

## **Tam Design Review Board Minutes Public Hearing - February 15, 2017**

**A. Meeting location:** : The Cabin, 60 Tennessee Valley Rd., near Hwy 1.

**B. Call to order:** 7PM Alan Jones, Chair

**C. Board Members Present:** Alan Jones, John McCormick, Doron Dreksler

**D. Approval of minutes of January 4 2017:** McCormick/Dreksler 3-0

**E. Correspondence + Announcements:** None

**F. Public comment on items not on the agenda:** None

**G. Public in attendance:** Rebecca Yarnold, Munirah Habib, Ron Kappe, Jonathan Erb, Sean Weland, Andy Spears

### **H. Items on Agenda:**

- 1. Tsang Design Review and Variance, 15 Midway Ave, Mill Valley**  
Applicant: Kappe Architects           Planner: Evelyn Garcia

The applicant requests Design Review and Variance approval to demolish an existing 1,057 sq ft single family residence and construct a new 2,251 sq ft single family residence with a 480 sq ft attached garage on an improved lot in unincorporated Mill Valley. The proposed development would have building area of 2,731 sq ft and a floor area of 2,251 sq ft. Therefore the proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 38 percent on the 5,924 sq ft lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 27 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks: 23 ft 6 in from the western rear property line; 2 ft from the northern side property line; 14 ft from the eastern front property line; 11 ft 1 in from the southern side property line.

- **Project presentation:** Architect / Applicant Ron Kappe presented proposed project.
- **Project support documentation:**
  - a) Plan set consisting of Site plan, floor plans, exterior elevations, building sections
  - b) Renderings showing existing conditions and exterior renderings of proposed project
- **Initial Board questions:**
  - a) Jones stated that he clarified with the planner that the project required a Variance because of the 8% overage on FAR

- b) McCormick asked if there was a section through the property and asked if any landscaping would be offered on the lower portion of the lot to further buffer any views.
- c) Jones asked how the FAR was calculated, Habib described the process for both FAR and setback conditions / requirements

- **Public comments + questions:**

- a) Neighbors agreed that the home design was very nice, and was a big improvement over the existing structure and would improve the neighborhood from a visual standpoint
- b) Several neighbors agreed that the project is much bigger than the average home size in the neighborhood
- c) Several neighbors asked to see story poles to help understand if any prominent existing views would be blocked
- d) neighbors appreciated that the home was 27 ft tall and not the maximum 30 ft height allowed
- e) Jonathan Erb He stated that he has lived in his home for many years and had remodeled his home particularly to capture the view. He was very concerned that his view would be obstructed and asked to see both story poles and more visuals from his deck to further understand the impact of the new structure. He was also concerned that the house was larger than the other homes in the area and was concerned with drainage and the height of the home in relation to the northern property line setback of 2 ft.
- f) Several neighbors were concerned with general site and roof drainage from the new building to the property below
- g) Suggested that any landscape take into account the views of the neighbors to the hills beyond and to landscape to maintain privacy on adjoining properties where possible
- h) Several neighbors suggested to the architect to contact the neighbor on the northern property line side of the project because of the 20ft plus wall that is only 2 ft. from the property line, which creates a cavernous area. The architect commented that the walls, although tall, on that side of the house, do not have any windows and maintain views from existing windows that exist in the neighboring home. Jones, commented that if that particular home added an addition or remodeled, the proposed home design would limit options.
- i) Public asked if the oak tree would remain because it is important to blocking the view from neighboring properties. Architect commented that the tree is on county property and that there is no reason to remove it or impact the tree and that it will remain. Dreksler commented that a tree protection plan could be added to the development plan of the project

- j) Public asked if the existing fence would remain and would it be maintained in the new design? Architect commented that the fence is technically on public property and that they have no intention of removing the fence. McCormick commented that because the fence is built on an easement, then the owner would need approval to modify, build and maintain anything within the easement and may be required to remove it at a later date.
- k) Public asked how long construction process. Architect stated 8 months once a permit is granted.
- l) Neighbors stated that parking is an issue in the neighborhood and that the garage as designed is very difficult to get in and out of and asked if there is any possibility of adding parking on homestead blvd.

• **Final Board questions + comments:**

- a) McCormick asked if solar panels are a possibility and commented that the glare could be an issue with neighbors who look down on the property / new project
- b) Jones commented that because no drainage plans and landscape plans were not provided that it is difficult to address any drainage issues and/or landscape implications. Architect commented that they are well versed in designing drainage related solutions that meet the county requirements and would provide those designs at a later date
- c) Jones commented that public works would require run off / drainage calculations
- d) McCormick asked neighbors if any existing drainage problems exist from run off from the existing property. Neighbors stated that no major issues exist at this point in regards to this property.
- e) Jones suggested that a complete site section needs to be completed to show the condition from the street above the property and below the property
- f) Jones/McCormick/Dreksler agreed that the size of the home was too large for the site and that the proposed design pushed past all setback elements in all directions
- g) Jones/McCormick/Dreksler agreed that the setback on the northern edge was too tight
- h) Jones/McCormick/Dreksler agreed that the exterior design of the house was very nice
- i) Jones/ Dreksler asked how the setback requirements were established. Habib/ Kappe, defined the overall slope of the property allowed for minimizing the setback. Jones/Dreksler clarified that the slope of the property is actually established from the highpoint of 281 and the low point of 246 with an estimated separation of 95 ft which approx. 37 % which is less than the architect had calculated and suggested that they clarify the calculation with the county
- j) McCormick was concerned with the lower floor garage could easily become additional living space in the future.

- k) Jones/McCormick/Dreksler agreed that definition /design of the drainage and landscape components needs to be addressed
- l) Dreksler asked for clarification of setbacks for the existing home and as designed. And commented that the northern side setback was a problem
- m) Jones stated the proposed design does not dictate a compelling reason to approve a Variance based on building size / setback issues.

- **Board Findings:**

**Completeness:** Submission found incomplete. Missing landscape plan and drainage plan McCormick / Dreksler 2nd - 3 ayes

**Approval status:**

Board recommends that application be rejected based on incomplete plans/  
McCormick / Dreksler 2nd - 3 ayes

Note: Applicant was given notice that the board would not be inclined to approve the variance on the project based on excessive FAR and setback issues. In the opinion of the board the applicant did not adequately demonstrate that there are special circumstances applicable to the property that don't apply to neighboring properties.

**Board Merit comments:** None

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

- a) Cursory discussion regarding Weissman forthcoming master plan project ID P1589

**J. Adjournment: 8:30 P.M.**

TDRB is advisory to the Marin County Planning Department.

For more information : <http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects>