

Tam Design Review Board Minutes Public Hearing - December 6, 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, Doron Dreksler, April Post, Logan Link, Andrea Montalbano

D. Approval of minutes of November 1, 2017 with additions + updates (rev 1): Post 1st /Dreksler 2nd : 5-0

E. Correspondence + Announcements: None

- a) Jones received a letter addressed to the board regarding the 330 Ridgeway Ave Project reviewed during the boards September 20th meeting.
- b) Jones discussed Developer Purchasing several properties on the east side of Shoreline and the goal of planning for this area.

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

G. Public in attendance: Norine Bruno, Will Revilock, Alan Harris, Simone, Correa, Tryggvi Thorsteinsson, Erla Dögg Ingjaldsdóttir, Bryon McCarthy, Dolly McCarthy, Sharon Rushton, Raoul Wertz, Rary Abrams, Joan Abrams, Gary Roth

H. Items on Agenda:

- 1. Haddad Design Review, 242 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley** AP# 052-052-09
Applicant: Phoenix Group. LLC/Mill Valley Auto Service Planner: Lorraine Weiss

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new attached 1,500 square foot commercial structure with five car bays on a developed lot with an existing 3,400 square foot building at 242 Shoreline Highway in Mill Valley. A 1,600 square foot building was previously demolished. The 1,500 square foot building on the 13,312 square-foot lot would result in a floor area ratio of 37 percent. The commercial structure would reach a maximum height of 20.0 feet above existing grade.

Design Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.42.020 because the property is within a Planned Zoning District, CP. Zoning: CP (Planned Commercial), Countywide Plan designation: General Commercial/Mixed Use Land Use.

- **Project presentation:** Architect Will Revilock with WSR Architects presented the proposed project.
- **Project support documentation:**
 - a) 24 x36 plans
- **Initial Board questions:**
 - a) Board: Are you doing anything to filter the water or protect drains that comes from the shop? Architect: “No”
 - b) Board: The owner disposes all required toxic waste as required.
 - c) Board: Are you aware of the tam plan maximum height requirements? Architect “Yes”
 - d) Board: Is the height needed? Architect: “No”
 - e) Board: The Height needs to meet the Tam Plan requirements, Did you think about a flat roof or lowering the roof to 15 ft? Architect: “No”
 - f) Board: The Proposed Design is over the maximum FAR, Why? Architect: The Space is workable for the owner.
 - g) Board: There is a 1965 use permit for an auto repair but the Tam Plan does not encourage this use in this location, According to the county, it sounds like the use permit is valid but that needs to be verified.
 - h) Board: This is a sensitive site, shouldn't Design Review see all of these types of projects to reinforce the Tam Plan goals? Is the County protecting these types of lots for development?
 - i) Board: The street frontage needs improvement, can we suggest improving both walkability and landscaping?
 - j) Board: The red racing stripe on the building needs to be eliminated. Architect: “I think we can do that and I think the client would not have a problem.”
- a) **Public comments + questions:** Concerned about pollution entering the Marsh. I suggest the following: 1) I prefer no Industrial use is allowed, So Make sure the Use Permit is verified. 2) Minimize Building Size by meeting the 35% FAR and the maximum building height of 15ft. 3) Since the building is raised 2 ft., Does this mean the maximum height is 13 ft ? 4) The view from the homes that are above the site is a concern and I would prefer that no vehicles are visible and should be stored inside after hours. 5) The County wide plan encourages returning the area to marsh based on the requirements defined in the Baylands Corridor of the Marin County wide plan.
- b) This property as well as others in the area are subject to change with sea rise, liquefaction and it exists in a tidal wave zone.

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

- a) Board: We need to vote on the project as it is presented.
- b) Board: “I am inclined to say okay to the project but establish clear conditions regarding building height and FAR.
- c) Board: We should also mention drainage and some sort of filter / separator and that the project should meet the federal requirements for the clean water act because it drains into the marsh.

- **Board Findings:**

Approval status:

Submission found to be complete and the Board approved the project with the following conditions:

- 1) The County staff should verify that the Use Permit is current / active and Approved.
- 2) The County staff should verify the impact of the site grading / buildup and the effect on the maximum building height of 15 feet.
- 3) The building needs to meet the maximum 35% FAR requirements. Additionally the County needs to address the site buildup to a new datum
- 4) Simplify Building color pallet by removing the red stripe.
- 5) Verify the Building and Site run-off requirements and make sure the project meets the most stringent requirements.
- 6) Project should add improvements to the street frontage walkability and landscaping that follows the landscape guidelines.

Montalbano 1st / Link 2nd: 5 -0

Board Merit comments: None

2. **Zingaro Design Review**, 1251 Waterview Drive, Mill Valley AP #048-233-05
Applicant: Laura Kehreiein Planner: Evelyn Garcia

PROJECT SUMMARY

This project was reviewed by our board on October 4, 2017. The applicant has submitted revised plans modifying the project addressing concerns raised by neighbors and the review board.

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new 203 square foot addition, and 563 square foot deck along the rear of an existing single family residence in unincorporated Mill Valley. The existing building area is 3,263 square feet and the existing floor area is 2,737 square feet. The proposed development would result in a building area of 3,466 square feet and would result in a floor area of 2,940 square feet. The proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 16.8 percent on the 17,500 square foot lot. The proposed addition would reach a maximum height of 19 feet 6 inches, and the deck would reach a maximum height of 30 inches from surrounding grade. The project is proposed to be the following distances from the property lines,

and right of way: 23 feet from the western side property line, 72 feet from the eastern side property line, and 5 feet from Skyline Terrace right of way.

Design Review approval is required because the project is in a planned zoning district.

- **Project presentation:** Architect Laura Kehreirein presented proposed project.
- **Project support documentation:**
 - a) 24 x36 plans
- **Initial Board questions:**
 - a) Board: Any neighbors informed? Architect: “No”
 - b) Board: The Neighbors were concerned with the decks intrusiveness, and noise.
 - c) Board: Landscape not included? Architect: “No, but we intend on doing a Landscape Plan”
 - d) Board: Will you address the drainage and roof runoff? Architect: “Yes”
 - e) Board: Are you willing to show the neighbors the landscape plan? Architect: “Yes”
- **Public comments + questions :**
 - a) Why can't the Landscaping be part of the plan ? It is intended but not included.
 - b) Moving the main wall back by 40% is good
 - c) Neither the owner or the Architect contacted us.
 - d) Drainage is a big issue
 - e) Landscaping is important to maximize privacy
 - f) I would prefer that the deck on the open portion of the property would be converted to a patio to minimize the “stage effect”.
 - g) Construction Vehicles should not be allowed to use Skyline Terrace during the construction of the project.
- **Final Board questions + comments:**
 - a) Board: Good Landscaping is a key element because of the impact on Skyline Terrace.
 - b) Board: Neighborhood involvement with Landscaping is important.
 - c) Board: The landscape plan should incorporate local native plants and drainage elements the disburse the runoff on the site.
- **Board Findings:**

Completeness: Submission found incomplete.

Approval status:

Board recommends that application be rejected based on missing landscape plan and drainage plan Montalbano 1st /Dreksler 2nd : 5 -0

Board Merit comments: None

3. Harris Design Review and Lot Line Adjustment, 420 Laverne Ave, Mill Valley AP#047-112-62

Applicant: Julia Minarc

Planner: Evelyn Garcia

PROJECT SUMMARY

This is the second transmittal to the Tamalpais Design Review Board. This project was heard at the May 17, 2017 public hearing.

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new 2,981 square foot single family residence, with a 442 square foot garage on a vacant lot in unincorporated Mill Valley. The proposed development would have a building area of 3,423 square feet and a floor area of 2,981 square feet. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 25 percent on the 11,719 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 24.5 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks: 26 feet from the southern front property line, 7 feet from the eastern side property line, 39 feet from the northern rear property line, and 11 feet from the western side property line.

The applicant requests Lot Line Adjustment approval to adjust the lot lines between two contiguous legal lots of record as described below:

Assessor's Parcel Number	Street Address	Existing Area	Proposed Area
047-112-62	420 Laverne Ave	11,719 sq. ft.	12,406 sq. ft.
047-112-29	412 Laverne Ave	58,319 sq. ft.	57,632 sq. ft.

Specifically, 687 square feet of land would be transferred from APN 047-112-29 to APN 047-112-62.

Design Review approval is required because the project is in a planned zoning district. Lot Line Adjustment approval is required because the project involves adjusting lot lines between two adjacent parcels where land is taken from one parcel and added to an adjacent parcel without creating more parcels than originally existed.

Zoning: RMP (Residential Multiple Planned)

Countywide Plan Designation: MF2 Low Density Residential

Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais

- **Project presentation:** Architect Tryggvi Thorsteinsson and Landscape Architect Gary Roth presented proposed project.

- **Project support documentation:**
 - b) 24 x36 plans
 - c) ipad presentation

- **Initial Board questions:**

- f) Board: The Story poles helped
- g) Board: Can the pool be covered? Architect: “Yes”
- h) Board: Were neighbors made aware of the project? Owner: “Yes”
- i) Board: The Driveway and Retaining wall layout in improved and looks better
- j) Board: The irrigation plan should use smaller emitters with staggered watering time to minimize erosion
- k) Board: Hiring a local landscape Architect is a great addition

- **Public comments + questions : None**

- **Final Board questions + comments: None**

- **Board Findings:**

Completeness: Submission found complete.

Approval status:

Board recommends that application be accepted and approved.

Post 1st /Dreksler 2nd : 5 -0

Board Merit comments: None

4. Election of TDRB officers for 2018

Board Nominated Dreksler as incoming Chair and Montalbano as Secretary / Vice-Chair

Post 1st /Jones2nd : 5 -0

I. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment:

Board reviewed plans form Charlie Barrett Associates

J. Adjournment: 8:51 P.M.

K. Document Revisions:

TDRB is advisory to the Marin County Planning Department.

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

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