

DRAFT: Tamalpais Design Review Board Meeting Minutes

Regular Public Hearing : March 4, 2020

I. Meeting Location :

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

II. Call to Order :

7:01 PM 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 : 2.19.2020
- Motion to Approve as written: AJ 1st/ AM 2nd : 3-0 , DD abstained

V. Correspondence + Announcements:

- LL contacted Code Compliance to see how things are progressing with the Tam Junction signage violations the board brought to their attention last year. Code compliance specialist Erin Yattaw responded that a letter would be sent to the board in the coming week.

VI. Public Comment on Items not on the agenda:

- a) public member, Lee Budish, discussed "NRG" which is the acronym for "Neighborhood Response Group." NRGs are volunteer-led, grass-roots neighborhood groups which use the strategy of "Neighbors Helping Neighbors" to prepare as a community to support one another in the event of wildfire, flood, earthquake and Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS.) for more information, please contact budishlee@gmail.com.
- b) public member in attendance asked about tam junction developments and if the board was aware of the current projects. board stated that most of those

projects have not been reviewed by the board. board discussed that because of the impact and sensitivity of the area, that the board should be made aware of the projects and that it would allow a public forum to review.

VII. Items on Agenda:

A : Trailhead LLC Design Review : 116 Evergreen Avenue, Mill Valley
Assessor's Parcel Number: 048-011-18 | Project Planner: Immanuel Bereket,
415.473.2755 | IBereket@marincounty.org | Applicant: Barry Toronto, 415.302.9563

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to construct a new 441 square-foot detached garage on a 10,200 square-foot developed lot in Mill Valley. The existing residence is 2,982 square feet, and the proposed development would have a building area of 3,423 square feet and a floor area of 2,982 square feet, resulting in a floor area ratio of 29 percent. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 15 feet above surrounding grade and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: eight feet from the southern front property line; five feet from the eastern side property line; 67 feet from the western side property line; and more than 100 feet from the northern rear property line. The project includes the following proposed improvements: construction of a driveway, and general site grading to accommodate the proposed project.

Design Review approval is required pursuant to Marin County Development Code because the project entails the construction of a detached accessory structure in the required 25-foot front yard setback per the R1-B1 (Residential, Single-Family, 6,000 square feet minimum lot size) zoning district.

Zoning: R1-B1 | Countywide Plan Designation: SF6 (Single-Family, 4-7 units/acre) Community Plan: Tamalpais Valley Area Community Plan

Project plans can be found here: https://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects/tamalpais-valley/trailhead-llc-design-review_p2758_mv

PROJECT PRESENTATION + SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION :

- applicant + architect kimberly jessup presented proposed project documents including submitted plans, neighbors letters, and various support docs, images and graphics.

BOARD QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- AJ - fence layout on site plan accurate ? applicant responded yes.

- AJ - how is roof drainage and additional site drainage imposed by the new structure being accomplished ? applicant responded, per department of public works approved 2x2x2 drainage basin at each corner of the garage at downspout.
- AJ + AM + LL- asked about impact to neighboring properties. client / architect responded that the mass/scale has been reduced because of the removal of the upper deck / stair and the minimal impact of the new hip roof design and minimized height of the eave line, smaller footprint and modified location.
- LL- asked if the applicant met with the neighbors ? client / applicant responded yes.
- AJ- the removal of the roof garden / deck is much more in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
- LL + AM - why and how much of the building is in the setback ? applicant - it is impossible to provide for a 2 cars garage with building in the setback, setback is 25 ft and we are 8ft and 19 ft to the property line. the county code 24.04.20 for buildings in the setback has a minimum driveway depth of 18 ft which this project meets. that would allow 2 inside cars and 2 driveway vehicles off of the street
- AM- i still don't understand why you have to have a 2 car garage ? applicant: we want to provide a 2 car garage for both of our electric vehicles
- AM- do you have elevations ? applicant, yes and the eave line is 9 to 10 feet and a max height of 15 ft.
- LL- commented that the board had received 4 letters from neighbors. 3 in support and 1 letter expressed concerns about the project and its effect on neighborhood standards, asking for more time to review the design documents. (letters from 101, 119, 125 and 138 evergreen)

PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS + CONCERNS :

- three neighbors expressed overwhelming support for the project and the efforts the applicant has gone through to improve the building design.
- one neighbor was concerned with building in the setback and if allowed would set a precedence for similar projects. and it should not be allowed. AJ- stated that the county encourages off street parking. AM- commented that the applicant could build a legal 1 car garage that would dramatically effect the view and light from the neighboring property. applicant responded that there are 2 houses with similar garages on the street. AM- responded that

those garages feel a little out of character. AJ + DD- responded that this particular garage actually lines up with the neighboring property and is a different condition. additionally, the neighbor was concerned that the project is not in the character of the neighborhood. AM- stated that the tam plan specifically outlines that projects such as this must meet the character of the neighborhood and should not effect the privacy of the neighbors. and the neighbor commented that the bamboo on the fence blocks his light and view. applicant responded that the bamboo has been trimmed. AM- commented that the fire department does not recommend / allow bamboo to be used as a planting. finally, the neighbor commented that the project footprint has not changed much and should be denied. AM- asked if the applicant provided a shadow study and story poles to show the building height/ location and mass, and it didn't impacted your view, would you approve the project ? neighbor respond : no.

- LL- asked if any significant landscaping would be added. applicant responded that there would be a reduction in plants. AM + DD + AJ- commented that the reduction in fence and plant/ hedge removal would add a lot more light and relief to the street facade.
- AM- asked the neighbor : if the applicant did a shadow study and it showed an increase in light and a reduction in massing, would you approve the project. neighbor responded: no ! you should not allow for any exceptions on this project. AM- continued to respond that if the applicant built a single car garage with a 25ft setback, that it would have a much bigger impact with the neighboring property and asked if the neighbor would be ok with that, neighbor responded, yes, because its legal and i would not be able to say anything for a legal building, built in the legal location.
- AJ- commented that the current design is sensitive and has significantly less impact vs. the initial design that was previously reviewed.
- LL- commented that the hedges are 20 to 25 ft tall and once removed and the garage is built, that it would have much less impact.
- AM + LL - asked owner if they would be willing to trim the existing trees + shrubs ? applicant said that they would not remove them until the project is approved. stating that they provide privacy.

BOARD COMMENTS:

- AM- stated that this project fits the scale, and character of the neighborhood.

- AJ + AM- agreed that the new building would provide more light on the site and to the neighboring property.
- AJ - commented that the project is better, with a fair balance between design and location. would visually encroach less but it is still a balance of relieving the neighbors concerns. the building has been optimized and will be better than the existing conditions.
- AM- commented that the issues could be easily demonstrated with both digital imagery, a shadow study and story poles
- LL- commented , great job, lots of information which is helpful, lots of neighboring support, existing trees are very tall.
- DD + AJ- commented that the tree across the street casts a big shadow on the site and neighboring properties.

BOARD ACTIONS :

Board approved design as submitted:

- AM motions 1st:/ AJ 2nd : 4-0 Unanimous

MERIT COMMENTS :

- the building design is consistent with the character of the neighborhood
- allowing for the proposed setback exception is a better alternative to what could be built behind the setback.
- the board suggests that story poles with eave line, roof line should be required.

B : Review and evaluate the impact of new state laws on the local design review process and consider possible recommendations to the planning staff about changes to the development code.

- board had general discussions regarding the development code and suggested objective standards as described : <https://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/long-range-planning-initiatives/objective-design-and-development-standards>
- also discussed ADU requirements , current bills and code changes and the potential impact to the tam valley region.
- it was agreed that at least one of us should attend the upcoming meetings and report back to the board.

- LL- questions the possibility that maybe one of the ODD meetings should be held in Southern Marin so that Tam Area, Strawberry, and unincorporated Sausalito and Tiburon residents can also be involved?

VIII.Adjournment:

9:06 P.M.

END OF DOCUMENT