

Tam Design Review Board

c/o April Post, Chair 314 Marin Drive, Mill Valley

August 20, 2014

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Post

Board members present: April Post, John McCormick, Jim Bramell, Patrick LePelch, Alan Jones

Meeting attendees: Mike Dunia, Eliz Dunia, Susan Keauper, Bill Washauer, Sam Kapukchyan, Armen, Nersisya, Kevin Gordon, Stephanie Gordon

Minutes for August 6th, 2014 were approved as submitted: Jones/ Brammel 5-0

The following matters were discussed not concerned with projects under review:

Allen requested discussing the web site at the end of the meeting.

Correspondence: Post referred to a letter she sent to the editor of the IJ regarding an article printed in regards to a project reviewed by the T.D.R.B. The article in the IJ referred to tree removal from the site. And that no possibility for public review was available. There were calls from people to Post and Jones regarding the article. Posts set the record straight in regards to the review that came before the board. Editor will clarify and correct the matter.

The following projects were reviewed:

1. 14 Madrone Park Circle, Mill Valley

Project ID 2014-0253

Applicant: Daniel McKenzie Planner: Heidi Scoble

Proposal for 2,732 s.f. new house on a down-sloping lot. 2nd Review of the project.

Applicant presented the project, explaining that the house had been revised in location, shifted in angle and pushed back from the street so as to provide additional room for cars backing in and out of the garage. Two additional off street spaces are provided and are not impeded by the power pole or the fire hydrant. A construction management plan was included in the package, showing on site parking during construction and carpool provisions for workers. This management plan was shared with neighbors in the community. 1 foot of depth in the garage and 1 foot of width in the stair was provided to allow more backout space for cars in front of the garage.

Post asked if applicant reviewed the e-mail sent with suggestions on design modifications and input. Applicant had not yet had time to review it. Applicant explained that since the house was pushed back to the rear property line they were not able to step the house down the hill to break up the severity of the rear wall as requested in the first meeting.

Bramell asked about 3 or 4 major oak trees taken down and if they were taken down with permits. Applicant explained that they 18" or less and that they were not required to have a

permit. Bramell also asked what landscaping was being planned to mitigate the severity of the downhill facade.

Applicant indicated that trees were to be added below the house to screen the house from homes below. The landscape plan, however showed that no proposed trees were added. Bramell reiterated the need for screening and also asked how high are the trees going to be. Board members indicated that this needed to be reflected in the landscape plans.

The drainage plan was reviewed. Bramell expressed his concerns that the dissipaters, as shown, would not be enough to handle the load of water from the roof area of the house and garage. The applicant indicated that Oberkamper, his civil engineer, said his plan is sound and will handle both the flow off the street as well as the flow from the roof. Dissipaters were moved up the hill as was requested in the first meeting. McCormick suggested that the public works department be advised to pay special attention to the proposed design to make sure that it was designed to handle the loads and that it would not sheet downhill to adjoining properties.

Post requested that the applicant illustrate how the permeable paving request was addressed. Review of the landscape plan revealed that the paving of the stairs, the entry patio and the parking area were scored concrete but not permeable paving as requested in the first meeting.

Post also pointed out that there were still not enough native plants in the design. She observed that in the Project Status Reports from the County, that the current requirement is 50% native planting.

Questions and comments were opened to attendees in the audience. One neighbor requested clarification of the ordinance regarding the lot being non-conforming. Lot is half the size allowable size per the zoning. Jones explained that the lot was created as a substandard lot, but before the slope ordinance was put into effect. Alan questioned whether the lot should be allowed to be developed. Can parking be accommodated? Jones requested clarification on the side yard set back as 6 feet. The applicant explained that the project is set back a minimum of 6' on both sides.

Another neighbor asked if there additional review boards in the process? Post explained that it does go back to the planner at the county. The T.D.R.B. is involved with reviewing the project against the Tam Plan. Post mentioned that if neighbors had comments, she encouraged them to send letters to the planner in charge.

The gable in the back exceeds the height limit by several feet. No sections were taken through this but from other sections, it is clear evident that the gable exceeds the height limit. McCormick proposed that the gable element was small and should be allowed since it was such a small element. LePelch disagreed and indicated that the gable was at least 8 feet across at the base of the gable and exceeded the height limit by at least 3 to 4 feet.

Another neighbor indicated that the garage roof at the apex impedes her view of the valley. Bramell asked that the applicant consider reducing the ceiling height from 9 feet to 8 feet to lower the height of the roof.

Alan indicated he was willing to find the project application complete as long as the project strictly adhered to the required setbacks and 30' height limitations set forth in the Tam Plan

Motion to find project complete with conditions that the project strictly meet the height and setback requirements- Lepelch/ Jones 5-0

Motion to approve with condition that project is reviewed by planner with regards to the height and setback requirements, and the other Merit comments are addressed satisfactorily

Jones/ Leplech 5-0

Merit Comments:

- 30 height limit and setbacks should be strictly adhered to
- Two additional cross sections should be taken at various points through the building
- Permeable paving at patio stairs and guest parking should be installed
- Dissipater drains have county engineering review the capacity
- Parking radius graphics to illustrate adequate visibility for on-coming traffic and backing out of driveway apron from garage
- More trees on the downslope side should be planted
- The Gable on the rear elevation at the top should be eliminated to meet the height limit
- 21 Madrone view is impeded by the garage
- Design Review Mandatory Findings were reviewed to assure all finding for approval were reviewed

Vote to accept Merit Comments – LePelch/ Bramell 5-0

2. 327 Loring Ave.

Applicant: Nersisyan Residence Planner: Heidi Scoble

Project I.D. 2014-0288

Applicant presented the new design for a single family residence on three levels.

Applicant explained that the house was designed to step up the hill and reduce offhauling. 4 parking spaces are provided on-site. The lot is very steep.

Applicant explained how he arrived at FAR calculations, helped explain difference between transmittal and measured amounts. Transmittal appeared to reflect the habitable and garage square footage. Applicant explained that the zoning allowed for 5' setbacks and not 6' as questioned by Jones.

Applicant was asked how much dirt was removed? Was a construction management plan provided?

Bramell asked if trees were to be removed? No heritage trees are proposed to be removed.

Landscaping plan illustrated that perennials and native plants are proposed and a pool is proposed as well.

Drainage plan- dissipater drains are proposed. Post indicated that it was the County's policy not to dissipate at street level into the street due to the impact on the surrounding creeks...high flood area for overflow and flooding. A request was made collect and percolate on site. Applicant stated his apprehension about percolation on site due to the slope as well as the minimal surface area and that the percolation would unduly load the retaining walls with hydrostatic pressure.

The TDRB questioned the appropriateness of the pool....not an appropriate use for this area. We simply don't have the water to sustain swimming pools.

A neighbor also commented on their concern about a pool based on the water shortages.

LePelch commented on the thoroughness of the drawings and the completeness of the information presented. He had concerns, however about how the house sat in the context of the neighborhood and that it appeared to be a 4 story house based on the design elements. He commented on other elements on the front of the façade and how they might be altered to reduce the scale of the house on the street.

Brammel commented on the colors illustrated on the 3-d rendering and that the stucco appeared too light and too contrasted against the other, darker materials. LePelch agreed, and they both suggested that the colors be muted and more earth toned, rather than what appeared to be white or nearly white stucco.

Jones commented that he thought the house was pushing the envelope on what he would deem acceptable. It has a very urban sensibility in this suburban environment.

Motion to find incomplete Jones/ LePelch 5-0

These materials were requested to complete the application:

- A Color material board
- The top of the railing should be made lighter, more like the top railing
- The roof should be made less massive by reducing the overhang slightly and reducing the thickness of the fascia
- The base should be modified so that the front does not appear to be a 4 story house. i.e. raise the stone base
- Appropriate landscaping should be provided on the side yards for anticipated future development which will be close to the subject property
- The pool should be removed from the proposal due to retaining walls, excavation that would be required and the impact that the pool would have on the local water consumption

Applicant requested to send in the interim his design ideas to Post for review. Post indicated that the proper procedure was to send changes to the planner and that the planner would forward them to her.

3) Board previewed, without comment, an application that will be on the next agenda.

4) Jones presented the status of the website and options for how it might be changed or upgraded to a free service. It was agreed that the web site was redundant with respect to the county's website and other resources. The web site has not been revamped or changed in over 1 year.

LePelch motioned that a web site is not necessary and should be eliminated. Jones indicated that, despite the agreement, this was not an item on the agenda and could not be voted on. Jones suggested thinking further about it and making it an item on the agenda for the next meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.