

Tam Design Review Board Minutes Public Hearing - May 17, 2017

A. Meeting Location: The Cabin, 60 Tennessee Valley Rd., near Hwy 1.

B. Call to order: 7:05PM Alan Jones, Chair

C. Board Members Present: Alan Jones, Doron Dreksler, Logan Link, Andrea Montalbano

D. Approval of minutes of April 5, 2017: Dreksler/Link 2nd, 3-0 (Andrea Montalbano abstained)

E. Correspondence + Announcements:

- a) Alan received a letter from Kate Sears regarding John McCormick's contribution on the board.

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

G. Public in attendance: Alan Harrison, Steve Bouchard, Hideho Okada

H. Items on Agenda:

- 1. **Okada Design Review**, 359 Durant Way, Mill Valley 94941 AP# 200-302-40
Applicant: Paul Okamoto Planner: Tammy Taylor

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a 194 square foot front entry addition and a new carport and storage area on a developed lot in Mill Valley. The 194 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 45 percent on the 5,665 square foot lot. The proposed front entry addition would reach a maximum height of 20 feet above surrounding grade, and the carport would reach a maximum height of 12 feet 6 inches. The front entry addition exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 35 feet 3 inches from the west front property line, 0 feet from the north side property line, 28 feet from the south side property line, and 88 feet from the east rear property line. The carport would have the following setbacks from the property lines: 0 feet from the west front property line, 24 feet from the north side property line, 13 feet 11 inches from the south side property line, and over 88 feet from the east rear property line.

Design Review is required because the project is in a Planned Zoning District. Zoning: RMP 2.5 Residential Multiple Planned. Countywide Plan designation: MF2 Low Density Residential.

- **Project presentation:** owner presented the proposed project.
- **Project support documentation:**
 - a) set of plans by architect Okamoto Saijo
- **Initial Board questions:**
 - a) Alan: are neighbors aware of the plan. Owner responded yes

b) Montalbano: asked about the FAR and the rules for a planned unit development. Alan, commented that the FAR exceeds the standards but it appears to be part of a planned development where higher density was allowed.

c) Link: asked if there was a neighbor across the street, owner response, no

- **Public comments + questions :** none

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

a) Alan: project does not have any impact on landscaping

b) Alan : drainage is a challenge on such a small lot

c) Link: open space below the site should help with dissipating runoff, Alan commented that everything should be done to dissipate the runoff on the site and that rocks should be added at water discharge areas

d) Alan: roof above carport doesn't add more area to the drainage

e) Alan: the design minimizes the impact on neighbors

f) Montalbano: good looking design

- **Board Findings:**

Completeness: Submission found complete. Dreksler / Montalbano 2nd, 4 ayes

Approval status:

Board recommends that application be accepted Dreksler / Link 2nd, 4 ayes

Board Merit comments: recommend controlling and dissipating runoff on site if possible.

2. **Harris Design Review**, 420 Laverne Ave, Mill Valley, AP # 047-112-62

Applicant: Julia Minarch Planner: Evelyn Garcia

PROJECT SUMMARY: 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.

Design Review approval is required because the project is in a planned zoning district. Zoning: RMP Countywide Plan designation: MF2 Low Density Residential

- **Project presentation:** owner presented proposed project.

- **Project support documentation:**

a) Architects plans, drainage plan, and landscape plan

- **Initial Board questions:**

- a) Link: why was the project recently on the market? owner said he was testing the market
- b) Montalbano: is this a spec house? will it be built + sold? owner said no, I will move in if costs are in check
- c) Dreksler: how much soil is being displaced / moved? owner responded, I don't know.
- d) Jones: previously parking was a problem on the project and I don't see the parking access clearly shown on the revised plans.

- **Public comments + questions : none**

- **Final Board questions + comments:**

- a) Design / Building location + orientation:
 - Jones/ Dreksler/ Link/ Montalbano: The house location and added parking platform looks down on the neighboring property and will minimize privacy and may seem imposing
 - Jones / Montalbano: concerned with the character of the design but agreed that you should be able to build what you want.
 - Dreksler: appreciated the design, materials and overall arrangement, thought that the forms and massing + the things like the green roof would yield a good building and it would be even better if the landscape component was further developed. Would like to see more 3d drawings showing the relationship of the building to the site and the immediate buildings in the area that may be impacted.
 - Dreksler / Jones / Montalbano/ Link: the driveway / access arrangement seemed a little heavy handed and could be improved
 - Montalbano: the built up parking area is imposing on stilts and it is not clear what the retaining wall arrangement looks like
 - Jones: said we need to see all of the retaining walls to see the impact to the site and to the neighbors
- b) Landscaping:
 - Jones / Dreksler/ Link/ Montalbano: the landscape plan does not clearly describe the existing landscape and the integration of the new plantings. Additionally, the plantings need to be California natives particular to the site and it would be nice if those plants also provided habitat similar to the native plants in the area
 - Dreksler: reminded the board that the construction process will have an effect on the existing plant materials and this will need to be taken into account with the landscape plan
 - Dreksler: landscape / demo plans must clearly show trees being removed and suggested that if any trees are protected, an arborist report would be helpful
 - Dreksler: suggest having the landscape architect present the project
- c) Neighbors:
 - Dreksler: suggest getting letter from neighbors to help with the approval process
 - Link: all the windows could effect the neighbors "light house effect"

- Jones / Dreksler/ Link/ Montalbano: suggested getting feedback / approval letters from the neighbors

d) Drainage:

- Jones: the plan does not clearly show roof drains, driveway drainage integrating with the drainage system
- Jones / Montalbano / Link: concerned with impact of potential pool drainage. Will it drain downhill to the creek if the pool is required to be drained?
- Jones: reminded the owner that people are concerned with runoff and the health of the creek and suggested that every effort be made to minimize any potential impact.

e) Topography + Building Height:

- Montalbano / Dreksler: natural grade not shown clearly on elevations and sections and therefore the building height line is not clear. Would be nice to have a couple full site/building sections showing existing and proposed grade info as well as the building

- **Board Findings:**

Completeness: Submission found incomplete. Dreksler/ Montalbano 2nd - 4 ayes

Approval status:

Board recommends that application be re-submitted to address issues raised (see notes below) Dreksler/ /Link 2nd - 4 ayes

Note:

Board Suggests that the Applicant address the following items:

- install story poles
- provide cut + fill calculations and indicate areas on plans with retaining walls
- provide diagram of parking and turn around access at driveway
- provide neighborhood plan showing neighbors homes and the creek.
- provide more information (imagery) of the parking deck design with retaining wall and enhanced planting to minimize impact
- provide additional information on the landscape plan, including showing plant materials removed, new plant materials with California native plants particular to the site

Board Merit comments: None

I. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment: None

J. Adjournment: 8:45 P.M.

K. Document Revisions: None

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>