

Tamalpais Valley Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting: February 7th, 2018: 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Tennessee Valley Log Cabin; 60 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley

I) Call to Order: 7:04 PM – Doron Dreksler (Chair)

Board Members Present; Andrea Montalbano, April Post, Doron Dreksler, Logan Link, Alan Jones

II) Approval of Meeting minutes – December 6th, 2017

AP motions, LL Seconds, 4 Ayes, 0 Nays (AJ not present for vote).

III) Correspondence and Announcements: None.

IV) Public Comment on Items not on the agenda: None.

V) Agenda Items

A) Presentation by Jeremy Tejirian, Planning Manager with the County of Marin Community Development Agency to discuss upcoming issues and the biannual report for the Board of Supervisors.

1. Staff will reinstate the practice of notifying Applicants that their projects will be reviewed by the Design Review board.
2. Wants to create survey for Planning applicants to see what their experience of the Planning process was.
3. Development Code will be rewritten to be more clear that Design review Boards are responsible for reviewing Public Works projects like roads and parks (as specified in the Tam Plan) Presently the Development Code is vague about this.
4. Would like to create a liaison for the Planning staff and Design review boards but has not received approval from Board of Supervisors. A purpose of the liaison would be to create more consistency across the Design Review Boards.
5. Would like to establish common guidelines across the Design Review Boards.
6. He will be collecting the bi-annual reports, which are due at the end of the month of February. The Board will work on this at the end of the meeting.
7. April Post suggests that the Brown Act should be presented to the new members of the Board, and that if another three day workshop on legal matters, is provided, it should be organized so that the Board members are only required to be present for the portions that are applicable to their work (Brown Act.) and be excused on all matters that are irrelevant.

B) Lutzker Design Review and Variance, 214 Beryl Street, Mill Valley AP #051-181-29 Applicant: Geoffrey Butler Planner: Sabrina Sihakom

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review and Variance approval to demolish an existing 664 square-foot single-family residence, and construct a new 1,610 square-foot single-family residence with a 582 square-foot attached garage on a 3,299 square-foot lot in unincorporated Mill Valley. The proposed development would have a building area of 2,010 square feet and a floor area of 1,610 square feet, resulting in a floor area ratio of 48.8 percent. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 30 feet above surrounding grade. The house is proposed to be located 25 feet from the southeasterly front property line, 4 feet, 6 inches from the northeasterly side property line, 4 feet, 6 inches from the southwesterly side property line, and 32 feet, 4 inches from the northwesterly rear property line. Design Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.42.020.D because the project includes construction of a new single-family residence on a vacant lot that contains less than 50 percent of the minimum lot area as required by slope regulations for new lots. Variance approval is required because the project exceeds the maximum 30 percent floor area ratio established by the governing R1-B1 zoning district. Zoning: R1-B1 (Residential, Single-Family, 6,000 square feet minimum lot size) Countywide Plan

Designation: SF6 (Single-Family, 4-7 units/acre) Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Area Community Plan

1. Geoffrey Butler, Architect, Presents Plans.
2. Items relevant to Tam Plan discussed and reviewed;
 - a) The applicant is requesting a variance for the FAR of the building. The Board understands that this is a very small lot but is concerned with setting a precedent of a building that appears too big for its lot. Consideration of the appearance of mass should be carefully considered by the applicant and designer.
 - b) Existing oak tree on adjacent property will need to be pruned and the roots must be carefully considered. An arborist should be on site when the demolition and excavation occurs.
 - c) The windows of adjacent houses are not shown on the plans and are important for the consideration of the project.
 - d) The drainage plans seem to divert all water directly to the street with no on-site retention. Is there any on-site capacity – drywells?
 - e) The Board would like to see an elevation comparison – what are the neighbors' home profiles in relation to the proposed?
 - f) There are no native plants on the plant list. The Board encourages use of local natives, not just Californian natives.
 - g) The height of the front portion of the building appears very out of scale and character with the neighborhood.
 - h) The balconies on the front appear to reinforce a rowhouse-like appearance. Changing the transparency of the railings may help to break up the tall plane of the front facade. Extending the balconies to wrap around the sides, even if only for planters, would help to break up the side elevations.
 - i) The side elevations of the front portion of the building need to be broken up – their continuity is out of scale with the neighborhood and will be very visible from both ends of the street.
 - j) There is a 7'-5" height "mechanical space" above the garage. This is very close to the 7'-6" height that would count in the FAR. It is encouraged by the Board to reduce or remove this height completely.
 - k) The rear bay appears at the exterior as an extension of the floor on the elevation, but is not counted in the floor area.
 - l) Dropping the floor level of the living room (as well as all of the floor elevations of the front portion of the house) is encouraged by the board in order to decrease the height.
 - m) There is a large two story glass facade facing the adjacent neighbor. Privacy for any future development on the neighboring site should be considered – translucent glass or a reduction of area is encouraged.
 - n) Asking for a variance and pushing the garage forward may help the project drop in height.
3. Neighbor Comments: Neighbor behind at 214 Julia states that the story poles show that her view will be impacted. She hopes that the roofline can be lowered. Neighbor at 212 Beryl says she is unsure if her view to the south will be impacted and would like it better explained to her.
4. AP motions to rule the project incomplete because of lack of unknown privacy impact on adjacent neighbors, neighbor at 212 Beryl Street's impact to the south is unclear and landscape plan is incomplete. AM Seconds the motion. Unanimous approval of motion by the Board.

C) Laputka Design Review, 802 Denise Court, Mill Valley, Mill Valley AP #049-063-37 Applicant: Stephan Laputka Planner: Sabrina Sihakom

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new 2,531 square-foot detached garage and workshop on a 38,416.95 square-foot lot in Mill Valley. The proposed development would have a building area of 5,940 square feet and a floor area of

5,460 square feet, resulting in a floor area ratio of 14 percent. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 15 feet above surrounding grade. The detached garage and workshop is proposed to be located 26 feet from the northwesterly front property line, 13 feet from the northeasterly side property line, 60 feet from the southwesterly side property line, and over 100 feet from the southeasterly rear property line. Design Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.42.020 because the project will result in total floor area that is greater than 3,500 square feet. Zoning: R1 (Residential, Single-Family, 7,500 square feet minimum lot size) Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single-Family, 4-7 units/acre) Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Area Community Plan

1. Stephen Laputka, Owner, presents the project.
2. Items relevant to Tam Plan discussed and reviewed;
 - a) Height of building, materials, relation to neighbor and visibility from adjacent properties, large size of accessory structure, probability of the next owner converting it to a second dwelling unit, no additional paving, good plan for on-site drainage – spills to open space.
3. AP motions that the project be found complete and the project be approved. AJ seconds. Board approves unanimously.

D) Bi-Annual Report

1. Board discusses Goals for the coming year
 - a) Reconfigure table and chair location so that neighbors can better view the project plans
 - b) Ask for a projector from the Board of Supervisors, so that plans can be displayed on the wall for all attendees to see.
 - c) Create better outreach to applicants to come to the Design Review Board earlier in the process, in order to save money by avoiding the need to pay engineers and architects to redraw and redesign.
 - d) Create a clear list of desired design considerations and required information for posting on the website and to be handed out by Planners at the County, in order to help people become more aware of what is expected of them.
 - e) Request that paper copies of plans be available to the Board members, as the website drawings are often blurry and illegible, making it impossible for the Board members to review without accessing the single set of paper plans sent to the Chair.

VI) Public in Attendance; Stephan Laputka, Emily Buskirk, Jeremy Tejrjian, Mark Lutzker, Geoffrey Butler, Rodrigo Izouierdo, Sharon Rushton, Adrienne Karp, Craig Adams, Mayrn Pall, Robin Assali