

**Tam Design Review Board Minutes
Public Hearing – April 5, 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 , April Post, John McCormick, Doron Dreksler

D. Approval of minutes of March 1, 2017: April Post presented changes to the meeting notes and asked that they be updated and resubmitted. Board approved meeting notes with alterations Dreksler/McCormick 4-0

E. Correspondence + Announcements: None

- a) Alan Jones, Chair, announced that several board member applicants would be attending tonights meeting
- b) Alan Jones, Chair, announced that a new review letter for the Weissman (Dipsea Ranch) Master Plan (P1589 had been uploaded to the county website

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

G. Public in attendance: Toby Levy Faia, Chris Ford, Logan Link, Alex Flint, Julia Polanco, Lee Goldstein, Scott Downes, Robinson Resid, Rich Storek, Anne Robinson, Curtis Robinson, Xallia Robinson, Laura Chariton, Marla Wentner,

H. Items on Agenda:

1. Introduce and interview applicants for board vacancy.

Logan Link, Lee Goldstein, Scott Downes

2. Calderon Design Review, 3 Ridge Ave, Mill Valley, AP # 046-095-03

Applicant: Hector Calderon Planner: Evelyn Garcia

Project Description

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a 1,020 square foot guest house, and a 7 foot, 8 inch fence with an 8 foot, 11 inch gate on an improved lot in unincorporated Mill Valley. The existing building area is 3,494 square feet and the floor area is 3,043 square feet. The proposed development would result in a building area of 4,514 square and a floor area of 4,063 square feet. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 13 percent on the 29,812 lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 15 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks: approximately 24 feet from the eastern rear property line; greater than 100 feet from the western front property line, 24 feet from the northern side property line; 15 feet from the southern side property line.

Design Review approval is required because the project would exceed a total building area of 4,000 square feet, and the fence and gate will exceed the maximum height limit.

Zoning: R1-B3 (Single-family Residential, 20,000 minimum lot size)

- **Project presentation:** Architect, Toby Levy, Landscape Architect, Chris Ford (GLA landscape architecture) and Client, Hector Calderon presented proposed project.
- **Project support documentation:**
 - a) Mounted 24x36 drawings, 11x17 reduced planset documents, submitted 24x36 drawings
- **Initial Board questions:**
 - a) April- why are you removing 26 trees ? landscape architect stated that the arborist report (Walter Levinson) identified 23 trees as either diseased, dangerous, not healthy or dead.
 - b) April- how many trees are protected (based on species), landscape architect stated 5
 - c) April- some of the trees that are proposed, are not native to the area
 - d) April- what are you going to do to reduce the impact to the environment by removing so many trees ?
 - e) Alan – it appears that no trees need to be removed to accomplish the construction of the project. Applicant responded – Yes, Except We would like to remove an unhealthy apple tree
 - f) John- how many trees are actually effected by the Bark Beetle ? Landscape Architect responded, 7 trees
 - g) April– are the cypress trees staying ? - Landscape Architect responded, Yes
 - h) April /Dreksler – how much material is being moved onsite - Landscape Architect responded, 200 cubic yards. Dreksler – will there be haul off ? Landscape Architect responded that the site is equalized, Architect responded, there may be a little haul off from the foundation of the new building.
 - i) John – is the new unit a rental – Architect + Client responded, No, it is a second unit for extended Family / Friends + Grandparents
 - j) Doron – What is the slope at the new building. Architect responded, 520 – 510 = 10 ft
 - k) Alan + Doron – the added parking will need to meet the county parking requirements for the new building being treated as a possible second unit in the future
- **Public comments + questions :**
 - a) Laura Chariton with the Watershed alliance of Marin presented a letter dated April 5, 2017 regarding the project. Discussed tree removal negative impacts, impact to watershed areas, and that the project would not meet the requirements of the Tam Plan.
 - b) Next door Neighbor commented that the applicant has been extremely responsible by removing dangerous trees and approved of the project.
 - c) Windload will be an issue when the trees are removed
 - d) Everything from this site drains into a protected watershed area
 - e) the proposed fence would block the view that is required to be maintained, Applicant responded by saying the fence is well above any potential viewing, Board agreed
 - f) plantings along the new fence are shown equally distributed and that just doesn't belong in such an area, it would look better if the plantings were grouped

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

- a) April – suggests adding trees that grow taller and phase the removal of the trees to minimize the impact.
- b) Board asked about a grading plan and drainage information
- c) Alan commented that all the runoff from the existing/new buildings and hardscape need to be captured onsite
- d) John- commented that the hidden gutter will cause issue if it is not detailed properly
- e) April- commented that the runoff on the site would require some sort of water dissipater system
- f) April- commented that a gradual impact would be achieved by phasing plant material removal
- g) April- asked about lawn type and encouraged a plant type that requires less fertilizer
- h) Board agreed that the new fence, fence height, and new gate location is not an issue
- i) Alan- commented that the grading and tree removal make it tricky to minimize the visual impact of the project
- j) Alan- asked that the drainage issue be addressed
- k) Alan- commented that the parking is far away and could be an issue with users of the new building
- l) John- asked if the existing materials match the main house, Architect responded, Yes

- **Board Findings:**

Completeness: Alan commented that because of the time it has taken to review the project, that we would not be ruling on the completeness of the project and instead should keep our comments directed toward merit comments

Approval status:

Board recommends approval of the Project with attached merit comments

April / McCormick 2nd - 4 ayes

Board Merit comments:

- a) Drainage on site, need a Drainage plan to address water runoff. All roof drainage from new building and as much as possible from existing house should be dispersed onsite.
- b) As much as possible change plantings to Local Native Species
- c) Retain trees, remove as needed, replace with fast growing natives, maintain a low maintenance grass at the lawn areas, cluster the plantings along the fence line and make sure to use local native plantings
- d) The building site, layout and configuration, massing, and materials are well thought out and well done.

3. Robinson Variance/Design Review, 309 N. Ferndale Ave, Mill Valley

Applicant: Rich Storek Planner: Megan Alton

Project Description

The applicant request Variance, Design Review and Second Unit approval to allow for the remodel and reconfiguration of the existing residence in Mill Valley, including the addition of floor area on multiple levels of the residence and a new second unit. The applicant proposes to convert an existing carport to floor area and construct a new 307 square feet upper story above the street level floor. Small additions are also proposed on the two lowest level of the residence. The existing building area and floor area is 2,908 square feet and the proposed development would result in a building area and floor area of 3,397 square feet. Therefore, the project would result in a floor area ratio of 35 percent of the 9,623 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 39 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks from the exterior walls: 2.79 feet from the western front property line; 16 feet from the northern side property line; 11 feet from the southern side property line; 70 feet from the eastern rear property line.

Variance approval is required per Marin County Code Section 22.54.020 because the proposed project entails construction of additional floor area and the total proposed floor area will exceed the maximum allowed 30% floor area ratio. Variance approval is also required because the project encroaches into the required 25-foot front yard setback and the 6-foot side setbacks. Design Review approval is required because the project exceeds the height limit requirements.

A Second Unit Permit is required to allow a new second unit pursuant to Section 22.56 of the County Code.

Zoning: R1 (Single-Family Residence, 7,500 sq. ft. minimum lot area)

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

- **Project presentation:** Architect, Rich Storek, presented proposed project.

- **Project support documentation:**
 - a) 24x36 drawings

- **Initial Board questions:**
 - a) April- The existing Building You can see over, How do the neighbors feel about the addition ? Client showed letters of approval from all of the neighbors impacted
 - b) April- Are there any drainage updates ? Architect, stated that all the existing drainage lines will need to be replaced and that everything drains into the existing creek onsite. As no roof area is being added the drainage demand is unchanged.
 - c) April- no native plants are indicated on the plan, consider changing plantings to local native plants
 - d) Alan- how does the building and site size compare to the neighboring properties. Architect responded that the site and building size is similar to this project
 - e) April- suggest adding native plants to naturalize the site area
 - f) Alan- Asked about the parking provided in the design. Architect responded 4 parking spaces at the street edge

- **Public comments + questions :**
 - a) Footings for the existing deck may impact the existing stream floor
 - b) The waterway is a blue line creek and is protected. Board member, April agreed
 - c) We understand the tight site constraints
 - d) Like the native planting ideas
 - e) Suggested the contractor use caution to minimize any impact on the creek

- **Final Board questions + comments:**
 - a) Alan- Read the Mandatory Findings requirements for a variances and added that the project met the requirements and he had no issue approving the variance. April added that she also did not have issue
 - b) Alan- stated that the project does exceed the required FAR but that it was so minimal that he did not have issue
 - c) April- stated that the project exceeds the height limit but doesn't seem massive and would not be an issue

- **Board Findings:**

Completeness: Submission found complete. Post / Dreksler 2nd - 4 ayes

Approval status:

Approval on Variance for FAR, building setback and Building height . McCormick / Post 2nd - 4 ayes

Approval on Design Review Post / McCormick 2nd - 4 ayes

Board Merit comments:

- a) Encourage native plants and minimize impact on creek
- b) We approve the variance and that the project meets Mandatory Findings

I. Potential Board Member meeting:

Board met informally with three of the applicants to share their impressions of the meeting and discussed amongst ourselves recommendations the chair might make to the Supervisors.

J. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment: None

K. Adjournment: 8:50 P.M.

TDRB is advisory to the Marin County Planning Department.

County Planning Department: <http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects>

For Tam Design Review: <http://apps.marincounty.org/bosboardsandcomm/boardpage.aspx?BrdID=68>