

Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting: May 16th, 2018: 7:00 PM

Meeting Location: Tennessee Valley Log Cabin; 60 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley

I) Call to Order: 7:07 PM – Doron Dreksler (Chair)

Board Members Present; Andrea Montalbano, Doron Dreksler, Logan Link, Alan Jones

II) Approval of meeting minutes – May 02, 2018

AJ, LL, Unanimous approval.

III) Correspondence and Announcements:

A) Bothin Marsh Sea Level Rise Workshop – Expect summary of meeting from Tam One and other parties (AJ)

B) Alta Way Project – Richard Halstead of Marin IJ called AJ to ask for a quote about the County's final report. AJ said the County did a very thorough and good job and they referred to the Tam Plan quite a bit in their report.

IV) Public Comment on Items not on the agenda: None.

V) Agenda Items

A) Branch Variance Review, 14 Brighton Blvd, Mill Valley 94941 APN: 045-253-22

Applicant: Molly Branch Planner: Inge Lundgaard

PROJECT SUMMARY: The applicant requests Variance approval to construct a 1,045-square foot addition directly below your existing residence in Mill Valley. The 1,045 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 25.5 percent on the 12,333-square foot lot. The addition would reach a maximum height of 9 feet above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks: 41 feet from the northern front property line; 5 feet from the eastern side property line; 75 feet from the western side property line; 39 feet from the southern rear property line. Variance approval is required because the proposed under-story addition encroaches 5 feet into the 10-foot side setback. Zoning: R1-B2 (Residential Single Family 10,000 sqft lot) Countywide Plan Designation: SF5 (Single Family 2-4 units/acre) Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan

1. Proposed Design presented by the applicant and architect;

A. Applicant explains:

1. The house is slowly sliding down the hill and they need to do a structural upgrade.
2. While they are doing all of this work it is most cost effective to install a slab and enclose the space now, for future use as an ADU or additional living space some time in the future.

B. Public Comment Period Opens:

1. Next door neighbor Harold Dittmer is present.
2. He states his house is only 4-1/2 feet from the property line, which is incorrectly shown on their drawings.
3. The existing grade on the north wall is actually higher than it is shown on the applicant's plans and the excavation will therefore be deeper than is reflected.
4. He is very concerned there has not been a geo-tech report and the excavation required for the new foundation would damage his property.
5. Their existing shed is on the property line and is supported on a bracket that is screwed

into a wall on his property.

C. Board comment period opens;

1. Do you have a drainage plan? Answer; yes, but it is not included in this set.
2. How is the “storage” area to be accessed? Answer: some terracing has been suggested, and there are some landscape steps shown.
3. Terracing is generally discouraged by the County, although at times it is unavoidable. The applicant should be very careful about how much terracing will be done and where.
4. There is a serious lack of parking on the property and street and this large potentially habitable area will make it very tempting for you or a future owner to put in a rental unit. It is impossible to tell what the impacts would be because there is no evidence of a worked through plan for the space.
5. The existing storage shed was built without a permit. It is within 5'-0" of the property line and is a fire hazard. Modern code requires the wall to have a one hour fire resistance rating. This should be upgraded along with any other work.
6. If a structural upgrade is required, leave some of the walls open and leave the slab out. This would greatly reduce the cost of the project.
7. If the deep foundation was pulled back, away from the property line, no variance would be needed and the impacts on the neighbor would be reduced.
8. This is a substantial addition, and it is undetermined as to what its potential impact on the neighbors would be. Without a proper plan showing how parking and room layout of this space would impact neighbors – privacy, noise, etc. it is difficult to approve it. Without more information on the future use of the space it is incomplete.

D. Board Decisions and Findings;

1. Motion; AJ, LL; The project is incomplete because of lack of drainage and landscape plan, inaccurate grade drawn on north elevation, and lack of plan for future use of large lower level addition and its supportive documentation. Three yeas. Motion carries. (AM abstains from vote because she is a close neighbor of the applicant.)

B) Boben Variance Review , 815 Autumn Lane, Mill Valley, APN 049-212-14

Applicant: Matthew Owens

Planner: Jeremy Tejirian

PROJECT SUMMARY: This is the second transmittal. The Accessory Dwelling Unit Permit portion of this application has been withdrawn. The applicant requests Variance approval to construct a new 442 square foot addition to a 2,455 square foot house. The 442 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of over 30 percent on the 9,525 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 12 feet, 6³/₄ inches above surrounding grade and would have the following setbacks from the exterior walls: 25 feet from the east front property line; 12 feet from the north side property line; 12 feet 9 inches from the south side property line; 4 feet from the west rear property line. Variance approval is required because the project is proposing additional floor area to be added to existing underfloor area within the rear setback of the property. An accessory dwelling unit permit is required because the project also proposes to add an accessory dwelling unit in the underfloor area of the existing house. Zoning: R1-B1

Countywide Plan Designation: SF6, 4-7 units/acre Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan

1. Proposed Design presented by the applicant

A. Applicant explains:

1. She removed the application for an ADU because the sewer fee for a second unit was very

expensive.

2. The only other thing that has changed is that they have decided to enclose one wall of the carport.

B. Public Comment Period Opens; No comments.

C. Board comment period opens;

1. The FAR is 30.41% which is over by a very slight amount.
2. The project was never approved by the Board and so now it needs to be voted on.
3. There are two parking spaces available in the carport, then one as tandem, for three total parking spaces.
4. Although the application for the ADU was withdrawn, we need to look at this as a potential rental or Air B&B because it can only be accessed from the outside, not from inside of the house.
5. The plans here show a fireplace on the West wall, but the applicant says there is no fireplace. The Board is concerned that they are not looking at the correct plans that have already been through the Building department.

D. Board Decisions and Findings;

1. Motion; AM, AJ; The project should be approved but the Department of Public Works should review the parking situation. 4 Yeas, Motion carries.
2. Merit comments:
 - A) If parking is a problem, the applicant should remove the kitchenette from the project.
 - B) There should no windows allowed on the West wall.

C) Yarnold Lot Line Adjustment Review, 134 & 138 Homestead Blvd, Mill Valley 94941 APN: 048-051-27 and 048-051-28

Applicant: Rebecca & Jonathan Yarnold Planner: Inge Lundgaard

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The applicant is requesting Lot Line Adjustment approval to transfer 290 square feet between two contiguous legal lots of record as described below, pursuant to conditions of approval of the Yarnold Variance and Design Review, project number P1735:

Assessor's Parcel #	Street Address	Existing Area	Proposed Area
048-051-27	134 Homestead Blvd	7,780 sq. ft.	7,780 sq. ft.
048-051-28	138 Homestead Blvd	7,500 sq. ft.	7,500 sq. ft.

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, pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.90.020.

Zoning: R-1 (Single Family Residential)

Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Community Plan

A) The applicant is not present.

B) Public comments; Neighbor reviews the plans and says it will not affect anyone in the neighborhood negatively.

C) Board Comments: It appears a reasonable exchange in order to make the existing buildings meet setback requirements.

D) Board Decision and Findings; Motion to approve; AM, AJ, 4 Yeas, motion passes.

VI) Meeting Adjourned 9:25 PM