

Draft Minutes Strawberry Design Review Board July 17, 2017

The meeting was called to order at 7:35pm

Members present:

Joe Sherer, Chair

Julie Brown

Penna Omega

Matt Williams

1. Approval of Minutes

Draft minutes of 6-5-17

**M/S** Brown and Sherer that Joe minutes be approved as submitted.

Ayes: Joe Sherer, Julie Brown, Penna Omega, Matt Williams

Noes: none

2. Peter Clark presented for Site Plan Review approval plans to remove and replace an existing floating dock and two structural support beams located on an existing pier that extends out into the Strawberry Channel. The project was pre-approved by BCDC as part of mitigation measures considered under the Strawberry Channel dredging project. There was discussion of pressure treated chemicals leeching into bay and a recommendation by JS to consider alternative laminated cedar. Duration of the repairs will last approximately one week. Dock will be assembled off site and floated in. Sidney Bushman, resident 40 Harbor Court Way, brought her concerns regarding activity at the dock after posted hours. The dock existed prior to the adjacent residences. Bushman, board members and Leanne Kruser of SRD discussed motion sensitive lighting and deer sprinklers (which would be installed at neighbor's residence) as potential deterrent during the nighttime hours.

Response to transmittal

1. Application Materials contain enough information? Yes
2. We do not need any more information.
3. Is the project feasible as proposed? Yes
4. We recommend that applicant consider using laminated cedar in lieu of proposed pressure treated douglas fir in order to avoid adding contaminants to bay waters.

**M/S** to approve the project as presented with the recommendation that applicant consider the substitution of cedar laminate for PTDF.

Ayes: Joe Sherer, Julie Brown, Penna Omega, Matt Williams

Noes: none

3. Leanne Kreuzer presented for Design Review approval plans to upgrade the outdoor lighting fixtures on the existing tennis courts located at the corner of the Belvedere Drive and Ricardo Road. The project

was before the board earlier this year. At that time, SDRB recommended additional measures be sought to improve the end result lighting levels. The SRD has since considered and priced several alternatives in order to increase the lighting levels on the courts. The project is restricted by existing conditions and budget. Further, complications from the structural condition of both existing posts and bases make the project objectives difficult to achieve within the \$100,000 budget. Penna Omega raised concerns of community reaction to substandard result after significant expenditure of tax dollars. Joe Sherer cited Tennis Court Lighting Standards (attached) noting that the projected light levels after the proposed work is complete, will still not meet the minimum levels for Class IV (Recreation, schools, and parks). In contrast, he noted that the recently upgraded public court lighting at local Boyle Park tennis courts exceeds Class II as recommended for tennis clubs. Mr Sherer noted that the tennis playing community- and local professionals seeking to rent the courts- will see negligible results and abandon night-time use if improvement is not substantive. Julie Brown suggested improvement of half the courts in order to achieve marked improvement within budget and increase tennis support and desire based on significantly upgraded experience. She suggested work could be targeted at the worst condition courts where several light posts have been removed. Ms Kreuzer cited mobilization cost savings in doing all courts simultaneously. She also noted the courts have additional work required in future in order to resurface them. JB noted that having two courts that were great and done well would be a better outcome than four courts without meaningful improvement.

It was also noted that the drawings submitted did not reflect the applicant's desire for 30 foot poles. The drawings submitted show 25 foot poles. Ms Kreuzer said the SRD wanted to hear the SDRB comments before paying for changes to the drawings.

Response to transmittal

1. Application Materials contain enough information? Yes
2. We do not need any more information.
3. Is the project feasible as proposed? Yes
4. The SDRB notes that the proposed increase in light level (measured in foot candles) does not substantively improve the existing court light condition. SDRB members are concerned that the considerable expense being considered will yield a substandard result.

**M/S** The SDRB Board is unanimously concerned that the proposed plan result is substandard lighting and substantially similar to the existing substandard lighting condition. The SDRB notes that existing lighting average of 21 foot candles is proposed to increase to a new average of 24 foot candles. The minimum average light levels recommended for recreational parks (Class IV) is 30 foot candles. The new lighting at Mill Valley's Boyle Park tennis courts is 118 foot candles. SDRB recommends any alternate solution that achieves at least a 30 foot candle minimum average and Class IV lighting.

Ayes: Joe Sherer, Julie Brown, Penna Omega, Matt Williams

Noes: none

The meeting was adjourned at 8:59