

Tamalpais Design Review Board Special Meeting Minutes

Regular Public Hearing : 07.01. 2020

I. Meeting Location :

online virtual meeting via ZOOM

II. Call to Order :

7:04PM Logan Link : chair

III. Board Members Present :

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 : 5.20.20
- Motion to Approve as written: AJ 1st/ AM 2nd : 5-0 Unanimous

V. Correspondence + Announcements:

a) LL: DD + LL talking about the need or option of recording zoom meetings. DW- asked if anyone has requested , LL responded "no". DD- said it would be much easier for preparing meeting minutes and several community design review boards in marin county tape meetings and allow access. DW- we should look at marin county standard protocol. LL added that closed captioning may be required. DD- added that we don't provide that now and if we did have the zoom meeting accessible we would still prepare a written meeting notice. DD- agreed to look into the matter further. community member rodrigo laqueado commented that the Brown Act criteria should allow capturing the meeting.

VI. Public Comment on Items not on the agenda:

a) rodrigo laqueado commented that the rule of voting for the board when we are split on a vote, like we have had in the past, the act of not agreeing is considered a "not approved" item based on Roberts Rule of Order

VII. Items on Agenda:

1. Hines Design Review, 1209 LaRe Lane, Mill Valley, Parcel: 048-223-17

Applicant: Scott and Rachel Hines Planner: Michelle Levenson

Project Summary:

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to install a 7-square-foot detached accessory structure (outdoor kitchen) and an attached deck on a lot developed with a single-family residence in Mill Valley. The proposed detached accessory structure would reach a maximum height of 6.78 feet as measured from existing grade and would have the following setbacks: 18 feet from the north front property line; 5.5 feet from the east side property line; 63 feet from the west side property line; and 90 feet from the south rear property lines. The proposed deck would maintain the following setbacks: 9 feet from the front property line; 5 feet from the east side property line; 60.5 feet from the west side property line; and 90 feet from the south rear property lines.

Design Review approval is required because the project involves the construction of a detached accessory structure and an attached structure (deck) located within a required setback pursuant to Marin County Development Code Section 22.20.090 (B)(2).

PROJECT PRESENTATION :

- sue with huettl landscape architecture presented project drawings
- project consists of 14 sq.ft. bar-b-q / refrigerator and deck addition on a steep site with not modification to grading
- a letter was provided from the neighbor at 1207 supporting the project.
- homeowner (scott hines) added that with the current work from home requirements, "we need additional outdoor space refined", and hope that the board sees the value of the improvements.

BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AM- asked what is seen from the new bar-b-q to the neighbors house ? DW - added smoke and odor is always an issue. applicant presented a picture showing the view and the board agreed that it wasn't an issue.
- AJ- commented that the presentation was very thoughtful and well done
- board agreed that the letter from the neighbor was important.
- LL- fire safety is important , and asked if it was taken into consideration in the design. applicant responded, yes we did and commented that the length of hose would reach the new area.

- LL- comment that the trash enclosure needs a door to keep it tidy. applicant responded that the trash enclosure was part of a previous approval and that it was designed with doors but the county required that we take it off because they encroached into the right-of-way. AM- suggested that the board add a comment that the doors should be added to the trash.
- LL- said that we usually ask about drainage. AJ- not an issue
- DW- commented that the project description stated 7 sq.ft. and AM - stated that it should be more like 14 sq.ft. applicant agreed and stated that the accessory structure is considered just the bar-b-q counter which is 2 ft x 7 ft

PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- rodrigo laqueado commented that a roll up door could be used on the trash and that it would not encroach in the right-of-way. applicant agreed and said they would love to add any kind of door to the trash

BOARD ACTIONS :

Board recommends that project be approved as submitted.

AJ motions 1st:/ DW 2nd : 5-0 Unanimous

Board Merit comments:

Board recommends that a door be added to the trash enclosure

2. Discuss County's Objective Design and Development Standard (ODDS) and TDRB survey and recommendations.

LL- stated that 70 responses have come in so far from LL's first post and AM second post on nextdoor. AM suggested that we each post the survey 2 times a day to get more responses from the community because we don't have much time left.

DW- asked about the process. LL responded : 1) the survey will be circulated until July 15th like the county survey. 2) once the timeframe is up, the county will need time to review their results for a week or two and that we should do the same.

DW- asked if LL had looked at comments today ? LL- stated no because survey monkey was difficult to open. AM- stated that she would transfer the administration to the general TDRB email which will make it easier. further stating that she has been reviewing the comments regularly and that she sees a wide variety of opinions.

AJ stated that you did a great job.

the board discussed several other options for posting the survey. TCSD, tam valley sustainable, tam valley improvement club , homestead valley improvement club, homestead valley community district, proof plan, facebook, in addition to nextdoor.

a member of the community, rodrigo laqueado, stated that he follows the LL on nextdoor and that it is difficult to find things and very cumbersome. further stating that nextdoor is not working.

DW- stated that he will repost on monday, LL- said post it and close off comments after posting

AM- asked if LL had talked to the county about adding it to the tam valley mailing list- AJ agreed

a member of the community, rodrigo laqueado, stated that the mill valley patch is a good place to get more exposure and that it is not as complicated as nextdoor. what about reaching out to the marin IJ ?

AJ- we should also reach out to kate sears.

Sarah Estes-Smith asked if LL could send a link specific to the survey ? LL said she can and will do so.

AM- also added a couple other organizations in addition to nextdoor: tourist club, alpine hiking club.

LL- asked the board, "do we need a meeting with the county", board all agreed, "yes". DW- stated, we need to make sure the results of the efforts is taken up with the county. AM- asked "who is the stake holders ?" LL- answered, "unknown".

AJ- i wrote the previous letter back in may to capture all of my feelings on the matter- i have strong feelings and i think the board should take action , if not, i will take actions by writing a letter to our representatives regarding affordable house, issues with housing based on the sprawling suburban model, which is causing the problem.

AM- i would agree to a letter to the county.

DW- stated that we have a current 54 billion dollar deficit , our development standards have been a disaster and we need to be careful how we craft our wants. AM- we should propose solutions. LL- can AJ + DW work together on a letter ? , both AJ + DW agreed.

3. Discuss signage violations at Tam Junction and Code Enforcement and board involvement.

LL- stated that she has been in contact with code enforcement and get far other than receiving a large document from them. further stating that they would like us to prepare a formal complaint for any infractions. AM - "last year we provided a document with the signage violations", did you review the document with code enforcement ? LL, responded "no".

AJ- we need to call the counties attention to these issues

AM- the document highlights the differences between the county code and the tam plan. its ridiculous for them to ask for more of our time.

LL- the sign situation has changed a lot.

DW- asked to see what has been submitted.

LL- asked AM, can you send the board what was sent to code enforcement ?

AM agreed to do so.

AJ- seems clear- i suggest LL send a letter with attached document to code enforcement and i would add the signage at the 7-11.

DW- the ball is in there court. we should just ask "please report on actions"

LL- i will do a letter

VIII. Informal Review Items not on Agenda:

None

IX. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment:

None

IX. Adjournment:

8:44 P.M.

END OF DOCUMENT