

**Tam Design Review Board Minutes  
Public Hearing - August 2, 2017**

**A. Meeting Location:** : The Cabin, 60 Tennessee Valley Rd., near Hwy 1.

**B. Call to order:** 7PM Alan Jones, Chair

**C. Board Members Present:** Alan Jones , Doron Dreksler, April Post, Logan Link, Andrea Montalbano

**D. Approval of minutes of May 17, 2017:** Dreksler/Link 4-0

**E. Correspondence + Announcements:** None

**F. Public comment on items not on the agenda:** None

**G. Public in attendance:** Jonathan Yarnold, Bob Hatfield, Mark Nieker, Nancy Siadch, Katrina Morgan, Gregory Dedona, Stephan Meyer, Mia Monroe

**H. Items on Agenda:**

1. **Special Appreciation:** Presentation of a Certificate of Recognition from Supervisor Sears to John McCormick and expression of appreciation from the board for his years of service.

2. **Yarnold Variance and Design Review**, 134 Homestead Blvd, Mill Valley, AP #048-051-27  
Applicant: Robert Hatfield Planner: Evelyn Garcia

**Project Summary:**

The applicant requests Variance and Design Review approval to construct a 111 square feet of additional floor area to a single family residence in unincorporated Mill Valley. The existing floor area and building area are 2,220 square feet. The proposed development would result in a building area of 2,331 square feet. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 30 percent on the 7,775 square foot lot. The proposed addition would reach a maximum height of approximately 34 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks: 9 feet from the eastern front property line; 13 feet from the southern side property line; 38 feet from the western side property line; 20 feet from the northern rear property line. The proposed project also includes additional roof alterations that would increase the maximum height of the building to approximately 38 feet, and car deck replacement located in the right-of-way.

Design Review approval is required because the project exceeds the maximum height of 30 feet. Variance approval is required because the project encroaches into the required front yard setback of 25 feet for the R-1 zoning district. Zoning: R1 Countywide Plan Designation: SF6

- **Project presentation:** Architect Bob Hatfield presented proposed project.

- **Project support documentation:**

- a) 24x36 planset

- **Initial Board questions:**

- a) Post, what is the difference between the existing and new building profile and why change roof profile ? architect – there is a minimal change “not much taller” in profile and a tradeoff between creating shade and maintaining the view from the street and improving the view from the interior.
- b) Jones- the addition at the front requires a variance regardless, based on the existing building location in the setback, correct ? Architect- Yes
- c) Post- the existing parking arrangement is challenging
- d) Dreksler- what is the parking space size as designed ? architect 20x20 is provided
- e) Post- are solar panels possible ? Architect- Yes
- f) Alan- it would be helpful if you showed the neighbors houses on a site plan
- g) Montalbano- are any redwood trees close to the new deck ? Architect- No
- h) Montalbano – did you do a lot slope calculation ? – Architect- Yes.

- **Public comments + questions : None**

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

- a) Post- generally I would vote know on any height increases, but this is a good project
- b) Post – only concern is any future solar panel reflectivity toward the neighbors
- c) Montalbano – I think it may be over the FAR based on the slope table, however, this is a reasonable solution and it improves the parking greatly
- d) Jones – Usually I would be concerned with setback but not on this project
- e) Jones – FAR vs slope would fall outside requirements, But given the thoughtful design, I like the project.
- f) Link- smart layout for parking improvement.
- g) Jones/Post- what are the exterior finishes and lighting.- Architect reviewed and Board commented on approval of “no glare” lighting and minimal glare for roofing materials selected.

- **Board Findings:**

- Approval status:**

- Board recommends approval of the Project, Approval of the Building height, and Encroachment into the Setback Design As Presented. Post / Dreksler– 5-0

- Board Merit comments:**

- a) Post- generally I would vote no on any height increases, but this is a good project
- b) Post – only concern is any future solar panel reflectivity toward the neighbors
- c) Montalbano/Post/Jones –much improved parking arrangement

3. **Morgan Design Review**, 303 Wickham Drive, Mill Valley, AP #048-031-10  
Applicant: Katrina Morgan Planner: Evelyn Garcia

**Project Summary:**

The applicant requests Design Review approval to raise the roof height of a single family residence by approximately three feet within the front yard setback in unincorporated Mill Valley. The existing roof height is 17 feet above surrounding grade. The proposed roof would reach a maximum height of 20 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setback: 14 feet from the southern front property line.

Design Review approval is required because the proposed development encroaches into the front yard setback, but [the project] is waived from variance approval pursuant to Development Code section 22.54.045.

- **Project presentation:** Architect Gregory Dedona / Applicant Katrina Morgan presented proposed project.
- **Project support documentation:**
  - a) 24x36 plans
- **Initial Board questions:**
  - a) Jones- Did an arborist look at the tree ? Architect- Yes
  - b) Dreksler- What roofing material was selected to slope at 1in12 – Architect “standing seam metal roofing with Ice + water shield”
- **Public comments + questions :** None
- **Final Board questions + comments:** None
- **Board Findings:**

**Approval status:**

Board Finds submission Complete and approves the project Design / Encroachment  
Post / Montalbano 2nd – 5-0

**Board Merit comments:** None

4. **Meldorf Design Review and Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit**, 443 Wellesley Ave, Mill Valley  
AP #050-043-60, Applicant: Charles Allen, Planner: Evelyn Garcia

**Project Summary:**

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct 568 square feet of additional floor area to the understory of an existing single family residence in unincorporated Mill Valley. The existing floor area is 2,386 square feet. The proposed development would result in a floor area of 2,972 square feet. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a floor area ration of 10 percent on the 28,800 square foot lot. The height of the building would not be changed. The proposed

development would have the following setbacks: 12 feet from the northern side property line; 28 feet from the front property line; 6 feet from the southern side property line; 148 feet from the western rear property line.

Design Review approval is required because the project is [in] the planned zoning district.

Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit is required because the accessory dwelling unit would entail new construction. Zoning: RMP Countywide Plan Designation: MF2 Low Density Residential

- **Project presentation:** Engineer / Charles Allen presented proposed project.

- **Project support documentation:**

a) 24 x 36 plans

- **Initial Board questions:**

a) Jones – is this a future 2<sup>nd</sup> unit ? / Applicant stated possibly in the future

b) Dreksler – abstained rulling on project based on project proximity to personal residence

c) Montalbano / Jones: Does this project fall within the boundary of the existing house ?

Applicant – Yes.

d) Jones – Is the dining area open ? Applicant- Yes.

e) Montalbano – Is the Retaining wall at the bedroom, near the property line ? Applicant – It is 6 feet away from the property line.

f) Jones / Montalbano / Dreksler- should show on site plan and shaped in an “L” to maximize setback and minimize any impact to the neighboring property.

g) Jones – Have you discussed the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit parking with public works? Applicant – Not yet, but there is plenty of parking in the drive.

h) Jones – Should show a parking diagram that indicates each of the parking spots and the ability to navigate in and out of each of those spots. The requirement is 2 spots for the main residence and 1 spot for the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit.

- **Public comments + questions :** None

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

a) Jones- Parking is an issue but I think you can possibly solve it.

b) Link- you should add more parking, Tandem parking doesn't work.

- **Board Findings:**

**Approval status:** Submission found complete (see merit comments) and approved as presented. Post / Montalbano 2nd – 4-0- 1 (Dreksler abstained)

**Board Merit comments:**

a) Montalbano / Jones: Should design / define “L” shaped retaining wall on site plan

b) Montalbano / Jones / Post / Link: Define parking for both the primary residence and 2<sup>nd</sup> unit

5. **Boben Variance and Second Unit**, 815 Autumn Land, Mill Valley, AP #049-212-14  
Applicant: Mathew Owens      Planner: Evelyn Garcia

**Project Summary:**

The applicant requests Variance and Second Unit approval to construct a new 442 square foot addition to a 2,455 square foot house. The 442 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of over 30 percent on the 9,525 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 12 feet 6 3/4 inches above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks from the exterior walls: 25 feet from the east front property line; 12 feet from the north side property line; 12 feet 9 inches from the south side property line; 4 feet from the west rear property line.

Variance approval is required because the project is proposing additional floor area to be added to existing under-floor area within the rear setback of the property. An accessory dwelling unit permit is required because the project also proposes to add an accessory dwelling unit in the under-floor area of the existing house.

- **Project presentation:** Architect / Matt Owens presented proposed project.
  
- **Project support documentation:**
  - b) 24x36
  
- **Initial Board questions:**
  - a) Jones/Dreksler- You will need a certified survey for this project
  - b) Post – Do you have any letters from neighbors – No, but I have a neighbor here to comment
  - c) Montalbano/ Jones / Post – The new addition will make any drainage issues worse, you will need a fully designed drainage system
  - d) Jones/ Dreksler- the Site survey will help with an exact calculation for the FAR
  - e) Jones- Take a look at the slope table when you do the calculations
  - f) Jones- You need a formal drainage plan, must demonstrate not going on neighboring property
  - g) Post- planting could help buffer / screen neighboring properties
  - h) Montalbano-The decks are very close to one another, Does the neighbor have any issue ? Neighbor commented “No”
  - i) Montalbano/ Link- Letters from the neighbors would be a good idea.
  - j) Dreksler- The drainage element could be placed under the new deck to minimize visual impact
  - k) Jones / Link – the parking for the 2<sup>nd</sup> unit is not indicated. You will need to define the parking.
  - l) Link- the street is narrow, additional parking would be nice

- **Public comments + questions :**

- a) Neighboring property owner did not have an issue with the proximity of the new deck / addition
- c) Mia Monroe commented that they were ok with the project but concerned with the property line location and setback. And agreed that a site Survey would help define those issues.

- **Board Findings:**

**Completeness:** Submission found incomplete. Missing certified Survey plan, drainage plan, Parking Diagram and detailed FAR calculations

**Approval status:**

Board recommends that application be ruled incomplete based on incomplete plans/  
Post / Dreksler 2<sup>nd</sup> – 5-0

**Board Merit comments:**

- c) Jones- would like to see the project again with a site plan prepared by a certified surveyor, a detailed drainage plan and detailed FAR calculations

**6. Okada Design Review,** 359 Durant Way, Mill Valley, Assessor's Parcel 200-302-40

Applicant: Paul Okamoto

Planner: Tammy Taylor

**Project Summary:**

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a 194 square foot front entry addition and a new carport and storage area on a developed lot in Mill Valley. The 194 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 50 percent on the 5,665 square foot lot. The proposed front entry addition would reach a maximum height of 20 feet above surrounding grade, and the carport would reach a maximum height of 12 feet 6 inches. The front entry addition exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 35 feet 3 inches from the west front property line; 0 feet from the north side property line; 28 feet from the south side property line; 88 feet from the east rear property line. The carport would have the following setbacks from the property lines: 0 feet from west front property line; 24 feet from the north side property line; 17 feet 9 inches from the south side property line, and over 88 feet from the east rear property line.

Design Review approval is required because the project is in a Planned Zoning District.

Zoning: RMP-2.5, Residential, Multiple Planned Countywide Plan Designation: MF2, Low Density Res

- **Project presentation:** None.

- **Project support documentation:**

- c) Submitted 24x36 plans

- **Initial Board questions:** None

- **Public comments + questions :** None

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

a) Jones- we are assuming that the only change is the storage / trash enclosure

- **Board Findings:**

**Approval status:**

Board approves project as submitted.

Post / Dreksler 2<sup>nd</sup>: 5-0

**Board Merit comments:** None

**I. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment:** None

**J. Adjournment:** 9:07 P.M.

**K. Document Revisions:** None

TDRB is advisory to the Marin County Planning Department.

County Planning Department: <http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects>

Tam Design Review: <http://apps.marincounty.org/bosboardsandcomm/boardpage.aspx?BrdID=68>