way it is written, the whole area could be a logo, that equals the size of the proposed area. If it was lettering, it would be limited in size.

JB: Did you look at the code? What was the thinking about the size limitations?

GB clarified that the way the sign code is written is for commercial retail storefronts, and that's not the situation here. This is an office building and we needed to propose something that was different. That's because of 1) it's physical location and 2) that this isn't a storefront that you can get up close to and needs to be at the scale of the building.

JS: You need it to be bigger so it can be seen.

JB: Did you consider signage down where you could see it on Belvedere?

GB thought they didn't own the property down at Belvedere.

JB: It would be in the right of way. So Matt is making the argument that they've used their whole sign size in the original one?

JS: And they are compliant in that it is not more than 10 ft. above grade. The original sign starts to fall into the multi-family zone that it exists in and you can see that maybe that is why they have what they have.

MW: And not more.

JS: But signage goes by use. (Michelle couldn't answer that offhand).

MW: So why doesn't Planning give us a primer on the code reading, we shouldn't be weighing in on Code issues, that's for professionals at Planning.

JB: Gabby, for your perspective, you understand what the issue is: if you get this, the Community is concerned about setting a precedent, about identity, about light pollution.

PO: What if the Seminary decides they need a lit sign?

ML: I'm not familiar with this property, but it likely got a conditional use permit to allow a commercial use in a multi-family zoning, so you'd have to go by that. It's allowing an office use in this residential area, so the allowances for that office use would apply. So in my reading of the Code, an exception has been made that this use is being allowed.

MW: Unless it was a condition of approval, which members of the public said it was at the previous meeting.

ML: Unless that use permit was very specific about you can't have signs...

JS: And that is what the public said, that the only sign they got was the one. The one Belvedere Place sign was all that was allowed

Michelle: Did this come up in the WeWork proposal?

JS: Sort of, but it never got to hearing. We recommended denial of the sign. County approved the sign. And there were two appeals of that, and after the appeals, the applicant withdrew the application.

JB: Yes. And part of our discussion with the County is that there didn't seem to be a master sign program, so that is why we asked that there are a series a sequences because each tenant shouldn't be coming for individual signs. So we appreciate that you are here, Gabby, doing that. But you are still asking for something we have severe reservations about.

PO: Well, more than that. The Board (SDRB) that looked at this building 20 years ago, went through rendition after rendition of this project because it wasn't about to get built. There were a lot of stipulations about what was allowed and what wasn't.

JB: And they didn't want medical offices...

PO: So things keep creeping and creeping, and then it will snowball. It's troublesome that the County doesn't maintain what the past Board members have worked so hard to establish for our Community.

MW: Would Planning have, under the APN, what the conditions of approval were?

ML: Yes, it is digitized and pretty good. Michelle talked about the process: when we get an application, we need to transmit it in 3 days in order to meet your timelines for agendizing it and holding meetings. We don't have time to get into all the nitty-gritty details. We are trying to get it to where it needs to go. That's a product of why you get an abbreviated analysis.

JS: They look to us and maybe what we could do, we could ask: what are the initial conditions of previous approval? What are the codes that apply here? Was there a one-time use or can they have multiple?

JB: Well, if we are trying to give the County what we are going to do, we can say we don't feel inclined to approve any additional illuminated signage. Does anybody here feel inclined to approve any illuminated signs?

MW & PO: No.

JS: I'm not opposed to illuminated halo lighting, particularly at 0.3 foot candles AND shut it off at 10PM.

PO: If you lived above it, you'd be OK with it?

JS: If I lived above it, I wouldn't be able to see it. The only people who are going to see it are going to be blinded by the In N Out sign down below. AND the West Elm sign.

PO: But West Elm also has the walkway and other lights that diffuse it, but this would be a logo floating in the darkness... That's OK?

JS: You've got 3 votes against me, so...

JB: So, let's talk about this: do we continue this until they give us the information last time this came to us?

JS: I think we ought to give them the benefit of our thinking now, and we can ask questions, but I think we need to tell them what we are thinking because Kathleen may say, no here's the deal, here's what I'm thinking. I think we tell her what we are thinking and let her respond. It will move forward faster, because it doesn't sound like we are moving towards an approval anyway. Once we're going down, let's let them have the benefit of coming back with something else or going past us...

MW: So, deny with conditions?

JS: It would be deny, with here's why, or here is our thinking.

JB: Well, this is a complete sign program, and there are elements in here that we are fine with.

JS: Well, it sounds like we are mixed on that, let's talk about that. You don't want any signs at all, on the building.

MW: I don't want lit signs

JB: Well, ground level signs are part of the program, and I think we are fine with that.

MW: Directional signage is fine.

JB: Right, which tell people where to go, but the branding signs on the building, you don't like that. Even if we limit it to brushed stainless, 24 SF total, unlit, on the side of the building?

PO: I would be open to seeing what that would be like.

JB: If the County came back and said, we think they should be able to have building signs...

JS: Well, they are talking about 2

MW: Total of 3, actually, with Belvedere Place.

JB: If they came back, we could say, we think they should be consistent, should be brushed aluminum, no bigger than the original, and not lit.

PO: The only thing lit should be the original Belvedere Place sign.

JS: It's lit?

JB: It's washed by ground lighting.

JS: Let's flush that out, why don't each of you state what is appropriate signage?

MW: One that's compliant.

JB: Yes, the master sign program should be compliant with the County signage code.

JS: Well, that might allow two 24 SF signs in addition to what they already have. We don't know that yet...

MW: We don't know the code on that, we're not Planners.

JS: But if they did, you'd be OK with that?

MW: Unlit.

JB: Absolutely not lit.

MW: I would want to know it is compliant with the code (1), that they are not asking us for anything that isn't compliant, and (2) that it is unlit, period. It seems to be inconsistent with what is established fact along the 101 corridor. And (3) I would want to know, from Planning, what the conditions of approval on the original building were: if it was one sign, then that's it. That's all you get. If Planning is going to transmit this to us, then give us better information about what it's zoned, because right now it shouldn't be higher than 10ft, and it shouldn't be bigger than 6SF. That's what the zoning allows.

JB: I don't follow you that they allow you to build in a certain zone, if they give you a variance to build a gas station in a residential neighborhood, and therefore you don't have to comply with the zoning for the neighborhood because you are a gas station. I think you comply with the zoning of the neighborhood.

PO: Right, not that "you let us in, now let us do a carwash, or a topless carwash".

MW: Motion to deny.

JB: Motion to deny in that the proposal is not Code compliant, and specifically is inconsistent with

JS: It is inconsistent, do we point to the 24 SF?

MW: I want the Planner to tell me what is legal. I understand the 3 day problem, I totally do. I just want what is permitted there to be all that is allowed. I don't want Belvedere Place to have any special exceptions. They are asking us for an exception, and I don't want to establish that precedent. So that is why I am voting to deny, period.

JB: Without any special reason that they need this. We're not hearing anything special about why you have to have it.

MW: They are basically asking for a variance, and the conditions for a variance are not met.

JL: Can I bring you to the place in the Code that talks about the findings that the County needs to make to approve, so you can read what the Staff is weighing in their decisions?

MW: You can, but specific to this, what I understand from the public comments last time, there were conditions of approval for the original permit. I would love to know those.

JB: They seemed to think that the original Belvedere Place sign was it.

MW: That's what the public has said.

PO: The County should be honoring that, right?

JL: As it goes through what's called the Merits Review of the project, you assess that. Actually, it should be happening now, in this initial 30 day period, where the application is being reviewed for completeness. They will look through and see what were the previous approvals, is it consistent with the Use Permit or the other approvals we had? And that comes back to you within 30 days of submitting the application to the County.

MW: I understand that too, but it comes to us as Multi-Family Zoning, it doesn't say multi-family zoning with a commercial use. It does not meet Residential...

JL: So, it would be more helpful if there was a history provided...

MW: Going by what its written here, we only see Residential, Multi-Family, so it'd be better for the public to know...

JL: But the Zoning are these prescribed designations, and does allow for deviations for other uses, so the Zoning will still say, Residential, Multi-Family

MW: Then it should have a sub-note "Commercial use allowed under Conditional Use Permit". We have no means to know what we should be applying here.

JS: We know it is commercial use.

MW: But we actually don't – that's not how it is transmitted to us.

JS: What was the initial conditional use permit that was granted to Belvedere Place? We don't know that. It may be limited to one sign or it may not...

JB: But we've asked for that.

JS: But as far as the Zoning, the way the code reads, signage is "by USE", it's not by your Zoning. 22.28.040 – by use. If you are in a single family or duplex, you get 6 SF. This is clearly not a single family or duplex.

MW: 22.28.040? "By Use", right.

JS: So the way the Code works, it is by Use, not by the Zoning. Their use is commercial, so I think there is no doubt about that.

MW: So, 24 SF, 2 at 24 SF?

JS: So, actually, if you take a look at it, under commercial you get 2 signs: "maximum number of signs: 2". What they are proposing is at least 3, and you could argue that it is more than that, because of the ground level signs. Even if you were to stick to those, only 2 are allowed and they've burned up the ground level sign at 50 SF. They could possibly get another 24SF.

JS: I think it's not our job to be interpreting the Code, as Matt's saying. I think it's more our job to be deciding, what do we think should be appropriate for the Community?

PO & MW: Not lit.

JS: You guys are saying maybe not signs, and I could hear that argument. I get it.

JB: Well, you shouldn't be allowed to have more than what are allowed under the Code. And if the most lenient code under this scenario is by use, and then that scenario says 2 signs maximum, then we wouldn't recommend anything more than 2 signs.

JS: And one of them is burned. So they get one additional sign, 24 SF, unlit. And it's our job not to interpret the code, based on Community input, what we would approve.

JB: And there is a mounting restriction, which is strange.

MW: OK, I could go with a sign, but I still am not for a lit sign, it seems inconsistent, and I'd love to know the history.

JB: I would specifically deny any illuminated signage. I feel very clear on that.

JS: Would you be OK, absent an initial Conditional Use Permit that specified only one lit sign, if it is silent on that, then you'd be OK with an additional 24 SF unlit sign, one more, because they already have one.

MW: As long as the original Belvedere Place sign doesn't exceed the SF of the one sign.

JB: 50 SF.

JS: Well, the original sign is shown, and it sounds like more than 50 SF to me. Yes, $34.5' \times 2.5' = 86$ SF.

MW: The signage code is written to be about the general area or the actual area of the letters themselves?

JB: That is the letters. They have all of their signs wrapped into one big sign.

JS: You want to make that argument, that they took the 50 SF and the 25 SF and applied it to the original?

JB: I don't know. There's no one here, except Gabby, trying to do the master sign program but the problem with what you're proposing is that you are re-defining what they are allowed to have. And we want to make sure, we can't approve this, because you're giving them more than what they're supposed to have.

MW: They are specifically asking us for approval, the only reason it is in Design Review, is because it is beyond.

PO: Can we continue and ask the County to give us the stuff we need?

JB: Why continue, if we are going to deny?

JS: What are they going to say?

PO: They may say they can do it, we don't care what you think.

JS: They may do that. Remember, we are advisory so they could do what they want.

MW: You wouldn't do that, right Michelle?

JS: Well, it has happened, as we're all aware.

PO: I just feel like we should make them work for it. There's no way to set the precedent that we need to have this information to work off of. If we keep saying "oh, we need it", and go ahead and make the decision...

JS: Well, wait. Let's just think about it. The best they could possibly do is say it is silent on it. Because if they were to make the argument that you could have future signs later, I think Julie was saying it, they have already used it. They used the 50 SF PLUS the 24 SF

JB: They have 86.25 SF and the maximum allowable is 75 SF.

JS: 74 SF, and they are already over it. They could make the argument "that 50 is over, but I still get my 24". I don't know.

MW: OK, Motion?

JB: Yes Matt?

MW: Deny, it's too excessive.

JS: Before we give the denial, I'd like everyone to go on record saying what you think the problems are, what the issues are with the sign. We started with Penna, you said absolutely the wrong area for lit, it's a residential area, they want a lit sign: wrong. How do you feel about the other signs, let's get it on record., so they can read it.

PO: The ground signs look fine to me, but I'm not going to support lit signs.

JS: You have no problem with Landlord Signs 2 and 3 (directional signage)? Could they serve as additional signs?

PO: They serve the purpose of needing to know where they are. I think the others on the side of the building are honestly just promotional and advertising, and in a residential area, I feel like that's not appropriate.

JS: So, branding on the side of the building, in a residential area, not appropriate.

MW: My comments: Not lit. From my first review, they've already exceeded their sizes.

JB: And let me put some numbers behind that. There Belvedere Place sign is 86.25 SF, and the two ground signs are each about 20 SF, Landlord Signs 2 and 3 are about 20 SF each.

MW: And my other comment would be, don't apply for anything beyond what is permissible, and spell out what is permissible by Planning.

JB: Those are two different people. You want the Planner to help us know what is permissible, and you want the applicant not to exceed what is permissible.

MW: Planning should be able to tell the applicant what is permissible. To not exceed it.

ML: Well, it is permissible, it's just permissible though this discretionary process. So it is your opinion that it is excessive.

MW: It is excessive, if you ask for this one Board Member's discretion, I'm going to deny it.

JB: I think the earlier comment is also part of the record, which is that it is inconsistent with the character of this community, as it sits in relation to the 101 corridor. Which is that it is a residential community that is dark at night and does not contain illuminated signage.

MW: And it does not have signage up on the hillside. Another one of my points.

JS: How about the other aspects that they are asking for, they're asking for 2 additional signs.

JB: I share all the same points. It doesn't meet Code. That it is inconsistent with the community character. That the earlier public comments from our meetings referred to a conditional use historically that did not have any additional signs. We don't have any information from the County, we've asked the County to provide us with that historical data. In the absence of that, I have to rely on community members who show up and say they were there. I defer to them.

JS: Well, we haven't asked yet.

JB: We did on the last time when we rejected WeWork.

JS: Well, we never got a Hearing.

JB: Well, yes, but we said in our comments for that meeting, we told the County one of the reasons we were rejecting it was because of this, we were told of this.

JS: Right, we were told this. That's true...

JB: Well that should have been a trigger for them to look that up.

MW: And transmit that to us.

JS: And the applicant.

JS: Let me give my opinion on this. I actually would not be opposed to a brushed aluminum sign, not exceeding 24 SF, and I'd actually be OK with two of those. It's a large commercial building, and it's not inappropriate to have two large tenant signs on it. I don't think we are going to tear down the value of the neighborhood by giving two what I think are attractive signs that actually tell who is in the building. I get it, I'm in the minority.

MW: Lit or unlit?

JS: I'm actually OK halo lighting. I think the 0.3 foot candles is going to be a very small halo. I would want a time limit on it, I would throw out 10PM at night. I would like to see the original use permit that allowed signage, if it's noted. I'd reserve the right to change my mind, and if it did say only one sign, I would probably say I'm not in favor of any more signs.

ACTION:

It was M/S by MW/JB to RECOMMEND DENIAL with the FOLLOWING REASONS to be conveyed to Staff:

1. Because we cannot support an illuminated sign up on the building on the hillside.
2. The proposal seems to exceed the sizes and number permitted.
3. The original "Belvedere Place" sign washed with lighting seems to exceed the maximum size of the allowed sign size for ground level signs.

Vote: JS: no, PO: yes, JB: yes, MW: yes

Motion carries 3-1.

ITEM #2

PLANNER

Marin County Administrator's Office

Michelle Levinson

2020-22 Budget Boards and Commissions Biennial Report.

DISCUSSION

JS: 2 years ago we wrote what we thought and now it's coming up again. Michelle is here to help us with that.

ML: Every two years we ask that the County's boards and commissions complete these reports highlighting the accomplishments of the last two years and maybe set out some goals, talking about what's working and not working. We're hoping to get this information submitted in early January. The report from 2018 was forwarded as a guide.

MW: No issues, same issues.

JS: No new things, yes. Top of mind, it would be most helpful to have a staff planner here. We even threw in ideas on how to pay for it. But of course, none of that happened. No staff, no hint, no response, no nothing.

MW: No response.

ML: I have good news. It's not necessarily a planner, but there has been money and funds designated to have someone come and take minutes, help with distribution of agendas, reach out to project applicants, letting them know when their items are scheduled. We're still flushing it out: materials to bring to a meeting.

JB: It's really helpful for someone to tell them to bring full size drawings, there are 5 members of the panel, be prepared, let them know they are going to have to present the project to us, to walk us through. If you're asking for something that is not code compliant, then be prepared to give a reason why.

ML: So that is in motion. It's heard from other boards. There was a letter from last Thursday, talking about how a member of the Tam Board thought it was 10 days to post the agenda. Some boards were doing 3, Tam was doing 10. We asked for review, and it came back at 10 days.

JS: I remember that the legal council guy, who told us 3.

ML: So that is the motivation on getting you help. We have 30 days to request items that we need from the applicant. So now with 10 days required for noticing, there is that added difficulty. But there is help...

JB: We're trying to get minutes back, quickly.

JS: We try to get our Draft Minutes by Wednesday.

MW: Unless it's Matt, then... you never know.

JS: That was one item, good. We also felt our Strawberry Community Plan is woefully out of date, and problematic. It doesn't really address the things we see day to day. It mainly deals with 3 major parcels, 2 of which are already developed and the other one is in application. We thought it would be great to

get an updated Plan, we gave some ideas on how to make that happen. I talked with Jeremy and Tom, and they came back, no, not going to happen.

ML: These are provided to the Board, so they see them and they ultimately decide on allocating funds.

JS: We also know there are over a dozen other out of date plans, but that's not my issue. Do the other ones have a major redevelopment, do they have senior housing aspect, a recreational district.

JB: So we were thinking is there a way to fix ours by looking at other Plans, and sort of cross pollinate.

PO: What's missing that Tam gets their wishes respected, and Strawberry, why is ours pushed. I feel like the County ignores us.

MW: Well, there was a desire to remove Design Review Boards, so there's that...

Discussions on how and why we need a new Plan.

JB: Is there a way to use the staff, to pull up past approvals and have those for meetings? That would be great to have.

JS: On the thing we asked for, should we ask for an update to the Strawberry Community Plan? We should ask again.

JB: Can we create low hanging fruit, and identify policies that exist throughout the County or from other Design Review Boards that are applicable to us and incorporate them to Strawberry? I mean, can we fix our old dress, not throw it out?

ML: Well then, you'd have to amend the Plan?

JB: Well, instead of saying "we couldn't possibly do that" couldn't we alter the dress rather than making a new one? Could we hem it so it fits us better?

JS: Should we be asking for an amendment, rather than a rewrite?

ML: Sure. I appreciate the attempt to make it more of an abbreviated process, but ultimately the Board makes the decisions.

JS: What else did we ask for?

ML: How about the Planning Staff to notify about the recommendations.

JS: I'll say that is getting better.

JB: Is it? We had asked them to pick up the phone if they were going to go against our decisions. That is what happened with the WeWork sign. We had to mount our own appeal. That is crazy.

JS: Well, they had a different answer.

JB: Again, we feel like we are advising each other and having conversations to come up with the right solutions, or are we just a process that you are enduring so that you can go ahead and do your thing? We've been assured we are important.

ML: You definitely make projects better. We definitely read the minutes and try to implement your recommendations. Maybe we need to talk more about connecting with the Boards about recommendations and how we are implementing them or not and why, if we can't.

MW: Do you communicate that back to Boards? I can't do that what you are asking is not supportable by the Code, do you send that back to the Board.

ML: I do.

MW: We want you on our projects.

ML: We're trying to post the decision notice on the SDRB website. Usually the DRB Chairs will get a copy of the decision letter of projects that came before their Board.

JS: What we really want is a phone call or some communication BEFORE you make the decision. If you are going to disagree with us, give us a call. Because we usually get agreement from applicants. About 80% of the time the applicant is OK with our recommendations. We usually get agreement right there. If it is different, call us, let us know. And post it to the website.

There was a discussion on how the website works (or doesn't). If something changes, you don't necessarily get that. I know I'm not getting a notice that new projects are showing up. Can we make it easier? Can it be with updates, or without updates? We all agree, we're not getting updates when new projects show up in the area.

JB: I would love to subscribe and be notified of everything.

We then discussed holding larger meetings and the difficulties for scheduling and possibly recording it. Joe is guessing at least 3 more meetings related to the Seminary.

We talked about having information on the Brown Act. We should hear more if it moves to 10 days or 3 days.

ML thought we should definitely ask for updating or abbreviating the Codes.

We talked about all the different Master Plans, couldn't there be just one location with all of them? ML will look at it.

JB: Internally, Staff has 3 days to get it to us. So is the Planner still looking into it on the merits? If the Planner finds anything, can they forward to us? We could use that information.

ML: All that is happening in that 30 days, while we're transmitting to others, sometimes there isn't enough information and we can't even review it on merits. But you are looking at it.

MW: There should be a stop, no submit if they don't have minimum drawings. If they don't pass the smell test?

ML: We try. There are minimum submittal standards. For instance, if I'm on the counter and someone asks me about submitting a variance, I point them to the findings and say these are difficult to make. But they can still apply.

ML: I'd have to ask my supervisor, but would you find it helpful to have a Planner come annually?

ALL: YES.

ACTION:

JS thought he would send around a draft report for review

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25.

Notes prepared by Matt Williams: 11.16.19