

Tam Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Public Hearing - June 3, 2015
Secretary John McCormick

Call to order: 7PM Alan Jones, Chair

Board Members Present: Alan Jones, John McCormick, Patrick LePelch, April Post, Loren Mollner

Approval of minutes of May 6, 2015: McCormick / LePelch 2nd 3 ayes 2
board members did not attend May 6, 2015 meeting

Public comment on items not on the agenda: None; Gentleman in audience waited to discuss an issue with Jeremy Tejirian.

Communications & Correspondence: Alan discussed the letter from TDRB that was sent to the Board of Supervisors regarding the “Good Earth” project review. TDRB will forward a new letter similar to the past letter to the Board of Supervisors, all board members approved new letter.

Present at Meeting: Phill Boersma

Design Review: Boersma, 909 Ventura Way, Mill Valley

Project ID: 2015-0110 **AP #** 050-044-05

Applicant: Terryl M. Lofrano **Planner:** Tammy Taylor

Project Summary:

Revised plans of April 21, 2015 project plans. Project is to construct a 116.2 SF’ additions on an existing multi-story residence in the Cultural Vista Assessment District. The additions & removal; converting an existing greenhouse into living space & expanding its floor area; addition to the kitchen space; removing 60 SF of the South rear facing living room in order to create an unenclosed deck. The additions are located in the south rear area of the property. The existing main house is 3,016 SF’ with a 512 SF’ garage, with a building area of 3,528 SF, on a 10,246 SF lot with a FAR of 29.4% (the garage is less than 540 SF’ and not included in the FAR). The new proposed building would be 3,072.2 square feet, with a FAR of 29.9% The additions are occurring only on the first floor, would reach a maximum height of 20 feet. The following setbacks: Front North property line – greenhouse 59 feet, kitchen addition 67; side East property line - greenhouse 73 feet, kitchen addition; 39 feet; Rear South property - greenhouse 12 feet, kitchen addition 17 feet; side West property - greenhouse 44 feet, kitchen addition 88 feet.

Design Review Required: The project is located in a Planned Zoning District, and is required by the Development Code.

Discussion: Owner Phill Boersma discussed the revised plans with TDRB. Floor Area Ratio changes to 29.9% to meet the required 30% limit. Changes to the revised plans are as follows; Small deck on the South elevation will be removed and replaced with a small Bay Window with seating; the existing wall/window/roof projection from South facing elevation will be removed and replaced with a new sliding glass doors located in the same plane as the South exterior wall, and install a new deck for the new sliding glass doors; Removed the existing greenhouse (solarium), and replace it with an enclosed space with a new roof, roof to match the existing roofing; the existing stairway will be changed to reflect the changes to the greenhouse; all new materials will match the existing structure. Owner provided to TDRB, a letter from a neighbor in favor of the new building changes.

TDRB discussion: Board discussed with the applicant the reason the first application was rejected. TDRB is pleased the applicant took the time to discuss the project with neighbors. TDRB recommended to the applicant that the plans presented be corrected to reflect the missing information (wall/window/roof projection) on the demo plan. TDRB felt the design had minimal impact to the neighbors.

Completeness of Application: Post / LePelch - 2nd 5 ayes

Project Approval: McCormick / Post – 2nd 5 ayes

Merits of Project: Recommend to correct the plans to show the demo of the Wall/Window/Roof projection.

Planning Dept Presentation by Planning Manager Jeremy Tejirian: Jeremy discussed TDRB role in the county planning process, and provided three (3) handouts; The Planning Process in a Nutshell; Planning Application Guide; Marin County Uniformly Applied Conditions For Projects Subject To Discretionary Planning Permits.

Jeremy provided information on how the county applies the various State / Country / Tam Plan codes relating too a project. The county reviews the project and applies the more stringent code requirements, which may over ride the Tam Plan.

Jeremy discussed the time restraints the county is under to review a project, and the reason projects are sometimes sent to TDRB incomplete. Once the county requests project information and the application complies with the request, and the county rules the project complete, the county cannot request additional information.

Alan Jones questioned how TDRB fits in the review process when TDRB cannot provide a complete review of a project when the plans are incomplete. Jeremy stated “ even though the project plans are incomplete, TDRB provides an important and valuable role, in providing their Merits comments on a project, and if the project meets the Tam Plan”.

Jeremy discussed a few Main Issues when a project is reviewed by TDRB.

1. The property owner has the right to build the project if the project meets the requirements of the county and the Tam Plan.
2. TDRB to rule only on the Design.
3. Unrelated issues to project plans, should not be address by TDRB.
4. TDRB needs to be on firm ground when they review the project and comment.

TDRB feels our meeting provides the public an important first view of a project, TDRB has received important information from the public, that needs to be addressed when reviewing the project design. Receiving a project that has been ruled completed by the county will impact the public’s change to provide input of how a project affects them, and will keep them out of the loop.

Variances: Have been an issue with the county, all variances need to be based on firm policy.

1. Only approve a variance if the project is unique.
2. Ruling on the FAR on a substandard lot must be view as a unique issue.
3. No special privileges can be granted, unless the other properties in the area are similar to the requested variance.
4. A height variance should be consistent with the Tam Plan.

Public Discussion:

During Jeremy’s presentation a gentlemen in the audience processed to question Jeremy on a planning issue on his personal project that has been submitted to the county. Alan Jones stated it would be appropriate to discuss his personal project issues with the planning department.