

**Tam Design Review Board Minutes  
Public Hearing – May 13, 2020**

**Acting secretary: Alan Jones**

**A. Meeting Location:** : Virtual meeting on Zoom.

**B. Call to order:** 7:10 PM Logan Link, Chair

**C. Board Members Present:** Logan Link, Andrea Montalbano, Alan Jones, Doug Wallace

**D. Correspondence + Announcements:** None

**E. Public comment on items not on the agenda:** None

**F. Public in attendance:** Stephen DeLapp, Sarah Estes-Smith

**G. Item on Agenda:** Discuss the County's Objective Design and Development Standard (ODDS) project and timeline, and consider the best approach for board involvement / recommendations. Public comment welcome

1. LL reported two phone conferences the past week with Jillian Zeiger, lead staff person for the ODS project, and Brian Crawford, Community Development Director.
  - 1.1. LL expressed to them our concerns from the last meeting
    - 1.1.1. We had wished to offer our input and encourage others to offer input but the deadline is coming soon.
    - 1.1.2. The website does not indicate clearly what information is being solicited nor what the purpose of the objective design standards might be.
    - 1.1.3. The survey offered for public input is unclear and does not offer the opportunity for thoughtful input.
    - 1.1.4. The examples offered in the survey did not seem to represent a comprehensive set of options for possible design standards.
  - 1.2. LL was assured by Mr. Crawford that:
    - 1.2.1. The deadline for public input into the first phase of the process would be extended until approximately July 15.
    - 1.2.2. The introduction to the survey would be modified and/or another more localized survey would be added to broaden the options for public input.
2. AJ reported on telephone conversation with Supervisor Kate Sears:
  - 2.1. KS acknowledged that her understanding of the main aim of this process was to craft standards that would comply with the new State mandates and at the same time retain and optimize local control in the process wherever possible.

- 2.2. KS applauded TDRB interest in being an active part of this process and encouraged us to respond by suggesting creative solutions to the current affordable housing crisis which we might recommend implementing in our area.
- 2.3. AJ pointed out concerns, which he has shared with the board, that the affordable housing situation together with the suburban sprawl which exacerbates it are the result of longstanding movements over the past 70 years together with the policies which supported them, so solutions will also be complicated and will take time and resources to implement effectively. Creative local input will be critical to this process.
- 2.4. KS and AJ agreed that environmental concerns such as sea level rise and fire, as well as the need for transportation, utilities, and public services infrastructure further complicate the problem.
3. The following questions were raised and discussed:
  - 3.1. How best to get detailed information about new State laws?
  - 3.2. How will the new laws and objective standards impact the Design Review process?
  - 3.3. What will and will not be subject to ministerial review?
    - 3.3.1. Relevance of potential flood areas?
    - 3.3.2. What parts of our area are in the applicable critical fire zone?
  - 3.4. What are the proposed stages of this County process and at which stages will public input be solicited?
4. What are "objective" design standards and how can they best be utilized?
  - 4.1. A lot of details can be included in these standards.
  - 4.2. We should check to see what has been implemented in other communities.
  - 4.3. AM has had some past experience in developing these standards.
  - 4.4. SDeL offered that any process of ministerial review is subject to the opinions of staff as well as the lobbying by applicants of public officials hence the presence of clear standards is critical.
5. What should the role of TDRB be in developing objective design standards and in addressing the ongoing challenge of existing and possible new State laws?
  - 5.1. LL to write letter to BC thanking him for his information and for extending the input deadline and indicating that we wish to be active in the ongoing process.
  - 5.2. TDRB will solicit input from our community regarding the recommended standards.
    - 5.2.1. We will prepare a draft of our own survey of local residents to be reviewed and approved at our next meeting.
    - 5.2.2. LL and AM will work on the draft.
    - 5.2.3. The outline should be clear and limited to a number of key points which are easy to understand.

5.2.4. We will contact TCSD, TVIC, Homestead Homeowners, and other community groups to help distribute the survey.

5.2.5. Question whether, and if so how, to post on NextDoor.

5.3. TDRB will explore options for contacting State officials to weigh in on the current legislation relating to development and local control.

5.3.1. Could we follow up on our recent meeting with Sen. McGuire?

5.3.2. Are there other ways to be active and are we willing to take it on?

**H. Adjournment:** 8:25 P.M.

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>