

# **Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes**

## **Regular Public Meeting : May 6, 2020**

### **I. Meeting Location :**

online virtual meeting via ZOOM

### **II. Call to Order :**

7:08PM Logan Link : chair

### **III. Board Members Present / Attending :**

Logan Link (LL) : chair,

Doron Dreksler (DD): secretary

Alan Jones (AJ)

Andrea Montalbano (AM)

Douglas Wallace (DW)

### **IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes :**

- meeting minutes dated : 3.4.2020
- Motion to Approve as written: AM 1<sup>st</sup>/ AJ 2<sup>nd</sup> : 5-0 Unanimous

### **V. Correspondence + Announcements:**

- a) LL - county is going paperless : AM / AJ - committed that we don't see all of the project now and that we should see projects that are on the county agenda regardless if they do or do not make it to design review. DD - committed that it is important to understand everything that is going on in the region because it could effect projects we are ruling on.
- b) LL - received email with attached letter regarding 116 evergreen garage project. applicant still having problem with the neighbor.

### **VI. Public Comment on Items not on the agenda:**

None

### **VII. Items on Agenda:**

- 1. Discuss County's Objective Design and Development Standard (ODDS) and consider possible board involvement / recommendations.**

BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- LL - contacted Julian Tam and was informed that the original public meeting process had been changed to an online survey.
- LL / AM- asked if everyone had taken the online survey and asked for feedback. DD + AJ did not take the survey, all others had.
- AJ- committed that he was looking forward to the public meetings and was hoping to maintain local control for those aspects that design review would have the most impact also committing that he would strongly object to anything that allowed developers to operate without oversight.
- AM- was shocked how bad the survey was put together. "worst survey ", "appalling, shoddy presentation of the information"
- DW- committed on the survey "puzzled by the process" also committing "are they trying to reduce the number of projects that are reviewed ?"
- LL- stated that because of all the new state laws being put in place, that new standards need to be put in place to act in the absence of the formal design review process..... "replace design review"
- AM- stated that there are several objective standards that work well. places like the sea ranch, seaside florida which have detailed standards.
- AM- committed that the survey is tragic and is supposed to ask for meaningful information which it does not. LL - agreed and stated that it is crucial to develop standards and that the survey doesn't aim high enough. continuing to discuss the 3 parts / types of developments being : urban, suburban and edge. DW- objected to the high density projects being focused / allowed in the edge defined locations. continuing "why allow high density @ the edge ?"
- LL - asked the board, i don't fully understand what part the state will mandate vs. what will an object design standard cover. we need to distinguish what we can control and what we can't.
- AJ + AM: we need a letter from the board that covers what the survey needs to do, like: more community engagement / involvement.
- AM - regarding the survey, please add images and information that are more applicable to our region and more information that actually allows people to understand and analyze the question being asked. the survey doesn't relate to anything.
- AJ- the current situation points to a non feasible environmentally based building and development standard. the problem is that the state is trying to engage developers without addressing real issues. this will create more problems than it solves.

- AJ- suggested that the board should get the supervisors involved to minimize thoughtless development
- AJ- affordable housing is what is trying to be addressed and it looks like they are forcing the process based on a short timeframe to fix the situation.
- AJ- design review has been a vital part of development in the past and should be incorporated in any future processes. the process must incorporate thoughtful , sensible rules.
- LL- the pandemic will change development. our opinion is relevant as a design review board.
- LL- we have the most visited national park in the nation and that traffic is already and what would happen with hourly done developments that do not fully understand the traffic situation. also, what about sea level rise issues.
- AJ + AM- stated that we need to understand what other design review boards are doing on this matter.
- DW- regarding objective design standards and our area, is any meaningful background given on the various conditions particular to our area ? AM- committed, "no" they lumped the entire region into one region. DD - in other words, no vernacular that is regional and particular to our area. LL - there is so much good design in the world. DD- why do we want the typical development solution ?
- DW- we should craft a letter to start over with the entire process. start from a place that the audience becomes the driver of the process. AJ- we should talk with kate sears and ask why are we doing this. LL + AM- we should focus on the big picture and add further detail at a later time. AM- committed on allens letter and stated that it should be our cover letter because it is good at defining the big picture. AM- we need to preserve and enhance anything we do. maybe we spilt up the tasks : survey, housing, other cities solutions. LL- who's attention are we going after ? AJ agreed and stated that we need to be more clear. we must aim at state level legislative people.
- AM- the ADU - situation is not going to fix the problem and won't help the situation. they will not be affordable in any way.
- LL,AM,DD,DW: the local level objective design rules are important, we need to slow down the process to allow for community involvement. LL- we need to put together points, stress that we are unique. AM- " Berkeley and oakland do it better, they already have objective design standards"
- DW- who are we speaking to ? this is a terrible time to attempt this process. what are other design review boards doing ? 90% is human interaction, it must engage the people it effects most. front time to accelerate. AJ- we should contact the design review boards, this whole thing sounds like a

developers opportunity to seize local control. AM- maybe we activate all of the design review boards somehow

- AM- logan, should contact brian crawford regarding the survey. depending on his answer / action, that will define our direction going forward.
- LL- should i write a letter to the marin independent journal. DW- i would hold off, its not the time. LL- Ok, i will talk to brian crawford, andrea can contact dennis rodoni and allen can talk with kate sears.
- DW- is there a deadline for the survey ? AM stated that it goes through the end of the month.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- none

BOARD ACTIONS :

Board Agrees:

first: LL will contact brian crawford

second: the board will prepare a letter to the board of supervisors

## **2. Preview, without action, upcoming projects and discuss the best way to go about reviewing projects during the Shelter in Place.**

BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- LL- stated that the county had a hold on all projects until last week when they lifted the hold. last week the county had 5 applications for projects submitted.
- LL - discussed the 1 hart lane deck addition / reconfiguration and the board agreed that it was minor and would not need a comprehensive design review process.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- none

BOARD ACTIONS :

Board Agrees to meet on our regular schedule via zoom and will adjust based on state and local regulations for public meetings.

## **VIII. Informal Review Items not on Agenda:**

none

**IX. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment:**

none

**IX. Adjournment:**

8:12 P.M.

**END OF DOCUMENT**