

Tam Design Review Board

c/o April Post, Chair 314 Marin Drive, Mill Valley

Sept 17, 2014

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Post

Board members present: April Post, Jim Bramell, Patrick LePelch, Alan Jones

Absent: John McCormick

Meeting attendees: Chris Ellison, Barry Peterson, Fiske Smith, Deanna Lee, Patti Collins, Margaret Zegart, Nancy Sterling, Jim Treman, Nate Henderson

Minutes for September 3rd, 2014 were approved as submitted: Jones/ Bramell 4-0

The following matters were discussed not concerned with projects under review:

Attendee Zegart, requested that the board address the gravel lot at Almonte and Miller Ave. Since there are often off-haul trucks, and other vehicles, that stay overnight or multiple days, "no overnight parking" signs should be posted.

No Communications and correspondence from Chair Post or other Board members.

Post requested that attendees who have comments to keep them succinct in order to get through all the items on the agenda.

The following projects were reviewed:

- 1. Rago/Lee Appeal of the Southern Marin Fire District Design Review.**, 309 Poplar, Mill Valley  
Project ID 2013-0437 (Design Review Application) and 2014-0164 (BOS Appeal)  
Applicant: New Cingular Wireless PCS dba AT&T Mobility Planner: Scott Greeley

Neighbor/ attendee input:

Jones Recused himself from the meeting due to his involvement in the proposed project

- No applicant was present to present the project changes. Drawings are dated July 23, 2015, although the appellants had requested an urgent transmittal of the latest drawings. The TDRB did not receive a copy either, although it was mailed by Scott Greeley.
- Post commented that there would be no findings, just making and taking comments on the proposal changes. Post had not received copies in the mail at the time of the meeting, but a copy was made available from Curry Ecklehoff, a member of the "Tamalpais Planning and Bayfront Coalition" who had been in receipt of the package submitted to the county. There are new items on this plan. Post had an opportunity to preview the plans. Plans were reviewed with interested neighbors reviewing as well.

Board comments-

LePelch- No dimensions on the new proposed enclosure. No setback lines are shown to indicate side, rear and front yard setbacks. There is no indication as to whether it complies with the planning criteria and it appears to not meet the setback requirements. No credible landscape plan was submitted. Plans indicate "possible" plantings and trees. There is no degree of specificity presented in order to comment on the merits. The cupola exceeds height limit by approximately 5 feet. No story poles were erected, as was required prior to the meeting. No neighboring building footprints were shown as was requested by the previous comments made by the TDRB. Cupola serves no function to the fire department. No new building was called out in the application. It should have been applied for and mentioned as part of the review. It's not described in the transmittal. Building will apparently cut down on noise but there are no details shown to address the acoustical merits of the proposal and no substantiating data to indicate how it will perform. Proposal doesn't deal with basic planning requirements for review.

Bramell discusses question about interplay or two antennas emissions and this should be considered and studied.

Post: Wished to reiterate TDRB's former position, that this is an inappropriate location. and that another preferred site be designated for future co-location, hopefully phasing out all antennae in the neighborhood over time. Look for a new location, such as the location being used by Verizon. LePelch noted that the proposal was previously rejected due to the height of the walled enclosure exceeding the height limit. She also pointed out that there was no correlation between the exceptions made to accommodate the special use as a fire station and making exceptions to accommodate cell phone equipment located at that site. Also that the studies used to examine other possible locations were not done by on site measurements, as requested, but by computer generated probabilities which are dependant upon what data is fed into the computer, therefore not a reliable indicator of how those actual sites would function. She pointed out that Verizon has located their antenna well away from the neighborhoods and that reception is so good that SMFD is using Verizon, themselves.

Fisk Smith, a neighbor, a video production professional working in the neighborhood for 32 years spoke. He states that the proposed antennas will severely impact the health of those residing in the neighborhood. He says he can't use wireless microphones in his studio because of the buzzing apparently emitted by the antennas. He would not like to see this antenna built in this neighborhood due to the health impacts on residents,

Zegart had comments: Concerned over the new ATT tower coaxial cables routing on the front of the building. From design point of view cables should not be on the front. Design is not balanced with the location of the cupola. Materials, what are the materials? No materials board or colors are shown as required for this process. How will coaxial cable go over the overhang? This is a very awkward detail. What are the acoustic details of the building enclosure with the equipment? How do we know how and whether it will work to

abate the sound? 13' within source is a health risk and poses dangers for Firemen who live and work there. Long term exposure to firemen would be detrimental. A condition, should it be approved, of shielding for the protection of the firemen, should be designed into the scheme. This lot was designed as open space, and now is being used for this industrial facility. The original plan for open space should be reviewed before any additions are considered, to meet the original intent of the use of this land. It is for firemen and as permanent open space, not for equipment for a for-profit company. Post: open space history should be researched.

Deanna Lee. Represented the appellant. She submitted a letter for review to the TDRB for inclusion in the package to the county planner and Board of Supervisors .Comments included:

Clarifications needed on misleading statements or information from ATT: Continuance was requested by ATT, not by the neighbors, even though ATT indicated the continuance was initiated by the neighbors/ appellant.

A letter was submitted with language regarding "Conditions of Approval". There were no conditions of approval according to Lee.

Lee clarified that extra equipment is being added and that this should trigger a new Design Review Process, from the beginning, as a new submittal. It's industrializing this neighborhood.

The proposed new building seems to recognize there is a sound issue with the ground equipment. New building needs new design review. Lot coverage will change and be effected. Needs design review from the beginning. Studies for the alternative site locations can be manipulated for their purposes.

Chief Irving has switched to Verizon. ATT no longer needed.

Bramell. Stated they no longer can claim any need for ATT at their location.

## **2. Bernstein Deck Addition, 320 Carrera Dr.**

Applicant: Studio 300A Architecture Planner: Heidi Scoble

Project I.D. 2014-0325

Barry Peterson presents the project. Taking out 56 s.f intermediate deck and replacing with 157 intermediate deck. Lower 270 removed, 334 s.f. deck for 165 net addition of decks.

Temperd glass to remain. Redwood deck surface and glass railings to match existing.

Showed on plan the intermediate deck location. No setback requirements for Planned unit Development in answer to LePelch's question.

Jones this will help clean it up. Neighbors are actually family. Lighting down lighting

Comments:

Bramell. It's a limited project. No drainage problems are created. Rule it complete from Bramell/ Jones 4-0 .

Merit Comments:

Show neighbors on the site plan for context and proximity to neighboring homes.

Nice materials which complement the existing house.

Motion to approve the project.

Bramell/ Jones 4-0 approved

**3. Courthouse Ventures Inc. Variance (15-2) and Design Review (15-23) , 390 N. Ferndale Ave.**

Applicant: Nate Henderson Planner: Scott Greeley  
Project I.D. 14-0332

Proposal Jim Treman and Nate Hendersen. Proposal presented by architect Treman. Obviously a steep lot. Little area that's buildable. Based on the constraints.

Usable house is about 20 feet wide because of the triangular shape. Propose a new house more or less in the same spot and use (e) outdoor areas. Existing house has no parking at all. Proposal has a garage with two off street parking spaces.

Dennis Gillespie did engineering for the parking. 14' is the narrowest point on the road in front of the property. County requires 20 feet as a minimum according to Bramell. Issues with the fire department width. Rigs got bigger over time and this road is too narrow.

Homestead Valley Land Trust owns property up the hill. Madrone Park Circle is even narrower. County said to be able to access. Bramell commented the street should be 20' wide, and suggested that the retaining wall might be re built into the hill to make it wider. LepLech had concerns about how tall the retaining wall would get to make the road that wide. Other points lower down are more constricted so why have this part be wider?

Applicant showed the landscape plan. LePelch proposed that different plants be planted along the top of the retaining wall to spill over the wall to soften it and make it appear less tall.

Bramell. Recommendation. Purchase the property from the county to make the lot larger and deal with the road width.

Post: add more Bay Area Natives for plantings. Also suggested that plants that are used to soften retaining wall could be of different varieties, offering various bloom times and fall color. She also suggested they consider texturing the retaining wall in such a way as to give it more visual interest, since it is so dominant.

Discussed materials. LePelch suggested making the stucco more green than cool gray and also suggested making the cedar siding on the top of the house lpe, a fire-proof wood, to address fire safe concerns raised by Post and tie it into the lpe of the garage siding

Bramell: Drainage. Percolate into the site. (e) brick. Make it permeable as it is currently not permeable. Catchment system for the garage roof. Suggested a cistern above the garage and below the deck as a suggestion.

Exterior color green/ gray.

Bramell: Provide parking for two guest cars.

LePelch complete/ Bramell. 4-0

Merit Comments:

Jones. Torn about the project. Good job with a tough site. But the numbers don't work for me. Lot that is too small for a house too big. It should stay within the 30%.

Discussion followed about how else one might treat the site. Post brought out that the lot was already developed, not pristine, and that the proposed building was only incrementally larger than the existing, involving little soil disturbance, except for the beneficial addition of the proposed garage, and an improvement over leaving it the way it is. LePelch pointed out that the floor plan was pretty economical as proposed, and in order to make it smaller a bedroom would probably have to be eliminated, making the house far less practical. Bramell suggested that the applicants look into purchasing the easement currently used by retaining walls, so that their parcel comes into alignment with the FAR that way.

The only neighbor past the site, Chris Ellison, was in general support of the project viewing it as an improvement.

Lepelch/ Jones 4-0 yes

- Purchase the county land to make the lot legal.
- Mostly native local plants
- catchment system
- provide off street garage find a good location
- Jones: regret the lack of guest parking but not many options available
- Permeable brick work
- Spill over retaining wall with native plants

Meeting was adjourned

