

Tam Design Review Board – Minutes
Public Hearing - July 20, 2016
Secretary, Alan Jones

Call to order: 7PM: April Post, chair

Board Members Present: April Post, Alan Jones, John McCormick, Doran Drexler

Approval of minutes: Minutes for July 6, 2016 were approved 4-0

Public comment on items not on the agenda: None

Communications & Correspondence: Email from Jim Bramell concerning proliferation of signs at Tam Junction was read. Post reports she forwarded it to County enforcement for their consideration.

Public Present at Meeting: Paul Faro, Tom Jeter, Loretta Fiuroa, Robert Vernali, Brad Hubbell, Suzanne Daily.

1. Jeter Design Review, Project ID P1290, 189 Morning Sun, Mill Valley

APN 051-094-06

Applicant: Paul Faro Planner: Megan Alton

The applicant for the project is Paul Ferro, and the property is located at 189 Moring Sun, further identified as Assessor's Parcel 051-094-06.

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new 723 square foot addition over an existing garage on a developed single-family lot in Mill Valley. The proposed development would also include an addition of 226 square feet to the existing garage. The existing building area is 3,046 square feet and the existing floor area is 2,803 square feet. The proposed development would result in a building area of 3,995 square feet and a floor area of 3,526 square feet. Therefore, the project would result in a floor area ratio of 26 percent of the 15,202 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 29 feet 2 inches above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 100 + feet from the southern front property line; 84 feet from the eastern side property line; 5 feet 5 inches from the western side property line; 4 feet 10 inches from the northern rear property line. Design Review approval is required because the proposed development would exceed 15 feet in height and encroaches on the required side and rear setbacks.

Applicant presented project. A 723 sq ft new second unit above an expanded existing garage.

Questions raised by board members: Where does roof drainage go? It appears that the drainage from this site may be going into the street at Lavender Ln. What parking is provided for new unit, including any guest parking? Where is existing parking for house? If garage is to be for new unit is there adequate remaining parking for house? Survey appears to be old. Is it up to date? Is it recorded? Have there been studies of the adequacy of existing foundation to support 1 1/2 floors above? If the existing structure is not adequate, shouldn't we consider it as new construction? Comments from board members focused on the appropriateness of the location, encroaching on the setbacks and so close to Lavender Ln., especially in relation to the poorly developed (without a permit?) garage next door, creating an inappropriate "canyon" effect of buildings that exceed the height limit and encroach. It was pointed out that this would clearly not be an acceptable site if a new building were being proposed.

Public comments from neighbors present: Is survey recorded? Why can't second unit be placed elsewhere on site to avoid setback problems? Why are they even considering building outside of the setback lines? Height of proposed project is imposing from Lavender Lane and will change the character of neighbor's views. What planting is planned? Will light from windows and outside lights impact neighbors at night? A recorded survey might indicate clearly the status of adjacent "Pine Path", a public right of way that has

been obstructed and is in a neighborhood dispute as to where it's actual boundaries are. Shouldn't a variance be required for building within the setback?

Board action: Project ruled incomplete. Jones, Drexler 4-0

Incompleteness items: 1) Drainage plan; 2) Parking plan showing parking for proposed unit and house; 3) Landscape plan showing screen planting; 4) Lighting plan; 5) Suggest an engineer's report on the feasibility of using the existing foundation, as proposed. Suggest review of Design Review mandatory findings A, D, G. Suggest stepping back from Lavender Lane.