

**Tam Design Review Board
(TDRB)
Approved Minutes**

Public Meeting – Wednesday, September 1, 2021

Meeting location: Via Zoom.

Call to order: 7:03 p.m. by Alan Jones, Chair.

Board members present: Alan Jones (AJ), Logan Link (LL), Andrea Montalbano (AM), Doug Wallace (DW), and Michael Wara (MW).

Board members absent: None

Other attendees: Katherine Lehmann (KL), notetaker.

Meeting minutes: from August 18, 2021, were approved 5-0.

Correspondence and announcements:

- Andrea mentioned that SB9 was recently passed by the California Legislature, which is a new law about lot splits. Alan said SB10 was passed, as well. Andrea said “both will have a tremendous impact on our work.”
- Alan said that Michelle Levenson, senior planner with the County of Marin, has received an inquiry from the local developer, who has been trying to build a hotel complex on a 2.2-acre site located between the Commodore Houseboat Marina and Heliport and Shoreline Office Center south of Mill Valley, for a number of years. This developer would like to meet with the TDRB, and Alan has agreed to do so.
 - Alan noted:
 - There aren’t currently any firm rules in place.
 - A lot of current issues would come into play (i.e. rising sea levels and flood planes).
 - This property is specifically mentioned in the Tamalpais Plan and the Marin Conservation League has a description on their website.

Members of the Public who wished to comment on anything not on the agenda: None

AGENDA:

1. The first agenda item for the evening was to review and vote to approve, or disapprove, the draft letter to the Planning Commission regarding the O'Donnell Financial Group Master Plan Amendment, Design Review, and Mitigated Negative Declaration, located at 150 Shoreline Hwy. Mill Valley, AP# 052-371-03.

The Planning Commission will hear this application at their scheduled meeting on September 9, 2021. TDRB ruled it incomplete on November 21, 2020. The TDRB was informed that for technical and/or legal reasons, the project will not come back to the TDRB for review. As the minutes from 2020 do not fully describe how the TDRB might have ruled on the project, a proposal was made to send a letter to the Planning Commission informing them of the history of the application and making recommendations. How should the board respond to the Planning Commission hearing on September 9? Should they designate a representative of the board to attend the hearing?

After some discussion, the board voted unanimously to send the letter of opposition to the Planning Commission, and for two board representatives, Alan and Doug, to present some simple bullet points at the next Planning Commission hearing on Thursday, September 9, at 1:00 p.m. Of course, everyone else is still welcome to attend the hearing.

2. The second agenda item was to review the letter from Michelle Levenson regarding new referral procedures and noticing deadlines. The board discussed how the recommended procedures can be implemented and whether or not it makes sense to prepare a response.
 - There is still some confusion about the new procedures that have been recently distributed to all of the design review board members, planners and staff.
 - Further clarification is needed; it seems like a “Catch-22.”
 - Michelle Levenson was invited to attend this meeting, but she had a prior commitment. She will try to attend the next TDRB meeting, in order to explain the new procedures and the rationale behind them.
 - The suggested waiting period of **16 business days** from the date an application arrives at the county, to when it can be scheduled for discussion and review by the TDRB, or any design review board, seems unnecessarily long.
 - With the 16 business days rule, the procedures seem to guarantee that it will usually take a month before a DRB meeting can be scheduled once an application is submitted. Why is that?
 - Members of the board also do not understand why the DRBs are no longer able to reject an application that is incomplete?
 - Why isn't the planner able to ensure that an application is complete, upon submission, and only accept completed applications in the first place?
 - Everyone is willing to try out the new procedures, and keep an open mind until Michelle is able to explain the logic to everyone.
 - The group consensus was it is premature to send a letter of response re: the new procedures until they have met with Michelle.
 - Everyone is hoping the Planning Dept. will be open to feedback and suggestions about the new process, as everyone tries it out.

Meeting adjourned: at 8:30 p.m.