Tam Design Review Board Minutes
Public Hearing - September 7, 2016

Call to order: 7PM Alan Jones, Acting Chair
Board Members Present: Alan Jones, John McCormick, Doron Dreksler
Approval of minutes of August 3, 2016: Jones / McCormick 2nd
Public comment on items not on the agenda: None
Communications & Correspondence: None

Public Attended:

John Hood / Diarro Foster / Dan Gildengorin / James Bradanini / Jeff Gosdigian
Adam McAfee / Rod Izquierdo / Margret & Kevin Trilli / Heather Page
Ruth Tobin / Casteller Bruihl

Design Review: Gildengorin & Second Unit Approval, 217 Cleveland Ave , Mill Valley;
AP# 051-172-19 ; Project ID# P1260 ; Applicant: John Hood; Planner: Tammy Taylor

Project Summary: Demolition of an existing 1,606 sq' single family residence and a 190 sq' garage. The proposed new development would have a 4,584 sq' home & 2nd unit, with an FAR of 29% and a 15,668.3 sq' lot, with a maximum height of 28.1 feet above surrounding grade.
Setbacks from the exterior walls: 3 feet from the North West front property line; 6 feet from the South West side property line; 3 feet from the North East side property line; 35 feet from the South East rear property line. Pool House setbacks: 79 feet from the North West front property line; 100 feet from the South West side property line; 116 feet from the North East side property line; 23 feet from the South East rear property line. New swimming pool; hardscape and landscape improvements.

Second review of submitted project – first review the project found incomplete.

Project Discussion: Architect presented revised plans: the size of the foyer reduced, the survey was reviewed to clarify the lot size and FAR – the project size is 4184 sq' including 2nd unit & pool house. This is one of the largest lots in the area. TDRB's past concerns of drainage was discussed – per civil engineer the water will be dispersed on site by a retention system, all rainwater will flow into various catch basins and be retained in a holding and disperser system. Neighbor views of project from below was presented on the plans, views of house and pool area will be screened by landscaping, uphill views of the home will be minimal. Access to the 2nd unit was discussed - enter thru door next to garage, then elevator down to unit, it will be used for family, but can be separated by doors. All exterior lighting will be down casting. TDRB questioned the amount of engineered fill at pool and if the structural engineer will design the pool with seismic considerations. Architect stated all unstable material will be removed, and replaced with engineered fill, the structural engineer will design for earthquake movement. Landscape Architect presented plans, and discussed the use of California and local drought tolerant native plants. TDRB questioned the location of the office, Landscape Architect office is in Mill Valley and is well versed in local plant requirements. TDRB questioned what be done for retaining Cleveland Ave – a retaining wall is planned and but no details of the design at this time. TDRB questioned, how will screening be handled along Cleveland Ave – a 4' high green fence along the road backed by deer fencing.

Public Comments:

A. Question on survey and 24 % slope at road- how was this measured, what are the location of the survey points. Answer- surveyor has reviewed the lot and stamped the plans
B. Questioned if the steep slope at the road is used in the FAR. Answer - the slope for the FAR is based on the property boundary lines, and does not use the 24% slope next to the road in the FAR calculations.
C. Concerns- project design does not take in consideration the total hillside and not just the project lot size. Answer - the country only requires that the design is based on the area within the property lines.
D. Concerns- size of the home and its impacts on the neighborhood – the feeling is that the project is too large for the community.
E. Concern-water run off onto properties down slope from the project. Answer- a civil engineer has designed a water retention system for the project to keep rain water on-site.
F. Concerns- construction times (early morning and weekends) and dust control. TDRB will recommend a Construction Management Plan, and a copy provided to the neighbors.
G. Question- number of parking spaces provided. Answer – country requires 5 spaces – 3 in the garage and 2 on the driveway in front of the garage.
H. Concerns- pool house and equipment noise, pool equipment is very close to the down slope neighbor. Answer - the equipment is located in a below grade vault, and the vault is accessed thru a door to the equipment room.
I. Concerns- rainwater running off site onto neighbors below, is the rain water retention system adequate for the amount of water running off the hill during our rainy season – it was noted that there are natural springs on the property.
J. Concerns- 226 Julia, rain water running off site and impacting her home – photos provided showing the amount of rain water off the hill flooding her steps in backyard.
K. Concerns-that the project is too large for the neighborhood.
L. Questions -is the correct Country Plan is being used to calculate the slope and building size?

TDRB Discussion: Applicant addressed the first review concerns with the updated plan. Size of the building on the lot is mitigated by the design of the home; placed lower on the site to lessen the impact to the views from the road.

Completeness: Jones / McCormick 2nd - 3 ayes

Approval: McCormick / Dreksler 2nd - 3 ayes

Merit comments TDRB:

A. A construction management plan should be required and a copy provided to the neighbors.
B. Recommend the pool be designed by a structural engineer, and address any seismic issues.
C. Country to verify rainwater retention system is adequate.
D. Country to verify the correct codes are used for the FAR calculations.