

# **Tamalpais Design Review Board Special Meeting Minutes**

## **Regular Public Hearing : 09.02. 2020**

### **I. Meeting Location :**

online virtual meeting via ZOOM

### **II. Call to Order :**

7PM Logan Link : chair

### **III. Board Members Present :**

Logan Link (LL) : chair

Doron Dreksler (DD): secretary

Alan Jones (AJ)

Andrea Montalbano (AM)

### **IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes :**

- meeting minutes dated : 7.15.2020, 7.29.2020, and 8.5.2020 : Approve as written: AJ 1<sup>st</sup>/ AM 2<sup>nd</sup> : 4-0 Unanimous

### **V. Correspondence + Announcements:**

1. AM - met with dennis rodin]deni regarding the Weismann project. Specifically Discussed project density issues and the fact that the county wide plan is more restrictive than the tam plan. Also discussed the legal issues surrounding the deed restrictions which may not hold up to scrutiny.
2. LL - informed the board that brian crawford is no longer with the county and a replacement has not been announced / position is open.
3. LL- announced that the alta way project that we previously reviewed will most likely be back for a second initial review. AM- commented that it may be back as an initial review to reset the 5 max meetings requirement.
4. LL- stated that she attended a first stake holders meeting for the objective design standards. Further stating that the meeting was a general overview and introduction with 8 or so members including developers, environmental and county employee members as well as a consultant. LL stated that the board is not very diversified and no architects are in attendance. AJ- asked who was running the meeting - LL responded , Jillian and the consultant. AJ- responded, that is concerning..... that plus the lack of county evolvment. LL- stated that

Julian would be sending out a recap to the meeting and that she would keep the board aware and updated.

5. AJ- informed the board that the assembly bills that involve high density developments have either stalled, not passed or passed after the required timeframe. Further stating that SB1120 was voted on and got 42 votes, which is over the required 41 votes but was voted on after 12 midnight. Further stating that Levine voted against it but McGuire is in support and a co-sponsor. AJ- further stated that his pet project ,”raising the homes and adding raised walkways to reinvigorate the marsh” is something he is going to present.

## **VI. Public Comment on Items not on the agenda:**

None

## **VII. Items on Agenda:**

### **A. Long Design Review**

address: 926 W. California, Mill Valley

Parcel number: 050-011-09

Planner: Sabrina Cardoza, 415.473.3607, scardoza@marincounty.org

Applicant: Terry Long

Project Summary:

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct a new 54 square-foot detached accessory structure (garden shed) on a developed lot in Mill Valley. The 54 square feet of proposed development would result in a building area of 1,204 square feet. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 10 feet above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 18 feet from the southern front property line; five feet from the eastern side property line; 30 feet from the western side property line; over 50 feet from the northern rear property line.

Design Review approval is required pursuant to 22.20.090.C.1(b) because the project entails the construction of a detached accessory structure located within the required 25-foot front yard setback of the governing R1-B1 (Residential, Single-family, 6,000 square feet minimum lot size) zoning district.

#### PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- Jesse Pearson (owner) explained that he unknowingly built a garden shed 2ft to 3ft over the front yard setback and that he is in the process of bringing the structure into compliance.

#### BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AJ- asked if the applicant has talked to the neighbors. applicant responded: yes, and they are all fine with the shed. AJ- the structure is a little troubling, but if the neighbors are okay, I would be inclined to approve. In one way it really sticks out, does not blend in, towering from the street. I am in a bit of a dilemma on the project.
- LL- I feel the project has a fairly minimal impact except that it sets a precedence that is not acceptable. LL- asked : does the shed have plumbing, electrical or heat ? applicant responded : "no". LL - the curb appeal of the house is nice, can you match the siding and color of the house ? , applicant responded : I could do that. LL- maybe you can add landscaping to the front to make it disappear.
- DD- I don't agree with painting the building the same as the house, I think the building is more like a fence and should be a part of the landscape. This is not a house, it's a simple shed in the landscape. applicant responded: yes, the intent was to allow the exterior materials to weather and turn gray. adding that he used salvaged redwood. DD- moving the ladder will help plus the landscape, as mentioned, to the front edge.
- AJ- I agree, it's an auxiliary structure and should be treated in natural finish/ materials. LL- agreed and stressed that the precedence is the key issue.
- LL + AM- added that landscape heavily would help.

#### PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- none

#### BOARD ACTIONS :

AM motions 1<sup>st</sup>: motion to approve the application recognizing that the structure does not represent a precedence. / AJ 2<sup>nd</sup> : 4-0 Unanimous

#### Board Merit comments:

- move the ladder out of public view
- shield front edge with landscaping , climbing vines , green fence etc.
- strongly recommend non-painted, more natural exterior treatment.

## **B. Pine Hill Design Review**

address: 503 Laverne Avenue, Mill Valley

Parcel number: 047-141-14

Planner: Megan Alton, 415.473.6235, malton@marincounty.org

Applicant: Eric Layton

### Project Summary:

The applicant requests Design Review approval to construct a new 3,160 square foot residence which includes an attached garage and Accessory Dwelling Unit on a vacant lot in Mill Valley. The new development would consist of 3,160 square-feet of total building area and 2,400 square-feet of total floor area, which would result in a floor area ratio of 29 percent on the 8,160 square-foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 25 feet above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 9 feet from the northeastern front property line; 18 feet from the southeastern side property line; 26 feet from the northwestern side property line; 11.76 feet from the southwestern rear property line.

Design Review approval is required because pursuant 22.42.020.B because the lot is substandard in size based on slope.

Zoning: R1

Countywide Plan Designation: SF6

Community Plan: Tamalpais Community Plan

### PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- eric bytons, Architect, indicated that he was hired after the client/owner had done substantial demolition without a permit and that he initially reached out to code enforcement to discuss the process to bring the project into compliance.
- architect indicated that his client wanted a larger home with an ADU.
- architect further explained that he took into account the impact of the new structure on neighboring properties and explained that the story poles will be erected in the next couple days and the new structure follows closely to the original. that the drainage design meets the county requirements. indicated that one of the larger trees by the driveway would be removed based on health which is indicated by the arborist reports. and that parking for the ADU is provided on the street.

#### BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AJ- i am confused by the footage , can you explain further ? applicant, explained the footage and the current code as it relates to the ADU. AJ- i am not accustomed to deducting the garage and the ADU, but if that is the current code, i guess it isn't something we can comment on. AJ- what is the garage size ? applicant responded: it is located in the same location and relative size as the original home. AJ- how do you meet parking requirements, the single car garage does not meet parking.... ? applicant responded: there is car in garage with another one in the driveway, AJ- tandem ?, applicant responded: yes. AJ- this looks questionable to me. AJ- i am also concerned with the live oak impact during construction, it could be a looming monstrosity without the oaks. applicant responded: other than the unhealthy tree, that will be removed, the roots will not be impacted by the new construction , or updated utilities.
- LL- 1 car in the garage, 1 parking spot on site and no ADU parking is required ? applicant: correct. AJ- street parking doesn't count in the calculation , its shared. LL- agreed.

#### PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- none

#### BOARD COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AM- this is a good looking project, with quality materials . it seems reasonable to me. LL- i agree with AM. LL- it seems reasonable plus no neighbor objections. DD- i agree. AJ- i do not agree

#### BOARD ACTIONS :

AM motions 1<sup>st</sup>: Board recommends that application be approved / DD 2<sup>nd</sup> :  
4-0 Unanimous

#### Board Merit comments:

- monitor and minimize the impact to the live oak trees
- parking and drainage are critical for this site and need to be carefully reviewed by public works
- any exterior materials that deviated from the approved plans, would require additional design review approval. we recommend providing a 24x36 sign with color 1/4"=1'-0" street elevation(s) with all exterior materials indicated and positioned to allow public viewing before and during construction.

### **C. Adobe Madera Use Permit and Design Review**

address: 265 Shoreline Hwy, Mill Valley

Parcel number: 052-051-16

Planner: Immanuel Bereket, 415.473.2755, ibereket@marincounty.org

Applicant: Negar Safapour and James Kime

#### Project Summary:

The applicant requests Conditional Use Permit and Design Review approval to construct a new 1,750-square foot dental office on a lot developed with a 2,400-square-foot structure. The 1,750 square feet of proposed development would result in a floor area ratio of 28.3-percent on the 6,176 square foot lot. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 28 feet, 3 inches above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 61 feet from the west front property line; 1 foot from the north side property line; 1.5 feet from the south side property line; and 1 foot from the east rear property line.

Conditional Use Permit approval is required because the project proposes a use, medical services, that is subject to Conditional Use Permit approval in the RMPC zoning district, pursuant to Marin County Development Code Section 22.12.030. In addition, the project involves new construction of a nonresidential building in a planned development district and thus requires Design Review approval, pursuant to Marin County Development Code Section 22.42.020(A).

Zoning: RMPC (Residential, single-family, planned, commercial)

Countywide Plan Designation: SF6

Community Plan: Tamalpais Community Plan

#### PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- james kime presented a new dental office building located where the current adobe pet hospital. mr. kime, indicated that the ownership was a team dentist and included moving an existing mill valley dental practice to this location. also, added that the building was designed to meet the tam plan requirements, specifically the village concept. adding that the building is located in a flood zone and that the new finish floor meets the code requirements, also the building as designed is a 28.4% FAR with is under the 30% maximum for the site and that the ridge line height is 28.25 ft which is under the maximum 30 ft.. further adding that the exterior is wood and stucco and that they have neighbors feedback letters in support of the project and are in process of receiving more feedback.

## BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- LL- well done presentation. i appreciate it.
- AM- can you explain the exterior space behind the front volume ? is it exterior space ? applicant responded: yes . AM- is it included in the FAR ? applicant : no
- LL- regarding the materials, are the colors on the presentation accurate ? because the massing model and the 3d imagery dont match. applicant responded: color / materials are accurate to the intent, dont want to be obnoxious, want visually appealing. LL- i personally like darker colors
- AM- it feels like you felt pressure to fit into the existing architecture which is exactly what we don't want. the pitched roof with no overhang does not fit in. the existing building is not great. we encourage you to read the tam plan - "semi-rustic character", more earthy textures and darker colors.
- AM- we prefer a clear architectural concept, more warehouse and less walgreens. big danger following bad examples like walgreens. make the building more contemporary.
- applicant team response : 3D drawings do not match the plans / actual design. we will fix that.
- AM-DD- are you keeping all existing walls ? applicant response : yes
- AM- where did the hip roof come from. applicant team response : ownership team asked for a hip roof. also, because the hip roof helps with rain and drainage. AM- maybe think about a parapet design with shed roofs and flat roof areas. it would be much more interesting / appropriate.
- AM- are the side and rear setbacks right minimized. applicant: yes. its important to the board to improve the front edge, like a sidewalk. also in front of the building entrance, maybe a trellis or awning. also the big areas of asphalt would be better if limited to backup. maybe plant along the western edge to minimize the expanse. also maybe different materials would be much more attractive.
- LL- i agree with AM. blending with local buildings isn't a positive. more contemporary like proof lab is a better direction. also, darker color pallet, darker roof. also consider the residential views from above, amp up the landscape, like double it and shield the cars if possible. landscape the front edge, shield the dumpster is also important.
- AJ- i agree with previous suggestions. adding that its an appropriate use, community serving, good scale, i encourage you to move forward.
- AM- did you consider moving the building to the front edge ? applicant team: yes, not enough space to meet the 1:250 s.f. (1750 bldg requires 17 parking locations)

- DD- i agree with most of the suggestions to improve the building and site previously mentioned .this project seems to be driven by engineering rather than architectural design which is unfortunate. DD- do you have a signage plan ? applicant: no, but we want to do something similar to the existing signage on the site. DD- that is not a good idea, maybe try integrating with the existing adobe like brick block front wall. DD- regarding the parking, did you try alternating the parking so that there are landscape areas between or maybe some vertical / stacked parking on the trash can side. applicant: it doesn't work, this is the only way to fit 17 cars. DD- i disagree. . i would prefer to see the cars parking on asphalt and the more permeable surface more visible. maybe even a drive on plant material. DD- about the building, the shape and form of the building could be solved in a much more interesting way, more in keeping with the preferred design direction mentioned by the board. a single shed roof or a butterfly roof that covers the entire building drains in a single spot, maybe water capture barrel, also darker windows. applicant team response: this is what the owner wanted. DD- also, if you look at the adjacent buildings and the landscape in the background, there are lots of opportunity to shape the building and clad the builing in a much more interesting and appropriate way.
- applicant team engineer: we looked at parking maneuverable + turning circles and this is the only way it works. also, regarding roof drainage, we could use a parapet with flat roofs, its doable

#### PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- none

#### BOARD COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AM- great use, great location, look forward to see what you come back to the board with
- LL- nice presentation and a great conversation

#### BOARD ACTIONS :

AM motions 1<sup>st</sup>: Board recommends that application be rejected based on incomplete design / plans as presented / LL 2<sup>nd</sup> : 4-0 Unanimous

## VIII. Informal Review :

### D. consultation for Peace Lutheran Church at 205 Tennessee Valley Road, Mill Valley.

#### PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- Applicant sebastian stein explained that the current operation is not financially feasible and therefore the board is looking for options to maintain the current community services, support red cross sister needs as well as current organizations utilizing the facility. the applicant proposed a property split maintaining the existing church on the front property and a residential property, existing parsonage, starting at the back edge of the church parking lot at the rear. the access to the residence will be by an existing shared driveway through the church parking lot. the applicant indicated that the rear property would be sold and the proceeds would be used to stabilize the financial needs for the church facility going forward.
- applicant explained that several subdivision plans have been attempted in the past and rejected, including: 1) 1980's attempt, 2) memory care facility 3) two single family homes and added that all where rejected based on noise, and/or traffic impacts.

#### BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AM- this seems like the type of solution that would result in the least amount of push back. to bad that it is not more community orientated. seems like an easy process, all the buildings are existing, and the zoning is appropriate.
- LL- we like the previous presentation for the preschool. do you know the property size for each ? applicant: no. LL- are you selling the house (parsonage) as is ? is it livable ? applicant response: yes, the pastor lives in the house now ? it is liveable. LL- how do you access the house, through an easement ? applicant response: yes, there is an existing drive access through the parking lot and it would require an easement to maintain the access.
- AM- what are the age of the buildings ? applicant response : 1958 to 1960 i think
- AM- what use would a buyer have for the single family home ? LL - would it attract a developer ? AM- the site looks steep, what are the views from the site ? applicant : "amazing" adding that the existing property is zoned single family. AJ- you could enlarge the existing home with minimal impact. LL- its hidden, seems like a smart angle.

- LL- did you connect with the planners ? applicant: yes, we sent out a letter but haven't heard anything back. LL- a general planning email now exists, i will forward it to you.
- applicant asked how the board would respond to this application :
  - AM- FAR relates to lot size and steepness, house is existing, good spot, setbacks could be an issue but all doable, i have no issue.
  - AJ- i agree, the community wishes for the church to exist. minimal impact solution, everything exists already.
  - applicant response: we are here to serve the community, maintain education and the other functions the facility already supports which wouldn't change and hopefully would grow. AM - we would love to host a meeting at the facility, is it possible ? applicant : happy to discuss.
  - community member (mary ann griller) - indicated that the driveway is currently shared / multipurpose
  - LL- i agree with the rest of the board, would love for the church to stay, seems sensible + doable

**V. Forthcoming projects reviewed without comment:**

None

**I. Adjournment:**

9:33 P.M.

**END OF DOCUMENT**