Tamalpais Valley Design Review Board Meeting Minutes Regular Meeting: January 17th, 2018: 7:00 PM

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

I) Call to Order:7:01 PM – Doron Dreksler (Chair)

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

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

AP motions, AJ Seconds, Unanimous approval.

- III) Correspondence and Announcements:
 - A) Marin Horizon School contacted Doron
 - 1. Met on site with Doron and some neighbors
 - 2. Reports they have met all of the Board's conditions Doron approved project.
 - 3. The school has scheduled additional public meeting for January 24th
 - B) State Design Review Board contacted Doron
 - 1. Is doing research about Design Review all over the state of California
 - 2. Will visit the Board and talk to us about the research some time in the future.
 - C) Doron and Alan met with Kate Sears
 - 1. Discussed Tam Valley Development with regard to natural and manmade disasters
 - 2. Discussed the lack of emergency shelters in the area
 - 3. Future effects of and preparing for sea level rise
 - 4. April Post mentions that she is very concerned that the area is potentially cut off from Emergency services. She wants to follow up with Kate Sears about this.

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

V) Agenda Items

A) Koulibaly Variance, 311 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley AP #052-041-26

Applicant: Beverly Van Dyke Planner: Megan Alton

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Variance approval to raise the roof of an existing residence located within the front 25 foot setback. The existing structure is 20 feet above grade and would be raised to 29 feet above grade, the setback would remain unchanged at: 12 ft 6 inches from the northern front property line; 7 feet 5 inches from the eastern side property line; 14 feet from the western side property line; and more than 100 feet from the southern rear property line.

Minor Variance approval is required because the project encroaches into the front yard setback. Zoning: R1 (Residential single family, 7,500 square foot minimum lot area) Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single family, 4-7 units/acre)

- 1. Proposed Design presented by the architect; Steve Thompson
- 2. The applicants describes the unique circumstances warranting the granting of a variance;
 - a) The house was there before the road
 - b) Cal Trans is not cutting down the large eucalyptus around her property, which is shedding a large amount of bark and leaves onto her roof, the 7:12 roof will shed the leaves.
- 3. Items relevant to Tam Plan discussed;
 - a) Impact on neighbors,
 - b) Ceiling height within new attic has potential impact on FAR
- 4. There are no public comments.
- 5. AP motions to approve, AM seconds the motion, Unanimous approval of motion by the Board.

B) **Haddad Design Review,** 242 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley AP# 052-052-09 Applicant: Phoenics Group. LLC/Mill Valley Auto Service Planner: Lorraine Weiss

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new attached 1,500 square foot commercial structure with five car bays on a developed lot with an existing 3,400 square foot building at 242 Shoreline Highway in Mill Valley. A 1,600 square foot building was previously demolished. The 1,500 square foot building on the 13,312 square-foot lot would result in a floor area ratio of 37 percent. The commercial structure would reach a maximum height of 20' feet above existing grade. Design Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.42.020 because the property is within a Planned Zoning District, CP. Zoning: CP (Planned Commercial), Countywide Plan designation: General Commercial/Mixed Use Land Use.

- 1. Will Revilock of WSR returned to present the changes made to appease the Design Review comments from the December 6th meeting.
- 2. There are no public comments.
- 3. Items relevant to Tam Plan discussed and reviewed;
- a) Maximum height allowed by Tam Plan is 15' 17' is desired by architect
- b) Removal of red stripe on exterior reduces visual impact on neighbors
- c) Added plants in roadside planter
- d) The Board is still concerned about filtering of site generated runoff
- e) Reduced floor area to meet FAR
 - 4. AP motions to approve project with maximum 15' height, AM Seconds the motion, with the addition that the submittal is deemed complete, Unanimous approval of motion by the Board.

C) **Maddox Design Review,** 49 Ridge Avenue Mill Valley, CA 94941 APN: 046-212-03 Applicant: Charlie Barnett Associates Planner: Lorraine Weiss

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review approval to demolish an existing 1,924 square foot two-story residence and 54 square foot accessory structure, and construct a new two-story 3,357 square foot residence in Mill Valley. The proposed development would consist of 3,357 square-feet of total building area and 3,004 square-feet of total floor area, which would result in a floor area ratio of 25.9 percent on the 11,554 square-foot lot. The residence would reach a maximum height of 28 feet and 7 inches above existing grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 25 feet from the western front property line; 24 feet from the northern side property line; 15 feet 4 inches from the southern side property line; and 37 feet 5.0 inches from the eastern rear property line.

Design Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.42.020.D because the property is located on a vacant lot and Section 22.82.050.C.3 for minimum lot size based on slope.

Zoning: R1-B3 (Single-Family Residential, 20,000 square foot minimum lot area) Countywide Plan Designation: SF4 (Single-family, 1-2 units/acre) Community Plan: Tamalpais Community Plan

- 1. Chris Maddox, Owner, presents the project.
- 2. Says it will be much more expensive to modify the existing building and get what they want, and instead want to demolish the building and start with new. There is a portion of the foundation that is from 1933, and a two story portion that is from 1976.
- 3. Explains the site plan, describes changes that are underway to landscape plan, a revised septic plan (already permitted but not shown) revised roof on accessory building (not shown) etc.
- 4. Board explains that according to the Tam Plan, there is an 18' height limit for a "new" building at this location because it is within 100' of a ridge. The applicant would not be able to rebuild to the existing height if the building is demolished.
- 5. There are some public comments from next door neighbors stating that they have come to an agreement with the applicants that privacy landscaping should be planted as soon as possible, and that blockage and

protection of the privately owned road will be established.

- 6. AP motions that the project be found incomplete for the following reasons;
- a) A written statement of keeping the road clear during construction should be included in the plans and be part of the Conditions of Approval.
- b) A bond should be put in place to ensure that any damage to the road will be fixed.
- c) The retaining wall at the rear of the property line should be shown on the plans, with elevations and materials described.
- d) The location of the neighbors' buildings next door and behind the property should be clearly shown.
- e) The change to the accessory structure's roofline must be shown for review.
- f) The applicant must examine the area analysis and make sure that the project meets the FAR. It appears the calculations do not follow the Tam Plan's area calculation guidelines and the project as presented is exceeding the allowable FAR for the lot slope.
- g) The maximum allowable roof height for a new building on the lot is 18' above grade, and as proposed the building does not meet this requirement.
- h) The newly revised septic system should be shown. There is some concern that pumping the waste uphill to enter the leach lines could be a problem in a power outage.
- i) A new landscape plan, utilizing local natives should be included in the revised submittal.
- j) Roof drainage appears inadequate. The project should take care of all roof drainage on its own site through bio-swales, rain gardens, drywells, etc.
- 7. AJ seconds motion
- 8. Unanimous approval of motion by the Board

D) **JMW Trust Design Review,** 307 Seymour Lane Mill Valley, CA 94941 APN: 047-125-14 Applicant: Doug Thompson Planner: Megan Alton

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review approval to raise the roof height of an existing single-family residence in Mill Valley. The existing roof height is 15 feet and encroaches into the rear yard setback. The proposed residence would have the following setbacks from the exterior walls: 74 feet from the western front property line; 5 feet from the northern side property line; 3 feet from the southern side property line; and 0 feet from the eastern rear property line. Although not triggering Design Review the proposed development includes a new 400 square foot detached garage and a new 828 square foot addition onto the existing single-family residence.

Design Review approval is required because the primary structure encroaches into the required rear year setback, but is exempt from Variance approval pursuant to Development Code section 22.54.045E. Zoning: R1-B1 (Residential, Single-Family, 6,000 sq. ft minimum lot area)

Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single Family, 4-7 units/acre)

Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Area Community Plan

- 1. Doug Thompson, architect, presents the project.
- 2. They show support letters from the neighbors.
- 3. Items discussed relevant to Tam Plan;
 - a) Removing ADU and adding three parking spaces.
 - b) Maximum height above grade is 20'
 - c) The existing house is completely within rear yard setback. New structure follows required setbacks. A roof cricket falls within rear yard setback but will have little to no impact on perceived height of structure and is unavoidable.

4. Merit comments:

- a) Try to use firesafe, local natives.
- b) Try to take care of rainwater on your own site through something other than drywells.
- 5. AJ motions to vote that the project is deemed complete and to approve the project as submitted.

AP Seconds the motion. Unanimous approval of motion by the Board.

VI) Public in Attendance; Steve Thompson, Jean Sublet, Beverly Van Dyke, Jonathan Witkin, Marwa Mascorro, Brad Silen, Will Revilock, Norine Bruno, Morgan Solorio, Doug Thompson, Chris Maddox, Tom Rutter