

Tam Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Public Hearing - June 17, 2015
Secretary (acting) Loren Mollner

Call to order: 7PM Alan Jones, Chair

Board Members Present: Alan Jones, Patrick Le'Pelch, April Post, Loren Mollner

Approval of minutes of June 3, 2015: Post / LePelch 2nd 4 ayes, 1 board member absent.

Public comment on items not on the agenda: None;

Present at Meeting: Mary Barone, Ted Barone, Doug Scherf, Jeremy Tejirian, Russell Bunch, James Svanda, Casey Clement

Design Review: Thompson; 766 Bay Road, Mill Valley

Project ID: TBD **AP # 049-184-04**

Applicant: Thompson development **Planner:** Jocelyn Drake

Project Summary:

Second Design Review application submitted for this project. A previous application was denied in January 2015. This design review application is in direct response to the commission's comments. The revised project is described as follows:

A request for design review approval of a new 2,096 sq.ft. SFR with attached 480 SQ.FT. garage on a 7,356 sq.ft. vacant lot.

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

Discussion: Owner's Rep, Casey Clement distributed copies of a presentation that included the history of the project, outlined all the revisions to reflect the input received from the planning commission and also included details of the drainage plan and construction traffic control. The project team is looking for input before returning to the planning commission. Proposed project was reduced by 4% in overall square footage and the cut was reduced by 14.7%. 2 USTs were incorporated to reduce peak runoff and the discharge flow was reduced by 8%. A construction management plan was introduced to show how parking and staging will occur on site.

TDRB discussion: Board discussed with the applicant the reasons the first application was rejected. TDRB raised questions regarding removal of 12 trees and discussed in detail the drainage plan and concerns regarding the swale and 3,000 GA of UST for water retention. TDRB questioned the applicant regarding roadway improvements and the process involved in removing the large amount of dirt from the site. TDRB engaged Casey Clement, Architect, Russell Bunch and Civil Engineer Jaime Svanda in a Q and A session that also included detailed information regarding maximum heights, plant list, setbacks, and details of the utility and elevator system. Details of the plan and explanations of the reductions were given and all TDRB questions answered during this session.

Public Discussion: Ted Barone who lives at 759 Bay, across the street from this project, objects to the project as proposed and questioned the applicants responses to Gutter drainage, 120 dump trucks on Bay Street, and the construction parking plan. The construction parking plan was inaccurate if not humorous.

Doug Scherf also a Bay Road resident also expressed similar concerns and brought up additional questions regarding road damage, lack of neighborhood outreach, construction management issues and setback requirements that seemed to have been overlooked.

Jeremy Tejirian, Marin County Planner, explained steep lot setbacks made some suggestions to mitigate traffic and informed residents that new letters will be needed now that will follow the new application throughout the process.

Close Public Discussion: TBRD discussed in detail the impact of the project including the removal of trees. Noticed the thoughtful changes but noted that 4% in the size and 14% in the cut seemed to be short of what TBRD has wanted to see. Discussion regarding the 40% slope made it a very difficult site and that the significant amount of soil removal is mostly for only garage and off street parking. Thoughts and open discussion regarding developer not having been rigorous in reducing the cut and size of the structure, discussion regarding massing and not meeting mandatory findings for Design Review.

Project Approval: Motion to Deny, Post / Jones 2nd : 2 Aye, 1 Nays and one Abstain.

Design review Application- Denied

Reasons for denial: 1) Project fails to meet mandatory Design Review finding "A." The massing and scale of the residence, including the building area and height, remains essentially unchanged or slightly increased from the previous submission. It is deemed inappropriate for the specific property. 2) Project may or may not meet mandatory finding "B." Mitigation of drainage and runoff has been improved but perhaps not sufficiently. Suggest detailed review by DPW to determine. TDRB does not have the expertise to evaluate. 3) The project fails to meet the requirements of mandatory finding "D." Although somewhat improved from the previous submission we find that grading, retaining walls, and off-haul of excavated materials will not be minimized by this design.