

# **Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes**

## **Regular Public Hearing : February 5, 2020**

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

The Cabin, 60 Tennessee Valley Rd., near Hwy 1.

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

7:02PM 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 : 1.15.2020
- Motion to Approve as written: AJ 1<sup>st</sup>/ AM 2<sup>nd</sup> : 4-0 Unanimous

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

- LL - reviewed discussion with Michelle Levenson regarding new ADU + JADU current requirements. The county will be processing an emergency Ordinance to Meet the State requirements. Because this would allow significant density for each lot, AM - stated that there should be a requirement for a minimum outdoor private space and DD- commented that this would effect how we deal with site drainage and the offsite impact. The board agreed that we should stay in touch with the county and access the potential impact to our area. The board agreed to prepare a letter to the county and stress the need for the board to review such projects in our jurisdiction as well as other concerns.
- LL - introduced Doug Wallace who has applied for the open seat on the board.

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

None

## VII. Items on Agenda:

**1 : Lotus Hotels Mill Valley LLC Sign Review** | 160 Shoreline Highway, Mill Valley  
Assessor's Parcel Number: 052-371-09  
Project Planner: Sabrina Cardoza, 415.473.3607 | scardoza@marincounty.org  
Applicant: David Ford, 510.387.0546

### Project Description:

*The applicant is requesting Sign Review approval to install a new 32 square-foot, non-illuminated free-standing sign on an improved lot developed with a "Holiday Inn Express" hotel building in unincorporated Mill Valley. The free-standing sign is proposed to reach a maximum height of sixteen feet above surrounding grade and is proposed to be located approximately two feet, eight inches from the northeastern rear property line. The proposed sign would be constructed of one green-colored box consisting of a white-lettered logo and a blue-colored box consisting of a white-colored letter. The base of the sign would be three feet, three inches wide and would be constructed of prefabricated cement and stone veneer.*

*Sign Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Code Section 22.60.020.A.2.a because the project entails the installation of a freestanding sign.*

*Zoning: CP (Planned Commercial)*

*Countywide Plan Designation: GC (General Commercial, FAR = 0.10 to 0.30) Community Plan (if applicable): Tamalpais Area Community Plan*

*For more information on this application, please visit the Planning Division's website at: <http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects>. Project plans and other documents related to the application are available on the project's webpage, where you can subscribe to receive email notifications and updates.*

### PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- Applicant David Ford presented proposed project and the documents previously provided to the Board.
- Applicant is asking for signage with more visibility from 101, and additional lighting

### BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AJ - commented that the existing sign was previously approved, but marginally. Also indicated that the Tam Plan encourages more of a neighborhood than a commercial center.
- AM - asked if the applicant read the Tam Plan, The applicant indicated that he did not. AM- commented that the Tam Plan requires a smaller sign, more natural colors, not as tall and natural materials.
- LL, AJ, DD - all commented that the Tam Plan specifically states that the marsh area is not the appropriate spot for a sign

- public commented that the light from the sign is not appropriate in the marsh area and would damage the nature of the area
- AJ - stated that the sign can not be back lit and lighting is a big issue in the area.
- LL- stated that the Marsh is a type of natural preserve; it needs to be respected, with minimal improvements. It is also key to keep the marsh area dark and natural as possible.
- AM - commented that the base of the sign, as presented looks like it was not calculated as part of the size of the sign. That and the height of the sign do not meet The Tam plan requirements.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- public concerned with lighting and glare in and around the marsh. any lighting would impact wild life and is therefore not appropriate
- sign seems to be excessive in size and height (15 ft seems very tall) (seems bulky)
- plans are not to scale and could be misleading
- please review the Tam Plan sections LU10.0 through LU 10.3A

BOARD ACTIONS :

Board recommends that application be denied based on two findings:

1. Inappropriate Size, Scale, Height, color , and lighting.
  2. the Tam Plan discourages signage and improvements in the marsh region.
- AM motions 1<sup>st</sup>:/ AJ 2<sup>nd</sup> : 4-0 Unanimous

**VIII. Informal Review Items not on Agenda:**

**1 : 234 + 240 shoreline (old uhaul + dorman architects building)**

PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- Ownership and Design team presented a multiuse 2 story building with retail at lower floor and office on upper floor and front loaded parking facing shoreline. building was designed to be 30ft high utilizing a conceptual barn layout similar to healdsburg SHED.
- Additional Site concepts were also presented and discussed
- owner commented that he wanted something viable and that gives back to the community

BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AM- asked if the applicant read the Tam Plan ? applicant replied no

- AJ - commented that 15ft was the maximum allowed building height on that side of shoreline.
- AJ- suggested that a master plan strategy should be developed for all of the buildings on that side of shoreline and an overall strategy of minimal impact for all the sites near the marsh
- DD- suggested of the possibility of a multiple use building with a few living units mixed in
- AJ + AM- seeing all that parking from shoreline is a negative. the building is similar to walgreens which is not what we want to see
- AJ + AM- seeing the marsh would be preferred. applicant suggested maybe a roof garden to maximize view. board agreed
- AJ- stated that many people in the area want to see the property go back to marsh land
- public comment- Tam Plan specifically outlines protecting habitat and planning for sea level rise
- board agreed that a building with actual frontage, laid out in an east-west orientation and a parking area on one side is preferred with a maximum 15ft building height as outlined in the Tam Plan, with a roof deck
- AM + AJ- commenting that creating a landscape + pedestrian front edge at shoreline what be a big positive
- AJ + DD- liked the idea of a multiuse building that keeps the site active and vibrant
- design team stated that possibly a small pop-up restaurant could be included
- DD- commented that possibly food trucks could be part of the strategy
- LL- siad it is important to continue the funky vibe of the existing buildings and activities that are near the site. tam valley has become cool
- LL + DD- parking is important and impacted later in the evening
- AJ +DD- front edge along shoreline is encouraged to encourage public access, define a clear pedestrian vs vehicle access + use by creating a buffer.
- public commented that earthquakes, tsunamis, and sea level rise must be considered and that the applicant should read the Tam Plan section LU10. also stating that based on the tam plan, a special study needs to be done that looks at the site impact and the impact of endangered species

## **2 : 337 Marin Avenue (Angel Moore)**

### PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- Angel Moore discussed and presented the existing house and possible improvements that they are considering. including:

- 1) uniform the exterior of the building with a simple roof, rather than the existing multiple roof pitches.
  - 2) enclose some of the exterior patio spaces.
  - 3) and/or create an second floor addition.
- owner described a previous mud slide and that the property has been inspected and that there isn't any additional risk of unstable soil

**BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :**

- AM+AJ- suggested she check the Tam Plan to see the maximum floor area ratio (appendix B) and the effects of the calculation based on the slope of the property
- AM- suggested that a certified survey is needed to help define the actual property line and the setbacks and possible buildable area plus verify the slope of the property to further define the maximum FAR
- DD- said the certified site plan and building location will help define the maximum building height for a potential upper floor addition.
- DD- said that the owner should also look at the drainage requirements for the project. owner stated that the lot above the property drains onto there site, AJ- stated that that does not sound like it meets the code.

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

None

**X. Adjournment:**

8:59 P.M.

**END OF DOCUMENT**