

Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Meeting: September 5th, 2018: 7:00 PM

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

I) Call to Order: 7:01 PM – Doron Dreksler (Chair)

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

II) Approval of meeting minutes – August 01, 2018

AJ motions, LL Seconds, Unanimous approval.

III) Correspondence and Announcements:

A) DD states that the Marin Horizons project will be discussed at the next meeting. He believes there have been some height changes since we last reviewed the project.

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

V) Agenda Items

A) Ogle Lot Line Adjustment (P2049), Vacant Lots along Marin Drive, Mill Valley Parcel Number: 049-231-03 and 09 Applicant: William Ogle, Jr. Planner: Sabrina Sihakom *Specifically, 1,672 square feet of land would be transferred from APN 049-231-09 to APN 049-231-03 Pursuant to Section 22.90.020 of the Marin County Development Code, 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: R1-B1 (Residential, Single-Family, 6,000 square feet minimum lot size) Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single-Family, 4-7 units/acre) Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Area Community Plan*

1. Proposed lot line adjustment presented by the Owner William Ogle Jr.

1. Purchase of small portion of neighbor's lot in order to increase lot size from 4,446 sf to 6,118 sf

Note post-meeting: there is a typo in the Planning document that misplaces the commas and does not represent the areas accurately. The numbers listed above reflect the drawings submitted by the applicant.

B. Public Comment Period Opens; No comments.

C. Board comment period opens;

The Board discussed the project at the last meeting and although there is no letter from the adjacent neighbor, the Board finds no reason the lot line adjustment should not be approved.

D. Board Decisions and Findings;

1. Motion to approve: AM. Second: LL. Unanimous approval.

B) Reineck Design Review (P2108) 522 Tamalpais Drive *The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to remodel and enlarge an existing residence and detached studio and construct a new garage on the subject property. The existing 1,126 square foot residence would be partially remodeled and enlarged to 2,062 square feet primarily through addition of a 747 square foot second story above the remodeled kitchen/dining area. The existing 109 square foot detached studio would be expanded with the addition of a 448 square foot kitchen/living area and bathroom. Finally, a new 480 square foot detached two-car garage would be constructed at the southeast corner of the property. In combination, proposed development would result in a total floor area ratio of 11.2 percent on the 23,357 square foot (0.54 acre) lot. As proposed, the residence, detached studio and garage would attain maximum heights of 27 feet, 16 feet, and 14 feet above grade, respectively. The existing residence maintains a minimum setback of 9.4 inches to the eastern side property line, which would be reduced to 5.1 inches as a result of the addition. The studio addition would be located on the west side of the existing building, with minimum setbacks of approximately 40 feet to the rear*

(north) property line and 66 feet to the front (south) property line. Finally, the proposed garage would be sited with a zero-foot front setback on Tamalpais Drive, 3 feet from the side (east) property line. Design Review approval is required pursuant to Section 22.42.020.A to allow for the construction of new structures and additions to existing structures in the RSP zoning district.
Zoning: RSP-7 (Residential, Single Family Planned, 7 units/acre)
Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single-family, 4-7 units/acre)

1. Proposed project presented by Jack Reineck, Architect:

- A) Existing house and shed to be expanded, retaining existing character, materials and roof slope.
- B) The shed will be expanded to become an ADU.
- C) A new 2 car garage will be added, an existing 1 car garage will remain. There is an additional tandem parking space in front of the 1 car garage.
- D) New roof area at addition to the shed is designed to be added to the drainage leading directly to the stream.
- E) No protected trees will be removed.

2. Public Comment Period Opens;

- A) Neighbor Carl Mogilinicki on Ridgewood has concerns about;
 - 1) The property has a history of construction performed without permits. Garage was issued a permit after it was built, and never would have been approved if it were too close to the stream. Stone retaining walls are a concern too.
 - 2) There is a tremendous need for parking in this neighborhood and the ADU is going to compound the problem.
 - 3) The redwood tree might be damaged by the proposed garage.
 - 4) He is familiar with the property and feels confident the project will need to be demolished and will be a much bigger project than is represented, having a bigger impact on the community.
- B) Neighbor Harrison Voight at 537 Charles Lane -
 - 1) He only received notice of this meeting two hours before the meeting.
 - 2) The road is privately owned and was recently paved. He is concerned that it will be damaged by trucks used during construction.
 - 3) Parking spaces are exceedingly short in the neighborhood. There is a shared parking lot that is only dirt, and the lot should not be used for construction vehicles or workers on the project. It must be restricted for residents only.

3. Board Decisions and Findings;

- A) AJ motions the project should be found incomplete because of the following items;
 - 1) The neighboring houses are not clearly shown on the site plan.
 - 2) The large redwood tree close to the garage is not shown on the site plan.
 - 3) A structural assessment should be performed to establish if this will be a completely new structure or not. It affects the Board's review, fees, etc.
 - 4) The drainage for new roof area should be accommodated in a bioswale or other retention area on site.
 - 5) A thorough research of the permit history should be performed.
 - 6) Proposed height above grade needs to be shown clearly and accurately on the elevation drawings.
 - g) The distance of the proposed garage to the creek needs to be demarcated.
- B) AM seconds the motion
- C) Unanimous approval.

VI) Meeting Adjourned 8:47 PM